

S P E N S E R • N E W S L E T T E R

WINTER 1994 • VOLUME 25 • NUMBER 1

MAIN
DISPLAY

THOMAS COOPER LIBRARY
MAY 19 1994
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA

Handwritten signature in cursive script, likely reading "E. J. Dees".

PR
2368
29
574

V. 25
1994

EDITOR: JEROME S. DEES

SPONSORED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

b.

CORRESPONDING EDITORS:
ELLEN M. CALDWELL, DONALD CHENEY, SHOHACHI FUKUDA,
A.KENT HIEATT, RITCHIE D. KENDALL, RICHARD D.SCHELL.
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT: TODD K. RAMSEY

•
CONTENTS

TO OUR READERS	1
BOOKS: REVIEWS AND NOTICES	
<i>Edmund Spenser's Poetry</i> . Ed. Hugh MacLean and Anne Prescott. 3d ed.	1
Goldberg, Jonathan. <i>Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities</i>	5
Halpern, Richard. <i>The Poetics of Primitive Accumulation</i>	8
Kinney, Clare Regan. <i>Strategies of Poetic Narrative</i>	11
Milward, Peter, Ed. <i>The Mutual Encounter of East and West 1492-1992</i>	13
Rhu, Lawrence. <i>The Genesis of Tasso's Narrative Theory</i>	13
ARTICLES: ABSTRACTS AND NOTICES	15
MEET ME IN SAINT LOUIS, 1994	21
ANNOUNCEMENTS	24
SPENSER AT KALAMAZOO, PROGRAM 1994	27

The *Spenser Newsletter* is published three times a year, Winter, Spring-Summer, and Fall, by the Department of English at Kansas State University. Please address all communications to *Spenser Newsletter*, Department of English, 122 Denison Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506-0701.

The editor solicits letters containing news of any sort which would be of interest to Spenserians, and will make an effort to print any legitimate inquiry. He also solicits abstracts and/or offprints of articles (with full publication data, please), the receipt of which may reduce the time between publication of the article and the report on it.

Subscription rates, institutional and private: \$6.50/yr in USA, \$6.50/yr (US funds or equivalent) in Canada, \$11.00/yr US in Latin America and overseas. These rates are for Vol. 24, 1993, and for Vol 25, 1994.

TO OUR READERS

94.01 The several slight changes of format that some readers may assume are yet another manifestation of the Editor's error-proneness are in fact intended. This issue marking as it does the commencement of *Spenser Newsletter's* silver anniversary, it seemed appropriate to celebrate it in some small, unobtrusive fashion. Other somewhat more obtrusive plans for celebration are pending.

I direct the attention of all *SpN* readers, but especially our far eastern ones, to the request in item 94.28.

I also remind readers, once again, that the most fool-proof way to assure that your article gets abstracted in a timely way is to send us a photocopy (accompanied by your own abstract *if that was a requirement of your journal*). Or, if it's a matter of saving costs, at the very least send a note instructing us where to find the article. Your sending them is especially useful in cases where the title does not clearly indicate *Spenser* (e.g., item 94.13) or where the journal itself is not listed in the MLA Bibliography (e.g., item 94.11).

Finally, I wish to express my gratitude to those Corresponding Editors who came to my rescue by providing several abstracts of articles for this issue--Don Cheney, Ellen Caldwell, and Kent Hieatt. Their efforts have enabled *SpN* to make small strides toward getting back on its wonted schedule.

BOOKS: REVIEWS AND NOTICES

94.02 *Edmund Spenser's Poetry*. Ed. Hugh MacLean and Anne Lake Prescott. 3d ed. (New York: Norton, 1993). xiii + 842 pp. \$13.95 paper.

I. What's There

Given this reviewer's delay, most Spenserians have already seen and many have used the third edition of *Edmund Spenser's Poetry*, for which Hugh MacLean has been joined by Anne Prescott. For those who haven't seen it the news is good. The Norton *Spenser* has been since its appearance in 1968 the most useful selection around, and the latest edition is the best. It stands an inch taller and half an inch wider than earlier editions; the old cramped format has now been replaced by larger borders and greater space between stanzas, making the new book a pleasure to use. Students now have margins to write in. The third edition is also substantially longer than the second: there are six hundred and fifty pages of poetry (an extra hundred pages) and 160 pages of criticism (slightly more, given page size, than in

the second edition). The editors have updated the excellent notes and developed further the incisive afterwords to the individual poems.

Probably no major English poet lends himself so poorly to selection as Spenser. He wrote nearly three times as many lines as Milton (the shorter poems alone are about as long as *Paradise Lost*); and his work is notoriously varied, complicated and self-echoing. Any selection has to omit much that's important. In dealing with *FQ*, one has to choose between including all the "great" passages and including the rest of the Books which help determine their force and meaning. (Heninger's Riverside Selection did the latter, including all of I, II and VI and the *Mutabilitie Cantos* but none of the intervening passages). The changes in the selections of the poetry, like everything else about the edition, show the editors' balance and judgment. Of *FQ* they have retained Books I and III and *Mutabilitie* complete, offering as well substantial portions of II and VI: they have added Alma's castle to the excerpts from II, in part "to respond to recent critical attention to bodies masculine, feminine and politic" (x), and Book VI now comes complete from Canto ix to the end. The Temple of Venus has been dropped to make room for these changes.

The most welcome addition to the shorter poems is a complete and beautifully edited *Amoretti and Epithalamion* but the book adds *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* as well and retains *Muiopotmos* and *Prothalamion* from earlier editions. Of *The Shepheardes Calendar* it contains E.K.'s Epistle and six eclogues--Jan, Feb, (replacing June), April, Oct, Nov, and Dec. To make room for the additions the editors have omitted the *Fowre Hymnes*, a text better for graduate than undergraduate teaching. The one absent shorter poem I would have liked to see is *Mother Hubberds Tale*, a work so different from Spenser's others that if we lacked it we would be hard-pressed to imagine his writing it.

This edition lends itself to many purposes. A class interested in pastoral can find representative selections from *SC*, *Colin Clout*, and the last cantos of *FQ* VI as well as the pastoral sections of Books I and III and *Proth*. Spenser's treatment of love appears in *SC*, *Am and Epith* and *FQ* III. The Ovidian *Muiopotmos* is there to be played against the reworkings of Ovid in *FQ* III and *Mutabilitie*, while Spenser's mildly obsessive concern with the court from which he was absent most of his life appears in various guises--in April, Oct, the House of Pride, parts of Book III, *Colin Clout* and, somewhat confusingly, *Proth*. Spenser's habit of making fictions from the materials of his own life, staging himself in different roles, appears throughout.

II. The Way We Live Now

The greatest changes come in the appended criticism which, as the editor's introduction suggests, provides "a full and fair sampling of the way we live now, in Spenser studies" (xi). The first edition, published in 1968, devoted more than a quarter of its space to criticism written before the twentieth century. To make room for more criticism from the 1960's and 1970's, the second edition (1982) reduced these earlier pieces to three, two of which (part of Hughes' 1715 Preface and several pages of Coleridge's lectures) survive here

along with Camden's account of Spenser's death. The third edition revises strenuously again. Of the fifteen critics included in the first edition, six remain, along with four more from the second edition, many represented by different and often reduced selections. To those ten selections have been added fifteen others, most of them written since 1975.

While these essays differ in focus, method and conclusion, the Spenser who appears in them is more troubled and the poetry both more conflicted and funnier than in earlier editions. Helgerson's chapter from *Self-Crowned Laureates* focuses on Spenser's uncertainty about his role as a poet; Giamatti's piece on processions argues for his gradual disillusion with the public facade of language; David Miller's Lacanian piece on the dance of the Graces suggests that in celebrating Colin's Acidalian vision both Spenser and his readers are buying into a desperately wished illusion of privacy. A related development foregrounds the uncertainties of Spenser's allegorical method: the "Editor's Note" on *FQ* contains a new paragraph describing these uncertainties as essential to the allegory:

It is precisely this sense of human confusion that should console the beginning reader of Spenser if he or she becomes puzzled. . . . In this Fairyland heroes and villains are somehow often related to each other and even perverted magicians like Archimago and Busyrane exert an art that is not the opposite of Spenser's own but a disturbing parody of it. The epic, then, shows the difficulty of seeing, reading and identifying, of figuring out where and who we are and what we should be doing; it is as much about epistemology as about morality, politics and cosmology. (495-96)

At the same time the essays develop a fuller sense of Spenser's comedy, not only in Martz's classic piece on *Am* (held over from earlier editions) but in Anderson's account of the overtones of "pricking" in the first line of the first book and Nelson's discussion of Spenser's playfulness about his fiction-making (these latter both revert to *Sir Thopas* and the Chaucerian connection).

While the selections' center of gravity has shifted from the sixties to the seventies and eighties, their range is wide and much of the recent work is still recognizably the offspring of the earlier criticism. Individual new approaches tend to be represented by one or two selections--New Historicism by Helgerson and Montrose, feminism by Suzanne Wofford. The editors seem above all to have looked for essays which had interesting things to say, and which would pair interestingly with other essays.

III. Reservations

While I'm likely to use this edition for my class in 16th-Century Literature until the fourth *Edmund Spenser's Poetry* appears, I'm not sure that the book as it stands is fully adapted to its probable audience. The Preface doesn't speak about the intended readership, but it seems primarily meant for an undergraduate course in Renaissance poetry though it might also serve as part of a Graduate survey. It's obviously sensible for the publisher to interest as many readers as possible. Yet an undergraduate's needs differ from those of a

graduate student. In particular, graduate students need to become members of the community of critics--to learn about and eventually to master the critical traditions of the texts they study. Undergraduates--as I see it, at least--need to develop a more elementary ability to make sense of texts in terms of ways of speaking--their diction, syntax, images, characteristic tonal shifts, etc., and to learn how to do that by themselves. This may mark me as a closet New Critic but I'd argue that the issue is primarily pedagogical. In my experience undergraduates in the habit of looking to the critics rarely acquire the basic skills they need to stand on their own literary feet.

At times the notes to the new edition tend to manifest a centrifugal tendency, sending the undergraduate reader out to the critics listed in the expanded "Select Bibliography" at the end. The edition has adopted the MLA style of reference which enables one to make citations in less space, and there are many more citations in the notes than there were in the second edition. (The note on the opening stanza of the Proem to Book I, for instance, contains references to five critics where the note in the second edition mentioned one.) The citations are apt and helpful for the teacher who hasn't looked at recent bibliography, but I'm not sure what undergraduates are likely to make of them. Perhaps the ideal reader for the book is the undergraduate who goes on to graduate school, buys a complete *FQ* and uses the Norton to supplement the information in the rapidly dating bibliographies of the standard editions.

I'm further uncertain whom the 160 pages of excellent critical materials at the end of the book are meant for. Where there's a good argument to be made for putting a series of critical essays at the back of a single novel like, for instance, *Jane Eyre*, producing at once an edition and a casebook, the function of the criticism is vaguer when one is appending it to the lifework of a prolific poet. While graduate students may find the excerpts helpful, the selection is bound to be too limited and the individual essays usually too abbreviated for serious graduate work. Yet they take up space that might otherwise accommodate additional poetry. In the place of these critical materials one might, for instance, include *Mother Hubberds Tale*, *The Temple of Venus* and the rest of Book VI. I think that if the essays were omitted my students wouldn't notice their absence, and while I would miss them I'm suspicious of my reaction: it seems to me compounded of a vague sense that the criticism gives the book a kind of special authority, makes it "complete" and puts something between me and the vertiginous uncertainties of the text. I think that comfort is largely illusory.

The editors did not of course invent the book's problematic format which is standard for the very popular Norton Critical Editions, and they have made the best of it. They've not only chosen good essays but arranged most of them in mini-casebook fashion: there are three essays (Berger, Maccaffrey, Alpers) on *SC*, four on *Muiopotmos*, two on *Am*, two (Tonkin and Miller) on the dance of the Graces on *FQ* VI, three more on the House of Bussyrene. Roche and Hamilton deal back to back with Spenser's allegory and they are joined by Frye's essay on the imagery of the poem, which insists on a different organizing principle for the book. This kind of pairing allows undergraduates to see that no one critic

is automatically right and sends them back (one hopes) to the evidence that the critics cite.

William A. Oram
Smith C

94.03 Goldberg, Jonathan. *Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1992. xvi + 295 pp. \$37.50 cloth; \$12.95 paper.

The subject of this important book is a complex of contradictorily defined cultural practices that Jonathan Goldberg prefers to call *sodometries* rather than *sodomy*, since, as he puts it in his preface, the less common term implies something "relational . . . a measure of whose geometry we do not know, whose (a)symmetries we are to explore." His "guiding supposition" is that by "exploring terrains of confusion in the Renaissance" he is also exploring "sites of present confusion" (18). The *dual* focus made explicit here is maintained throughout the book, both in its organization and its strategies of argumentation. Some may find it a *divided* focus.

The book is arranged in three pairs of chapters, in which the first attempts "a more generalized survey of the field," while the second focuses on the practices of specific authors. Spenserians are likely to find their interests most engaged by Part I: "'Wee/Men': Gender and Sexuality in the Formation of Elizabethan High Literariness," whose general chapter, "The Making of Courtly Makers," is followed by "Spenser's Familiar Letters," an expanded version of the essay that originally appeared in *SAQ* 88 (1989): 107-26 as "Colin to Hobbinol: Spenser's Familiar Letters" (abstracted in *SpN* 89.37). Part II is devoted to the Elizabethan theater, with chapters entitled "The Transvestite Stage: More on the Case of Christopher Marlowe," and "Desiring Hal." Part III shifts geographically to the new world, where its general chapter seeks to "dis-cover" the political imperatives that led the early English colonizers to demonize the natives as sodomites, and its specific one is given to a cultural analysis of "Bradford's 'Ancient Members' and 'A Case of Buggery . . . Amongst Them.'" An "Introduction: 'That Utterly Confused Category,'" situates the book in relation to the U.S. Supreme Court's 1986 decision in *Bowers v. Hardwick*, whose denial of any right of privacy for consensual homosexual acts of sodomy makes appeal to laws enrolled in English statute books in the sixteenth century. The concluding "Tailpiece" recounts a published exchange between Marvin Liebman and William Buckley over the former's public announcement of his homosexuality, an exchange that, in Goldberg's view, testifies to "the continuation . . . of the calculated misrecognitions that structure the terms of brotherhood in the . . . letters penned by William Bradford to his fellow governor . . . or even in the familiar letters that constitute Elizabethan high literariness" (249).

Conceptually, Goldberg's argument evolves from the writings of Foucault on the history of sexuality by way of Alan Bray's groundbreaking work *Homosexuality in Renaissance England* (1982); methodologically he performs "deconstructive analyses" that "seek to see what the category [of sodomy] enabled and disabled" (20). He is at pains to insist that he is "doctrinaire" neither in his allegiance to Foucault nor to deconstruction. He

appears to have read most of what's been written over the last dozen years in the ever-burgeoning fields (see, it's unavoidable) of gender theory, gay and lesbian studies, and the history and theory of sexuality--and, I might add, he reads not just critically, but combatively.¹ He wishes that his colleagues--chiefly the New Historicists and feminists (whose work constitutes "the most important critical interventions in Renaissance studies")--will view the book as a "call to engagement with the issues raised" (22). Some, I suspect, will view it as an invitation to a brawl. Few are those who escape without the charge of being misogynist, homophobic, or heterosexualist. The following sentence is thoroughly typical of Goldberg's critical stance and prose style, whose difficulty some will find sinuous, others torturous:

I've had, too, insofar as it seemed impossible to write this book and not to take on Shakespeare, to deal with more traditional criticism (Shakespeareans are, when so self-identified, definitionally coincident with that designation), but I've been less concerned to point out its most egregious lapses (Joseph Pequigney's *Such is My Love*, however banalizing and dehistoricized its readings are of what it calls homosexuality in the sonnets, nonetheless does a thorough job of demolition when it takes on prevailing desexualizing readings of those poems), than to suggest how it, like the more "advanced" historicist and feminist work produced around Renaissance texts (including Joel Fineman's formidable *Perjured Eye*), functions under the assumption that the only genuine form of sexuality one might find in them is heterosexuality. (21)

In general, the strategy of each chapter is to begin with a close reading of a specific, circumscribed Renaissance text (in Chapter 2, it is the final anecdote of Book II of Puttenham's *Arte of English Poesie*; in Chapter 3, lines 55-60 of Spenser's Januarye) whose aim is to show how the text is at odds with itself; from there, Goldberg relates the passage to other texts, social as well as literary, and situates his own reading within the current critical-theoretical field; finally, he subjects the most powerful or influential of those current readings to a critique whose aim is to reveal the pernicious distortions that result from their ideological blindness to any matters sexual that deviate from the entrenched norms of heterosexual relations designed to perpetuate the patriarchal inheritance system. Thus the main focus of each chapter basically moves from "Renaissance texts" to "modern sexualities."

One of Goldberg's major leitmotifs is that other critics, no matter what their theoretical orientation or political stripe--the only exception is Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick--have

¹Goldberg's notes contain what may well be the fullest list of up-to-date books and articles available on gender studies, gay and lesbian studies, and the history and theory of sexuality, certainly as these pertain to the early modern period. But because there is no bibliography, many readers may find themselves as irritated as I at having to spend so much time searching through the notes to find again names and titles that I recalled having seen earlier.

attended inadequately or not at all to the crucial difference between "gender" and "sexuality." This is true even of Alan Bray, whose work Goldberg relies on and admires, and whose conclusions underlie his own argument at every point:

If *sodomy* is the term most proximate to *homosexuality* in the period, it functions neither solely to designate sex between men, nor is it only (perhaps not even primarily) a sexual term. Designating a range of interlinked social and religious transgressions, it also leaves untouched, Bray argues, the ordinary social channels that permitted homosexual acts to be disseminated through all the differentials of power that mark the hierarchies of Renaissance society. (70)

This assumption leads Goldberg to assert, in the chapter on high literariness, that we can't understand Elizabeth's sexuality without invoking "the historicity of sexuality," for only so can we adequately recognize that "what was regarded as *illicit* can be connected to the queen's refusal of the licit mode of disposing the female body" [i.e. through marriage], or recognize further that "what is being done at the level of sexual desire also bespeaks a political desire--one that aligns the queen with her male progenitor" (43). This claim strikes me as legitimate and useful, even if a bit overheated; much more questionable, however, is a claim made later in rounding off an analysis of the Siena Sieve portrait of Elizabeth: "the represented body of the queen, the queen as seen only through the powers of representation, is a locus of the transformation of every sort of desire outside of marriage" (47). Readers must be prepared to spend a fair amount of time negotiating rhetorical swerves of this sort.

The chapter on Spenser, like the *SAQ* article, is concerned to expose the "mirroring" relations between Hobbinol and Colin in the eclogues, E.K. and Immerito in the Gloss, and Harvey and Spenser in the "real" world, through which Spenser affirmed his literary and social aspirations by means of the "open secret" of a sexual relation with Harvey which allowed him at the same time to veil or deny those aspirations. To that argument Goldberg has added a long section which asks "what if . . . the special friendship of Spenser and Harvey could be transported to the relationship with Sidney?" (84), and pursues an answer by way of re-examining the thorny question of who wrote the "Lay of Clorinda" (or, for that matter, the whole of *Astrophel*). He concludes that it is impossible to decide between Spenser and the Countess of Pembroke. Nor is this a case of joint authorship or cooperation, as proposed in the Yale *Shorter Poems*: rather the fact that the two hands cannot be distinguished "throws into question gendered difference and sexual difference, and no heterosexual plot of marriage will save it" (96). Identity and social relation in the real world are as "undecidable" as meaning in a written text.

Near the end of the chapter, Goldberg poses a flurry of questions: "Who sings to Sidney? What community is this? In whose words? On what erotic trajectory?" Rather than provide "answers" of a sort that many of us have been taught to look for, he proceeds for several pages in the following vein:

. . . perhaps--since these questions of gender are above all questions of sexuality--they start in Nashe's claims about Harvey; that he wrote under the cover of the names of Spenser and Sidney--courting the latter "as he were another Cyparissus or Ganymede"--and defended himself against Nashe by employing the hand of a gentlewoman (the countess?) that Nashe claims is Harvey too, his female impersonation one more sign of his sodomitical designs. (97-98)

Some will find this strategy (call it provocative) invigorating--as I often do; others will find it (call it evasive) coy and irritating--as I also often do. And it seems proper to end on this note of ambivalence.

On the one hand, I applaud Goldberg's steady adherence to a methodology that encourages a movement "from the poem to other texts and into the world" (73), without making the mistake of "thematizing" the text so that its sole purpose is "to read the world at the expense of the text" (75). Salutary also is his open and repeated declaration that our scholarly beliefs are "determined by structures of desire" (101). And I am impressed by the emotional depth of his political commitment: this is a passionate book, argued feelingly. But for that reason it has some of the defects that passion breeds--a self-indulgent fondness for repeating "thematic" words (*exorbitant* in the Spenser chapter, *preposterous* in the chapter "Discovering America") that don't advance the argument as much as he seems to think; pell-mell sentences that do not always stay in control; a dismissive air of superiority toward other colleagues whose goals are surely as worthy as his own ("Why can't they see it right like I do?"). These crotchets diminish the effectiveness of a book that aspires to "transform utterly our sense of what Renaissance texts are about" (24)--an admirable goal which I fear may not be reached because of them.

(Ed.)

94.04 Halpern, Richard. *The Poetics of Primitive Accumulation: English Renaissance Culture and the Genealogy of Capital*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1991. 321 pp. \$47.50 cloth, \$15.95 paper.

Like much of the most interesting recent work by younger scholars, this book ambitiously attempts to collocate many different phenomena under the rubric of a dominant cultural "poetics." Halpern's rubric is "primitive accumulation," taken from Marx's developmental stages of economic history. Think Althusser and Jameson on the relations of cultural artifacts to political economy. To use Halpern's terms, this book performs a partial "decoding" of familiar narrative histories, making it possible to reorganize thought about them through an ideologically understood aesthetics. The short introduction concerns this theoretical framing of Halpern's project. Here he wrestles with assaults upon the ideas that he wants to bring forward, castigating and rehabilitating theorists, confessing his alliances.

The book is then divided into two parts: part one consists of two interesting chapters on Tudor schools and humanist pedagogy, and on early modern political economy; part two gives us four bulging chapters on Skelton, More's *Utopia*, Spenser's *SC*, and Shakespeare's *King Lear*. The division is familiar: a historical and theoretical opening, with ensuing applications to canonical texts. It is possible and profitable to read a single chapter out of the context of the others, but I recommend that you not miss the two chapters of the first part of the book, which present an institutional history that is as conceptually provocative as, say, Walter Ong on Latin education.

Halpern's own style places great stress on each move in the logical structure of his argument. Every potential landmine is acknowledged with a harried but still urgent enthusiasm. Hedged, vexed, justified at every turn, the writing "situates" each problem carefully in its proper light according to the fields of history, economics, structuralism. Halpern speaks to us passionately and a bit plaintively from an ideological island where he's one of the tiny set of persons who belong to all his implied audiences (Marxist economic historians, educational and institutional historians, analysts of ideology and aesthetic forms in the mode of Adorno or Baudrillard, Deleuzean philosophers and radical psychiatrists like Guattari, and--certainly--people who work on Skelton, More, Spenser, or Shakespeare). For all the complaints about new historicism, there are very few sixteenth-century scholars today who would like to be heirs of Althusser's ideological analyses and of a (not yet written) Marxist economic history of early modern England. Thus Richard Halpern is to be treasured.

For me, the Skelton chapter--familiar from its previous incarnation in the Parker and Quint volume *Literary Theory/Renaissance Texts*--is the strongest and the most important contribution to its topic. No one who writes about Skelton can ignore it. Unfortunately, the connection between Skelton and Spenser is left untouched. Worse, for my present audience, the Spenser chapter ("Margins and Modernity: *The Shepheardes Calender* and the Politics of Interpretation") is the weakest. It is strangely ignorant of economic questions, as well as of the opening chapters of part one (was it written first?). Halpern begins with an aphoristic distinction between the "scientific" philology of humanism and the "narrative" and "colonial" allegory of the medieval church. The brush is so broad here that the argument fails to register as historical. An undermotivated chain of associations structures the chapter, leading from Erasmus to the *Vewe* (which is put into an untenable opposition with *SC*), to Lyotard's distinction between narrative and scientific knowledge, to a brutally schematic tour of medieval exegesis inexplicably meant to explain the structure of the *Kalendar of Shepherdes*. Half-way through the argument, we reach this restatement of what is at stake:

The problem is not, therefore, that *The Shepheardes Calender* is a stylistic and cultural amalgam. The problem is that this is seen as a problem, that it generates a set of decisions and discriminations based on a sense of cultural decorum. . . . *The Shepheardes Calender* may thus be a humanist text that employs medievalisms within its strict frame of decorum, a prehumanist text that employs medievalisms uncritically (E. K. considers both possibilities), or

even a humanist simulation of a prehumanist text which wittily abandons its sense of decorum out of a sense of decorum. Or it may be a mixture of the three. (195-6)

Have we really gotten anywhere? When Halpern discusses the individual eclogues, they function as "registering" or as "figures for" the issues he is interested in, but the connections are too often tentative or vague:

But the eclogue is also clearly about competing modes of cultural and literary authority, and thus to some degree about the contradictory status of *The Shepheardes Calender* itself. (196)

Next appears the curious Abraham Fraunce--who dissected *SC* as evidence for natural reason in shepherds--and his treatise *The Lawiers Logike* (1588), where Fraunce attempts to reconcile common law's basis in custom to reason. At this point, the chapter's opening tension between Spenser's medieval English heritage (described in the sketchiest of terms) and Italian humanist philology is lost: it has simply dissolved into a series of oppositions that displace each other freely as the chapter goes by. The underlying theme is "a crisis of legitimation." Nearly everything is assimilated: the problem of the gloss, landscape theory, the marriage crisis, the crisis of the Elizabethan settlement, Fraunce's conflict between customary law and Ramist logic, dialect and linguistic nationalism--it's all in there, as the saying goes, in *SC*. Well, I agree. But this approach remains merely suggestive; it doesn't let the author or the reader dig down to any satisfying depth. There are no conclusions. Closure is signaled by adverbs such as "finally": "What these eclogues stage, finally, is the absence of any normalizing framework that could decide contested issues" (214). In my view, this is not true of *SC*; it is merely a symptom of the chapter's lapse from argument, the result of too many frameworks. But Halpern has a nose for fertile conjunctions, and I look forward with eagerness to what he will write about Spenser in the future.

Like many Spenserians, Marx spent months under the blue sky of the British Library's reading room. Thinking about economic history for Marx really means thinking through the history of Britain. Halpern has begun to explore how productive Marx's English cases and examples can be when returned to the cultural history of England. Previous attempts to link ideology and aesthetics in Renaissance writing centered on conflicts between the social divisions defined by religious affiliation, especially, of course, during the civil wars of the seventeenth century (e.g., Barbara Lewalski's *Protestant Poetics*, to which the alliterative title of Halpern's book perhaps unconsciously alludes). But factional politics are simply not as aesthetically powerful for the history of earlier years. For all our fascination with Wolsey, courtiers, in-fighting, and Elizabeth's marriage plans, such obsessions haven't explained much of importance about the politics of Skelton's or Spenser's poetry. Looked at in the company of Halpern's learning and passion, the Tudor era is revealed to be still uncharted. We don't fully understand the politics of the writing, and we especially don't understand the politics of the aesthetics. The achievement of *The Poetics of Primitive*

Accumulation is to take up these challenges in the context of one of the most important intellectual traditions of our century.

Elizabeth Fowler
Yale U

94.05 Kinney, Clare Regan. *Strategies of Poetic Narrative: Chaucer, Spenser, Milton, Eliot*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992. 261 pp. \$54.95.

Clare Regan Kinney's *Strategies of Poetic Narrative* is based on an important insight: poetic narrative operates according to different principles than prose narrative. The demands of stanzaic form, meter, and rhyme make the process of telling a story in verse far different from telling a story in prose. The point seems obvious, and yet Professor Kinney is correct when she says that the differences are seldom acknowledged or studied. Her book, therefore, is intended to examine "the poem-as-narrative" (5) and to show that "formal pattern becomes not so much a framing device for the unfolding of a distinct separable 'plot' as a kind of emplotment in its own right" (10). To accomplish this end, Kinney offers a theoretical introductory chapter and individual chapters on three narrative poems, *Troilus and Criseyde*, *FQ* (focusing especially on Book VI), and *Paradise Lost*. The book concludes with a briefer look at *The Wasteland* and a graceful recapitulation of some important points. This is a very readable book, a point that I do not make lightly. Its focus is on the works being considered rather than on the author's own cleverness and there is much to learn here, even when the reader disagrees, as I frequently do.

The introduction, in which Kinney discusses the problems of telling a story in verse, raises issues that I shall surely consider as I continue to think about narrative verse, from the Homeric poems onward. Kinney's discussions of the poems themselves are also interesting and worth reading. The problem I have with this book, however, is that I fail to see a necessary relationship between problems and positions that are announced in the opening chapter and the discussions of the narrative poems. What Kinney says about the poems seems to have little to do with their status as *poetic* narratives and she almost never refers back to the points she raises in the introduction. Perhaps I am simply being obtuse, but I would have found it helpful had Kinney included an assessment of a prose work (like the *Arcadia*) to illustrate what she sees as the difference between prose and poetic narrative.

Let me show what I mean. Kinney offers some interesting comments on the Spenserian stanza in the introduction and at the beginning of the Spenser chapter, but she never mentions the stanzaic form in her analysis of Book VI. I do not agree with her analysis of the stanza form, when she says,

The repeated rhyme in line five lays the foundation for a second (BCBC) quatrain which complicates, augments or re-examines the narrative content of the first four lines and thus produces a structural matrix exploiting both repetition (the B rhymes of lines five and seven) and difference (the C rhymes

of lines six and eight). Narrative syntax moves forward linearly, but within formal parameters that draw in part upon what has gone before. (70)

I might have been more sympathetic to the argument had she provided some examples and then tied the argument into her analysis of the poem. The only connection she makes, however, is that she sees this "re-pleating effect" reflected in the "larger narrative structure" of the poem as Spenser generates "successive books of *The Faerie Queene* out of revisionary recapitulation" (70). That connection, if, indeed, it is there, hardly strikes me as a strategy of poetic narrative.

Ultimately Kinney's readings of the three poems all focus on what she describes as lyrical moments within the larger narrative, moments that she sees as subverting the narrative sweep of the poems. Again this is a significant idea, but I would have found it helpful had she explained more clearly what she meant by "lyric" and why these lyrical digressions are more noticeable or more important in a poetic narrative than they might be in a prose narrative. Her references to "heteromodality" indicate that she thinks there really are pure examples of various genres, which gives the works she considers here "duplicitous" countertexts. Since I see most literature (yes, even Spenser) as subversive, I am happy to have Kinney's argument; but again, I would like to know what makes this a strategy of poetic narrative.

Kinney's reading of Book VI itself is provocative. I cannot agree with her, but she has made me reconsider my views of the poem. In her focus on canto x, she argues that in the dance on Mt. Acidale we see not, as Tonkin would have it, "the poem coming into being" but "the representation of a very different kind of poetic making" (108). She goes on to say that

there is no lyric as such embedded within the epic narrative, but rather a narrative description of a nostalgic, synchronic and "lyricized" ideal of courtesy. Spenser may have turned from narrating the diachronic unfolding of the quest to celebrating the space which contains the quest's titular virtue, but the ultimate ordering of that space is carried out by the song we never hear, the song which is "unspeakable" because the identity of its subject--the fourth grace, the Beloved, the figure at the center of the sacred space--is withheld, and is thus for ever protected from the Beastly reader's slander of allegory, from the dismembering misprisions of the cannibal consumers of the graces of poetry and the poetry of grace. The reversion to pastoral does not, in the end, involve a simple substitution of "lyric" for "narrative" as a vehicle for the allegory of courtesy: the significant space of Acidale is constituted by a story about a song about something unspoken: seeing courtesy whole is paradoxically dependent on creating a hole in the picture, in denying the power of *any* fiction to speak the whole truth. (108-109)

I am troubled here not only by her references to the reader as Blatant Beast and cannibal (these are points that she makes earlier) but by the notion that the song we do not hear is a "lyricized" ideal rather than a lyric, which allows her to have it both ways. Furthermore, we may not hear it, but we see it, just as we may not hear but see the whole of *FQ*. But even if we accept Kinney's terms, if the song is unspoken, how do we know what it is about? It could be what she says it is, but it could also be an ad for Grace's School of Dance.

Despite my quarrels, however, there are valuable aspects to this book. My biggest problem with it is a matter of truth-in-advertising: it doesn't do what it promises. On the other hand, it does present some striking views on three related poems, and it certainly raises issues that deserve further consideration.

Theodore Steinberg
SU of New York C, Fredonia

94.06 Milward, Peter, ed. *The Mutual Encounter of East and West, 1492-1992*. Renaissance Monographs, 19. Tokyo: The Renaissance Institute (Sophia U), 1992. vii + 202 pp.

This volume of proceedings from the International Conference on "The Mutual Encounter of East and West, 1492-1992," held at Sophia University, Tokyo, 25-27 Sept. 1992, contains 16 essays, divided into three parts: Encounter in Japan, Encounter in the Far East, and Encounter in Europe. In addition to Peng Yi's essay, abstracted at 94.20, Spenserians may be interested in several others in Part III, in particular Thomas Heffernan's "Images of Savage and Courtly-Civil [Man] in the Later English Renaissance." Heffernan briefly situates Spenser's "dreadful compound image of the savage-monster" (in *FQ* 4.7) at a moment of transition in the tradition when images of the savage man and the courtly-civilized man are "converging into one image," before undergoing a further "devotional transformation" in Henry Hawkins' emblems. Other essays in Part III include Germain Marc'hadour's "The Planetary Concern of Thomas More" and Peter Milward's "Providential Discovery in Shakespeare's Plays." (Ed.)

94.07 Rhu, Lawrence. *The Genesis of Tasso's Narrative Theory: English Translations of the Early Poetics and a Comparative Study of Their Significance*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1993. 191 pp. \$28.95 cloth; \$19.95 paper.

Lawrence Rhu has opened the way for a major reevaluation of Spenser's relationship to the Italian Renaissance. Until now, English readers have had to rely on Cavalchini and Samuel's 1973 translation of the 1594 *Discorsi del Poema Eroico* for an introduction to Tasso's narrative theory. Published at the end of Tasso's life, these discourses expound the severe aesthetic of Tasso's late epic, *Gerusalemme Conquistata*. But for an account of the artistic principles underlying the 1581 *Gerusalemme Liberata*, the poem that directly influenced *FQ*, one must examine the three works that Rhu has translated in one convenient

edition: the prefatory remarks to *Rinaldo* (1562), the *Allegoria* (1575-76) affixed to the Bonnà edition of the *Liberata*, and the magisterial *Discorsi dell'arte poetica* (1562-65; published 1587). These early works enable scholars to see the *Liberata* and its principal English descendants, *FQ* and *Paradise Lost*, as poetic responses to theoretical debates over epic writing. In general, the earlier Tasso advocates a *via media* between "the most severe laws of Aristotle" (96) and the apparent lawlessness of Ariostan narrative: "But I would like my works to be judged not by the strict followers of Aristotle . . . nor by those overly enamored of Ariosto" (97). Evoking the newly rediscovered *Poetics*, Tasso rejects the authorial intrusions, multiple actions, and complicated entrelacement that typify the *Furioso*. But despite his Neo-Aristotelian commitment to unity, he insists that an occasional digression does not invalidate a poem's claim to classical excellence.

Like so many early modern compromises, the balance that Tasso advocates between ancient critical authority and contemporary poetic practice is unstable. Arguing that epic ought to represent the marvelous, Tasso insists that it must simultaneously fulfill canons of verisimilitude. While the poet ought to confine himself to one single action, he must still achieve a pleasing variety. Steering between Aristotelian discipline and Ariostan excess is no easy task. At one point, Tasso echoes the Cumaean Sibyl in commenting on the difficulty of writing an epic that fulfills such antithetical critical expectations: "*Hoc opus, hic labor est*" (131). Balancing unity and variety, wonder and verisimilitude, proves a no less formidable achievement than returning unscathed from the Virgilian underworld.

Rhu's provocative, three-part introduction traces the impact of these theoretical speculations on Tasso's own *Liberata*, Spenser's *FQ*, and Milton's *PL*. As Rhu argues, the boundaries between theoretical discourse and poetry itself are highly permeable. Poets often adopt the language of literary criticism in couching their poems as implicit replies to the debates over epic decorum. Rhu's introduction casts valuable new light on such familiar passages as Clorinda's conversion and the Gardens of Adonis by demonstrating their role as metacommentary on poetic theory. In a particularly insightful discussion, Rhu notes that Clorinda justifies her persistence in Islam through the same arguments and metaphors that Tasso himself uses in the first *Discorsi* to sanction the verisimilitude of Christian marvels. Here the slippage between critical and poetic discourses exposes significant contradictions between Tasso's poetic and religious vocations. As Rhu observes, the early Tasso's "emphasis on the expressive power of true religion dangerously subordinates the value of truth to the efficacy of linguistic ploys" (29).

Questions about the relationship between poetry and belief resurface in Rhu's discussion of Neo-Aristotelian and Protestant poetics in Tasso and Spenser. According to Rhu's analysis, Spenser inherits from Tasso anxieties about the unbridled proliferation of language. Whereas Tasso defines his own poem against the endless plot-spinning of Ariostan romance, Spenser defines *FQ* against the Reformation's fragmentation into competing readings of scripture. Rhu centers his argument around a suggestive reading of Error's Wood as a revision of the haunted forest encountered by Tasso's Crusaders outside Jerusalem. Tasso's *Allegoria*, which glosses the forest as "errors of opinion," stands as a crucial

mediation between the two texts. Rhu connects Rinaldo's victory over the enchanted trees, an action that preserves the poem's unity and hastens its denouement, with Tasso's own triumph over Ariostan digression. Spenser departs from Tasso by situating his haunted forest at the beginning, rather than at the end of his epic action, and by making Redcrosse's victory less decisive than Rinaldo's. While Spenser's knights confront spiritual error under various guises, his readers wrestle with aesthetic error, or romance divagation, as the poem's central structural principle.

If Rhu had devoted an entire book to Spenser's appropriations of Tasso, he might have developed more intricate connections between romance narrative and Protestant sectarianism. Free-wheeling Protestant exegesis is hardly the only error stigmatized in *FQ*'s opening canto. Nevertheless, Rhu rightly contends that interpoetic relationships are charged with ideological significance. As he argues convincingly throughout his introduction, New Historicist treatments of episodes like the Bower of Bliss suffer from an inattention to Spenser's Italian sources. Guyon's violence mirrors not only English interventions in Ireland and the new world but Spenser's own struggle to "overgo" his continental precursors.

The final section of Rhu's introduction links *PL*'s mixture of epic and tragic conventions to Tasso's discussions of the relationship between the two in the early *Discorsi*. In theory, Tasso distinguishes the fear and pity associated with tragedy from the wonder evoked by epic. But in actual poetic practice, an episode like Tancredi's accidental murder of Clorinda has strong affinities with tragedy that challenge Tasso's theoretical rigidity. In the Invocation to Book IX, Milton announces a shift to tragic note that defies Neoclassical standards of generic purity altogether. The pathos of Adam and Eve's redemption through tragic loss distinguishes them from Tasso's crusaders, whose "Christian heroism, unqualified by ordinary humanity, entails an off-putting austerity" (85).

Tasso's theoretical writings make a superb introduction to the debates over heroic convention that inform both *FQ* and *PL*. I recommend Rhu's book highly for graduate seminars on Spenser and Milton, and for courses on the history of criticism.

John Watkins
U of Minnesota

ARTICLES: ABSTRACTS AND NOTICES

94.08 Champagne, Claudia M. "Wounding the Body of Woman in Book III of *The Faerie Queene*." *LIT: Literature, Interpretation, Theory* 2 (1990): 95-115.

Through a Lacanian reading of Book 3 attempts to answer why the "passage from virginity to married love necessitates that the body of woman--Britomart's and Amoret's--be wounded." Argues that for Spenser chastity means "the ability to love"; Britomart's psychical wounds must be healed before she can do so. Discusses Britomart's fears of

female sexuality (because she cannot accept its "passivity" or its "lack") and her role in marriage. Her armour represents a response "to desire and to the male other." Agrees with Roche's interpretation of Amoret in the House of Busyrane. Britomart, like Amoret, fears sexuality and sees it as a "wounding"; unlike Amoret, however, Britomart is angered rather than paralyzed by her "wound." Her sympathy for Amoret leads Britomart toward healing herself, loving others, and therefore, toward true chastity. (EMC)

94.09 Copeland, T.A. "Surrender of Power in *Epithalamion*." *Selected Papers from the West Virginia Shakespeare and Renaissance Association* 13 (Spring 1988): 58-65.

The speaker's role as master of ceremonies in *Epith* seems to conflict with his painful unlearning in *Am* of mastery in love. In fact the speaker recovers from this relapse as the wedding day proceeds. At first he directs imperative verbs at the muses, three kinds of nymphs, the bride, the boys and girls, and, initially, the sun, which he then, however, entreats. Intellectual ordering, each concept awakening its complement, in stanza 8, is followed by delirious idolatry of the bride, in turn succeeded by proper sorting out of her flesh and intellect, and then, at church, of her saintly role under God. A sense of time and transitoriness quickly succeeds a second set of comic imperatives. His impatience disappears in the scenes of evening and night: recognition of his own powerlessness culminates in surrender to the transhuman powers of generational renewal and heaven. (AKH)

94.10 Esolen, Anthony M. "Spenser's 'Alma Venus': Energy and Economics in the Bower of Bliss. *ELR* 23.2 (Spring 1993): 267-86.

In Book II of *FQ* Spenser shows that the virtue of temperance is, in a broad sense, economic. A good knight must subordinate his desires and marshal all his resources for the greater glory of God and country. Temperance thus requires a hierarchy within the body politic and within the individual, and is geared toward a goal rather than a state of being. Rightly understood, temperance produces a healthy, muscular, relentless chivalry. By contrast, Spenser uses several allusions to Lucretius, Epicureanism, and the worship of ancient fertility goddesses to show that false moderation--that which has no end but pleasure--is a kind of retreat into social and personal languor. The Lucretian Venus must be Christianized, absorbed into the sexual and theological hierarchies implicit in Alma's castle. Only then will the sweat of her brow be of any value, or be the result of any true pleasure. (AME)

94.11 Fisher, James R. "Signs and Seasons in Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queene*." *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 5 (1993): 57-76.

Explores how Spenser incorporates a zodiac, calendar, and history into his allegory, each based on the twelve signs, and each Christ centered. In Spenser's historical allegory, Guyon symbolically travels through the zodiac, sign by sign, in a quintessentially Christian odyssey. Guyon's Imitation of Christ in the center of Book II marks the structural transition between classical and Christian temperance, reflected in a physical transition from the lunar

to the solar signs of the Zodiac. By modelling the world of Book II on the zodiac, Spenser epitomizes the Renaissance theory of poetics: to create a poem modelled on the universe was to worship its creator. (JRF)

94.12 Fisher, James R. "The Seven Deadly Passions: Edmund Spenser, Architectonike and Genre Critic." *EIRC* 19 (1993): 135-46.

Though the Cave of Mammon is regularly compared to the House of Pride on the basis of their both being places of temptation, it has gone unnoticed that Lucifera's Pageant of the Deadly Sins has a more exact parallel in the Phedon Story (2.4.17-33). By making allowances for Lucifera's role as the seventh sin, Pride, and by including the two stanzas of the Palmer's gnomonic advice to Phedon (2.4.34-35), we find that the Pageant and Story begin and end at the same places in their respective books, exact to the canto and stanza. This correspondence is matched by other, previously recognized parallels. By paralleling a formal pageant with a rambling monologue, Spenser illustrates both the similarities and differences between Sin and Passion. (JRF)

94.13 Gregerson, Linda. "Narcissus Interrupted: Specularity and the Subject of the Tudor State." *Criticism* 35.1 (Winter 1993): 1-40.

The Tudor subject was always a crux and an interpellation of power. The Earl of Essex's 1595 Accession Day entertainment and Spenser's 1596 installment of *FQ* describe an explicitly specular structure of subject formation upon which larger movements of war, statecraft, philosophy, and justice depend. Each work is grounded in the Narcissus myth--Essex's entertainment in the figure of Philautia, *FQ* in an "inscription of Eros as a species of reformed narcissism, the closed embrace broken to allow for the discursive path of knightly 'error,' or wandering." Especially in Britomart, subjectivity and national destiny evolve around an interpolated otherness, a second, 'better' likeness (Artegall) that translates into vocation. The progress of her love is defined in relation to and against various forms of erotic monstrosity--"an increasingly subtle negotiation with prohibited analogues." She revives the lineage of female warriors in order to defend the prerogatives of patriarchy. One important manifestation of narcissism is the hermaphroditic embrace with which the 1590 poem ends, but which is dispersed and displaced throughout the second half of the poem (Venus in 4.10, Isis-Osiris in 5.7, Nature in 7.7), and which, in the form of the monster beneath Belge's altar of Idolatry invokes Oedipus, who is "Narcissus made political, made civic, made a matter of collective destiny." When Britomart's fate unfolds before her in Isis Church, she is embraced by a foreshadowing avatar of this monster beneath the altar, and in the admixture of Britomart, crocodile, and lion "we are expected to read the diachronic parable she has earlier encountered in Merlin's cave and in Merlin's mirror, the parable (her own face, the other's) about the fate of nations." In Book V, Spenser instructs the Queen that history is misrecognition: the Queen "requires a history that will unambiguously authorize her expanding--and expansionist--future. Ans she must consign to oblivion [via the death of Duessa/Mary Stuart] every impediment to the future her poet has in mind."

- 94.14 Hendrix, Laurel L. " 'Mother of laughter, and welspring of blisse': Spenser's Venus and the Poetics of Mirth." *ELR* 23.1 (Winter 1993): 113-33.

Through his mythopoeics of Love and Beauty, or Cupid and Venus, Spenser articulates the paradoxical nature of human experience in love. Significantly, Spenser's Venus, the "mother of laughter, and welspring of blisse," laughs only once in *FQ*: at Scudamour's forcible removal of Amoret from Venus' temple. As Venus' laughter occurs within the context of the most blatant rupture in Spenser's text--Amoret's inexplicable disappearance from the narrative--Scudamour's perception that Venus laughs in approbation at his act of *raptus* is subject to question. Why does Venus laugh, and what might her laughter signify? In answering these questions, we must carefully examine the classical antecedents which inform Renaissance speculations regarding laughter in the works of Spenser's contemporaries and within Spenser's own poetry. In exploring the means by which laughter defines the dynamics of love, we realize that in laughing at Scudamour's "pretence" and his seizure of Amoret, Spenser's Venus marks a crisis point not only in Scudamour's chivalric career, but also in Spenser's poetic vision. (LLH)

- 94.15 Laws, Jennifer. "Sexual Politics and the Interpretation of Nature in Spenser's *Two Cantos of Mutabilitie*." *Renaissance and Reformation/ Renaissance et Réforme*, n.s. 16.2 (Spring 1992): 21-35.

In *FQ* Spenser's views on the roles of men and women are complex. His varied attitudes are used to guide our responses to the narration in *Mutabilitie*. Our perception of Mutability, Jupiter, and Dame Nature gradually changes as Spenser exploits the complexity of sexual politics. Spenser first uses role expectations to enhance the power and authority of the male Jupiter; then by a change in point of view he undermines that same authority and the Titaness rises to a position of equality in grace and beauty and possible superiority in courage and integrity. Thus Spenser creates an element of true suspense for the entrance of Nature, who in canto vi is male and then in vii is female. Between the two cantos comes the tale of Faunus, which makes absurd the kind of role distinctions we have seen between Jupiter and Mutability. The episode makes more splendid the goddess of Nature "who transcends all differences." In the trial, Mutability comes more and more to identify with Nature, but not completely. For finally Spenser uses the traditional sexual hierarchy to underline Nature's subordination to Almighty God.

- 94.16 Leslie, Michael. "Spenser, Sidney, and the Renaissance Garden." *ELR* 22.1 (Winter 1992): 3-36.

The gardens and designed landscapes of the literary world of the English Renaissance are usually discussed in terms only of their antecedents in English, European, and classical literature. However, English writers and readers had considerable experience of sophisticated garden styles both in their own country and in Continental Europe. A reading of the styles of literary gardens in the light of contemporary garden design and practice

reveals that the descriptions of landscapes in the works of such authors as Spenser and Sidney contribute to political, cultural, aesthetic, and religious meanings. (ML)

94.17 Parkin-Speer, Diane. "Allegorical Legal Trials in Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 23.3 (Fall 1992): 494-505.

Briefly acknowledging the intertextuality of the trials of Duessa before Mercilla (*FQ* 5.9) and of Mutabilitie before Nature (7.7) with other literary trials in e.g. Ovid and Chaucer, examines Spenser's trials in the light of contemporary common law practice, of Spenser's stands on law in the *Vewe*, and of his concern with land conveyance in Ireland. In Duessa's trial the freely given, opposing sets of testimony, without judicial inquisition, embody the English adversarial method of arriving at a true verdict, although the accused's silence, and some other features, are untypical. Trespass and land-title are parallel issues in the contest between Mutabilitie and Jove. Having a single, imperial judge in each trial chimes with Irenius's opinion in the *Vewe* that English Common Law was imposed by the Normans, not developed by the English; and that, even if it works in England, it's unsuitable for the insubordinate, lying Irish. Only royal power works there. Some other 16th-century, and 17th-century, literary trials follow common law procedure, with a non-royal judge and a jury. Spenser's tendency is disturbing. (AKH)

94.18 Stephens, Dorothy A. "'Newes of devils': Feminine Sprights in Masculine Minds in *The Faerie Queene*." *ELR* 23.3 (Autumn 1993): 363-81.

The Petrarchan idea that the feminine images invading a poet's mind both inform and threaten his artistic self-containment becomes allegorized in Spenser's description of an anthropomorphized castle inhabited by a woman named Alma, who is the castle's chaste soul. Although the servant Phantastes in Alma's turret-brain is male, and although Phantastes generically represents human imagination in general, the combination of his masculine identity with the explicitly effeminate disorder of his fantasies become problematic. Alma's fantasy unsettles the oppositions between dreamer-subject and dreamed object, between inner chastity and outer threats to that chastity, between masculine and feminine. This is not a matter of androgyny; instead, in Alma's house, difference is always where we are not looking. By displacing Guyon and Arthur's "infinite desire" for an inaccessible Queen Gloriana onto Alma, who graciously gives them a tour of her body, the poem makes Alma's fortress into two types of enclosure: the castle figures the knight's own bodies in that it figures all human bodies; but Alma also represents a femininity separate from them, a source of bounty which they desire to disclose and know. Perhaps this is masculine reappropriation of the feminine, but insofar as the hero's desire for entry is reproduced in Maleger's monstrous regiment of besiegers, and insofar as Maleger's monsters are projections of the similar fiends swirling through Alma's turret imagination, the two knights become, in some sense, the foolish delusions of a feminine imagination. Yet whatever fear the poem registers about the possibility of discovering its debt to a monstrous, feminine imagination is mingled with an investment in the erotic exchanges between this femininity and the masculine borders that would wish to contain it. (DAS)

- 94.19 Walker, Julia M. "Spenser's Elizabethan Portrait and the Fiction of Dynastic Epic." *MP* 90.2 (November 1992): 172-99.

Sees *FQ* as an analog to portraits of Elizabeth in which emblems must be manipulated to represent "the multiple nature of her image" and her ambiguous status as female monarch. Argues that through the tension between the narrative and the story of Britomart in Books III-V, Elizabeth is offered "a text which mirrors her own multivalent image." Britomart engages the reader as a "flesh and blood" woman on the way to becoming a "dynastic heroine." Through the course of Book III, the epical insistence on dynastic prolepsis is maintained through Britomart's allusiveness to Dido, Aeneas, Odysseus, and Penelope. Both rhetorically and iconographically, however, the poet, like Elizabeth, must mitigate the fact of temporal power and her female sexuality--and the fiction of her motherhood. Spenser thus deflects the dynastic narrative and refigures Britomart as justice. By Book 5, Britomart has been "reinscribed as the perfectly allegorical Mercilla, Mercilla who can clearly--not secretly--be read as a representation of Elizabeth." (EMC)

- 94.20 Yi, Peng. "The New World of *The Faerie Queene*, Book III: From Apposition to Compassing." *The Mutual Encounter of East and West, 1492-1992*. Ed. Peter Milward. Tokyo: The Renaissance Institute, 1992. 145-57.

Explores the way in which the actual discovery of the new world affects *FQ* 3, i.e., in what way the discovery is symbolically transformed. Begins with Columbus and Mandeville in order to show the elemental forces that mark Spenser's allegory, with Raleigh providing the connection. Similar to Raleigh's invasion of the virgin territory of Guiana, Spenser's idea of conceits, both in *FQ* and the *Vewe*, aims to claim an ideal history from mere chronological succession. However, the progression from Columbus and Mandeville, via Raleigh, to Spenser is not just a progression but also a retrogression--a folding back on itself. The ambivalent attitude (termed "apposition") of the earlier figures returns when *FQ*'s personifications try to "encompass" *Gestalten* of themselves and to establish a connection with the "other." (PY; modified by Ed.)

- 94.21 An exchange between A. Kent Hiatt and Thomas P. Roche, Jr., which appeared in the "Forum" sections of *Spenser Studies* 8 (1987) and 9 (1988), was inadvertently omitted from an earlier issue of *SpN*. We abstract it here.

In "The Projected Continuation of *The Faerie Queene*: Rome Delivered?" 8: 335-43, Hiatt argued that when writing *FQ* 2.10.49.6-9, Spenser was projecting a politic, not private, sequel to *FQ* in which Arthur would conquer Rome and become emperor. By this Spenser would supposedly convey that some notable mate of Elizabeth would lead forces to break the power of Spain and set up a Universal Reformed Church in Rome--a sharp answer to Tasso's *Jerusalem Delivered*. Details in Hardyng's *Chronicle* and Caxton's Malory are followed. Perhaps Spenser thought of persevering in this project, transferring the heroic role from Leicester to Essex.

In "A Response to A. Kent Hieatt," 343-47, Roche replied that Hieatt is right about Spenser's meaning in those cited lines, although Malory, writing before the Reformation, makes little of Arthur's imperial role. But after the death of Leicester as figured in *FQ* 1.7.36, Spenser's plan for the marriage with Gloriana and conquest of Rome also died. Also, Essex's marriage precluded a union with Elizabeth and blocked the possibility of giving him Arthur's role. Further, a sequence of "private" virtues in Books I-III and "politic" virtues in IV-VI tends to replace the one (in the "Letter to Raleigh") embodying the same division in two separate epics.

Hieatt replied in "Arthur's Deliverance of Rome (Yet Again)" 9: 243-48. If Essex's marriage blocked his potential Arthurian role as mate of Gloriana, why didn't Leicester's earlier marriage, surely known to Spenser, have the same effect? A symbolic, institutional union would have suited in either case. Even *Proth* 145-62, near the end of Spenser's career, points towards Essex. Further, the area of meaning for "politic" suggested by Roche is far from what Spenser and contemporaries meant by the word. And if not Malory, then Hardyng (pre-Reformation, Medieval) magnifies Arthur's imperial role: Spenser, like Hardyng, wants national aggrandizement, and is not animated solely by Protestant zeal.

MEET ME IN SAINT LOUIS, 1994

A total of six papers on Spenser were presented at the annual meeting of the Central Renaissance Conference, held at the Adam's Mark Hotel in St. Louis, 24-27 March 1994. The language of the abstracts is mainly that of the speakers, in most cases abbreviated and modified by the editor to conform to reportorial style.

94.22 Session 2, "Decent Exposure: Fashion and Tudor Sumptuary Legislation," chaired by Donald Stump (St. Louis U), concluded with a paper on Spenser. In "'Attired with this englishe habit': The Clothes of Rhetoric and the Rhetoric of Protestant Nationalism in Spenser's 'Maye,'" Laura Nilges Matias (Loyola U, Chicago), suggested that clothing in Spenser's eclogue sustains a triple significance. The "bloncket liveryes" to which Palinode refers in the opening lines (glossed by E.K. as "grey coates") are drab, rough, and quite likely woolen. To wear wool, the product of England's most important industry, was possibly the mark of an Englishman's collective, cultural identity. But if this is true, then Spenser's reference to clothing would have had another distinct but closely related meaning, for the English *language* was often conceived of as a garment--a gray, sensible, woolen coat, in which the truth could be attired without the distracting fripperies of more sophisticated continental or classical vernaculars. Yet this new identity was not a matter about which the English were secure, for if "bloncket liveryes" functioned for Spenser's readers as a trope for linguistic nationalism, then Palinode's suggestion that such clothing might best be cast off would suggest an ambivalence about his identity--not only as a Protestant, but as an English speaker and an Englishman.

94.23 Session 6, "Literary Problematics of Tudor Queenship," chaired by Vincent Casaregola (St. Louis U) contained "'And yet in some places els, I doe otherwise shadow her': Elizabeth's Dark Presence in *The Faerie Queene*," by Stephen Bennett (New York U). From the premise that the Letter to Raleigh acknowledges the dangers of writing an epideictic poem in the sociopolitically charged context of Elizabeth's court, he suggested that Spenser's foregrounding of these dangers alerted certain readers that in addition to the positive images of the queen, there were dangerously unflattering ones: the representations of the Queen in the poem are fractured and unstable. Positing a distinction between Petrarchism as an inherently patriarchal poetic convention and as an applied monarchical structure that Elizabeth used to maintain control over her courtiers, and noting the "artificiality" of the authentic Florimell, as well as the similes used to describe both true and false Florimells, he argued that the two are "equated," and that Elizabeth is caught up in the equation. Spenser's subtle use of this "unholy Petrarchan trinity" to critique Elizabeth's monarchical Petrarchanism confirms Annabel Patterson's claim that "the institutionally unspeakable makes itself heard inferentially, in the space between what is written and what the audience, knowing what they know, might be expected to see": a courtly male audience may have been expected to see represented its anxiety about a female monarch.

94.24 The single Spenser paper in Session 7, "Literature and Family Values in Tudor England," chaired by Joseph Freedman (Illinois Wesleyan U), was "'Signs of Their Fathers Blood': The Risks of Lineage in *Faerie Queene* 4.2-3," by Craig A. Berry (Northwestern U). He examined the purpose and consequences of Spenser's making parallel the process of traduction by which Agape's sons share spirits and the infusion of Chaucer's spirit into himself. For Elizabethans, Chaucer was an authority to be admired and imitated, but linguistic change and the English Reformation made him a remote and in some ways troubling ancestor. The ambivalence can be felt in Sidney's comments on Chaucer in the *Apology for Poetry*: ". . . great wants, fit to be forgiven in so reverent antiquity." For Spenser, this ambivalence translates into an affirmation that Chaucer was not only a great father who had left a formidable legacy to follow, but also a dependent Anchises who had to be packed up with the household gods and carried into the future. To invoke Chaucer, then, is to engage the double risk that Spenser may appear either smaller than his medieval predecessor or smaller than he would have had he stuck to classical models and their less ambiguous reputations. Unlike Chaucer's fifteenth-century admirers, Spenser avoids direct paternal metaphors in his invocation of Chaucer. Like the sons of Agape, who in showing "signes of their fathers blood" also expose themselves to the dangers of combat, Spenser must live with the risks of his Chaucerian parentage. Conversely, like Chaucer's "warlike numbers and heroicke sound," the sire of Priamond, Diamond, and Triamond provides a crude but invigorating force which cannot be directly resisted, but can be lovingly augmented and sustained by means of spiritual infusion. For Spenser no less than for the sons of Agape, filiation as spiritual infusion offers a model of inheritance which is more supple and more susceptible to fashioning than filiation as begetting, for imitating the father too closely can be dangerous and limiting.

Session 17, "Morality and Literacy in Elizabethan Literature," chaired by Thomas Shippey (St. Louis U), offered two Spenser papers.

94.25 In "Don Quixote's Sisters: Reading Women in Book III of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*," Caroline McManus (California State U, Los Angeles) explored ways in which Spenser reinscribes contemporary male anxieties about women's reading in *FQ* 3. Several of the Book's female figures define themselves by selectively appropriating various literary roles and discourses in their erotic pursuits. In playing the medieval romance lady, Malecasta substantiates Juan Luis Vives's fear that such texts "inflare" their readers "with all beastly and filthy desire." Similarly, Hellenore's participation in Ovidian love games bears out Thomas Salter's fear that literate women might read not just the Bible and sermons, but also "Lascivious bookes of Ovide . . . and among the Greeke poetes of the filthie love . . . of the Goddes themselves." In contrast, Britomart's "reading" of British history, seems to exemplify the interpretive practices of a virtuous female reader. However, Glauce's use of history is more suspect, and when she convinces Britomart to don knightly armor, she brings her ward "perilously close to the potentially subversive manner in which women could read romances in such a way as to threaten traditional gender distinctions." The female characters in Book III suggest that women "could exercise a remarkable degree of interpretive agency in reading the texts that sought to read them."

94.26 Jay R. Curlin (U of Central Arkansas), argued in "Pelican Gratitude: Rejection of Origin in *A View of the Present State of Ireland*," that Spenser's "denigration of the Anglo-Irish" is fueled by "a heartfelt repugnance for what Maureen Quilligan has called 'the sin of originality.'" Although Spenser sees the native Irish as like the children of Errour, "suffering in a cannibalistic feast of their own making," and though "he rewed the same," he could see it as the logical consequence of their living under a system of laws which made leadership elective and not hereditary: in a sense, they had no proper "origin." Though this condition should be corrected, it is understandable. Quite otherwise is the case for the Anglo-Irish, who in adopting the practices and language of the conquered have wilfully rejected their hereditary English origins, which Spenser sees stemming from "overreaching pride," similar to Satan's, an incorrigible "desire to mount above and thus obscure one's original source." It is to solve this problem that Spenser "advocates a return to square one, a total subjugation of the land in the manner of William the Conqueror while taking care not to repeat his mistakes."

94.27 Session 23, "Visions of Justice in Elizabethan England," chaired by James F. Hitchcock (St. Louis U), concluded with "Love that Passes Understanding: Justice in Elizabethan England as Defended in *The Faerie Queene*," by Jane Riggs (U of Kentucky). She argued that Elizabethans understood the compatibility of the duties of love and forceful justice and that "the wise administration of these attributes were the responsibility of their earthly and heavenly sovereign." To promote this acceptance, Spenser relies on scriptural examples of justice. Mortals who judge are imperfect, but those who mete out justice do so by divine precedent. For Spenser and his contemporaries, to be loved was to be assured of unyielding, ironclad justice.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

94.28 COME HOME, SPENSER. Volume 19 of *The Renaissance Bulletin* (1992), published by The Renaissance Institute, Tokyo, contains brief accounts of "Renaissance Studies in Korea," by Anthony Teague (Sonjae An), and of "Recent Renaissance Studies in Taiwan," by Francis K.H. So. The latter lists seven items on Spenser published between 1981 and 1991, none of which, so far as I can determine, either appear in any standard bibliography or have been abstracted in *SpN*. The article lists them, without publication data or indication of language, as follows: Liang Ju-chen 1985; Sissy Han-hua Huang 1989; Cheng kuan-juan 1991; Chen Ling-hua 1981; Yeh Tuan-wei 1983; Liao Pen-jui 1985; Cheng kuan-juan 1991. The first three seem to be more general studies, the last four to deal specifically with pastoral. Should any of our readers be able to provide copies, or abstracts, of these items, I shall make every effort to provide abstracts in a future issue.

94.29 CONFERENCES. Southwest Regional Renaissance Conference, 13-14 May 1994, Huntington Library, San Marino, CA. Address: Alison Taufer, Dept. of English, California State U, Los Angeles 90032.

Conference on William Tyndale: Church, State, and Word, 12-16 July 1994, Washington. Address: Anne M. O'Donnell, English Dept., Catholic U of America, Washington, DC 20064.

New Chaucer Society, 23-27 July 1994, Trinity C, Dublin. Address: Christian Zacher, Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Ohio State U, 230 West 17th Ave., Columbus, OH 43210-1311.

International Association for Neo-Latin Studies Ninth International Congress: The Impact of Italian Humanism: Continuations and Transformations, 29 Aug.-3 Sept. 1994, Bari. Address: Mauro de Nichilo, Dipartimento di Italianistica, Universita di Bari, 70121 Bari, Italy.

Aesthetics and Ideologies: Collisions, Conjunctions, Collusions, 6-8 Oct. 1994, Michigan St. U. Address: Judith Stoddart, 201 Morrill Hall, Michigan St. U., East Lansing, MI 48824.

Group for Early Modern Cultural Studies, 3-6 Nov. 1994, Rochester. Address: Thomas DiPiero, Dept. of Mod. Langs. and Cultures, 303 Gavett Hall, U of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14627.

Southern Conference on British Studies, 9-12 Nov. 1994, Louisville, KY. Address: John L. Gordon, Jr., Dept. of History, U of Richmond, Richmond, VA 23173.

Fourteenth Barnard College Medieval-Renaissance Studies Conference: Alternative Realities: Medieval and Renaissance Inquiries into the Nature of the World, 3 Dec. 1994, Barnard C.

Address: Catharine Randall Coats, Dept. of French, or Antonella Ansani, Dept. of Italian, Barnard C, 3009 Broadway, New York, NY 10027.

Baseball and the Sultan of Swat: A Conference Commemorating the National Pastime and the Hundredth Birthday of Babe Ruth, 27-29 Apr. 1995, Hofstra U. Address: Natalie Datlof, Hofstra Cultural Center, Hofstra U, Hempstead NY 11550. (After all, the late A.B. Giamatti, eminent Spenserian, was also Commissioner of Baseball.)

94.30 CALL FOR PROPOSALS. The literary wing of the Society for Reformation Research is planning two sessions for May, 1995 at the 30th International Congress on Medieval Studies held in Kalamazoo, one on the devotional writing (prose or poetry) of women in the Reformation, and a second on Erasmus and the Reformation. Please send proposals by 1 July 1994 to Prof. Paul Auksi, Dept. of English, U of Western Ontario, London, Ont., Canada N6A 3K7.

The Emblem Studies Group at the University of Minnesota invites participation in an international conference on the theme "The Ages of Life and Learning: Explorations in the Emblem," the second in a series on "cultural emblematics," to be held at the University of Minnesota 27-28 April 1995. Including Emblem books, but looking beyond them, cultural emblematics looks to the iconics (i.e., word/image complexes) of all illustrated media from all eras. Emblem scholars are invited to explore the Ages of Life (or Jacques' "Ages of Man," or the stages of human life, or the seasons of life) as a thematic unit in relation to education. Proposals are due 1 September 1994. Send abstract (for general circulation) of 50-75 words and a summary of 300-400 (for circulation to conference participants) describing scope and main ideas and citing illustrative references of 3-6 titles. Send diskette and printout to: Cultural Emblematics Conference, 246 Peik Hall, 159 Pillsbury Dr. S.E., Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455-0208.

94.31 CALL FOR PAPERS: A reminder that the deadline for submitting paper proposals for the 1995 Spenser at Kalamazoo meeting (4-7 May 1995) is 15 September 1994. Send abstracts by that date to Robert Stillman, Dept. of English, U of Tennessee, Knoxville, 301 McClung Tower, Knoxville, TN 37996-0430.

The Society for Emblem Studies will be holding the Fourth International Emblem Conference at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from 18-23 August 1996. Proposals for 20-minute papers, consisting of title and a 500-word abstract, should be submitted by 1 October 1995 to the Conference co-ordinator, Prof. dr. Karel Porteman, Department of Literature, P.O. Box 333, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium. FAX: 16-28.50.25.

94.32 JOURNAL NOTES. *Connotations: a Journal for Critical Debate*, edited by Inge Lemiberg, Lothar Cerny, Michael Steppat, and Matthias Bauer, has a special interest in receiving articles concerning the English Renaissance. Its editorial address is Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Department of English, Johannisstrasse, 12-20, 4400 Münster, Germany. FAX: (02 51)83-4827. In the USA orders for subscriptions should be sent to

Waxmann Publishing Company, PO Box 1318, New York, NY 10028. Cost in the US is \$50/year, including postage. A disk version in WordPerfect 5.0/5.1 is also available at \$30/yr. Single copies are \$18, plus postage. Articles should not exceed 12,000 words and should follow the MLA Handbook, 3rd ed., with notes at the end of the text. All submissions should be in English on a 3.5" or 5.25" disk in WordPerfect or any other DOS program, accompanied by a hard copy. Manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by international reply coupons.

94.33 SIDNEY AT KALAMAZOO. The 1994 International Congress on Medieval Studies at Western Michigan U, 5-8 May 1994, will devote three sessions to Sidney, each containing three papers and a response. The programs are as follows:

Sidney I: Discourses of Method: Casey Charles (Lewis and Clark C), Presiding.

1. Todd K. West (U of California, Santa Barbara): "Discrete in Discretion: Identity Crisis in Sidneyana"
2. Peter C. Herman (Georgia State U): "*Astrophil and Stella*: Poetry, Politics, and Masculinity"
3. Stephanie Chamberlaine (Purdue U): "For the Public Weal: Amphialus's Culturally-Fashioned Narrative."

Respondent: Mary Ellen Lamb (Southern Illinois U).

Sidney II: Making and Modelling the Poet: D'Orsay Pearson, Presiding.

1. Willy Maley (U of London): "Philip Sidney and Ireland";
2. Roger Kuin (York U, Toronto): "Sidney's Archetype of the Statesman";
3. William A. Sessions (Georgia State U): "Sidney's Archetype of the Poet: The Earl of Surrey."

Respondent: William A. Craft (Mount St. Mary's C).

Sidney III: Arcadian Constructs: Marvin Hunt (North Carolina State U), Presiding.

1. Victor Skretkowicz (U of Dundee): "Romano-Greek Morality and Arcadian Misery"
2. Karen Nelson (U of Maryland): "'Then euery Pastor had his flock, and euery flock his sheepheard': Philip Sidney's Old *Arcadia* and Church-State Discourse of the 1570's"
3. Karen Saupe (U of Rochester): "Trial, Error, and Revision in Sidney's *Arcadia*."

Respondent: Jon Quitslund (George Washington U).

SPENSER AT KALAMAZOO, PROGRAM 1994

SPENSER I

**Who is Edmund That All These Swains Commend Him?:
History and *The Faerie Queene***

Welcoming Remarks: William Oram (Smith C)

Presider: Lauren Silberman (Baruch C, CCNY)

"Di-Spensing Authority: The Unconsummated Historiography
of *The Faerie Queene*"

David Stern (Rutgers U)

"Apocryphal Texts, Epic Duplexes, Eastern Empires:

Spenserian Genetics in *The Faerie Queene*"

Elizabeth Mazzola (Union C)

Respondent: Gordon Teskey (Cornell U)

"Gendering Biography: Spenser as a Man"

Gary Waller (Hartford U)

Respondent: Theresa M. Krier (U of Notre Dame)

SPENSER II

**Tending Lambs and Hanging Sheep:
Authority and Submission in Spenser's Canon**

Presider: Marianne Micros (U of Guelph)

"Pastoral In and Out of History: Immerito's Courtly

Limitations and Colin Clout's Divided Self

in *The Shepheardes Calender*"

James Gibbons (Rutgers U)

"*Agitante Calescimus Illo*: The Inspiration Debate in Spenser's
October Eclogue"

W. Russell Mayes, Jr. (U of Virginia)

Respondent: Lynn Staley (Colgate U)

"The Politics of Submission:

Timias and Raleigh in *The Faerie Queene*"

Martha J. Craig (Purdue U)

Respondent: Thomas H. Cain (McMaster U)

SPENSER III
The Kathleen Williams Lecture

Presider: Jerome S. Dees (Kansas State U)

Walter Davis (Brown U)"
"Spenser and the History of Allegory"

Closing Remarks: William Oram (Smith C)



DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
122 DENISON HALL
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
MANHATTAN KS 66506-0701

Nonprofit Organization
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
Permit #525
Manhattan, Kan. 66502

Serials Acquisitions
Thomas Cooper Library
Univ. of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208 25.3