THE Spenser REVIEW

Autumn 2003 • Volume 34, Number 3

Published with the assistance of
MACALESTER COLLEGE

THE Spenser REVIEW Autumn 2003 • Volume 34, Number 3

The Spenser Review is published three times a year, Winter, Summer, and Fall with the generous support of Macalester College. Please address all communications to *The Spenser Review*, Department of English, Macalester College, 1600 Grand Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota 55105.
Phone 651/696-6000; e-mail: Krier@Macalester.edu

The editor solicits letters containing news of any sort which would interest Spenserians, and will make an effort to print any legitimate inquiry. She especially solicits abstracts and/or offprints of articles, receipt of which will reduce the time between publication of the article and the news of it.

Subscription rates, individuals: $10.00/yr. in U.S.A. and Canada (in U.S. funds); $15.00/yr. for all other countries (in U.S. funds). Rates for libraries: $14.00/yr. in U.S. and Canada; $19.00/yr. for all other countries (in U.S. funds). Back issues may be purchased from the editor or, in microfiche, from ProQuest Information & Learning, 300 N. Zeeb Road, P.O. Box 1346, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.
Members of the International Spenser Society receive *The Spenser Review* automatically:
for membership and forms, go to the website of the Society at
<http://www.english.cam.ac.uk/spenser/society/htm>.

The Spenser Review has a website at
<http://www.english.cam.ac.uk/spenser/spenrev>.

To Our Readers

03.79

With this issue, *The Spenser Review* takes up its new home (and the editor also takes up her new institutional home) at Macalester College in St. Paul, Minnesota. We are very grateful to Macalester for its logistical and financial support. Our new contact information appears on the copyright page; we list it here for your convenience:

The Spenser Review
Theresa Krier, editor
Dept. of English
Macalester College
1600 Grand Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105
email: Krier@Macalester.edu

Readers who plan to attend MLA this year will be interested in the events sponsored by the Spenser Society, listed in Item 03.115 below. We are especially looking forward to the Luncheon lecture by Janet Adelman. Please plan to attend the regular sessions on Spenser if you possibly can; remember that MLA takes attendance and allocates future sessions accordingly. Our organizers and speakers can use all the support you can give them.

Book Reviews and Notices

03.80

McCabe, Richard. *Spenser's Monstrous Regiment: Elizabethan Ireland and the Poetics of Difference.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. xiv + 306 pp. ISBN 0-19-818734-3. $70.00.

Reviewed by Richard Helgerson

With the recent books of Willy Maley, Andrew Hadfield, Christopher Highley, and Andrew Murphy, plus dozens of articles and conference papers by these and other critics, there is not much danger that anyone interested in Spenser will have failed to notice that his poetry was deeply engaged in the same colonial enterprise as his now notorious *Vewe of the Present State of Ireland.* Richard McCabe is well aware of this. He cites Maley, Hadfield, Highley, and Murphy on the first page of *Spenser's Monstrous Regiment.* But McCabe has something new to offer. As well as reading *The Faerie Queene* and Spenser's other poems in the light of the *Vewe* and a wide variety of other early modern writings on Ireland, McCabe also lets us hear the voices of Spenser's Irish contemporaries, the Gaelic "bards" Spenser reviles in his *Vewe.* The result is a significantly more polyphonic understanding of the colonial milieu from which much of Spenser's poetry emerged than we have had up to now, one that profoundly qualifies the self-justifying sense of absolute difference between English civility and Irish barbarity that Spenser worked so hard to maintain both in the *Vewe* and, McCabe would claim, in most of his poems, including every book of *The Faerie Queene.*

As McCabe describes their situation, the most striking difference between Spenser and his Gaelic counterparts is that the Gaelic bards actually enjoyed the influence and prestige for which Spenser so fervently longed. Laureate status was not something the bards had to construct out of the distant memory of a long-departed classical past. It was theirs by well-established tradition. Professional jealousy may thus have had its part in the vehemence with which Spenser denigrated them. But in keeping with his larger colonial aim, Spenser had also to deny their very civility and that of their nation. What McCabe's frequent quotations from the Irish do is radically to undermine that denial in a way strongly reminiscent of—though infinitely better informed than—Montaigne's celebration of native American poetry in his essay "Of Cannibals." Few Spenserians will ever have seen the names of Tadhg Dall Ó hUiginn, Eochaidh Ó hEódhasa, or Eoghan Ruadh Mac an Bhaird, much less have read their poems. But once McCabe has quoted from them, it is hard not to echo Montaigne in exclaiming, "There is nothing barbarous in this imagination." And no less striking than the revelation of early modern Gaelic poetic art is the force and clear sightedness of their condemnation of English policy in Ireland. Unlike Spenser, the Gaelic bards had no illusions about the superior civility of the English.

McCabe's title, *Spenser's Monstrous Regiment*, firmly sides with the Irish writers. McCabe sees, as they did, the savage monstrosity of the English colonial regime in Ireland. And, indeed, when one thinks of events like the massacre of some six hundred unarmed mercenaries at Smerwick in 1580 or the deliberately provoked famine a few years later in Munster, a famine whose death toll contemporary English observers estimated at

more than thirty thousand, "monstrosity" seems an inescapable term. Nor can one deny Spenser's complicity. Both events occurred during the government of Lord Grey of Wilton, whom Spenser served as secretary and whose actions he glorified in Book 5 of *The Faerie Queene*. Spenser participated in these events; he approved them; he boldly defended their chief perpetrator against his squeamish courtly detractors; and he even proposed in the *Vewe* that the worst of them, the intentional famine, be repeated a decade later to subdue the rebellious people of Ulster.

Neither the brutality of Elizabethan colonial behavior in Ireland not the place of that behavior in Book 5 are news. Nearly sixty years ago, C. S. Lewis famously charged that in Book 5 Spenser's involvement with Ireland "begins to corrupt his imagination." But like other recent critics, McCabe sees the corruption spreading throughout *The Faerie Queene* and the rest of the Spenserian corpus. Book 1 features the militant Protestantism that was essential to Spenser's colonial project; the action of Book 2 "is 'set' . . . in the common 'land' of colonial opportunity" (122), a land that belongs equally to Ireland and the New World; the royal genealogies of Books 2 and 3 struggle to maintain an enabling myth of racial difference; the river marriage of Book 4 presents an ideal image of universal dominion, one that appropriates Irish rivers for an English empire; Book 6 reveals how civility can be made an instrument of subjection; and the *Mutability Cantos* put Irish claims formally on trial. As for the *Complaints*, *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*, or the volume containing the *Amoretti* and *Epithalamion*, they all give voice, sometimes quite openly, to the interests and concerns of the New English official and planter who was Edmund Spenser. Even *The Shepheardes Calender*, published the year before Spenser left England, anticipates issues that were to become central to Spenser's poetics of empire.

The most pressing of those issues is suggested by a second reading of McCabe's title, a reading that notices the echo of another title, *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*, John Knox's vitriolic, 1558 attack on female rule. From our point of view, the "monstrous regiment" of Elizabethan Ireland is the regiment that Spenser supported and that such lord deputies and generals as Lord Grey, Sir Henry Sidney, Sir John Perrot, the earl of Essex, and Lord Mountjoy did their best to enforce. But from Spenser's point of view, which was also the point of view of those deputies and generals, the true monstrosity belonged rather to a monarchic regiment with a woman at its head, the regiment of Queen Elizabeth. Though few of these men went as far as Sir John Perrot, who complained of serving "a base bastard piss kitchen woman" (11)—Essex, of course, went much further—they all chaffed under Elizabeth's reluctant, shifting, overly merciful, pinch-penny control. And Spenser, who penned Lord Grey's letters of complaint, shared their concern. For him, as for his New English friends and associates, the queen herself was the prime obstacle blocking their "imperial cause" (99).

What a long way we have come in the last twenty-five years! From Spenser as the leading contributor to the so-called "cult of Elizabeth" to Spenser as another John Knox delivering a second trumpet blast against the monstrous regiment of women. The shift has not come in a single step. McCabe has had many predecessors, but few have been quite so insistent. What justifies that insistence is the Irish perspective from which McCabe writes. Elizabeth rarely failed to disappoint her English administrators and her New English subjects in Ireland. Such disappointment, McCabe argues, turned into something verging on open antagonism in Spenser's many unappealing figures for female rule: Satanic Lucifera, frivolously proud

Philotime, Circean Acrasia, Amazonian Radigund, and weak-willed Mercilla. And even his more attractive ruling women, Gloriana, Belphoebe, *The Shepheardes Calender*'s Eliza, and *Colin Clouts*'s Cynthia, variously weaken or impede the men who serve them—never more obviously than when Gloriana recalls Lord Grey's allegorical counterpart, Sir Artegall, from the Salvage Island, as Elizabeth recalled the real Lord Grey.

Supported by a careful reading not only of Spenser's poetry and his *Vewe* but also of countless other documents of the period, including particularly the many letters Spenser wrote for Lord Grey, McCabe makes a compelling, if starkly one-sided case both for Spenser's pervasive engagement in the business of Ireland and for his resistance to female rule. On at least one occasion, he does, however, let his special pleading distort the evidence. Early on he argues that Elizabeth's womanly "frustration of *The Faerie Queene*'s imperial agenda is suggested by its 'feminine' form." A poem destined by "colonial conquest" and "racial difference" to resemble Camões's Virgilian *Lusiads* was, he claims, "transformed" into an Ariostan romance. "It is as though the genre itself has become emasculated, as though the body of the text has grown to resemble the effeminate body politic" (14-15). As gender/genre fantasy, this notion of "feminine" romance frustrating "masculine" epic may have some justification, but as literary history it has none. From all we can tell, *The Faerie Queene* began as a still more Ariostan romance than it now is and was nudged in the direction of greater Virgilian unilinearity by Spenser's encounter in the 1580s with Tasso's newly published *Gerusalemme liberata*, a poem which gives thematic significance to the difference between epic and romance. And if the multiplicity of Spenser's romance, its many books and many heroes, has a political meaning, that meaning is less an unhappy submission to female rule than a neofeudal revival of aristocratic male prerogative at the expense of a female monarch.

In McCabe's book, this gender/genre fantasy is at most a minor distraction. Its exposition requires only one paragraph, and it never comes up again. But it does point to a larger and more pervasive problem, a problem of compositional chronology. McCabe writes as though the whole of *The Faerie Queene* was written in Ireland and was deeply affected by Spenser's experiences there. But we know from the Spenser/Harvey correspondence that some part, perhaps a significant part, of the poem was already in existence before Spenser ever got his Irish assignment. Many years ago, in a book McCabe quotes with approval but whose implications for his own argument he ignores, Josephine Waters Bennett made the plausible and, so far as I know, still unrefuted suggestion that the remains of that first, pre-Irish *Faerie Queene* are to be found in the most Ariostan parts of the poem—that is, in Books 3, 4, and perhaps part of 5. But these are also parts of the poem where McCabe discerns a particularly strong Irish engagement.

How are we to reconcile these differences? Was Spenser already writing under the influence of Ireland even before he had any thought of going there? Or is McCabe simply projecting onto Spenser's poems concerns that had no part in their composition? It seems to me that at some level both are likely. In *The Faerie Queene*, only the Irena episode in Book 5 is specifically and unequivocally concerned with the English conquest of Ireland. And in Spenser's poetic corpus at large, only the *Epithalamion*, *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*, and the *Mutability Cantos* could have been written by no one but a poet who had lived or was then living in Ireland. Otherwise the relevance of Spenser's poetry to his experience as a colonial administrator, settler, and polemicist could be almost as easily

coincidental as deliberate. Writing of Guyon's brutal destruction of the Bower of Bliss, Stephen Greenblatt suggested analogies not only with English depredations in Ireland but also with Protestant iconoclasm and the European devastation of the Americas. The passages McCabe discusses would lend themselves to a similar multiplicity of applications. Yes, the conflicts of Catholic and Protestant in Book 1, the temptations of Mammon in Book 2, the genealogical constructions in Books 2 and 3, the river marriage in Book 4, the violent imposition of "justice" in Book 5, the encounters with savagery in Book 6, and the frustrations of female rule throughout the Spenserian canon can be seen to have specific relevance to the situation in Ireland and are brilliantly illuminated by the many contemporary documents McCabe cites, including especially the Gaelic writings he is the first to make available to Spenserians. But they can all be equally illuminated by other documents dealing with other sixteenth-century concerns, whether within England itself, or with England's European neighbors, or with the larger world that Europeans were then encountering, often for the first time.

If *The Faerie Queene* and Spenser's other poetic writings are deeply engaged, whether by coincidence or intent, with Ireland—and McCabe does a fine job of showing that they are—they are also and at the same time just as deeply engaged with much else. And from that broader perspective, Spenser's "monstrous regiment" can assume a distinctly less monstrous appearance. Remembering the papal call for Elizabeth's overthrow and assassination, the St. Bartholomew's Eve Massacre, the brutal Spanish response to the Dutch Revolt, the Invincible Armada, and the isolation of England and the English language from continental Europe, we can even think of Spenser as the English equivalent of those Gaelic bards McCabe quotes, a voice of the oppressed crying out against the annihilation that threatened him, his queen, his nation, his culture, and his religion. Spenser was, in fact, both the oppressor and the oppressed. Forgetting either will only diminish our sense of him and his poetry.

Richard Helgerson is Professor of English at the University of California, Santa Barbara. He is the author of The Elizabethan Prodigals *(1976),* Self-Crowned Laureates *(1983),* Forms of Nationhood *(1992), and* Adulterous Alliances *(2000).*

03.81

A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture. Ed. Michael Hattaway. Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 2000. xix + 747 pp. ISBN 0-6312-1668-5. $124.95 cloth.

Reviewed by Judith Owens

It's a shame that most library users—and there should be many—of Blackwell's *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, edited by Michael Hattaway, will not see the book's dust jacket. It's not so much that the jacket has exceptional visual appeal (although it is arresting), but that it reflects certain of the key interpretive assumptions, questions, themes, and practices that link many of the book's essays. The illustration, from a painting by Girolamo da Treviso (1497-1541) which depicts the stoning of papal figures by apostles, foregrounds the Reformation as the bedrock, however fissured by violent conflict, of the English Renaissance. Such emphasis is sustained as well in the lettering, which combines red and black, flourishes and straight lines, to suggest the bracketing of Italianate influences by native English ones. In a critical milieu as conducive as is ours to iconographic analysis, it's unfortunate that so

many readers will miss out on the preliminary pleasures afforded by the jacket. Hattaway's introduction picks up precisely with the matters adumbrated on the cover, however, by asking: "What does it mean to speak of 'the English Renaissance'?" (3). The answer to this question follows in 60 chapters, by 51 different contributors, of commentary that is, for the most part, thorough, balanced, and engaging. That so compendious a collection sustains such quality is no small achievement.

In his brief but pointed introduction, Hattaway sets the terms of this engagement by reminding us that the term "Renaissance"—particularly as invented by Burckhardt in the nineteenth century—bears limited application to the "English experience" of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (3): because English traditions of literature and culture retained strong links to medieval ones; because the kinds of civic structures that underpinned the Italian Renaissance never informed English life; because the Burckhardtian "Renaissance," with its foci on individual "'men of genius'" and aristocratic culture, is too exclusionary to accommodate traditions that included women and popular culture (5); because, finally, "Renaissance" is too secular a term to denote culture and literature that are thoroughly inflected with Reformation politics and theology. The increasingly popular "early modern," a label that does "avoid problems of origin" and that, in salutary fashion, "encourages us to look in texts for scepticism and doubt" (5), will not serve either, however, because it implies a decisive break with medieval traditions, a break that did not occur, and because it anachronistically requires analysts to import back into the seventeenth and sixteenth centuries political and cultural formations that emerged only in the eighteenth. Complicating still further the task of definition is the fact that native English and medieval traditions were qualified by theories and practices of education that disseminated classical models and modes. Hattaway himself would be happy with "Reformation England," a designation which, he tells us, determined his choice of cover illustration (5).

What emerges most strongly from Hattaway's introduction is a sense of the unprogrammed vitality of the English arts; the implication for this book is that there is no one "map," or at least no map without "lacunae" (6), for the exploring of English culture. More than anything else, perhaps, this sense of release from any Burckhardtian "master proposal" (3) serves as the rubric under which many of the book's essays take shape. Most of the essayists prefer not to draw or re-iterate prescriptive lines, choosing instead to multiply contexts, adduce overlapping categories, or chart new trajectories, even when rehearsing topics well worn by scholarship. But while there may be no one map, students of the period need some signposts to what is vast and varied territory; these are provided in the section titles—"Introduction," "Contexts and Perspectives," "Readings," "Genres and Modes," and "Issues and Debates"—as well as in the conscientiousness of individual contributors, who almost all take care to situate their comments within current critical debates. As a result of what I take to have been an editorial policy designed to balance stock-taking and innovation, most of the essays develop refreshing perspectives without either lapsing into idiosyncrasy or toeing party lines.

This latter feature—along with the book's ambitious aim to be comprehensive—makes Blackwell's *Companion* pre-eminently suited to serve as a guide for serious students of the period. It will be especially useful for undergraduate students, who, increasingly, bring to upper-level courses in Renaissance/early modern literature relatively sophisticated habits of reading and analysis, but only the haziest sense of the period (they almost all know that

Donne and Shakespeare wrote then, but their sense of the period is elastic enough to sometimes also include Chaucer and Dickens, as well as the impression that the steam engine fuelled the transitions of the Renaissance). A guide that can fill undergraduate gaps in knowledge without condescension is indeed valuable. Because nearly all the essays develop an argument along with their overviews, graduate students will also find the *Companion* a useful resource, as will teachers of Renaissance courses—and not just new teachers: when I was preparing this review, I was also devising an outline for a graduate seminar on early modern London life and literature and I kept finding in the *Companion* commentary that helped me to shape the course.

Given the scope and aims of the book, direct commentary on Spenser remains relatively sparse (the index records a scant 67 references to Spenser in 706 pages of essays, with only 5 multiple-page entries: those range from 4 to, in one instance, 11 pages, for a total of 32 pages; Shakespeare, in comparison, appears 82 times in the index, with 10 multiple-page references amounting to 46 pages). Nevertheless, Spenserians, new and established, will almost certainly find this *Companion* useful—although less, perhaps, for its direct Spenser commentary than for the opportunities it affords for contextualizing Spenser. Scholars new to the field will benefit from the chance to step back from their immediate interests (if the book hesitates to offer itself as a map to the period, it is generous in proffering prospects), while more experienced scholars will derive new ways of approaching familiar territory—not least because the sheer range of topics covered will inevitably bring into purview some previously obscured line of inquiry. Before returning to these merits, I would like to canvass those essays with very immediate bearing on Spenser.

To begin where Spenser started, Michelle O'Callaghan's "Pastoral" aligns *The Shepheardes Calender* with the social and ethical functions ascribed to pastoral by Renaissance commentators such as Scaliger and Sidney, a tack which enables her to separate her understanding of the mode from Louis Montrose's influential approach. Noting that Renaissance theorists assumed that "genres are social rather than purely literary constructs and do not merely reflect culture but are constitutive of it" (307), she acknowledges Montrose's affinity with this socially-inflected model, but finds that Montrose's emphasis on pastoral as pre-eminently courtly in aim and action privileges (along Italian lines) otium as the desideratum of Renaissance pastoral practice. The likewise influential Annabel Patterson, whose model of pastoral as "under cover" writing allows her to stress, as Montrose does not, the "possibilities [for expression] that pastoral metaphor offers," nevertheless shares with Montrose the assumption that pastoral is geared toward "courtly ambitions and their attendant anxieties" (309). O'Callaghan wishes to stress instead the idea that, in native English "plowman" tradition, "[l]abour is at the centre of *Calender*'s value-system" (310), so much so that "shepherd-pastor merges with the shepherd-poet" and "the ethical and political responsibilities of the poet become a prominent theme of the eclogues" (310). Accordingly, Colin—so often read as figuring Spenser's laureate ambitions—is centred with E.K. and Harvey in a "communal effort" to produce not just the *Calender* but also a "semiprivate space in which like-minded friends can freely meet and speak with each other" (311). O'Callaghan's emphasis is salutary (and *au courant*) in its finding grounds for "collective agency" (313) both in Spenser's own pastorals and in his influence on pastorals of the early seventeenth century, which "developed the anti-courtliness of pastoral satire to produce an effective oppositional poetic" (313).

Given her mandate to provide an overview of Renaissance pastoral, O'Callaghan's discussion of Spenser is necessarily cursory; given her own research interests in "early modern textual communities" (xvi), her analysis of the *Calender* is, perhaps understandably, one-dimensional in its emphasis on the communal and ethical imperatives of the work. And (inexplicably, even in light of an editorial injunction against lengthy notes and bibliographies) neither Jane Tylus's work on the georgic elements of the *Calender* nor Lynn Staley Johnson's work on its reformative vision is cited.

The minimal reference to *The Faerie Queene* in Clara Mucci's "Allegory" suffers, not from exclusiveness of theme, but from broadness. Mucci's strategy for grasping what is a large and nebulous topic—her stressing that "allegory expose[s] polysemy in language" (298)—enables her to conclude with the welcome reassurance that the distances opened by allegory in the Renaissance are creative (rather than, in post-modernist fashion, disjunctive). But her working premise, that "all aesthetic forms of the period . . . have an allegorical dimension by virtue of their ideological focus on the queen and the legitimization of the House of Tudor" (303), relies too uncritically on a now widely-contested position and, as formulated, remains much too large to serve as an interpretive category, particularly for as polysemous a work as *The Faerie Queene*. Whereas O'Callaghan traces the separation of pastoral from courtly aims, granting to the *Calender* an important role in that development, Helen Moore, in "Romance," focuses on the "increasingly close relationship between romance and the royal circle in the seventeenth century" (323). She traces this alliance to the sixteenth-century recruiting of romance to serious historical, political, and moral purposes, and, not surprisingly, situates Spenser firmly within this process: "It is in Spenser's *Faerie Queene* that this combination of historical narrative, poetic pleasure and moral worth reaches its full potential" (321). In doing so and in adducing the Bower of Bliss as the example of Spenser's melding of moral and aesthetic purposes, Moore does not substantively extend our understanding of Spenser's poem; but in reviewing the ways that romance draws on chronicle and chivalric traditions, she encourages more historically-informed generic understanding of Spenser's claim that "Fierce warres and faithfull loves shall moralize [his] song" (*Faerie Queene*, Proem 1).

Rachel Falconer's more theoretically-informed review of generic matters, in this case, Renaissance epic, adapts Bakhtin's definition of epic, teasing out from that seemingly monologic position the flexibility to accommodate what she identifies as peculiarly Renaissance pressures. Falconer concedes that "[t]o a modern reader, Renaissance epic may appear to speak with the voice of unchallenged, regal authority," but contends that "when we turn to the poems themselves, we find that the heroic ideal takes shape in the midst of bitter and polemical argument with contemporaries, by means of narrative strategies that call into question the very efficacy of epic poems as vehicles for heroic virtue" (330). For Spenser and other Renaissance epicists, the relationships among poet, text, and audience readily admit irony, and just as readily shift in response to English political concerns: "In the hands of Chapman, Spenser, Harington, Fairfax and others, epic poetry is made to criticize present government even as it reveres the mythic past" (337).

In suggesting that the versatility of genres and modes in the English Renaissance is at once formal, social, and political, Falconer, O'Callaghan, and Moore follow the critical temper of the times, which is increasingly keen—as new historicism and cultural materialism become second-, even third-, generation movements—to retain both literary and

sociopolitical categories of analysis. Diana Henderson, in "Love Poetry," similarly wishes to balance politically-contoured criticism—in this case, analysis that regards love poetry as primarily a form of power-brokering—with criticism that reflects on what "we may continue to learn . . . about love as well as poetry" from Renaissance lyricists (378). Without denying that love sometimes is not love in the lyrics of our period, Henderson chooses to emphasize that "love poetry [was] being written in Renaissance England," and that "often it was very good indeed— arguably the greatest body of lyric poetry in the English language, in quality as well as quantity" (378).

Taking at face value the claims of this body of poetry to be poetry, Henderson sketches the "traditions upon which the English poets constructed their own" (379), returning us especially to Petrarch as "a remarkable craftsman of sound and sense who made the love lyric seem capable of capturing all that mattered most in human experience" (380). Henderson pairs Spenser and Sidney within this tradition to demonstrate the "capaciousness" and "malleability" of the sonnet sequence as a form and to conclude that "[w]hat emerges from reading their sequences . . . is a more vivid awareness of distinctive sensibilities and adjustments to the social, philosophical and religious quandaries occasioned by erotic desire" (385). She offers a reading of Spenser's *Amoretti*, with a particular focus on 67 ("Lyke as a huntsman"), that is finely tuned to the ways in which Spenser's verse turns convention to personal uses while remaining engaged with historical particularities. In stressing that we need to attend to both historical context and artistry, Henderson affirms that "poetry matters now because it . . . makes us aware of how people have imagined their worlds . . . and it simultaneously aspires to free itself from those worlds through its own internal systems, shapes and beauties" (390).

If Henderson's essay rehearses values that have occasionally been lost in the prevailing critical practice of recent years, Judith Anderson's chapter on Spenser, "Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, Book V: Poetry, Politics and Justice," reminds us that what has been gained through the new historicist and materialist schools includes widening of the canon, re-definition of literary values, and extension of literature's significance. She begins by acknowledging that "[u]ntil quite recently, it would have been inconceivable to focus the chapter on Spenser . . . on the fifth book of *The Faerie Queene*, the book treating Justice and concluding with efforts to impose an effective political order on England's unruly colony Ireland" (195). Comparing the fifth book both to the other books in *The Faerie Queene* and to the *Vewe*, Anderson demonstrates that "from a modern or a Renaissance view," the Book of Justice "is finally a hybrid . . . of poetry and history that threatens conventional moral, political and aesthetic categories of interpretation" (196). The detailed synopsis that follows in the remainder of the essay highlights the "dislocations" (198) and "contradictions" (200) that characterize Spenser's handling of hero and theme.

Anderson's is the only essay devoted exclusively to Spenser; readers wishing for more detailed Spenser coverage in the format of a guide-book can turn to the recent *Cambridge Companion to Spenser* (2001). (Readers looking for a guide to the period that is narrower in time-frame and in topic, and so in some ways more sharply-focused, can turn to the almost as recent *Cambridge Companion to English Literature 1500-1600* [2000]; both of these were reviewed in this journal's issue 34.2, Summer 2003). As I've suggested, the *Blackwell Companion*'s greatest usefulness for Spenserians will stem from the opportunities it provides for contextualizing Spenser—whether in customary ways, such as

those supplied by chapters on humanism (Mary Thomas Crane), the Reformation (Patrick Collinson), classical philosophical traditions (Sarah Hatton), history (Collinson), education (Jean Brink), courts and coteries (Curtis Perry), literary kinds (John Roe), Renaissance poetics (Arthur Kinney), complaints and satire (John King)—or in the novel ways afforded by chapters that cover topics, conventional and avant-garde, that do not routinely come into range with Spenser. With respect to the latter, for example, this *Companion* invites the reader to think about Spenser in light of customary drama that included performances of "'ridings' of St. George and the dragon" (Thomas Pettitt, 469), or in terms of ephemeral popular verse (Malcolm Jones), or in connection to London literature (John Twynning), or in view of (literally, since 18 plates are reproduced) woodcut and engraved prints (Jones), or in terms of Renaissance categories of sexuality (James Knowles) and race (Margo Hendricks). Certainly one of the chief pleasures for me as I read through the essays was the incentive to think about Spenser aslant.

Judith Owens, University of Manitoba, is the author of Enabling Engagements: Edmund Spenser and the Poetics of Patronage *(2002) and essays on Spenser's* Epithalamion *and* Mutabilitie Cantos*; her current research interests include Spenser and London, and early modern pedagogy.*

03.82

Van Es, Bart. *Spenser's Forms of History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. ISBN 0199249709. x + 240 pp. $65.00 cloth.

Reviewed by John Curran

Bart Van Es's *Spenser's Forms of History* is an interesting study of that most difficult but vital area of Spenser's thinking, how he conceived of the past. By parceling out the different approaches to history Spenser would have known and used, Van Es has shown some of the ways in which Spenser's historical vision was even more complex than we have imagined.

Van Es sets out to demonstrate how we have under-appreciated the ways in which different genres—forms—of Renaissance historiography shaped the complications in it as well as the reactions to it and the meanings of it. For Van Es, this oversight was not shared by Spenser, who infused his works with playful and problematic versions of these different genres: chronicle, chorography, antiquarianism, euhemerism and universal history, analogy, and prophecy. These categories are familiar to students of Renaissance historiography, but Van Es has usefully sorted them out and eloquently explained the paradoxes emanating from them.

Van Es is especially good at discovering paradoxes, and he does so in making interesting connections between Spenserian texts, other Renaissance works, and topical issues. Antiquarian discussions, for example, invite questions on legitimacy of rule—conquest, precedent, ownership of the past, the right to assemble, and the varied interpretations that are bound to result from free intellectual exchange—and these questions connect the proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries, the *Vewe of the State of Ireland*, and the *Mutabilitie Cantos*. Hence Van Es is able to spell out for us how the ambiguities of past, present, and future play out in these works: "Spenser's text is a kind of *Britannia* in reverse: where Camden's painstaking enquiries gradually reveal the ordered network of roads and settlements that was Roman Britain, Spenser's lead him *forward* to a neo-imperial vision of what could be." Similarly, in Spenser's hands prophecy is exposed as the most self-unraveling of encomiastic devices, for while it praises the monarch it not only warns her about

her situation—she is threatened, like Britomart, with falling into narcissism, looking at herself instead of her destiny—but it also works to dissociate itself from itself, lest it be rendered absurd like the efforts of the Harvey brothers.

Van Es's use of non-Spenserian works is learned, skillful, and effective. He draws on much that was of no influence on Spenser, but does so to illuminate concepts that the poet was certainly struggling with, and also to help emphasize the overarching point that forms of history "have the capacity to change their aspect depending on the political context in which they are read." The opening with *Poly Olbion* is characteristic of this design, as is the use of the Society of Antiquaries, Ware's edition of the *Vewe*, Raleigh's *History of the World*, and a number of manuscript sources. When Van Es does draw on true Spenserian sources, such as Camden, Holinshed, and Warner, he is just as persuasive in making connections. And it should be said that a number of these texts, like Warner, warrant the kind of closer look Van Es pays them. In all, the book is impressively well versed in primary as well as secondary materials, though the neglect of church history is something of a disappointment. Foxe is enlisted to help explore the paradoxes of analogy—the age appears as both a golden age and a declining one—but otherwise the ecclesiastical dimension gets short shrift.

Of greatest interest to Spenserians, however, will be the various incisive readings Van Es offers of Spenser's own stuff. The opening chapter contains a wonderful account of the way Spenser plays upon the word "monument," with its connotation of a physical remainder of the past at once connected to and disconnected from the present. Van Es's reading of "The Ruines of Time" is especially deft here, as he explains how the lost city of Verulamium "fixes upon a multiform insubstantiality." The following discussion of Briton Moniments traces artfully the ways "monuments"—"elements that exist outside the world of the poem"—are woven into Spenser's chronicle, and some of the close readings here, as with the now renowned stanza on how Arthur "defrayd" Caesar's conquest of Britain, are superb indeed. And later in the book similar gems can be unearthed, as with the discussion of giants and the ways they complicate allegorical valences: giants point to "the fact that 'progress' toward civility was at the same time 'degeneration' from an ideal state. . . . The Proem to Book V subtly holds these two possibilities in suspension."

In precise commentary such as this, the book is surely a success; if called upon to cite a flaw in it, I would have to point to its lack of unity and of an overall thesis. Van Es ventures a few provocative generalizations about what we should learn about Spenser's thought, such as the suggestion that the poet regretted the eclipse of the legendary British history more than we have heretofore stressed. But such moments are fleeting, this one indeed being dropped casually in parentheses. Beyond telling us that Spenser was especially clever and well informed about history and quite well attuned to the paradoxes of its forms—all which we know—Van Es offers us little to chew on in the way of central claims. This is probably the expected result of what seems to be a typical practice these days, the publication as a first book of a dissertation that is not really a book, but rather a series of loosely connected essays many or even most of which have already been published as articles. But Van Es can hardly be blamed for following this trend. He has himself contributed clever and well informed insights into Spenser's work and makes a worthy addition to the conversation about the "poet historical."

John Curran, of Marquette University, is author of Roman Invasions: The British History, Protestant Anti-Romanism, and the Historical Imagination in England, 1530-1660.

03.83

Palmer, Patricia. *Language and Conquest in Early Modern Ireland: English Renaissance Literature and Elizabethan Imperial Expansion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. xii + 254 pp. ISBN 0-521-79318-1. $ 60.00 cloth.

Reviewed by Christopher Ivic

This book is a study of Elizabethan linguistic colonialism, covering, roughly, the period from Elizabeth I's accession (1558) to the flight of the earls (1607), the moment in Irish history that many historians Vewe as marking the end of Gaelic power. The Elizabethan conquest of Ireland, Palmer notes, signals a crucial moment in the fortunes of English and Irish: "the conquest marks the inaugural episode of [English's] imperial expansion"; moreover, "it is the originary moment of a language shift that constitutes the great drama of Irish cultural history" (1). In her Introduction, Palmer turns to Frank McGuinness's play *Mutabilitie* (1997), which takes place in Kilcolman during the Nine Years War, as an example of scholars' "inattention to the linguistic face of the conquest" (3). Just as McGuinness's play effaces the Irish language, and thereby anachronistically portrays sixteenth-century Munster as "uncomplicatedly anglophone" (3), "most literary critics on 'Elizabethan Ireland'" have been firmly rooted "deep inside an anglophone universe of discourse" (4). The danger, for Palmer, is that these critics engage only canonical English texts, thereby eliding the Irish language and its worldview (4). Palmer's suggestion that we must read not only colonial masterpieces but also "minorpieces" of the colonized—texts that "represent an essential counterpoint to the voluminous colonial record" (5)—is certainly refreshing. Given the plethora of work on early modern Ireland over the last few years, one has to wonder if Palmer is not overstating the lack of critical attention to the role of language in the recolonizaton and reconquest of Ireland. Probably more than any other group of Renaissance literary historians, Spenserians are well aware of the wealth of work on colonial discourse in early modern Ireland. While this may be the first monograph on language and conquest, surely Palmer's description of the "exiguous attention . . . the language encounter has so far attracted" (4) is misleading. Scholarship that "reinsert[s] Irish interlocutors" (6) into the framework is most welcome, though historians and literary historians, such as Willy Maley, Vincent Carey, Richard McCabe, Marc Caball, to name a few, have already done crucial spadework. This book, then, does not significantly redirect our understanding of English colonial practices in early modern Ireland; however, it does provide a thorough examination of the role language played in the reconquest.

The first chapter establishes Palmer's methodological framework: it turns to the Spanish colonization of the New World—in particular, the languages of colonizer and colonized—as a model for approaching English colonial ideologies and language policies. The chapter opens with something of a history lesson, recounting early Tudor policy toward Ireland, with copious references to historians. It then turns to ground apparently uncovered by historians, language. While Palmer delves deeply into historical scholarship on early modern Ireland, citing a range of scholars (Bradshaw, Brady, Canny, Ellis, Gillespie), her critical perspective on their work rarely goes beyond noting their inattention to language: "Bound up in the drift towards colonisation traced by historians was language; but the historians leave that story untold" (13). While Palmer does well to examine the "Tudor (re)conquest of Ireland [as] part of a much larger pattern of sixteenth-

century colonial expansion" (6), the question of placing Ireland in a broader British framework is overlooked, which is odd, for some of the critics she cites–Ellis, especially–are central participants in British history. While there are reference to Wales and Scotland, this is very much a book on England and Ireland. The rest of this chapter summarizes scholarship on Spanish linguistic colonialism, drawing a comparison between English linguistic colonisation in Ireland and Spanish linguistic colonisation in the New World, with attention to both similarities and dissimilarities. Indeed, Palmer is careful to note that the Elizabethan reconquest of Ireland was different than the Spanish conquest of the New World precisely because a previous wave of colonists—the Old English—inhabited parts of Ireland. Having established this English/Irish — Spanish/New World model, Palmer returns to it again and again. For example, she notes in chapter three that, unlike the Spanish, who delved into Amerindian languages, the English showed little or no interest in Irish, which seems unusual given that the English who went to Ireland in the sixteenth-century were not only soldiers but also planters and government officials, people who would reside in Ireland for many years. But they picked up little Irish; hence, unlike in the New World, Ireland witnessed an absence of inter-lingual exchange. Take Spenser, for instance, whose interest in Irish, Palmer correctly remarks, is "forensic and superficial" (79). Edmund Campion, on the other hand, is singled out for his "openness to Irish" (91); however, Campion's later disparaging references to Irish and the Irish (99, 103) unsettles any sense of inclusiveness. Elizabethan colonial discourse on the Irish produced no Bartolomé de las Casas. The fifth chapter serves as the prime site of Palmer's Atlantic perspective; it traces English encounters with native languages in the New World, encounters modeled on the English presence in Ireland: "there was no greater inclination among Elizabethans in America to see the world through another's eyes than there had been in Ireland" (168). In many ways, Palmer is supplementing the work of D. B. Quinn and Canny, though her approach calls much more attention to linguistic expansion and the languages of the New World.

In the second and third chapters, Palmer turns her attention to the representation of Irish in Elizabethan texts. She begins with the keen observation that "[t]here is an outflow of *Vewes, Discoveries, Descriptions, Images, Platts, Anatomies*, but, as the relentlessly visual register of these titles insists, Irish-speakers are looked at rather than heard" (40). Focusing on the writings of Sir James Perrot, Thomas Churchyard, Captain Thomas Lee, Sir John Harington, John Dymmok, Fynes Morrison, Richard Beacon, to name a few, Palmer considers the ways in which colonial texts "translate" Irish, always a "translation" that serves to obscure the undeniable presence of Irish (within both Irish and Old English culture) and legitimate English colonial policy. Palmer centers in on three narrative strategies that she sees working to deny or traduce the native's language: unacknowledged translation, ventriloquism, and spectacle. Unacknowledged translation—paraphrase, quotation—serves to iron out and assimilate difference. Ventriloquism involves not only linguistic but also ideological submission. The wonderful example given is from John Derricke's *Image of Irelande* (1581), wherein Rory Óg O'More is ventriloquized to confess "I *Rorie Ogge* . . . A rebell false," which the marginal gloss comments upon as "Rorie is here a very penitent persone." Moments such as these (and there are many of them) reveal Palmer to be a close, critical reader of the colonial ideology of Elizabethan texts. The third narrative strategy, spectacle, involves pictures without sounds, a frequent occurrence in early modern English discourse on Ireland: "Time and again, the

colonial texts translate verbal exchanges into wordless tableaux[;] the primacy of the eye is asserted over that of the ear" (60). The process of viewing Irish speech renders the speech inaudible, which is to say the ideological work of spectacle is to at once picture, and thereby refigure, Irish while denying it of its oppositional voice. Of course, Irish isn't totally obscured; many texts do record the sounds of the natives. However, those sounds—cries, wailing—are ideologically charged recordings which work to confirm Irish savagery and barbarity.

Chapter four, which focuses on English linguistic nationalism and imperialism, is one of the weaker chapters, and its problems, unfortunately, are not restricted to it. That the English worked hard to stamp out Irish and plant English is not a novel idea: not surprisingly, this chapter is rather predictable. Familiar quotations celebrating the English language from Daniel and Spenser surface, as do familiar passages on the suppression of Irish from Spenser and Davies. One gets the sense that Palmer is retracing rather than reorienting the critical terrain. As her many references attest, Palmer is more than familiar with the scholarship; thus, she is not oblivious to the fact that she is treading on ground already covered. Her response, however, is to cite more primary material in support of the main idea; indeed, Palmer never leaves her reader wanting evidence. Another problem, especially given the book's subtitle, is the lack of attention to literature: not simply literature per se but also generic conventions and literary allusions. Her attention to ventriloquism and spectacle, for instance, could have provided a fascinating and original reading of Jonson's *Irish Masque*. Palmer does a superb job of attending to archival material, both print and manuscript, English and, especially, Irish. Literature, though, appears only here and there. Spenser's poetry, for example, receives little attention: the most sustained reading—on troubled civil conversion in Book VI of *The Faerie Queene*—spans a mere three pages. When she does discuss Spenser, she fails to attend to the complex and contradictory utterances in his work. By insisting that Malfont, "whose tongue had once reeled off 'bold speaches' and 'rayling rymes' against her majesty," "unmistakably echoes the Irish bards in the *Vewe*" (139), Palmer reads this passage in a way that overlooks what many Spenserians see as a subversive depiction of Mercilla, i.e., Queen Elizabeth. Spenser's anti-Elizabethan politics, a topic that has received much critical attention recently, is glossed over. If Spenser despised Irish poets, did he not also envy their proximity to those in power? When discussing Eudoxus' denigration of Irish in Spenser's *Vewe*, Palmer notes that although "Irenaeus might set him straight— 'it is certain that Ireland hath had the use of letters very anciently, and long before England'—Spenser allowed Eudoxus' retort, 'How comes it then that they are so barbarous still and so unlearned, being so old scholars?', to close the discussion" (102). Both of these critical readings, it seems to me, foreclose critical investigation precisely at moments that afford the critic an opportunity to open up Spenser's text, to read him more than simply another New Englishman.

At times, Palmer, as her reading of Spenser attests, misrepresents English colonial discourse on Ireland as monolithic. In this, she repeats what she accuses other literary historians of doing. In her Introduction, Palmer challenges what she terms New Historicism's "mesmerism with the colonial canon" (5). Postcolonial critics, too, come under fire: "When writing about early modern Ireland, postcolonialists' fixation on English literary texts—once more unto the breach with *Henry V*—quite unintentionally ends up representing colonial discourse as triumphantly omnipotent" (5). Critics such as David Baker and Patricia Parker have shown us that colonial, canonical texts themselves often

unsettle any notion of a stable colonial discourse. *Henry V*'s MacMorris, with his "broken English," has been read as a hybrid figure who destabilizes simple binary identities, so it is odd that Palmer not only ignores this play but undermines recent work on it. Having said this, I must acknowledge Palmer's genuine contribution: her brilliant reading of Irish texts as sites of resistance, which comes across most forcefully in the final chapter, though the chapters on the silencing of Irish also contain crucial material. In the final chapter, Palmer uncovers a "countervailing polyphony" (185-6) registered in the voices of Irish poets and interpreters, offering many intelligent readings of these voices. It is precisely in her attention to Ireland's linguistic plurality that Palmer has most to offer.

Christopher Ivic, Assistant Professor at SUNY-Potsdam, has articles in Archipelagic Identities: Literature and Identity in the Atlantic Archipelago, 1550-1800, *eds. Simon Mealor and Philip Schwyzer,* British Identities and English Renaissance Literature, *eds. David J. Baker and Willy Maley, and in* Genre, The Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies, *and* ARIEL. *He is currently co-editing, with Grant Williams,* Forgetting in Early Modern Literature and Culture: Lethe's Legacy.

03.84

Fox, Thomas Albert. *"The Fairy Queen."* justWords. iii + 88 pp. ISBN1-901382-01-X. £7.99 paper.

Reviewed by Theodore L. Steinberg

I'm sure you've all had this experience: You've just finished giving a lecture on Spenser at the public library or the YWCA or your child's drivers education class. Now you're ready to go home, have a cold bottle of celery tonic, and get back to that game of quoits you abandoned earlier in the afternoon, when inevitably someone asks the *question*, which is, "What would have been the result of a collaboration among E.K., T.S. Eliot, and Vladimir Nabokov?" No doubt you've given this question as much thought as I have, but in the absence of a really good answer, you do what academics always do. You make up something and say it in the most ambiguous terms possible. And you use the word "hegemony." The good news, though, is that now there is a really good answer, Thomas Albert Fox's "The Fairy Queen," edited by Terry Edwards.

Thomas Albert Fox is obviously a prolific poet, with seven volumes of unpublished poetry currently in progress, all of them edited, on a volunteer basis, by Terry Edwards. "The Fairy Queen," apparently Fox's first published work, is a poem of nine nine-line stanzas written to commemorate the queen's visit to Bath in May, 2002, or, as Edwards puts it, in his inimitable style, "an exceptional attempt to express how it is that Mrs. Elizabeth Mountbatten (Windsor), a shy, little lady in love with her husband Philip the Duke, a lady of unobtrusive but steely personality . . . holds what seems to be an inexplicable grip on the seemingly irrational feelings of the British people" (11). The nine stanzas of poetry occupy three and a half pages of this volume. The rest consists of critical apparatus—acknowledgements, introduction, commentary, conclusion, and 168 footnotes, including several to Jennie Weston! If Cuddie is "the perfecte paterne of a Poete," Edwards is the very perfect pattern of an editor.

Which, of course, is part of the point here. The poem itself is purely awful:

To swamp her shores with soapy waves
That wash old fabrics with pure crap

But Edwards, playing at Boswell, adores every

terrible word, for Fox and Edwards share a simultaneous loathing and love for the modern world, disparaging modern thought and modern modes of criticism while partaking plentifully of them. The result is a satire that cuts in many directions. Edwards, for instance, gets a lot of mileage out of his use of etymologies to explain aspects of the poem and of his critical apparatus, including an etymology of "etymology," but he is not above inventing his own jargon in the fashion of contemporary critics who cannot find the precise word they need in already existing English: "These mental visibilities ('visimentals') goaded their bodies to make their speech visible, and to 'really, preserve it that it stayed distinct and continuing (an 'existinctual'). These 'representations,' as it were 'existentualisations,' of the 'uniquities' . . ." (26). Well, you get the idea. He also proves, quite conclusively, that math is a form of prayer.

Readers of this journal will undoubtedly enjoy the riffs on *The Faerie Queene*, that "huge, unwordprocessed book" (14). Those nine-line stanzas, though not in any way Spenserian, provide Edwards with plenty of Spenserian commentary, including the following, which should provide a good idea of the apparatus' logic, which is not terribly unlike that of E.K.: "Let me not pretend to a capacity to summarise the 75,000 lines of 'The Faerie Queene' to provide you with a sound bite that encapsulates its whole point in one tasty, digestible pill; but, in essence, Spenser says there is a human behaviour named 'courtesy,' which is good, and that by following this moral code of behaviour you will actually be good. But, what is this moral code 'courtesy,' you ask? Indeed! Well, there are approximately 75,000 lines of explanation, formed in nearly 8,000 highly structured stanzas, in 72 cantos, in 6 books. Thus, the question is begged as to why Spenser needed 75,000 complex lines of verse to explain what 'good' is, when one sound bite will do?" (14-15).

A major convenience of this volume is that it includes detailed instructions for reading the text and apparatus as an on-line hypertext, the only drawback to which is that neither the text nor the apparatus is available on line, though there is a web site for Thomas Albert Fox that presents excerpts from his seven unpublished volumes, including "Songs of Nocence."

Except for a couple of spots where a joke is ridden too hard, "The Fairy Queen" is a strange, funny, and insightful satire on us, on modern ways of thinking, and on those who claim to reject such ways of thinking. Unlike most satire, though, it relies heavily on *The Faerie Queene*. And having gotten this far, I will call it quits and return to my quoits.

Theodore Steinberg believes that he teaches English at the State University of New York at Fredonia. His book, Reading the Middle Ages, *has just appeared from McFarland.*

Articles: Abstracts and Notices

03.85

Cheney, Patrick. **"Shakespeare's Sonnet 106, Spenser's National Epic, and Counter-Petrarchism."** *English Literary Renaissance* 31, 3 (2001): 331-64.

Brings back into focus for current scholarship Shakespeare's indebtedness to and rivalry with Spenser, first through a survey of the field, then through the lens of Shakespeare's Sonnet 106, in which Shakespeare pays homage to Spenser and tries to eclipse his achievement by wittily compressing in the space of the sonnet a complex Vergilian matrix of a literary career that Spenser had unfolded in *The Faerie Queene* and a counter-Spenserian Petrarchism. Shakespeare works these and other complex genre traditions in order to write the nation, especially along aristocratic, not simply royal, popular, or radical lines; Shakespeare claims to overgo Spenser as a national poet.

03.86

Cooney, H. **"Guyon and His Palmer: Spenser's Emblem of Temperance."** *Review of English Studies* 51, 202 (2000): 169-92.

Argues for increasing our sense of the Palmer's subtlety, including in his figure aspects drawn from Renaissance doctrines on the gift of counsel, the vice of curiosity, the taking of due care, the nature of guardian angels. Thus the Palmer represents the taking of due care as defined in Matthew's gospel, with Phaedria (II.vi) and Mammon (II.vii) signifying two extremes of which the Palmer is the mean. Argues that the Geneva Bible's glosses on Matthew 7-8 may have been the inspiration for Spenser's pairing of Tantalus and Pilate in Mammon's underworld. The Palmer may function as a meta-figure for the interpretation of allegory, so that there is a fundamental correspondence between Guyon's struggling toward temperance and prudence and the reader's struggling toward a providential interpretation of his book.

03.87

Fox, Cora. **"Spenser's Grieving Adicia and the Gender Politics of Renaissance Ovidianism."** *English Literary History* 69, 2 (2002): 385-412.

Argues that Spenser's deployments of Ovid involve a wrestling with the latter's anti-authoritarian politics and an engagement with the ironic and shifting ideologies of *The Metamorphoses*. Spenser's *Faerie Queene* both highlights and then often struggles to contain the disorder that results. Ovid is both the genius and the internalized nemesis of Spenser's poem. Specifically makes an argument about the gender politics and constructions of female subjectivity of the two poems, by examining Spenser's Adicia (V.viii), her transformation into a tiger, and the episode's relationship to Hecuba's transformation in Ovid. Adicia's metamorphosis complicates Spenserian gender politics in the Elizabethan age, and also enacts her transition from character to allegorical daemon, thus pointing to ways that Renaissance Ovidianism intersects with allegory and narrative.

03.88

Fukuda, Shohachi. **"The Numerological Patterning of the *Mutabilite Cantos*."** *Notes and Queries* 50,1 (March 2003): 18-20.

Argues that the final episode of *The Faerie Queene* is related to the opening one in the triple

use of the number 27. The structure of VII.vi is twofold: in addition to its obvious pattern of 36 (Mutabilite) + 19 (Faunus), it has a symmetrical pattern of 27 + 1 + 27 (the identical one for the opening canto). That of V.ii.vii is also twofold: 13 + 33 + 13 and 27 + 32. Concludes that "by this Spenser hints at the return to the beginning, indicating (in the same spirit of Nature's verdict) the circular pattern of eternity—from Arlo hill back again to the Wandering Wood."

03.89

Gardiner, David. **"A View of Elizabeths' Ireland(s): Robert Welch's *The Kilcolman Notebook* (1994)."** *Notes on Modern Irish Literature* 10 (1998): 4-16.
Description and situating of Welch's fiction, which focuses on the intersection of Spenser's poetic and political projects in Ireland, and thus calls into question the place of Spenser in English and Irish cultural criticism during the second Elizabeth's era. Argues that Welch identifies the central difficulty of Spenser's imaginative relation with Ireland as the mutability of language and law in that realm.

03.90

Gooch, Bryan N. S. **"Handel, Milton, and Spenser: *The Occasional Oratorio* Revisited."** *Seventeenth-Century News* 58, 1-2 (Spring-Summer 2000):1-15.
Makes an argument for the worth (contrary to the usual view among music historians) of Handel's *Occasional Oratorio*, first performed 1746, the librettist of which—perhaps Thomas Morell—uses Milton and Spenser in a patriotic amalgam. Lists the Milton and Spenser passages seriatim; Spenser's come from *Teares of the Muses*, *Hymne of Heavenly Beautie*, and *Faerie Queene* I.iii and V.viii.

03.91

Harvey, Elizabeth D. **"The Touching Organ: Allegory, Anatomy, and the Renaissance Skin Envelope."** In *Sensible Flesh: On Touch in Early Modern Culture*, ed. Harvey (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003): 81-102.
Examines early modern explorations of the female body's interior, especially its reproductive organs. Juxtaposes theories of allegory, Spenser's Castle of Alma in *The Faerie Queene*, and Phineas Fletcher's *The Purple Island* (1633) with medical depictions of the inside of the female body (Helkiah Crooke's 1615 *Microcosmographia*) to understand how early modern culture entered the interiority of the female body in epistemological and imaginative ways. Compares these representations with the early 18-century wax models in the obstetrical museums in Bologna and Florence. Whereas allegory continually struggles with the materiality of the body it represents, the wax models expose the secret interiority of the body not only to the eye but also to touch. The tactility and malleability of the wax reproduce the very qualities of the flesh that allegories of the body solicit and attempt to control.

03.92

Huizung Perng. **"Genre Study and Intertextuality: The Case of Ovid and Spenser."** *Studies in Language and Literature* 7 [Taipei, China, National Taiwan University] (August 1996): 135-53.
Makes a case for the usefulness of genre study, citing Bakhtin and Jauss among others; exemplifies it with a survey of some scholarship on the relationship of Ovid and Spenser. Argues that Spenser incorporated into *The Faerie Queene* at least three Ovidian genres: allegory, romance epic, and mythological tale; argues further that

both authors reveal anxiety over closure, a concern with reflexive rhetoric, and a concern with the limitations of language.

03.93

Iyengar, Sujata. **"Handling Soft the Hurts': Female Healers and Manual Contact in Spenser, Ariosto and Shakespeare."** In *Sensible Flesh: On Touch in Early Modern Culture*, ed. Elizabeth D. Harvey (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003): 39-61.

Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* and Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* dramatize anxieties that the power of touch could inflame lust in both the healer (since women were thought to be particularly susceptible to tactile arousal) and the healed, by portraying mystical, virginal healers who purvey a manual, sexually-charged cure: Ariosto's Angelica and Medore, Spenser's Belphoebe and Timias. The healers cure physical wounds only to inflict emotional ones on both doctor and patient instead. Concludes with the scene of healing between Helena and the suffering King of France in *All's Well That Ends Well:* it must take place off-stage, precisely to defuse the threat posed to virginity by manual intervention (historically the only known cure for the King's ailment, the fistula), in a displacement parallel to the bed-trick that simultaneously destroys and preserves virginity.

03.94

Lees-Jeffries, Hester. **"A New Allusion by Jonson to Spenser and Essex?"** *Notes and Queries* 50, 1 (March 2003): 63-65.

Proposes that Jonson's reference to Essex as Hesperus, an unusual attribution, in *Cynthia's Revels* V.i (the Hymn to Cynthia, a plea for clemency and favor sung by Hesperus), is an allusion to Spenser's *Prothalamion*. The allusion would function to complicate the play's take on the situation of Essex, making it not entirely unsympathetic toward him, and to further place Jonson as a literary heir to Spenser, who died the year before the play appeared.

03.95

Lockey, Brian. **"Spenser's Legalization of the Irish Conquest** in *A Vewe* and *Faerie Queene* Book VI." *English Literary Renaissance* 31, 3 (2001): 365-91.

Should the Irish be ruled by English common law or should they have a system of law "fashioned vnto" Irish nature? This question, pivotal to Spenser's *A Vewe*, never finds an answer in the tract. While Spenser initially identifies the problems inherent in English rule of Ireland as having been caused by the failure of English law to conform to the Irish disposition, his prescriptions for reform are ironically a continuation of past English policies. Shows that this contradiction is driven by Spenser's concern for the beleaguered identity of the English settlers in Ireland. In *A Vewe*, Spenser fails to offer a convincing account for why English law should continue to be used in Ireland, but aspects of Spenser's analysis can serve as useful tools for understanding several crucial episodes in Book VI of *The Faerie Queene*. Ultimately, this essay shows that Book VI presents English identity as allied with nature and natural law and therefore impervious to the Irish threat of degeneration.

03.96

McMichaels, John. **"The Lady Rises: Stoicism and Spenser in Milton's *Comus*."** *Renaissance Papers* (1998): 151-63.

Proposes to resurrect the questions of nature, grace, and chastity in *Comus*, and argues that the many misunderstandings of these terms in the

masque can be cleared up if we follow Milton's allusions to Spenser and to Stoicism. Draws on Cicero on Stoicism and Spenser's House of Temperance and the Maleger episode, in order to understand what ails Milton's Lady and why Sabrina can free her. For instance, the Lady is modeled in part on Spenser's Alma, the rational soul. But further, Milton's Lady has much in common with Guyon, e.g. in his entry into Mammon's cave, with its lessons about idle curiosity, humility, and with Arthur's reading of British history (*Faerie Queene* II.x), with its lessons about the classical virtues of prudence, temperance, justice, and wisdom.

03.97

Oram, William A. **"Spenserian Paralysis."** *Studies in English Literature* 41, 1 (Winter 2001): 49-70.

Surveys the manifold forms of paralysis in *The Faerie Queene*: stalemated battle, imprisonment, amazement, astonishment, encumbrance, and distinguishes the Spenserian forms from the teleological impetus of, for instance, battles in other epics and romances. The image of violent stalement is a Spenserian signature, pointing in at least three directions. One, the theologically focused paralysis of the opening books, develops the weakness of the independent human will; the more secular third book makes paralysis dramatize failure of love; the second half of the epic registers, through the notion of stalemate, frustrations of action in the external world. Argues that the motif suggests Spenser's ambivalence toward the world itself, which appears good and yet vain. Concludes with the closing ambivalence of the *Mutabilitie Cantos.*

03.98

Rothman, Irving N. **"Fielding's Comic Prose Epithalamium in *Joseph Andrews*: A Spenserian Imitation."** *Modern Language Review* 93, 3 (July 19998): 609-28.

Detailed analysis demonstrating that in the comic prose epithalamion concluding *Joseph Andrews* Fielding imitates the spirit and structure of Spenser's *Epithalamion*, in such a way as to complicate the novel's initial aims of celebrating Joseph's male chastity and parodying Richardson's *Pamela*. Provides a detailed survey of Fielding's longtime interest in Spenser.

03.99

Sanford, Rhonda Lemke. **"Marriage Pageants and Ceremonial Maps,"** Chapter 2 of *Maps and Memory in Early Modern England: A Sense of Place*. (Palgrave/St. Martin's 2002), 27-52.

Argues that Spenser, a disgruntled civil servant, uses the Marriage of the Thames and the Medway to present suggestions to the queen about her world view. His bringing together of various rivers of the world adumbrates a map room or an atlas that Spenser is delivering to the queen in much the same way that other courtiers presented maps to promote New World agendas. Spenser's highlighting of New World Rivers—the Oronoco and the Amazon—his friendship with Sir Walter Ralegh, and his taunts to the men of England and their queen to conquer the Amazon women, make clear that Spenser is using a pageant of maps to suggest that the queen is out of date in her thinking about the world. Finally, Spenser is suggesting obliquely that the queen's body is also outdated; in 1596 this queen who is past childbearing has shown no interest in naming a successor. Like Florimell, held against her will by Proteus in a rock surrounded by waves, Elizabeth, too, surrounded

by waves in the *Ditchley Portrait*, and in real life, is a prisoner of an outdated world view. The medieval *mappae mundi* to which Spenser seems at times to refer, such as the *Hereford Mappa Mundi*, put England in an unprivileged lower position. Spenser would prefer an England whose world position is central, prominent, and privileged, as it is in newer world maps showing both hemispheres. Spenser is certainly audacious in his presentation of cartographic fantasies. Just as Florimell is eventually freed by Marinell, whom she will marry, Spenser's fantasy seems to be that Elizabeth, too, will marry herself to sea venture to establish her legacy.

03.100

Wofford, Susanne L. **"Epics and the Politics of the Origin Tale: Virgil, Ovid, Spenser and Native American Aetiology."** In *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World: The Poetics of Community*, ed. Margaret Beissinger, Jane Tylus, and Susanne Wofford (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Resituates study of epic by comparing the use of origin myths in epic to the origin tale as a distinct genre, including works by Joel Chandler Harris (retellings of African and Indian origin stories) and two Labrador Indian aetiologies. Argues that epic stands against aetiology and origin tale: although the latter often naturalize violent change at the founding of a society or nation, they also expose they violence, representing the beginnings of custom, ritual, or elements of landscape as forced impositions on a different original form; epic, in contrast, often occludes causes and evades especially the kinds of revelation that the origin story presents.

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Spenser at Kalamazoo, May 2003

Thanks to those participants who provided abstracts, and to Ted Steinberg for helping to gather them.

The session "Spenserian Strategies: Fable, Parody, Emblem," presided over by Lauren Silberman and with opening remarks by Bill Oram and a response by Clare Kinney, gave us papers by Andrew Escobedo, Jeff Dolven, and Ellorashree Maitra.

03.101

Andrew Escobedo (Ohio University), **"Spenserian History and the Ornament of Fiction."** Argued that historical poets such as Spenser combine history and fiction not only in the ideological service of patriotism but also in the etiological search for national origins. The growing historical skepticism about England's ancient Galfridian roots did not only deny the nation its glory; more alarmingly, it robbed it of its beginning. Hence, *A Vewe* acknowledges that national myths of origin stem from present-day narcissistic projections, yet also implies that a nation without clear beginnings cannot maintain a stable identity. *The Faerie Queene* employs fable as the "ornament" of historical narrative, on the one hand providing a quasi-fictionalized origin for his nation, on the other hand acknowledging that the historical loss facing England may be unrecoverable in a strict historical sense. Spenser knows that fabled origins stem from vanity, but he believes that this is a vanity the nation cannot do without.

03.102

Jeff Dolven (Princeton University), **"Making an Example,"** offered an account of the trope of example as an unstable mediator between experience and emblem: a piece of the original experience (en*sample*), cut out (*eximere*) from a larger field. Making an example thus involves an act of excerption, and the boundaries established by it can have important ethical effects. Explored how Guyon—so vulnerable to the boundary-erasing effects of sympathy—learns (or is taught) over the course of Book II to see himself as traveling through a landscape of examples; how the *form* of example, its boundedness, comes to displace any reckoning with its content. His facility as an example-maker steadily increases from Amavia to Phaedria's island to the "ensample" of Tantalus in the Cave of Mammon. Along the way the trope's didactic promise, and its promise as a mediator between traumatic repetition and cold epitome (or allegory), are exposed as vulnerable to some characteristic manipulations, misprisions, malfunctions.

03.103

Ellorashree Maitra, **"Parody as Reading Strategy in Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender.*"** *The Shepheardes Calender* is crucial to any attempt to trace the link between parody and Spenser's deep concern about the art of reading. E.K.'s glosses act as a series of parodic responses to the verse. In Renaissance literary criticism, parody is a mode of ridicule but the Renaissance ideal of creative imitation can also encompass practices that we would now identify as parodic. Parody is a mode of ironic imitation, a dissembling form that resists the closure of a definitive, final

interpretation. In the spirit of the Socratic *eiron*, it is a subtle and indirect mode of discourse, a Bakhtinian polyglossia. E.K.'s glosses generate ambiguity through strategies that involve reading against the grain of the text, or even creating a text where there is none to be had, as the voice from the margins takes centre-stage, re-locating itself as the primary speaker. E.K. demonstrates the closeness, and the complexity, of the relationship between the contending voices generated by a multi-vocal text.

Rob Stillman presided over the session "Shades of Grey," with papers by David Morrow, Jean Brink, and Su Fang Ng, and a response by Charles Ross.

03.104

Jean Brink (Huntington Library), **"Spenser's Lord Grey,"** questioned the universally accepted identification of Artegall in Book V of *The Faerie Queene* as a literary representation of Spenser's patron—Arthur, Lord Grey of Wilton. Noted how the mere fact that Grey was recalled in disgrace hardly identifies him as Artegall, since all lord deputies failed in one way or another, and all faced some level of envy and detraction back in England. Further, since Grey left Ireland in 1582 and had been dead for three years prior to the publication of the second half of *The Faerie Queene* (1596), it is unlikely that Spenser's contemporaries would have assumed Spenser intended Artegall to represent Lord Grey. Grey was not the one-dimensional soldier so often identified with the worst aspects of Elizabethan policies in Ireland, but a complex intellectual respected by both friends and enemies for his integrity. Concluded with the suggestion that Artegall more likely represented a number of leading figures, such as Leicester, Sidney, and Essex, rather than a single individual.

03.105

Su Fang Ng (University of Oklahoma), **"Colonizer and Colonized: England as Colony in Spenser's *View*."** In analyzing Spenser's *View* as a key document of an emerging British empire, critics have not noted that besides Ireland England itself is the other important colony scrutinized by the text. Anglo-Irish colonial relations are complicated by England's dual status as both colonizer and colonized and by the double image of England in *A View* as now civilized but formerly savage. Through England's colonial past, Spenser understands civilization to be built on being properly colonized. Spenser advocates military subjugation not only from a conviction that English imperium is right, but also out of a context of the civilizing effects of colonies. The humanist study of antiquity leads to reading English history as part of Roman history, and properly as colonial history, though it does not preclude England's imperial claims.

03.106

In his response, Charles Ross (Purdue University) agreed with Brink that Arthegall is not Gray, but multiple governors of Ireland, and with Su Fang Ng that Spenser is aware of England's own colonilized past. He suggested that Spenser's awareness of England's own deficiences helps us appreciate Spenser's humanist breadth of mind, illustrated also by Spenser's choice of the dialogue form, which presents two sides of an idea but never, never, when done right, reveals the author's own attitude. And so Ng leaves us this this question: Why did Spenser's awareness of England's colonized past not lessen what seems to have been Spenser's personal commitment to the violence of England's program in Ireland? These

two papers face two versions of the same problem, not to relate Spenser's imaginative work to the time and place of composition, and the old chestnut of what historical figures appear in *The Faerie Queene*. Or: was Spenser really a cruel tormentor of the Irish, but no matter who he knew or how he behaved, just how wild was his imagination?

The session "Untying Spenserian Knots" was chaired by Beth Quitslund; papers were presented by Andrew Wallace, William Heise, and Patrick Gray, with a response by James Broaddus.

03.107

Andrew Wallace (University of Toronto), **"Gloriana's Feast and the Dedicatory Sonnets to the 1590 *Faerie Queene*."** Read the Letter to Ralegh's description of a feast at Gloriana's court as a justification for the surprising placement of Spenser's Dedicatory Sonnets at the end of the 1590 *Faerie Queene*. The Letter to Ralegh makes it possible to view this sequence of poems dedicated to lords, gentlemen, and eminent and anonymous ladies of Elizabeth's court as only provisionally occupying the position that will be reserved for a feast at Gloriana's court in a future twelve-book version of the poem. Arguing against the tendency to view Spenser as a poet who almost pathologically resisted the lure of closure, suggests that the 1590 Dedicatory Sonnets are positioned to mimic Spenser's stated desire to conclude his poem in a gathering of Gloriana's elite.

03.108

Patrick Gray (Lincoln College, Oxford), **"Phantastes, Fancy, Phantasia: The Role of Archimago in an Aristotelian Psychomachia."** Archimago is not only an "external impediment," not only the Pope, a 'Catholic enchanter,' Satan, or some sub-demon, but also, like Tasso's sorcerer Ismeno, an "internal impediment," imagination. "External" and "internal" interpretations of Archimago are, furthermore, far from complementary. As a Catholic clergyman, Archimago represents Spenser's anti-Catholic beliefs. As imagination, Archimago represents Spenser's anti-Protestant doubts. If Archimago, a deceitful faculty, a fallible instrument, is within us, how can the Protestant trust himself? How can he be sure his God-given inner light is not his own imagination? For Ronsard, imagination is integral. Divine inspiration improves, but does not supersede, imagination. For Spenser, a more radical Neo-Platonist, imagination is replacable. Divine illumination is not an assistant, but an alternative. Neo-Platonism, Spenser discovered, allows a clear, complete separation of imagination and the inner light of conscience. Enthousiasmos is not, cannot be, "fantasy"; Merlin is not, cannot be, Archimago.

Elsewhere in sessions at Kalamazoo:

03.109

Genevieve Guenther (University of California-Berkeley), **"Beauty and Ethics in Sidney and Spenser."** In the *Defense of Poesie*, Sidney articulated an "instrumental aesthetics of ravishment," whereby the beauty of the Ideas of virtue that poetry conveys to the reader compels him to love and emulate those Ideas in ethical behavior. Sidney's poetic Ideas were at once ideational and metaphysical, hence subject to the Protestant critique of Neoplatonic Ideas, which held that metaphysical entities not mediated by scripture appeared to the mind by the agency of demons. Spenser was influenced by this critique, and by arguments in faculty psychology that demons could present images directly to the

imagination. In the 1590 *Faerie Queene*, therefore, Spenser produced an "instrumental aesthetics of wonder," whereby the reader is inspired at once to love the beauty of metaphysical Ideas and to doubt the ontological provenance of their images in the mind's eye. This wonder over one's own imagination enacts the inward-looking self-monitoring that characterizes Spenser's ethical subject.

03.110

Paul Rovang (Edinboro University of Pennsylvania), **"Reforming Malory: Spenser's Protestant Humanist Reading of the *Morte Darthur*,"** argued that while critical attacks on the *Morte Darthur* and the new taste for classical models were putting Malory's work out of favor with Renaissance humanists, the appetite of Protestants for morally and spiritually edifying literature was creating a space for allegories of redemptive quest. At the same time, a transformation was occurring in the nature of chivalry as an institution, increasingly rendering it a symbolic and ceremonial adornment of the state, a means of representing modern policy in the guise of the old ideals of knightly courtesy and gallantry yet to be found in the pages of Malory. This paper, after establishing the above historical-cultural backdrop to Spenser's reading of Malory, examines as a model several aspects of the poet's adaptation of *The Tale of Sir Gareth* to his own *Legend of the Knight of the Red Crosse*.

03.111

In **"Protestant Tears of Contrition in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*: Emotion and the Epic from the Classical Age through the Renaissance,"** Jennifer C. Vaught (University of Louisiana at Lafayette) examined Book I in relation to the increasing tolerance for demonstrations of emotion by men in the sixteenth century. In the Wandering Wood Spenser exhibits such tolerance by alluding frequently to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in which male expressions of grief are unmoderated by stoicism. In the grove of Fradubio Spenser emphasizes Redcrosse's need for confession, tears of contrition, and grace for salvation and thereby distinguishes his epic hero from those in Virgil's *Aeneid* and Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*. In the cave of Despair Spenser exposes the pitfalls of the stoical views of Seneca and Cicero for a Protestant hero by illustrating that self-sufficiency and emotional rigorism are deadly for a despairing, suicidal Redcrosse. In the course of his battle with the dragon Redcrosse's "twelve thousand dolours" that far exceed the twelve labors of Hercules make him heroic (I.xi.27). Spenser's focus upon the critical importance of emotional expressiveness in religious experience allies him with the Augustinian rather than stoical branch of humanism.

03.112

Andrew Zurcher (Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge) sends this report on the first British and Irish Spenser Seminar, also held in May.

The first annual meeting of the British and Irish Spenser Seminar took place on 10 May 2003, in the Senior Parlour at Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. Convenors Colin Burrow (Gonville and Caius, Cambridge) and Patricia Coughlan (Cork) presided over a busy slate of invited and submitted papers from younger and more senior speakers alike, and we all enjoyed the informal, collegial, and enthusiastic conversation that spilled into and around the sessions.

After a brief welcome from Colin Burrow, Bart van Es (Christ Church, Oxford) opened the meeting with his plenary paper, 'Spenser's Missing History', in which he expanded upon some of the concerns of his recent book by considering lost 'moniments' in Book II of *The Faerie Queene* and in *Complaints*, both the missing (and mythologized) Arthurian 'history' of Britain as well as the missing compositional history of Spenser's early poetic career. Shorter talks followed from Jane Grogan (Royal Holloway, London) on '"Strange waies": Courtesy's Endless Quest', an analysis of the weaknesses of Spenser's adaptation of the courtesy-book tradition in the 'Legend of Sir Calidore'; from Amanda Jones (University of Virginia) in 'More or Less Beastly: Spenser's *Prosopopoeia* and the Transformation of Genre', a discussion of the social and political dynamics of embedded genres like encomium and sonnet within the beast satire of *Mother Hubberds Tale*; and from Syrithe Pugh (Leeds) on 'Spenser, Ovid and Political Myth-Making: Mutabilitie's Challenge to the Ideology of Power', a painstaking tour of metaphysical and ideological tensions in the final cantos of *The Faerie Queene*.

The afternoon sessions were both focused on this year's seminar theme, history and the historical in Spenser's poetry. In '"Irenius's bards" and the ethics of ventriloquism', Patricia Palmer (York) discussed Eochaidh Ó hEóghusa's 'Fúar liom an adhaighsi dh'Aodh', a bardic poem with Spenserian resonances, as a test case for her belief that incommensurability, rather than dialogue, ought to structure genuine 'comparative' readings in a postcolonial context. Christopher Burlinson (Cambridge) offered a fascinating preliminary discussion, in 'History Against Historicism: Spenser and his Readers', of a new historical reading [of Spenser] that would consider events without embedding them within overdetermining historical contexts, [asking] how such a critical act could reconfigure the co-ordinates of historical reading' and 'what the implications of this would be for the reading of Spenser, and how can we use this model to think about the Spenserian scholarship of the past twenty years.' In my own brief contribution, 'Spenser's State Letters: Contents and Contexts', I discussed some of the more interesting and telling textual and palaeographical details of my recent research (with Christopher Burlinson) into Spenserian manuscripts among the Irish State Papers. Julia Major (University of Washington) finished off the open session with a careful reconsideration of Guyon's descent into the delve of Mammon. Finally, Richard McCabe (Merton College, Oxford) concluded the official meeting with further remarks on Spenser, the politics of patronage, and the Irish bards, expanding on the discussion in his recent *Spenser's Monstrous Regiment*.

Some of the most exciting discussions, of course, occurred offstage—over coffee, lunch, or wine in Colin Burrow's room after the meeting. We are looking forward to welcoming even more of our British and Irish, and even itinerant American colleagues, next year! Provisional

arrangements will be circulated by email and paper soon; meanwhile, if you are interested in joining the seminar, or want to keep track of our business, please see the seminar website at http://www.english.cam.ac.uk/spenser/biss.html

03.113

Mari Mizuno sends the following news about a Spenser meeting in Japan.

The conference of the English Literary Society of Japan, held in May at Seikei University, Tokyo, provided occasions for the annual meeting of The Spenser Society of Japan (SSJ) and two Spenser-related presentations. The SSJ meeting approved, along with other matters, the officers: President Shohachi Fukuda, Vice President Hiroshi Yamashita (Tsukuba U) and new members of the committee: Mari Mizuno (Kyoto U), Yoshitoshi Murasato (Fukuoka Women's U), Nobuo Shimamura (Kanto Gakuin U), and Harumi Takemura (Himeji Dokkyo U). Also approved was the opening of the SSJ website.

At one of the symposia given at the English Literary Society of Japan, Harumi Takemura (Himeji Dokkyo U) gave a talk titled: "Romancing London: The Civic Legend in the 1590s;" and Kayoko Adachi (Osaka U), read a paper: "Hermaphrodite Cancelled: The Narrator's Counterargument in *The Faerie Queene.*"

Since June 2003 The Spenser Society of Japan has opened its website at **http://www.spensersocietyjapan.org.** Its content, mostly still under development, is expected eventually to provide a Web forum, *SSJ Journal*, On-line Text, *SSJ Newsletter*, and Spenser link pages. Operated mostly in Japanese, the site is readable only through a Japanese language OS, but accessible also to people overseas is the Yamashita-Suzuki text of *The Faerie Queene.* Graced with a congratulatory message by Professor A. C. Hamilton, the site has a beautiful front page showing the pictures of Kilcolman landscape with Spenser's rivers.

03.114

Jon Quitslund sends this report on the May 2003 events honoring Tom Roche's retirement from Princeton.

Spenserians were numerous in the throng that gathered in Princeton on May 24th to honor Thomas P. Roche, Murray Professor of English Literature, on the occasion of his retirement from teaching. Some were colleagues; many others had been introduced as undergraduates to Spenser, Shakespeare, and other Renaissance authors by "T.P." (as he is now affectionately known to the youngest of his acolytes); several, like myself, had written dissertations and begun careers with Tom as a mentor. ("You were #3," he said when I sentimentally recalled how long ago our acquaintance began, and I'm sure he knows not only who preceded me—Peter Marinelli and Peter Saccio—in the ranks of Ph.D. candidates, but the proper places of all the others on a roster running into three digits.) Others in attendance had come to know Tom as a friend and mentor through his summer-season NEH-sponsored teaching, and still others through the International Spenser Society and *Spenser Studies.* The name of Thomas P. Roche has been known far and wide for decades through his enduring scholarship; this gathering on behalf of the man himself showed, as if in response to the canceled emblem at the end of Spenser's *Calender*, that his genial wit endures in many lives beyond his own.

The occasion began with a memorable staged reading of *The Winter's Tale*, which Tom

directed, bringing together colleagues, friends, and former students in a richly talented cast. A play more germane to the occasion could not be imagined. Tom himself appeared appropriately as Time, and his genius was also apparent in the many details of costume and business by which Bohemia became Princeton. (Antigonus exited pursued not by a bear, but by the Princeton tiger.) A reception and a dinner followed the play in due course, culminating in a series of tributes. Kathryne MacKenzie (2000), who had performed brilliantly as both Hermione and Perdita, spoke on behalf of generations of undergraduates, followed by Peter McCullough (1992), who had written his dissertation under Tom's generous, light-handed, clairvoyant direction. Bill Oram and Anne Lake Prescott offered testimony from their experience with *Spenser Studies*, of which Tom was a founding editor and where he still plays a crucial role. Roland Greene (1985), current President of the International Spenser Society, paid tribute to Tom as a co-founder of the Society and described the Colin Clout award for lifetime achievement, bestowed on him at the most recent annual luncheon, during the 2002 MLA meeting.

Anne Shaver, a participant in more than one of Tom's NEH seminars, gave a spirited account of the style with which he led summer sojourners from provincial places through long reading lists, rare books, and after-hours recreation. The tributes were rounded off nicely by Jeff Nunokawa, a junior colleague in the Department of English, and Michael Wood, Chair of the Department, let Tom say the last words of thanks and valediction.

03.115

Spenser at MLA 2003: The Program

Session 71 (A101A):
Spenser, Time, and Memory
Saturday 12/27/2003 5:15–6:30 p.m.
Betsy C, Manchester Grand Hyatt
Program arranged by the International Spenser Society
Presiding: Debora K. Shuger, University of California, Los Angeles
1 **"Marine Mothers: Mortality and the Temporality of Genres in Vergil and Spenser,"** Theresa M. Krier, Macalester College
2 **"Time, History, and the Pun,"** Georgia Elizabeth Brown, Univ. of Cambridge, Queens' College
3 **"Collection and Cultural Memory: Spenser's 'Goodly Cabinet,'"** William Edward Engel, Independent Scholar

Session 413 (A101B):
Shakespeare Counters Spenser
Sunday 12/28/2003 7:15–8:30 p.m.
Molly B, Manchester Grand Hyatt
Program arranged by the International Spenser Society.
Presiding: Katherine Eggert, Univ. of Colorado, Boulder
1 **"Counter-Spenserian Authorship: Shakespeare, Lucrece, and Republican Epic,"** Patrick G. Cheney, Pennsylvania State University
2 **"'Single Nature's Double Name': Spenser's Skepticism and Shakespeare's Materialism,"** John Lee, University of Bristol
3 **"Shakespeare as Spenserian Allegorist,"** Lauren Silberman, Baruch College, City University of New York

The Spenser Society Luncheon takes place 29 December, 12:00 noon, at the Candelas Restaurant, 416 3rd Avenue, San Diego, with the annual Hugh Maclean Memorial lecture this year by Janet Adelman, titled **"Inwardness and Allegory in Spenser."**

The restaurant is within walking distance of the main convention hotels; restaurant phone number is (619) 702-4455. Each ISS member will be able to choose between two starters and two entrees on the day of the banquet. Details will be posted on the website, and there will be a cash bar. The cost per person will be approximately $45, or $35 for students; please watch for the letter sent to members in October.

After reading Jackson Boswell's gathering of Spenser illusions in our last issue, John Shawcross sent us this note, which we are glad to print.

03.116

The addition to the record of allusions to Spenser in the late seventeenth century which Jackson Boswell has collected are so very important in showing his wide and often nonliterary presence. (See "Spenser Allusions: 1641-1700: Part I," *The Spenser Review*, 34. 2 [Summer 2003]: 24-40.) One item, however, needs revision—No. 14, p.30, Matthew Locke's *The Present Practice of Musick Vindicated* (1673). As the title page records, "Duellum Musicum: or the Musical Duel" was written by John Phillips; that is, by John Milton's younger nephew (*The Present Practice of Musick Vindicated against hte Exceptions and New Way of Attaining Musick Lately Publish'd by Thomas Salmon, M.A. &c. By Matthew Locke . . . To which is added Duellum Musicum by John Phillips, gent.* [London, Printed for N. Brooke and J. Playford, 1673]). Locke wrote a critique of a study by Salmon: *Observations upon a Late Book, Entituled, an Essay to the Advancement of Musick, &c. Written by Thomas Salmon, M.A.* (London, Printed by W. G. and are to be sold by John Playford, 1672). It included an epigram by "J. Phillips," A$_2$r, which has a line referring to Salmon "*though he* Flea's *not his* Skin, *he* Tawes *his* Hide." In rebuttal of Locke, Salmon printed *A Vindication of an Essay To the Advancement of Musick, from Mr. Matthew Lock's Observations* (London: Printed by A. Maxwell, and are to be Sold by John Car, 1672). Herein Salmon quotes heavily from Locke and takes out after Phillips and the line in the epigram (pp. 4 and 77). *The Present Practice* is Locke's surrebuttal, with the epigram reprinted and the "Duellum Musicum" by Phillips added on pp. 25-76. The allusion cited by Boswell thus comes from Phillips, who primarily criticizes Salmon's logic; Boswell's annotation should thus be revised.

De Mulieribus Claris:

03.117

Remembering Mrs. MacCaffrey

by Jane Hedley

Spenser's Allegory: The Anatomy of Imagination was published by Princeton University Press in 1976; within two years its author, Isabel Gamble MacCaffrey, was dead from cancer at the age of fifty-six. According to her preface, this four hundred and thirty-three page book was mostly written on a Guggenheim fellowship during a single year's leave from Harvard, where she was teaching when she died. Clearly, however, a much longer period of gestation lies behind its account of the allegorical mode as a literary arena in which "the ways of knowing available to human beings" are self-reflexively staged and analyzed. For me the authoritative, serious voice that speaks from the pages of *Spenser's Allegory* never fails to re-kindle the sense of intellectual excitement and discovery that was ignited ten years earlier as I worked through Spenser's poem one canto at a time, in MacCaffrey's undergraduate course in sixteenth century literature. It was an experience akin to the one Keats claims to have had "On First Looking Into Chapman's Homer": this, I felt certain, was a poem I would happily spend the rest of my life learning to read.

Scholarly prefaces nowadays envision literary scholarship as a richly collaborative enterprise; they tend to be full of other scholars' names. Mrs. MacCaffrey's preface largely eschews these acknowledgements of what she calls "private indebtedness," but devotes an entire paragraph to the one book to which, as she puts it, "I have found myself continually returning, for refreshment, inspiration, and understanding": Rosemund Tuve's *Allegorical Imagery*. By the time she wrote these words Miss Tuve had been dead for a dozen years; her book had been published posthumously in 1966. That Tuve "did not live to write on *The Faerie Queene* itself cannot be sufficiently lamented," says MacCaffrey: "I would like to regard [*Spenser's Allegory*] as another contribution to the prolific scholarly 'posterity' of her spirit." As in the book itself, so too in its preface, we come to understand that her own scholarly odyssey has been a relatively solitary voyage, its connectedness to the work of other scholars accruing not from conference papers, reading groups and scholarly colloquia but from a vivid sense of kinship, achieved and sustained through reading, with the "spirit" of their thinking about matters of abiding human concern. Like Tuve's, MacCaffrey's book is concerned with allegory's resources for envisioning "the mind's life in the world," rather than with the political questions that have come to the fore in Spenser studies since her death. Her own training, as a graduate student at Harvard during the 1940s, was in intellectual history. She knew the political history of the period as well as she needed to, for her purposes; her husband Wallace MacCaffrey, a Haverford faculty member whom she had met and married not long after she joined the faculty of Bryn Mawr College in 1949, would become in due course an eminent political historian of the Age of Elizabeth. Isabel MacCaffrey's own interests, however, were philosophical and broadly psychological. The critical and scholarly work on Spenser that interested her most was concerned with the kind of reading Spenser's poem asks us to do, and with the way in which it models for us a process of "learning to fathom our own lives."

Her students learned to read *The Faerie Queene* in the Everyman edition, which had neither footnotes nor endnotes. I would not make that choice today for my own undergraduate stu-

dents, and yet for me it was the best possible way to encounter Spenser's poem. As a graduate student who had been won over to the study of literature in the first place by practical critics who kept me away from "secondary sources," I assumed the poem would teach me how to read it, and this was Mrs. MacCaffrey's pedagogical premise. The first books about the poem that she suggested I read were A. C. Hamilton's *Structure of Allegory in The Faerie Queene*, which teaches us how to read the poem in relation to itself, and C. S. Lewis's account of allegory as an imaginative and literary activity with a particular history in European literature. In class she took us through the poem canto by canto, asking interpretive questions that opened up the allegory's implicit premises: Queen Lucifera's palace is full of light, but what's the tip-off that it is not really a place of enlightenment? Why should Prince Arthur, at his first appearance in the poem, remind us of Lucifera in a number of ways? In the House of Holiness everything is all too easy to read, beginning with Zeale, the porter, whose name "his nature rightly did aread": why is not Redcrosse, and why are not we, being asked to puzzle out the meaning any longer? She would annotate the poem as we went along, but in such a way that we were never overwhelmed with its erudition, or with hers. The only ancillary text she had us read was the Book of Revelation, not only to expose us to the tradition of typological reading but also to give us first-hand experience of how Spenser's poem cites and presupposes other texts. To this day I can remember getting goose-bumps at the moment in Book I when Orgoglio mounts Duessa on the many-headed beast and we can see, along with Redcrosse, who she has "really been" all along.

From a critical and scholarly standpoint the 1960s was a stunningly prolific decade, both for Spenser studies and for the study of allegory as such: Honig's *The Dark Conceit* came out in 1959, followed by Fletcher's *Theory of a Symbolic Mode* in 1965 and Tuve's *Allegorical Imagery* in 1966; *The Kindly Flame* was published in 1964, *Spenser's Image of Nature* in 1966, and Paul Alpers' *Poetry of The Faerie Queene* in 1967. Harry Berger produced one article after another throughout the 1960s, each more provocative than the last: I learned from Mrs. MacCaffrey that you didn't have to *agree* with the reading in question to be intrigued and delighted by its ingenuity and panache. The only scholarly books whose approach she took exception to were those which seemed to suggest that the only limits to the poem's range of external reference were those of the commentator's own erudition.

Mrs. MacCaffrey's first book was based on her Ph.D. dissertation, written under the direction of Douglas Bush, which won a dissertation prize at Harvard. In 1959, the year of its publication, *Paradise Lost as "Myth"* won the Explicator Prize for the year's best piece of *explication de texte* in the field of English and American literature. Opening that book again in 2003, what you would be struck by is the incisiveness and clarity with which, making her scholarly début, its author explains what she will and will not be attempting to do for Milton's poem. "Students of comparative mythology," she observes at the beginning of her second chapter, "have often attempted to establish a paradigm to which all local myths could be related as instances. These efforts are alike chiefly in their sketchiness and dogmatism, and their results are not usually helpful, since a comprehensive scheme will necessarily turn out to be so elastic that no product of the human imagination need fall outside it." These sentences are typical of the book as a whole not only for their dry wit and the understated elegance of their syntax (the incongruous pairing of "sketchiness and dogmatism," the expansive "since" clause with its witty punchline), but also for the superb poise, the unruffled confidence, with which they expose

the fallacy in an approach that must be reckoned with but will not be taken on board. "The test [of any particular critical terminology] is pragmatic," MacCaffrey urges: "does it work, does it further analysis and elucidation? What matters," she insists, "is poems (novels, plays) and their accessibility. Their voices do not cease; it is for us to tune our ears as best we can." There, in brief, is the credo that informed both her published work and her teaching.

In 1966, the year she was promoted to Full Professor, the student newspaper at neighboring Haverford College ran an article on "teaching couples": nine of Haverford's hundred or so faculty members, including Wallace MacCaffrey, were in two-career marriages with spouses who also had faculty positions at other colleges in the Philadelphia area. Most of the faculty members quoted in this article are the wives; it's clear that what makes their perspective newsworthy is that insofar as they have elected to teach in addition to raising children and running a household, they are in the position of needing to explain, if not defend, that choice. Such a life, according to one woman faculty member whose remarks are cited as typical, is "'stressful' but purposeful": "there are always things which have to be left undone," she explains, "but I'm happiest when I teach." The only husband who is quoted comments, disarmingly, that his wife has "spent a good bit of her life getting advanced professional training, and it would be a shame not to use it." Mrs. MacCaffrey is mentioned in this article, but not quoted. Interestingly enough, however, her own perspective on the everyday challenges and rewards of a faculty member's professional life was published five years earlier in the Bryn Mawr *Alumnae Bulletin*, where she sketched for alumnae of the college "a week in the life of a faculty member."

Her article's premise is that a typical week of hers will be different in its details, but not in its structure and rhythms, from that of her full-time colleagues in other departments—regardless, it seems, of whether they are women or men. An English professor's week is spent reading outlines for freshmen long papers and meeting with the students to discuss them, embarking on a very long dissertation that has just come in to be read, teaching three classes, attending committee meetings, taking in a concert and an evening lecture. What is conspicuously absent from the list of Monday-through-Friday pursuits is scholarship, but the weekend allows for some reading toward a project tentatively planned for the next sabbatical year, as well as for reviewing "yet another book on *Paradise Lost*." On the weekend, one also "hopes to find time to see one's friends; to make Beef Stroganoff; . . . to set out the pansies." Summing up, MacCaffrey tells her alumnae audience that these kinds and this mixture of activities are typical: "Our lives belong partly to the college, partly to our research, partly to our families and our private selves." The "we" of whom this mix of activities is predicated is a generic, gender-neutral "we," and it is the "we" of a small-college faculty, whose teaching responsibilities encompass every level of the curriculum, involving them with their students' intellectual growth in a strikingly intimate way. Confronting the long paper outlines she has received from her freshman students, MacCaffrey comments that many of them are unworkable: "advice that one has driven oneself mad by repeating throughout the year has been ignored" by their authors. And yet, one first-year student "whose tears have worn a small channel in the arm of my office chair as the weeks passed, has produced a scheme for what promises to be a lucid and elegant essay, her first real breakthrough"; another, "one of the class's stars, is clearly working her way to a paper which will be the triumphant climax of her year . . .". The frustrations and the satisfactions of working this closely with very good students, week in and

week out, is typical for liberal arts colleges, now as then: MacCaffrey did her own undergraduate work at Swarthmore College. The knowledge and experience she gained from doing this kind of teaching and learning made her an ideal candidate, in 1971, for the William R. Kenan Chair at Harvard, endowed to support "a scholar of eminence with a special interest in teaching undergraduates."

MacCaffrey worked with graduate students both at Harvard and at Bryn Mawr, but in very small numbers; she is the adviser of record for only five Bryn Mawr and two Harvard dissertations. When she was hired at Bryn Mawr the English department already had a senior Miltonist and a sixteenth-century specialist; thus even after receiving tenure, she had fewer opportunities to do graduate teaching than most of her tenured colleagues, and was involved more heavily than most of them with freshmen and sophomore courses. She taught both Experimental Writing and English 101, an introductory course for prospective English majors that focused on the long poem from Chaucer through Wordsworth; for several years she ran the Freshman English program as well as teaching in it. Her particular niche in the Renaissance became "sixteenth century prose"; she did not begin to teach Spenser in an upper-level course until the last five of her nineteen years at Bryn Mawr. During those last five years, her courses in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century literature drew bigger enrollments than most of her colleagues' upper-level courses. In her own lifetime, then, her influence as a "Spenserian" was disseminated chiefly, though not exclusively, by way of her undergraduate students' first encounters with *The Faerie Queene*—as early, for some, as the sophomore year. While at Harvard she taught graduate seminars for the English department, but again the education of undergraduates was the primary thrust of her professional life. She was the first holder of the Kenan professorship when she joined Harvard's faculty in 1971, and in 1972 she became the first woman to chair the Committee on Degrees in History and Literature.

In 1965-66 Mrs. MacCaffrey pioneered a 200-level course entitled "Philosophical Themes in Poetry," in which "about a dozen poems of middle length by different authors" were closely read "with copious supplementary reading in the poets and their background." Her next book, had she lived to write it, would almost certainly have moved in this direction, and would have included chapters on Wordsworth, Stevens, and Andrew Marvell. Her commitment to the discernment and exposition of imaginative capacities, needs and longings that are generically human, shared by poets as wide apart in time and in cultural context as Spenser, Wordsworth and Stevens, is currently unfashionable. The powerful eloquence with which she articulated these capacities and longings augurs, nevertheless, for the long-term staying power of her books and essays. In addition to her book-length studies of Spenser's and Milton's epics, she published important articles on "Lycidas," "The Shepheardes Calender" and the poetry of Wallace Stevens, and edited an edition of *Samson Agonistes and the Shorter Poems of Milton* for the Signet Classic Poetry Series. She wrote some of the most accessible, wittiest, most eloquent prose that we have in Spenser studies; it is therefore fitting that the Spenser Society gives an essay prize in her memory.

Paradise Lost is a remarkable book, but *Spenser's Allegory* is larger and deeper; it bespeaks the richness, but also the austerity and even loneliness, of a life devoted to teaching, reading in, and thinking with a series of writers whose common interest and gift was for the creation of poems in which "the mind turns inward in order that it may return [to its own experience] with a more powerful sense of identity and purpose...".

In her preface, along with Rosemond Tuve, MacCaffrey salutes and thanks a small handful of local colleagues: Renaissance scholar Ann Berthoff, whose husband left Bryn Mawr for Harvard a couple of years before MacCaffrey and her husband made the move; her husband Wallace; and Robert Burlin, the Bryn Mawr medievalist who became her closest friend and whose knowledge of allegory complemented and enlarged her own. The tone of these acknowledgements is one of cheerful serenity; meanwhile, however, the book's epigraph, from a poem of Wallace Stevens, strikes an elegiac note: ". . . because the ear repeats, / Without a voice, inventions of farewell." In completing a major work of this kind, and in the context of her own life circumstances, the sense of achievement and of gratitude are accompanied, it seems, by an ineffable but pervasive sense of loss. Not far into the book MacCaffrey suggests that Spenser and Wordsworth, each for his own age, had the same goal: to "describe the Mind and Man / Contemplating; and who, and what he was— / The transitory Being that beheld / The Vision." Like the epigraph from Stevens, these lines from *The Prelude* are hauntingly elegiac: by the time she finished her magisterial study of Spenser's poem, the transitoriness of her own being had already begun to urge itself upon her.

Acknowledgements: For their assistance in locating pertinent background information and materials, I would like to thank Bryn Mawr Archivist Lorett Treese, Brian Sullivan, Senior Reference Archivist at the Harvard University Archives, Professor Richard Mallette of Lake Forest College, and my research assistant, Gretchen Hitt.

Jane Hedley teaches Renaissance literature at Bryn Mawr College. She is the author of Power in Verse: Metaphor and Metonymy in the Renaissance Lyric, *as well as a number of articles on Renaissance poetry and on American women's poetry since 1945; she is a contributor to* The Spenser Encyclopedia *and to the MLA volume* Teaching Shorter Elizabethan Poetry. *Her Ph.D. dissertation, "Masculine and Feminine in* The Faerie Queene," *was directed by Mrs. MacCaffrey.*

The Spenser Review
c/o Theresa Krier
Department of English
Macalester College
1600 Grand Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55105

Address Service Requested

David L. Miller
Department of English
1215 Patterson Office Tower
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506-0027