THE Spenser REVIEW

FALL 2007 • VOLUME 38, NUMBER 3

Published with the assistance of
EMORY UNIVERSITY

THE Spenser REVIEW

Fall 2007 • Volume 38, Number 3

The Spenser Review is published three times a year, Winter, Summer, and Fall. It is a publication of the International Spenser Society which is generously supported by Emory University's Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Emory College, and the Department of English. Please address all communications to *The Spenser Review*, c/o Sheila T. Cavanagh, Department of English, Callaway Suite N302, 537 Kilgo Circle, Atlanta, GA 30322. Phone 404/727-6420; FAX 404/727-2605; email: engstc@emory.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 for libraries and institutions are $20.00/yr. in North America and $26.00/yr. in all other countries. Please make checks payable to *The Spenser Review.* Payments may be mailed to: Sheila T. Cavanagh, Department of English, Callaway Suite N302, 537 Kilgo Circle, Atlanta, GA 30322, U.S.A.

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/membership.htm>.

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

To Our Readers

38.61

This issue includes reviews of several books and abstracts from the recent *ELR* issue devoted to Spenser studies. It also offers a piece by Frank Ardolino that encourages Spenserians to view *FQ* in conjunction with *The Spanish Tragedy* and a preview of Spenser activities at MLA. We hope that many Spenserians will be able to gather in Chicago for the Spenser panels and for Gordon Teskey's talk at the annual luncheon of the International Spenser Society.

Book Reviews and Notices

38.62

Gray, Erik, ed. *The Faerie Queene. Book Two.* Indianapolis, IN.: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2006. xxvii + 244 pp. ISBN 0-87220-848-6. $32.95 cloth. ISBN 0-87220-847-8. $9.95 paper.

Stephens, Dorothy, ed. *The Faerie Queene. Books Three and Four.* Indianapolis, IN.: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2006. xxxi + 480 pp. 0-87220-856-7. $37.95 cloth. ISBN 0-87220-855-9. $12.95 paper.

Reviewed by Wayne Erickson

The volumes under review follow, in the same series, editions of Book I (edited by Carol Kaske) and Book V (edited by Abraham Stoll, General Editor), both reviewed here in fall 2006 (37.113), and precede the final volume, an edition of Book VI and the Mutabilitie Cantos (edited by Andrew Hadfield), which will appear in September 2007. I join other Spenserians and teachers of early modern literature in commending Hackett Publishing and the capable editors of these volumes for producing handsome, sturdy, and very affordable annotated editions of individual books of *The Faerie Queene*. Those who love the poem welcome new readers, and while I cannot imagine that the publication of these books will initiate widespread reading of Spenser's epic, I suspect that certain teachers who would not order the whole *FQ* for their classes might—attracted by the inexpensive price of the paperback versions, the reader-friendly scholarly apparatus, and the exotic Walter Crane illustrations on the covers—consider adding one of these volumes to their syllabi.

Particular volumes in the series would certainly be appropriate for genre or special topics classes, graduate or undergraduate, and those who use anthologies in undergraduate and even graduate surveys of English Renaissance literature could add one of these volumes; on the other hand, those who use individual texts in their surveys would have to supplement one of these volumes with one that includes at least a selection of Spenser's other poetry, in which case, many teachers would probably find the Maclean/Prescott Norton Critical Edition, with much of the minor poetry and all of Books I and III, a smart and convenient alternative. As for single author classes on Spenser, whether undergraduate or graduate, I use Hamilton's *FQ* and Oram et al.'s *Yale Shorter Poems*; for less than half the price, Roche's Penguin *FQ* and McCabe's Penguin *Shorter Poems* would also serve. But other teachers will have different opinions on these matters, so on to the books themselves.

All volumes include the Letter to Ralegh and a brief biography of Spenser, and each editor supplies an introduction, textual notes, a glossary, an index of characters, a select bibliography, and a freshly edited text with annotations at the bottom of each page. Introductions and annotations vary in length and content, introductions in terms of balance between introducing *FQ* as a whole and introducing the particular books, annotations in terms of relative attention to glossing, paraphrasing, and interpreting. Editors seem to have been given free rein to do as they please, which makes results somewhat uneven from volume to volume, with the best introductions—most complete, original, and well-informed—being those by Kaske of Book I and Hadfield of Book VI.

Erik Gray clearly and concisely introduces Book II, writing an excellent analysis of Guyon's

character, a comprehensive yet pointed survey of the virtue of temperance, an extremely helpful discussion of the Spenserian stanza, and an original and convincing interpretation of the thematic and structural significance of *Briton monuments*. Gray's introduction is less helpful concerning the Bower of Bliss, that enigmatical crux of the poem. While I cannot fault him for blaming Guyon's annihilation of the Bower on the knight's incomplete embodiment of temperance compounded by personality disorders, Gray fails to interpret the Bower itself, mentioning neither the art/nature debate initiated by C. S. Lewis long ago nor the more recent psychoanalytic/colonialist argument proposed by Stephen Greenblatt in his seminal chapter of *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, readings that complicate and even justify Guyon's action. Gray's annotations, like his introduction, are concise and to the point, most of them glosses of words and names with relatively little interpretative commentary.

Dorothy Stephens's annotations, by comparison, are voluminous, often taking up about twice as much space on the page as Gray's; they gloss words and names, but they also offer stories from mythology, paraphrases of difficult passages, catch-up summaries of the narrative, and concise mini-essays on many episodes, especially those involving female characters. First-time readers of *FQ* will find these varied annotations both helpful and illuminating. After writing all those good notes, I suspect that Stephens put together her introduction a bit too quickly: its writing is marred in places by some awkwardness and by annoying shifts in person, and, apparently trying to cover all bases, she includes fairly unnecessary sections on amazons, homoeroticism, and Ireland.

Stephens's opening rhetorical strategy, which emphasizes the strangeness of Spenser's poem and culture as a prelude to partially domesticating both, exposes a common theoretical conundrum: Stephens seems hemmed in by conflicting ideological assumptions, for while she appears to endorse historicist dictums concerning the social construction of identity, she also wants to leave open the possibility of modest assertions of independent agency, especially for the female characters in the poem and, apparently, in the culture. When Stephens writes with conviction that, unlike "we" moderns, Elizabethans "believed that we construct ourselves through our manipulation of surfaces" (ix), I am not sure if she wants me to view, for example, Britomart, Belphoebe, Amoret, and Florimell as versions of a stable cultural construction, aspects of a concept of woman, or independent fictional entities with personal identities and wills of their own. Similarly, after reading that a "sixteenth-century . . . chaste woman" was not supposed to "feel erotic desire before marriage" (ix), I fail to understand why Stephens finds Amoret's "happily erotic union" with Scudamour "inconsisten[t]" with the "unwilling abduction" (x) that, according to Scudamour, brought the lovers together. (Stephens does not appear to notice the narrator's very different version of the supposed "abduction," from Amoret's point of view, at III.vi.52-53.) Of course, I am even more confused than Stephens about the enigma of human identity, and what I call problems in her discourse are some of the issues the poem demands that readers face and think about—in the end, very fruitful topics for classroom discussion.

Unfortunately, there are more concrete problems with Stephens's introduction, errors that suggest a less than intimate acquaintance with, especially, Books I and II. Most glaringly, Stephens says that the Red Cross Knight "marries Una" after he "slays the dragon" (xx); rather,

they are "betrouthed" (I.xii.Arg), their "marriage to [be] accomplish[ed]" when the Red Cross Knight returns in "six yeares" (I.xii.19)—indeed, the marriage is destined to initiate apocalyptic events. In a less serious but equally illogical error, Stephens has Guyon rather than Arthur reading "the chronicle of Briton kings" in Alma's castle (xxv), a mistake repeated in her note to III.iii.26 (55); she also confuses the names of the two books (xxi). In addition, she asserts that Guyon "rides a famously calm horse" (xxi)—not for very long!—and that "[t]hrough all his travels, Guyon is accompanied by the Palmer" (n. to III.i.9), apparently forgetting Guyon's lone sojourns with Phaedria and in Mammon's cave. These and a few other minor errors in the introduction and the notes do not disqualify this fine edition with its excellent notes from being a strong classroom text, but teachers who use it will have to correct the mistakes for their students in their own introductions, which, in the case of all volumes in this series, will require filling in some information about the whole poem that the introductions to the individual books necessarily leave out. Whatever reservations I have about the usefulness of these sound volumes, Hackett Publishing should be commended for them as well as for its fine, inexpensive editions of many classical texts.

Wayne Erickson is a professor of English at Georgia State University. His recent publications include editing *The 1590 Faerie Queene: Paratexts and Publishing* in *Studies in the Literary Imagination* (38.2, 2005) and "The Poet's Power and the Rhetoric of Humility in the Dedicatory Sonnets" (*SLI* 38.2, 2005).

38.63

Lamb, Mary Ellen. ***The Popular Culture of Shakespeare, Spenser, and Jonson. Routledge Studies in Renaissance Literature.*** London and New York: Routledge, 2006. vii+271 pp. ISBN13: 978-0-415-28881-1. $130 cloth. ISBN13: 978-0-203-50685-1. $113 eBook.

Reviewed by Rosemary Kegl

In the final pages of *The Popular Culture of Shakespeare, Spenser, and Jonson,* Mary Ellen Lamb writes that, in analyzing the production of popular culture, she has attempted to convey the "very real complexity of the entanglements between diverse higher status groups and the lower sorts, as these are worked out in literary texts" (229). In the book's introductory remarks, Lamb divides these higher status groups into "sometimes overlapping subgroups such as the humanist-educated male elite learned in Latin [Chapters 3 and 5], the middling sort forging its own nationalistic identity [Chapters 6 and 7], and the aristocracy of the Stuart court redefining itself in response to changing modes of consumption [Chapter 8]," each producing a vision of popular culture that helps it to define "itself against and through lower status groups" (3). Initially, I was a bit skeptical that analyzing works by "three authors commonly perceived as canonical," however compelling or valuable an exercise, would demonstrate for me the "centrality of these productions" and their "techniques of self-definition . . . in the culture and especially in the literature of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries" (3). If, as I moved closer to the end of Lamb's study, I still questioned the status of her readings as evidence of these much larger cultural claims, I quickly was won over by the suggestiveness and the explanatory power of

a book that offers both the breadth of allusion that gives so rich a texture to her description of the cultural meanings associated with fairies, old wives' tales, and hobby-horses, and the depth of analysis that makes so rewarding her insights about *A Midsummer Night's Dream, The Merry Wives of Windsor, The Faerie Queene, Oberon,* and *The Sad Shepherd.*

Chapter 2 outlines how "fairylore" allowed various "middling and elite groups," including "godly reformers, bourgeois householders, and Stuart aristocrats," to define themselves by evoking an association with lower status groups and by activating narratives of transgressive sexual activity, property crimes, bribery, and infanticide (16, 32). Chapter 3 describes the power of old wives' tales to evoke the lower class women (wetnurses, caregivers, maids) who populated the childhoods of the humanist-educated male elite, and emphasizes the flexibility of that association as these men managed the dissonance between their childhood culture and the humanist classroom and professional culture that increasingly defined their lives. Chapter 4 focuses on the hobby-horse, St. George, and the morris dancer as figures of a "merry England from which many early moderns were attempting, with mixed success, to distance themselves" (63). Lamb explains that, by the early seventeenth-century, these figures were prominent as "elite and middling groups" (including writers and religious reformers) attempted to distinguish their forms of performance and aesthetic pleasure from a "vigorous and largely improvised" amateur performance whose debased aesthetic depended on a "robust form of embodiment," including "unconstrained bodily movements" (86, 64). And yet—and here Lamb elaborates on the mixed success of this attempt at aesthetic and social distinction—"these figures still signified a more unified and festive past that some early moderns were not yet ready to give up" (87). Although all three chapters provide material that will enrich our teaching and scholarship in English Renaissance studies, it is this fourth chapter that is for me the most provocative and that elicits some of the most intriguing turns in Lamb's own analyses of Renaissance writing in the chapters that follow.

Lamb devotes the remaining chapters to analyses of writing by Shakespeare (Chapters 5 and 6), Spenser (Chapter 7), and Jonson (Chapter 8). She has selected works whose productions of popular culture are associated with the self-definition of various "higher status groups" (*MND* with a humanist-educated male elite learned in Latin, *MWW* with "middling" householders sensibly managing their goods, *FQ* with an educated and highly literate middling sort, and *Oberon* and *The Sad Shepherd* with an aristocratic elite whose patterns of living and modes of spending were increasingly distanced from the behavior of both middling and lower sorts). In each case, Lamb analyzes a production of popular culture that emerges from an intricate entwining of all three of her key categories: fairy stories, old wives' tales, and performances by "hobby-horses and fellow travelers" (63). She moves effortlessly among these three categories, and between her general sense of their cultural prominence and her specific sense of their literary and social significance for Shakespeare, Spenser, Jonson, and their English Renaissance audiences. Readers of *The Popular Culture of Shakespeare, Spenser, and Jonson* will find that Lamb's analyses are unfailingly attentive to nuances of literary style and social distinction, generous to the literary critics and historians with whom she is in constant conversation, and illuminating in their ability to give a new inflection to established interpretive concerns like the conjunction of classical Athens and early modern England in *MND*, the immoderate mocking of Falstaff by the sensible citizens

of Windsor, the persistence of a "dangerously (or pleasurably) effeminizing" perception of fiction in at the heart of Spenser's nationalist epic, and the sometimes surprising combinations classical and fairy elements that define Jonson's masques (164).

In the first paragraph I mentioned one of my misgivings about Lamb's project. I want to say now that, although any book will include a few overstatements in its presentation or inconsistencies in its argument, *The Popular Culture of Shakespeare, Spenser, and Jonson* is not unusually susceptible to these. In fact, one of its considerable accomplishments is Lamb's attentiveness to the problems of evidence and interpretation with which scholars of early modern popular culture inevitably grapple, and her willingness to entertain interpretive questions that arise from her analyses but that are not easily resolved within the design of her project. Readers of *The Spenser Review* will be glad to hear that these speculative passages on the many forces, both generalizable and quotidian, that might impinge on the early modern production and reception of work by Shakespeare, Spenser, and Jonson are given a particularly thoughtful treatment in Lamb's discussion of intertextuality and authorship in *FQ*.

Rosemary Kegl, Associate Professor of English at the University of Rochester, is author of *The Rhetoric of Concealment: Figuring Gender and Class in Renaissance Literature* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994), and of articles on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English writing. She is currently at work on two projects, *Revisiting Death in English Renaissance Drama: Apostrophe, Tragicomedy, and Utopia,* and *Tabloid Shakespeare at the 1934 Chicago World's Fair.*

38.64

Spenser Studies: A Renaissance Poetry Annual. **Volume XIX.** Eds. William A. Oram, Anne Lake Prescott, and Thomas P. Roche, Jr. New York: AMS Press, 2004. vi + 257 pp. $79.50 cloth. ISBN 0-404-19219-X.

Reviewed by Katherine Eggert

This review is late in coming, but not for lack of something to say about the stimulating essays in *Spenser Studies XIX*. The passage of time has only made these essays, as a group, a more comprehensive statement of the direction of Spenser criticism at the present moment. While no single theme dominates all the essays, I detect three trends. The first is not new, but rather a familiar one in Spenser studies: exploring to what degree *The Faerie Queene* hews to the Letter to Ralegh's stated aim of lessoning the reader, instructing him/her in virtuous and gentle discipline. The second trend is a version of the first, but, it seems to me, a more subtle and useful one: exploring whether *FQ* displays some kind of "method"—"method" in a protoscientific sense of the word, a mode of working to conclusions. The difference between these two questions is that, whereas in the "lessoning" model of Spenser criticism the critic often presupposes Spenserian ends, in the "method" model, the end might be surprising. Indeed, the point of looking for Spenser's method might be to show how *FQ* allows for readings contrary to presuppositions rampant in Spenser's culture or intellectual apparatus. The most successful of the essays in this volume examine the very process by which Spenser's texts make method possible. These essays might, in fact, be said to create a third current school of Spenser criticism: those critics who view the Spenserian text as engaging in a

process of *thinking*. (*Thinking* is *metamethod*: a ruminative action that sometimes brings method into being.) Spenser's poems—in particular, of course, *FQ*—are thinking poems: they not only pose problems and engineer solutions, but also manifest the delights and follies of reaching for, toying with, and discarding solutions that often prove to be transient, unworkable, over-rigid, overcomplicated, or merely dead ends.

I am almost tempted to announce, after reading the essays in this volume, the death of cultural studies of Spenser. Or perhaps cultural studies' transmutation into something more complex and more interesting. What was, just a decade ago, an easy and predictable formula for critical argument—"this essay examines [some object, some cultural phenomenon, some prevailing ideological construct] in such-and-such literary work"—is little in evidence here. (This formula is still fairly prevalent in Shakespeare studies; I would venture to say, then, that Spenserians are taking the lead in moving early modern literary criticism past what David Scott Kastan has memorably termed the "New Boredom" of cultural studies.) Rather, the best of the essays in this volume ask us to consider *why* such a thing, whatever it is, might be present in Spenser's poetry, what difference it makes to the process of cognition, recognition, and revision that Spenser's poems insist upon.

The Spenserian text as a thinking organism makes its first appearance in this volume in Lauren Silberman's excellent 2002 Kathleen Williams Lecture at Kalamazoo, "*The Faerie Queene*, Book V, and the Politics of the Text." Silberman proposes that *FQ* is a kind of thinking project, a series of essays (in the Montaignean sense) on topics such as "Of Holiness," "Of Chastity," and so on. Silberman focuses on what she calls the "red flag" stanzas condemning female rule in Book V, cantos v and vii, and queries, not whether Spenser did or did not endorse the antigynecocratic sentiment of those stanzas, but why it should pop up when it does. Arguing that Book V is a hard-nosed realpolitik response to the earlier books' utopian experiments in gender relations, she also notes the next step in the Spenserian essay form is to "[register] some sense of just what price reality exacts" (9). Register, but not declare: for Silberman, the point of *FQ's* exploration of alternative political arrangements is not to promote one as better than another, but to reveal both as ideological formulations that are designed only for occasions when they may be put to use.

Two short essays describe Spenser's thinking as taking place on the level of the stanza. Jeff Dolven's "The Method of Spenser's Stanza," which inspired my label of Spenserian "method studies," describes "method" in late sixteenth-century terms as not yet a word for bringing up knowledge from a brand-new foundation, but rather a way of "bringing systematic order and concision to existing fields of study" (18). But Dolven's sense of the Spenserian stanza goes beyond method, into a study of the *FQ* stanza as a kind of thinking machine. Like Ramist analytical diagrams, "the Spenserian stanza might likewise be understood as an engine for deriving some kind of concrete result in the form of that sententious hexameter: for making, out of thinking, a thought" (23). That thought, however, is often not one of Ramist certainty, but rather one of disruption and doubt—a thought, in other words, that prompts and even requires further thinking. Kenneth Gross, analyzing *FQ* III. vi.42—the description of "continuall spring" in the Garden of Adonis—in "Shapes of Time: On the Spenserian Stanza," finds a rare hexameter that does not break into halves and thus gives us a "liberated, unanxious possession of time and space" (30). That liberation is necessary, how-

ever, only as a counteractive to the disruptions of Time that threaten to ravage the Garden. For Gross, the *FQ* stanza is "both seed and seed-bed, the atomic fuel or genetic code of the poem's unfolding structure, the analogy of analogies that shapes the motion of Spenser's romance" (32). If the stanza is *FQ*'s DNA, then one must allow for natural selection; a thinking that is so deeply embedded in poetic structure that it is almost instinct rather than choice.

Two essays in the volume focus on patterned structure in the 1590 *FQ* and thus ought to fall into the "method" category I described above. Instead, however, the authors have largely presumed in advance the ends to which patterns might take the poem. Thus *FQ* has, in these essays, a lesson to teach, and the repetition of patterns only guarantees that we learn that lesson often. Which is not to say that these two essays do not add significantly to awareness of the extraordinary design of the poem. Shohachi Fukuda's "The Numerological Patterning of *The Faerie Queene* I-III" describes *FQ*'s first three books as a complex and symmetrical structure of numerological ratios, many of them involving numbers familiar to Spenserians from A. Kent Hieatt, Maren-Sofie Røstvig, and Alistair Fowler—27 (the cube of the divine 3); 24 (hours of the day); 33 (years of Christ's life); and so on. Fukuda parses the episode structure in each canto as displaying one or usually more than one of these ratios. Fukuda's ingenious reading gives us a Spenser who has, as Fukuda puts it, a "beautiful mind": the beauty of his mind, however, is bent toward establishing divine order as the order of his poem. Similarly, Alexandra Block's and Eric Rothstein's "Argument and 'Representation' in *The Faerie Queene*, Book III" focuses on episodic binary parallels in *FQ* III as (another) instance of Ramist logic, the point of which, they argue, is to model for the reader the set of "discriminables" by which one may remain chaste. As a whole, then, Book III "embodies a comprehensive schema with a hermeneutic, heuristic, and mnemonic energy" (177). The key here is "heuristic": if *FQ* III has energy, it is energy directed only toward one end, an education in the exercise of chastity.

Several other essays follow in the same vein of demonstrating *FQ*'s lessons. Raphael Lyne's "Grille's Moral Dialogue: Spenser and Plutarch," invaluably traces the sources of Book II's Grille not just to Plutarch, but also through Calvin, Erasmus, Montaigne, and Gianbattista Gelli—all of whom, Lyne fascinatingly demonstrates, learn from Plutarch that the pig (or some other Circe-transformed animal) might serve as a kind of voice of cultural diversity. For Lyne, however, the sense of alternative viewpoint can only go so far: "*Clearly* Spenser does not share this relativistic view of religious truth: for him the many false paths religion can take may parallel the potential for confusion in allegory" (167, my emphasis). This is an essentially Stanley Fishian view of Spenser: false paths exist only to show up the gullible reader who attempts to take them. Jason Gleckman's contention in "Providential Love and Suffering in *The Faerie Queene*, Book III" is that for Spenser, erotic desire may be ennobled when it takes the form of holy bodily suffering—as long as, in Protestant-approved fashion, it is externally imposed, rather than self-inflicted. Gleckman's argument adds to a burgeoning critical literature on the passions in Spenser, and I am eager, when I next read the poem, to test out his thesis that *FQ* is so in favor of divine pain "that sensations which lack a dimension of suffering are radically excluded from the epic's narrative" (214). I fear, however, that Gleckman ends up endorsing a sentimental view of women like Britomart's being an ideal locus of suffering, so long as their erotic desire is channeled into marriage and childbearing. He does not

consider that *FQ* exposes this sentimental view as a convenient one for a hypermasculine cultural and poetic milieu to hold. In contrast, James W. Broaddus's essay on "Renaissance Psychology and the Defense of Alma's Castle" demonstrates the need for *FQ*'s readers to be studying up on their anatomy, not their Protestant martyrology. Following somewhat in the line of current studies of the physiology of early modern emotion, Broaddus ingeniously reads Maleger's siege of Alma's Castle as a symptom of human mortality –not a problem that the Knight of Temperance (who has left the scene anyway) can solve. The best moment in Broaddus's essay is when he reads Guyon's faint in Book II as, literally, a heart problem –a "fitt of the mother" like the one that overcomes Lear.

The three remaining full-length essays in this volume are also devoted to the moral lesson in *FQ*, but with a difference: these critics describe the poem as demonstrating how difficult it is to determining what, and how, to learn and teach. In these rewarding essays, *FQ*'s "lessoning" verges back into its "method" and even its "thinking." Paul Suttie's "Moral Ambivalence in the Legend of Temperance" establishes that the ambivalence evident in critical reactions to Guyon's destruction of the Bower of Bliss is not critics' alone, but rather is inherent in Book II's ambivalence about which is the greater virtue: self-restraint, or irascible, militaristic valor. Whereas Book I requires the Christian knight to reject a life of contemplation for a life of active responsibility, Book II makes it impossible for Guyon to succeed at action because he is constantly incited to—and sometimes rewarded for—a course of passion and violence. How, then, shall we live? More to the point, how, then, shall we learn? Andrew Wallace's "'Noursled up in life and manners wilde': Spenser's Georgic Educations" describes a non-Virgilian tradition of pedagogical georgics, with a textual thread that runs back from the Letter to Ralegh to humanist educational treatises to Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*. The problem with educational georgics, though, is that they trope students as farm animals, best trained when best beaten. The problem of georgic pedagogy is exemplified, e.g., by Satyrane, who learns to subdue beasts through force, but does not learn to extend that behavior into a more complex ethical system of self-government. The 1596 *FQ* seems to have thought through this problem and lost some of its taste for georgic pedagogy, dumping both the Letter to Ralegh and the original georgic ending to Book III. Todd Butler similarly examines the difficulty of religious education in "That 'Saluage Nation': Contextualizing the Multitudes in Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*," which explores the problem of educating the masses in post-Reformation England. Wisely describing "Spenser's poetry as deeply invested in the complicated and varied constructions of English Protestantism, creating a site upon which multiple religious voices converge but do not dominate," Butler shows how *FQ* wrestles both with the question of what exactly to teach the masses and what to do when they cannot or will not learn. But the poem's ultimate turn is to stop wrestling about the matter. Book I allows that the blind Corceca might be ignorant of right religion through no fault of her own; Book V, in contrast, presents no consideration of alternatives when Artegall, after conquering the Egalitarian Giant (who, Butler convincingly shows, has a great deal in common with manipulative Puritan preachers), does not bother to instruct the masses better.

The volume ends with two well-turned "Gleanings" or notes. Frank Ardolino examines how the Protestant interpretation of the Armada's defeat appears in the storm passage in

Virgil's *Gnat*; and Thomas Herron discerns allusions to Irish-Scots relations in the satire of court corruption in *Mother Hubberds Tale*. Herron uncovers references to Spenser's acquaintance Nicholas Dawtry—who engaged in fruitless diplomacy to prevent Scots mercenaries from coming to Ireland—and to the coat of arms of the Earl of Ormond.

Katherine Eggert is Associate Professor and Chair of English at the University of Colorado, Boulder. She is the author of *Showing Like a Queen: Female Authority and Literary Experiment in Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton* (2000), and is currently working on a book-length study of alchemy in England from Spenser to Newton.

38.65

Suttie, Paul. ***Self-Interpretation in* The Faerie Queene.** *Studies in Renaissance Literature.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2006. x+204 pp. ISBN 1-84384-087-1. $85.00 cloth.

Reviewed by Humphrey Tonkin

Spenser, declares Paul Suttie at the opening of this provocative book, chose to write an allegory "in which the main locus of allegorical interpretation is within rather than extrinsic to the story world, such that the characters' self-interpretative activity does not merely echo but largely constitutes the way in which the book interprets itself to readers" (vii). Spenserians will recognize a variant of the well-established argument that the poem is subversive of itself, that it raises the question of the extent to which we should take "either the poem or its characters as authoritative guides to the story's moral significance" (vii). Harry Berger, Jerome Dees, and many others have shown that the narrator is a singularly unreliable exegetical guide; Maureen Quilligan has explored the way in which the poem itself seems to allegorize interpretation (receding into interpretations of interpretations); and for a century or more readers have worried over the Letter to Ralegh and its disregard for the poem's structural complexity. As for the moral basis of the allegory, is a Protestant chivalric romance even conceivable, given profound Protestant suspicion of human advancement through the exercise of good works? In essence, Suttie maintains that we can only be deeply wary of all externalities, all moral statements, all chivalric encounters: "God's will, far from constituting a straightforwardly external and independent reference point, a stable marker against which all earthly claims to right can be measured, has itself to be distinguished from false pretenders by reference to the inner yardstick of a personal competence" (137). The poem is mostly about how *not* to act.

The book has three parts: an initial section on allegory, an extensive analysis of Book I, and a rapid overview of the remaining books. Suttie concentrates on Book I for two reasons: because his method of close analysis could not accommodate the entire poem between the covers of one book, and, more importantly, because we are already aware of how the later books move away from the illusion of moral certainty set up by the commentary of the narrator, the "arguments" affixed to each canto, and other accoutrements of what might appear to be conventional allegory. Suttie wishes to show us that reading the early books as a progress toward virtue (the approach of Padelford and others), or even as a regression from it, is equally illegitimate.

The section on allegory begins with the Letter to Ralegh, a mystery from the start (and before: Spenser's intentional authorial obfuscations begin with the *Calender*). Suttie suggests that,

while our approach to the poem might have been different if no Letter to Ralegh existed, the Letter is only the most emphatic invitation to read the poem as a coherent allegory—among many, and most of them deceptive. Perhaps we can agree with Wayne Erickson that the Letter was necessary not for interpretation but for political expediency; but, either way, as Suttie explains, it proposes a level of certainty that the poem itself belies—and belies emphatically by leading the Red Cross Knight and Una and their stumbling crowd of breathless readers headlong into an encounter with Errour. In no sense can we see this meeting as a magnificent battle between a virtuous knight and an evil foe; on the contrary, it is only by error that the knight encounters error, and he will tangle with it repeatedly as the narrative continues (in a sense, misinterpretation *generates* the story: botched encounters produce more characters and more action).

Suttie pursues his avenues of inquiry with focused energy and perceptive reading that are both exhilarating and disquieting—exhilarating because he synthesizes criticism not only from the recent past but also from earlier periods (Josephine Waters Bennett, C. S. Lewis, William Nelson, Northrop Frye and numerous others put in cameo appearances, along with more recent contributors like Gordon Teskey, Annabel Patterson, and Louis Montrose), disquieting because in doing so he does not allow himself to be distracted by what might seem to the disinterested reader significant issues raised by recent criticism, particularly the larger political, social, and cultural context, and the related question of the nature of Spenser's fiction. The latter appears to him to be settled: Spenser's characters are fully formed, and it is legitimate to interrogate them about their interior lives. Indeed, for Suttie the entire narrative hinges on this assumption; these characters are not rhetorical positions, but people. While he stresses the shifting nature of Spenser's allegory (though he may not fully appreciate the witty ironies that this instability allows), there seems little room for a correspondingly shifting conception of characterization, and this reader was troubled by how much Spenser's characters, in Suttie's reading, seem lifted out of novels. Suttie gives due attention to the effect of expectations about chivalric romance on the reader, but perhaps not enough to other generic and rhetorical expectations that might accompany particular literary modes and *topoi* and might limit our conception of characters as free agents.

The lucid opening section on allegory helps set the context for the following two sections, yet seems almost to stand on its own, sometimes only loosely connected to the argument. Its discussion of allegory in Dante and its distinction between this-*for*-that allegory (in which interpretation obliterates character) and this-*and*-that allegory (in which interpretation supplements character) significantly illuminate the later analysis of the poem. But he has little to say about the *history* of allegory (beyond Dante and the *Bible*), of the kind provided by, say, Rosemond Tuve, Michael Murrin or, more recently, Jon Whitman, Michael Weatherby, and others. What was Spenser's understanding of the allegorical mode and how did he come by it?

In his reading of Book I, Suttie moves right down the middle, arguing that, while Red Cross engages in constant special pleading, blaming everyone but himself for much of what happens in the first half of the book and failing to notice that sin comes from within (Suttie's discussion of scapegoating is particularly germane), the book is ultimately not about the futility of action but about its contingency: Red Cross may learn little (he is still eliding the truth in Canto xii), but he does discover (and hence *we* discover) that moral interpretation can be "deployed for clearly wrong

or right purposes, which can be decisively disentangled" (122). Thus, Book I as a whole may stand at odds with prevailing Elizabethan policy but it is ultimately affirmative of god, country, and Tudor absolutism.

While Suttie's treatment of the later books is hurried, his comparison of Books I and II and his emphasis on the fact that Book II problematizes the solutions proposed in Book I are illuminating—as is his fairly radical analysis of Books III and IV. But perhaps the greatest incidental blessing of the entire book is its clarity of style and argument and its jargon-free discourse. The reader does have the impression that some of those with whom Suttie takes issue would gladly explain to him that their views are more like his than he imagines, but his sharp eye for difference helps sharpen our eyes too.

Humphrey Tonkin is University Professor of the Humanities and President Emeritus at the University of Hartford. He is author of *Spenser's Courteous Pastoral* (1972), the Unwin Critical Library volume on *The Faerie Queene* (1989), and numerous other contributions on literature, language, and education.

Essay

38.66

Frank Ardolino (U. of Hawaii), **"Staging Spenser: The Influence of Spenser's Bower Scenes on Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*"**

In "The Influence of Spenser's *Faerie Queene* on Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*," I argued that Kyd and Spenser share a similar vision of literature as mystery and a series of major motifs and themes, including infernal descents, Empedoclean discord/concord, "Truth, the daughter of Time," revenge as justice, and the destined apocalyptic fall of Babylon/Spain in 1588.[1] Now I would like to analyze how they employ similar techniques to create spectatorial scenes which involve the violation of a bower by an intrusive audience. The bower scenes in *FQ* and *The Spanish Tragedy* primarily involve characters, most often lovers, who meet in a secret place; an audience of hidden spectators who violate their privacy; and a betrayer who helps break the secrecy by allowing the audience to see the bower scene, which he in some instances may have created and staged for its benefit. Moreover, Spenser and Kyd's complex delineation of this opposition is placed within a dramatic context which depicts the hierarchical levels of awareness in the creator/director, actors, and the various audiences involved, including the detached readers and theater audience.[2] Above all of these participants are the authors who create this Chinese-box structure of watchers watching watchers. On their most basic level, these scenes depict the conflict between secrecy and revelation and serve as dramatic mysteries which are fully comprehended only by privileged audiences (Krier 85). In the remainder of this article, I will compare the bower scene in *The Spanish Tragedy* to six Spenserian bowers to demonstrate how their structure, elements, and essential theatrical qualities influenced Kyd's dramaturgy.[3]

The ironies of the bower scene in *The Spanish Tragedy* arise from the pattern of the theater audience watching the onstage audience of Revenge and Andrea watching the play-within-the-play which begins in the induction scene with the return of Andrea from Hades. He tells us of his "secret" affair—known to Lorenzo and Castile as we discover—with the high-born Bel-imperia and his subsequent death in the war with Portugal. He has been allowed to return to earth with Revenge to see the mystery play—"Here sit we down to see the mystery"[4]—which Revenge prophesies will result in the death of Balthazar, who has killed Andrea in battle.

Horatio is an impediment to Lorenzo's dynastic ambitions involving Balthazar's marriage to Bel-imperia. She, however, is determined to avenge Andrea's death and enlists Horatio's aid in her plot. Their growing love results in a rendezvous in Hieronimo's bower where, blinded by false expectations of secrecy, they are unaware of the danger surrounding them. Throughout the scene, Kyd contrasts the lovers' ignorance with the ominous presence of the hidden violators, whose level of evil knowledge is distinguished from the involved and yet dispassionate perspective of the onstage otherworldly audience of Andrea and Revenge. Beyond these spectators is the theater audience, which, as Barry Adams has pointed out, is being shown by the examples of the onstage audiences how to react to and interpret the complex scene.

The lovers interpret the natural aspects of the bower—the shade, the passage to night, and certain plants, birds, and insects—as proof of its paradisiacal qualities.[5] But these features promote and foreshadow the violence to come. The

dichotomies between day and night, light and dark establish the sense of growing danger. The lovers expect the trusted servant Pedringano, whom they instruct to "watch without the gate" (10), to provide the protection they need, but the theater audience recognizes with increasing apprehension that Lorenzo's earlier threat to "send thy [Horatio's] soul into eternal night" (2.2.56) will soon be fulfilled. Horatio's attempt to soothe Bel-imperia's anxiety by exclaiming that "Luna hides herself to pleasure us" (19) only serves as counterpoint to the concealment of the villains.

As the lovers move toward consummation of their love, Horatio alludes to Flora as the Roman goddess of flowers and springtime. In response, Bel-imperia depicts Flora as jealous of her: "[I]f Flora spy Horatio here, / Her jealous eye will think I sit too near" (26-27). Again, a remark from one of the lovers takes on an ominous tone because we know that jealous Balthazar is spying upon them. Bel-imperia and Horatio engage in further byplay concerning Cupid, who "counterfeits the nightingale, / To frame sweet music to Horatio's tale" (30-31). The word *counterfeits* repeats the note of disguise and deception, and the reference to the nightingale recalls its tragic tale of violation and mutilation. Mention of Cupid leads to the reference to the ill-fated affair between Mars and Venus, which functions as the mythological epitome of the scene's overall characteristics of profane love, approaching darkness and danger, and growing discord and imminent violation. After depicting themselves as Mars and Venus, they reenact the wars of love (34-37). As Sacvan Bercovitch explains, their aggressive loveplay is a sign that discordant love is now in the ascendancy (224). The Mars/Venus reference receives violent denouement from Lorenzo, who, as he stabs Horatio, snarls "these are the fruits of love" (55). Like the adulterous Mars and Venus trapped in a net by Vulcan and displayed to the ridicule of the gods, they are caught by the jealous Balthazar and Machiavellian Lorenzo in the act of adultery and subjected to mockery, imprisonment, and death.

The ironic consummation of the ill-fated tryst is heightened by the inversion of a traditional emblem and the inevitable pun on the word *die*. When Horatio grasps Bel-imperia in his arms, he compares their posture to the union of the elm and vine, which served as an emblem of unswerving marital loyalty with the vine supporting the elm even after the tree dies (Edwards, 40 n). But Horatio suggests that the vine pulls the elm down: "Nay then, my arms are large and strong withal: / Thus elms by vines are compass'd till they fall" (44-45). He pulls her down for amorous purposes, but his pun quickly changes to a fatal fall when he is killed and the significance of the elm and the vine as a symbol of friendship even after death receives a macabre confirmation. Similarly, the traditional pun on *die* moves from the erotic context of orgasm to a literal death. Approaching climax, Bel-imperia says, "for in my troubled eyes / Now may'st thou read that life in passion dies" (46-47), and Horatio replies: "O stay awhile and I will die with thee"(48). As if on cue, the murderers rush in and literalize the pun by killing Horatio.

The bower scenes in *FQ* are similar in structure, themes, images, motifs, and language to the bower scene in *The Spanish Tragedy*. In Book I, Archimago creates false lovers to fool the Red Cross Knight into believing that Una is lascivious. Archimago places his lovers in a bower-like setting "[c]overed with darkenes and misdeeming night" (ii.3), and then brings the Red Cross Knight "into a secret part" (ii.5) to witness their "hidden" act of love.[6] Here we have a malevolent artist\magician, creating false semblances in a contrived play-within-a-play which is deceptive on all levels. Archimago makes the Red Cross

Knight an audience of one who misinterprets what he sees and almost reacts violently to this ostensible betrayal before running away. In *The Spanish Tragedy* Pedringano betrays the secret lovers by allowing Balthazar and Lorenzo to be an audience of two, who rush in to prevent their union and consequently foster Balthazar's dynastic marriage to Bel-imperia. Like the Red Cross Knight, the assailants represent an enraged audience, but unlike him they punish the "actors" appearing before them. In both instances, we are being shown that we have the perspective to know the truth. In Book I we are aware that the Red Cross Knight is deceived by the false lovers, and in *The Spanish Tragedy* we are aware of an otherworldly doom pronounced by Revenge which will defeat Lorenzo and Balthazar's attempts to conceal their murder of Horatio.

In Book II, Guyon hears the tragic story of Phedon, whom anger has driven to multiple murders. Phedon loved Claribell, a woman of "great degree,"(iv.19), who told Philemon about her secret affair with Phedon, not expecting him to betray her confidence. Philemon then told Phedon that he had secretly discovered that Claribell was involved with a base groom "who used in a darkesome inner bowre / Her oft to meete" (24). In order to prove his lie, Philemon created a bogus play-within-the-play with himself as the leading actor, the maid Pyrene posing as Claribell, and Phedon as the "secret" audience to their coupling:

> Me leading, in a secret corner layd,
> The sad spectatour of my tragedie;
> Where left, he went, and his owne false part playd,
> Disguised like that groome of base degree,
> Whom he had feignd th' abuser of my love to bee. (27)

Phedon did not discover that it was not Claribell making love in the bower because it was too dark, but when he did learn the truth he murdered her, poisoned Philemon, and pursued Pyrene to kill her.[7]

A number of significant similarities with the bower scene in *The Spanish Tragedy* are evident. First, there is the emphasis on the unequal status of the lovers. Andrea and Horatio are inferior to high-born Bel-imperia, and it is this disparity which causes them to hide their love. Phedon is born below Claribell, and the "base groom" who ostensibly makes love to her is a caricature of Phedon's lower status. Secondly, the role of the betrayers is emphasized. Pedringano betrays his mistress and allows the conspirators to see the secret bower meeting. Similarly, Philemon, the apparently loyal friend, deceives everyone with his plot, during which he serves as betrayer, playwright, and, actor. Finally, the stage-like quality of these bower scenes is invested with real violence: in *The Spanish Tragedy* the conspirators make literal the verbal and physical love play of their victims, and Phedon acts out his rage at the performance he misinterprets by killing its author/actor and impersonated lover.

The third pertinent bower scene takes place in Book IV when Aemylia relates the story of her secret and unequal love affair. Aemylia was nobly born, but the fates and Cupid "did secretly agree, / To overthrow my state and dignitie" (vii.15). Her father adamantly opposed her relationship, but she was determined to meet with the squire secretly to plan their escape.

> Thenceforth I sought by secret meanes . . .
> And in a privy place, betwixt us hight,
> Within a grove appointed him to meete. . . . (17)

Instead of finding her lover, she was kidnapped by "this accursed carle of hellish kind" (18). Like Bel-imperia, Aemylia loved a social inferior who was opposed by her father. Both of these defiant women set up secret meetings with their lovers,

and both had that secrecy breached by intrusive audiences who imprisoned them.

The Bower of Bliss also provides significant parallels to Kyd's bower scene. The major difference in the two scenes is that while Guyon and the palmer destroy an evil bower and an obvious witch, Lorenzo and Balthazar are villains who invade the bower "made for pleasure not for death" (II.v.12). However, both episodes are based on violent reactions to theatrically framed scenes taking place in deadly gardens. [8]

The Bower of Bliss appears to be an earthly paradise, "beautifide / With all the ornaments of Floraes pride" (II.xii.50), but, as in *The Spanish Tragedy*, it is characterized by deceptive appearances.[9] The Genius figure in this paradise is not the classical guardian Agdistes, who "ofte of secret ill bids us beware" (47), but "[t]he foe of life, that good envyes to all, . . . / Through guilefull semblants (48)." Spenser depicts a duplicitous gatekeeper devoted to leading people astray through the promise of hidden pleasure. He is similar to Pedringano, who betrayed the lovers for gold and in the process became the "guilefull semblant."

Acrasia's bower, like the bower in *The Spanish Tragedy*, contains an inversion of the marital *topos* of the elm supported by the vine so that "the weake boughes, with so rich load opprest, / Did bow adowne, as overburdened" (55). Further, there is a similar byplay between secrecy and revelation. The wanton nymphs attempt to seduce Guyon, alternately revealing and concealing themselves (63-67). Finally, the enchantress Acrasia and her lover are captured, like Mars and Venus, in a net by Guyon and the palmer, who then destroy the bower. The Bower of Bliss is a decidedly evil place rightfully violated by the intrusive, but justified, audience who exact divine punishment upon it, as God did upon Babylon (Graziani 269). Similarly, when Isabella later destroys Hieronimo's bower, she, as S. F. Johnson has noted, foreshadows the "fall of Babylon / Wrought by the heavens" (IV.i.196) in Hieronimo's revenge playlet (26-27).

The next example of secrecy violated occurs in canto vi of the *Mutabilitie Cantos*. The violation of the secret place is depicted as a sacred mystery being profaned, a context that has strong relevance for Kyd's mystery play and its spectatorial motifs.[10] Faunus wanted to see the goddess Diana naked when she "lay in covert shade where none behold her may" (42), so he bribed Molanna, one of her nymphs, to allow him to observe her secretly. When Faunus saw Diana, he laughed and thus betrayed Diana's privacy and his own secret spectatorship (46). As punishment for his intrusiveness, Diana captured him in his secret place and had him pursued like a stag and Molanna pelted with stones. Because of Faunus' profanation, Arlo was defiled, deserted by Diana, and overrun by wolves.

In *The Spanish Tragedy*, although the context is more earthy to suit the erotic plot, the mechanism of spectator betrayal and violation is similar. The "vild profaner[s] of this sacred bower" (2.5.27) bribe the guardian to allow them to catch the lovers *in flagrante delicto*. After their intrusion and crime, they are unable to keep their secret crime hidden; subsequently, Pedringano is hanged and Lorenzo and Balthazar are punished in a mystery playlet whose text they do not understand. Finally, the violation of the bowers results in their destruction by Diana and Isabella, respectively.

It is instructive to conclude this essay on bower scenes in Spenser and Kyd with an analysis of the Garden of Adonis, which Spenser changes from the balefulness of the deceptive bowers into a contained but fruitful context.[11] As Terry Comito has remarked, enclosure in the Garden of Adonis does not signify darkness or

limit, but it frames the clarity and expression of perfected order and temporality, "its potential destructiveness precluded by embracing lovers" (108). The Garden of Adonis surpasses "All other pleasaunt places" (III.vi.29) with its beautiful flowers and its steady hum of generation and love. Cupid appears with his true love Psyche and they enjoy the presence of their daughter Pleasure who brings joy to the Garden.

Neuse has traced a major theme of Spenser's Garden of Adonis to Theocritus' *Idyll 15,* "The Women at the Adonis Festival," in which the festival functions as a ritual celebration of the sacred drama of love, death, and anticipated resurrection enacted in the myth of the dying and reviving gods (8). The conflation of the stories concerning the wounded and dying vegetal gods was facilitated by their common elements. The basic *mythos* concerns an abortive love between the god and a mother goddess: either the god spurns her amorous advances and is killed subsequently by a boar, as in the case of Adonis and Attis, or he vies with a rival for her affection, as in the Osiris myth, and is slain by his brother Set or Typhon, who scatters the pieces of his body. Other common features include the gods representing, like Proserpine, the cycle of the seasons; their metamorphosis into flowers, either a rose, violet, or anemone; and, finally, their relationship to a pine tree, against which they have been gored to death by a wild boar or from which they have been hanged in emulation of the hanged and flayed Marsyas.

Spenser draws upon the significance of this *mythos* for his presentation of Adonis as the vegetation god whose "mysterious resurrection" (46-49) gives the garden its positive meaning (Neuse 9). Venus hides Adonis from the world and the Stygian gods; although he may have died, he is "eterne in mutability / And by succession made perpetuall" (47). He lives in eternal bliss with Venus, who has imprisoned "that wild bore, the which him once annoyd" (48). The mortal enemy of the lovers does not intrude upon their love, but he is contained and enclosed.

However, in *The Spanish Tragedy,* Horatio is stabbed and hanged from the tree as an image of the dying vegetation god whose union with his lover is cut short by the murderers.[12] What we learn from Horatio's parents, who enter the bower after hearing his cries, is important in identifying his death with that of the hanged gods. Hieronimo depicts his son's murderers as savage animals: "What savage monster, not of human kind, / Hath here been glutted with thy harmless blood" (2.5.19-22). Kyd is alluding to the boar's goring of the god, which traditionally represents the onset of winter and sterility. As Macrobius explains: ". . . Adonis . . . is the sun . . . killed by a boar . . . intended to represent winter . . . which inflicts a wound on the sun . . ." (141). Hieronimo also apostrophizes Horatio as "[s]weet lovely rose, ill-pluck'd before thy time"(46), which alludes to the metamorphosis of the slain god into a flower.[13]

We do not learn what type of tree Horatio has been hanged from until Act 4 when Isabella, maddened by grief, destroys "this unfortunate and fatal pine" (2.7). Her condemnation of the bower as a place of sterility and death marks the culmination of the theme of fruitlessness established by the murder; however, the pine tree, a symbol of immortality, points to the promise of resurrection, which is fulfilled in the revenge playlet when Hieronimo, as I have argued in *Thomas Kyd's Mystery Play,* resurrects his dead son as the image in whose honor he is enacting revenge (123-44). In sum, Kyd has employed the Adonis myth in a manner and context similar to Spenser, albeit more tragic, to impart a central ritual meaning of death and resurrection to Horatio's murder in the bower (Sacks 18-37, 68-74).[14]

The bower scenes of Kyd and Spenser are important in that they serve as epitomes of their creation of multiple levels of meaning and audience understanding. Kyd's play consists of a series of plays-within-the-play which he uses to create multiple perspectives on chance and fate and art and reality. It was these methods that, along with its sensationalist revenge plot, made this the most popular and influential play of the Elizabethan period.[15] Kyd learned the play-within-the-play methodology and the mystery context from Spenser and thus through him he generated that extensive dramatic influence. Two objections may be raised to my argument: parallels do not necessarily constitute an influence and the elements and themes I have analyzed as belonging to Kyd and Spenser are common to all writers of the period and therefore can not be ascribed to them exclusively. The answer to these objections is that the number and significance of the parallels I have described in this article and the previous one make it quite probable that Kyd was influenced significantly by Spenser.

Works Cited

Adams, Barry. "The Audiences of *The Spanish Tragedy*." *JEGP* 68 (1969): 221-36.

Ardolino, Frank. *Apocalypse and Armada in Kyd's Spanish Tragedy*. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Studies, 1995.

---. "Dekker's Use of *The Spanish Tragedy in Satiromastix*." *ELN* 41 (2003): 7-18.

---. "The Induction of Sly: The Influence of *The Spanish Tragedy* on the Two *Shrews*." *Explorations in Renaissance Culture* 31.2 (Winter 2005): 165-87.

---. "The Influence of Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* on Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 7 (2002): 4.1-70 http:// purl.oclc.org/emls/07-3/ardofaer.htm>.

---. "Shakespeare's Allusion to *The Spanish Tragedy* in *The Merchant of Venice* (2.2)." *Discoveries* 23 (Fall 2006): 4 pages http: www.scrc.us.com/ discoveries.

---. *Thomas Kyd's Mystery Play: Myth and Ritual in The Spanish Tragedy*. New York: Peter Lang, 1985.

Barber, C. L. *Creating Elizabethan Tragedy: The Theater of Marlowe and Kyd*. Ed. Richard Wheeler. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Bate, Jonathan. "The Performance of Revenge: *Titus Andronicus* and *The Spanish Tragedy*." *The Show Within: Dramatic and Other Insets in English in English Renaissance Drama (1550-1642)*. Ed. François Laroque. 2 vols. Montepelier, France: Publications de Université Paul-Valery, 1992. 2: 267-83.

Bercovitch, Sacvan. "Love and Strife in Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*." *SEL* 9 (1969): 215-29.

Bergeron, David. "Pageants." Hamilton. *The Spenser Encyclopedia*. 524-26.

Comito, Terry. "Bowers." Hamilton. *The Spenser Encyclopedia*. 107-09.

Crewe, Jonathan. *Hidden Designs: The Critical Profession and Renaissance Literature*. London: Methuen, 1986.

Dolven, Jeff. "Spenser and the Troubled Theaters." *ELR* 29 (1999): 179-200.

Dudrap, Claude. "La *Tragédie Espagnole* Face à la Critique Élisabéthaine et Jacobéene." *Dramaturgie et Société*. Ed. Jean Jacquot. Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1968. 2: 607-31.

Erne, Lukas. *Beyond The Spanish Tragedy: A Study of the Works of Thomas Kyd*. Manchester: Manchester U P, 2001.

Freeman, Arthur. *Thomas Kyd, Facts and Problems*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1967.

Graziani, René. "*The Faerie Queene*, Book II." Hamilton. *The Spenser Encyclopedia*. 263-70.

Hamilton, A. C. *The Spenser Encyclopedia*. Ed. A. C. Hamilton et al. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1990.

Hintz, Howard. "The Elizabethan Entertainment and *The Faerie Queene*." *PQ* 14 (1935): 83-90.

Hopkins, Lisa. "What's Hercules to Hamlet? The Emblematic Garden in *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Hamlet*." *Hamlet Studies* 21 (1999): 114-43.

Hyman, Wendy. "Seizing Flowers in Spenser's Bower and Garden." *ELR* 37.2 (2007): 193-214.

Johnson, S.F. "*The Spanish Tragedy*, or Babylon Revisited." *Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama in Honor of Hardin Craig*. Ed. R. Hosley. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1962. 23-36.

Krier, Theresa. "The Mysteries of the Muses: Spenser's *Faerie Queene* II.3 and the Epic Tradition of the Goddess Observed." *Spenser Studies* 7 (1987): 59-91.

Kyd, Thomas. *The Spanish Tragedy*. Ed. Philip Edwards. London: Methuen, 1959.

Macrobius. *The Saturnalia*. Trans. Percival Davies. NY: Columbia UP, 1969.

Madelaine, Richard. "'The dark and vicious place': The Location of Sexual Transgression and its Placement on the Early Modern English Stage. *Parergon* 22.1 (2005): 159-83.

Neuse, Richard. "Adonis, gardens of." Hamilton. *The Spenser Encyclopedia*. 8-9.

Nohrnberg, James. "Britomart's Gone Abroad to Brute-land, Colin Clout's Come Courting from the Salvage Ire-land: Exile and Kingdom in Some of Spenser's Fictions for 'Crossing Over.'" *Edmund Spenser: New and Renewed Directions*. Ed. J. B. Lethbridge. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2006. 214-85.

Pugh, Syrithe. "Acrasia and Bondage: Guyon's Perversion of the Ovidian Erotic in Book II of *The Faerie Queene*." *Edmund Spenser: New and Renewed Directions*. Ed. J. B. Lethbridge. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2006. 153-94.

Ramachandran, Ayesha. "Clarion in the Bower of Bliss: Poetry and Politics in Spenser's 'Muiopotmos.'" *Spenser Studies* 20 (2005): 77-106.

Sacks, Peter. *The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1985.

Schulze, Ivan. "Spenser's Belge Episode and the Pageants for Leicester in the Low Countries, 1585-86." *SP* 28 (1931): 235-40.

---. "Blenerhasset's *A Revelation*, Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender*, and the Kenilworth Pageants." *ELH* 11 (1944): 85-91.

Sofer, Andrew. "Absorbing Interests: Kyd's Bloody Handkerchief as Palimpsest." *Comparative Drama* 34 (2000): 127-53.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Complete Poetical Works of Edmund Spenser*. Ed. R. E. Neil Dodge. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1936.

Walton, Charles. "'To Maske in Myrthe': Spenser's Theatrical Practices in *The Faerie Queene*." *The Emporia State Research Studies* 9 (1960): 3-42.

Wheelwright, Philip. *The Burning Fountain*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1968.

Wilson, Rawdon. "Images and 'Allegoremes' of Time in the Poetry of Spenser." *ELR* 4 (1976): 56-82.

[1] In *Apocalypse and Armada*, I argued that the play contains an apocalyptic/Armada subtext which dates it post-1588. It was first published in 1592.

[2] Krier has delineated Spenser's four-part structure as consisting of the observed, the observers,

the observing narrator, and the readers (85). For discussions of Spenser's theatrical qualities see Bergeron, Crewe (94-118), Dolven, Hintz, Schulze, and Walton.

[3] Although the bower scene in *Muiopotmos: or The Fate of the Butterflie* does not depict the violation of secrecy in quite the same way as the bowers that will be discussed, its presentation of revenge being enacted within a private bower upon an unsuspecting victim provides a close parallel to the death of Horatio and Kyd's use of interlocking cycles of revenge in *The Spanish Tragedy*. Like Horatio, Clarion is hanged—suspended in a net—and stabbed by the "author of confusion," who parallels Lorenzo as evil author-figure (Wilson 73). The poet declares that either Fortune or fate caused Clarion's death, but the title of the poem declares that his death was fated. This duality is also the perspective of *The Spanish Tragedy*: what appears to be done by chance actually is destined. See also Ramachandran for an analysis of the parallels between the Bower of Bliss and the bower in *Muiopotmos*.

[4] 1.1.90. All citations of the play are from the Edwards edition.

[5] For a comparison of this garden and the one in *Hamlet* where Claudius murders his brother, see Hopkins.

[6] All citations of Spenser are from the Dodge edition.

[7] It is generally accepted that the Phedon/Philemon bower episode influenced Shakespeare's creation of a similar scene in *Much Ado About Nothing* (3.3.144 ff.) when Claudio is tricked into believing that Hero is unfaithful to him.

[8] Dolven argues that Spenser demonstrates his awareness of the issues raised in the attacks on the public theater by presenting in the "pageant" of Book II spectacles which involve the different levels of audience perspective on the dramatic action witnessed. This theme reaches its culmination in Guyon's reaction to the Bower of Bliss, "the place where we can see with greatest clarity how the original problem of viewing and involvement is being transformed" (187).

[9] Pugh remarks that the use of *display* (II.xii.76) as a stage direction meaning to reveal a scene or a dumb show "implies that Guyon and the Palmer are also in some way actively responsible for the scene of 'That wanton Ladie, with her louer lose,' which they reveal to us mediated, interpreted, judged even created, as a scene in a play might be presented on stage" (186). Hyman describes Phaedria's "framed fit" (II.vi.13) island, which foreshadows Acrasia's bower as a stage-managed enclosure in which "Phaedria comes off as a shrewd stage manager, ticking off a list of properties and dazzling effects" (197).

[10] Nohrnberg remarks that "Faunus's story has affinities with classical stories about a male voyeur illegally present at mysteries" (231).

[11] However, Hyman argues the Garden of Adonis is a baleful and deceptive bower like the Bower of Bliss (207-14).

[12] Philip Wheelwright was the first scholar to note Horatio's symbolic role as the hanged god in his discussion of T.S. Eliot's use of *The Spanish Tragedy* in *The Wasteland* (248-50), Barber has compared Horatio to a Christ figure hanged on a tree in the arbor, which becomes a Calvary or Golgotha (151-53). Similarly, Sofer has stated that "to a contemporary audience the hanging and stabbing of Horatio by four men, on an arbor-property designed to resemble a tree, may well have suggested the Crucifixion on the 'tree' dramatized by the Corpus Christi Passion Plays" (142). However, I would argue that Kyd is more concerned with the pagan *mythos* as befitting his debt to Spenser.

[13] Spenser uses the same elegaic imagery and language in *FQ* and *Astrophel*. At II.i.44, Guyon questions the dying Amavia about the cause of

her imminent death:

> What direfull chance, armd with avenging fate,
> Or cursed hand, hath plaid this cruell part,
> Thus fowle to hasten your untimely date? . . .

In *Astrophel,* in which Spenser elegizes Philip Sidney as a dying god, Clorinda mourns Astrophel as

> The fairest flowre in field that ever grew . . . .
> What cruell hand of cursed foe unknowne
> Hath cropt the stalke which bore so faire a flowre?
> Untimely cropt, before it well were growne,
> And cleane defaced in untimely howre. (31-36)

Similarly, "The Mourning Muse of Thestylis" compares Astrophel's death to

> damaske roses bud
> Cast from the stalke, or like in field to purple flowre,
> Which languiseth being shred by culter as it past. (74-76)

When Stella laments her lover's demise, she uses the cruel hand image: "What cruell envious hand hath taken thee away . . .?" (103).

[14] Hyman has remarked that "Spenser introduces Adonis as a presence in the poem with a . . . sense of death and loss, a[n] . . . awareness that . . . Adonis was worshipped as 'the absent—and presumed dead—god'" (209). As I have argued in "Shakespeare's Allusion to *The Spanish Tragedy*," after Horatio is killed in the bower, he disappears from the play, apparently with no awareness of his murder from the other characters. He is "resurrected" and displayed during the revenge playlet as Hieronimo's justification for his revenge.

[15] For treatments of the influence of the influence of *The Spanish Tragedy* on other plays of the period, see my "Induction," "Dekker" and the following: Bate, Dudrap, Erne (119-46), and Freeman (131-37). For an article on the specific influence of Kyd's bower scene on subsequent plays, see Madelaine.

Articles: Abstracts and Notices

Abstracts compiled by Gitanjali Shahani.

38.67

Bond, Christopher. **"Medieval Harrowings of Hell and Spenser's House of Mammon."** *English Literary Renaissance* 37.2 (Spring 2007): 175-92.

Takes up an episode in *Faerie Queene* II.vii where Guyon visits the House of Mammon. In the subterranean dwellings of the money-god, the Knight of Temperance resists numerous temptations of wealth and power before demanding he be led back to the surface where he promptly faints. Several critics have commented on Guyon's willingness to expose himself thus. Harry Berger, Jr.'s. suggestion that Guyon's overconfidence and "unprofitable curiosity" are manifest in this episode has in turn prompted critics to speculate on every aspect of the knight's foray into Mammon's realm. Bond's essay aims to examine "one particular interpretation of this episode—that it is analogous to Christ's Harrowing of Hell—and to excavate some of the substrata of Spenser's medieval antecedents." The story of the Harrowing especially captivated the medieval imagination, and while there was no shortage of English versions that may have inspired Spenser, two achievements of Medieval literature are especially important: William Langland's *Vision of Piers Plowman* (c. 1365-1386) and the mystery cycles, in which the Harrowing-myth is most vitally preserved. Bond goes on to analyze the relationship between these works and Spenser's version.

38.68

Hyman, Wendy Beth. **"Seizing Flowers in Spenser's Bower and Garden."** *English Literary Renaissance* 37.2 (Spring 2007): 193-214.

Guyon's destructive fury in the Bower of Bliss has been variously read as morally righteous, fearful, misogynistic, and imperialistic. It has been viewed as a response to the concupiscence, the hierarchical power structure, and to the power structure of the Bower. However, little attention has been paid to its culminating poetic expression—the *carpe florem* lyric, beginning "Gather the Rose of loue, whilest yet is time, / Whilest louing thou mayst loued be with equall crime." Hyman seeks to rectify this omission, arguing that Spenser's lyric is not merely decorative, but is imbricated in Guyon's razing of the Bower. The brief invitation in the poet's message to seize the day "seems utterly moot in what is, after all, a self-regenerating and static biosphere." Indeed, in light of this discrepancy, "one would think that delay, caution, and dilation would be called for. Instead, Guyon's climactic violence razes both the Bower, and . . . any claim he had on Temperance." Hyman goes on to argue that the *carpe florem* moment is an important if unrecognized hinge between the Book of Temperance and the Book of Chastity.

38.69

Mills, Jerry Leath. **"Mountain Grills and Hoggish Minds: W.O. Gant's Allusive Invective."** *The Thomas Wolfe Review* (2006): 87-92. Abstract by Thomas Herron.

Focuses on the character W.O. Gant's invective—"Mountain Grills! The lowest of the low! The vilest of the vile!"—describing Appalachian yokels in Thomas Wolfe's novel, *Look Homeward Angel: A Story of the Buried Life* (1929) and its version *O Lost: A Story of the Buried Life* (2000). Despite plenty of pigs in the neighborhood, mountain dialect and folklore cannot account for the term "mountain grill"; rather, it is based on Spenser's famous character in *FQ* II.xii. Wolfe would have read *FQ* while a student at UNC-Chapel Hill under the tutelage of Edwin Greenlaw, who is allegorized in Wolfe's *The Web and the Rock* (1939) as Professor Randolph Ware (who proclaims, "Do I know more about Spenser than God and Spenser put together? Yes."). Article includes brief survey of relevance of Circe myth to Spenser's episode as argued by Merritt Y. Hughes, as well as speculation that Wolfe knew Thomas Love Peacock's character Gregory Gryll, Esq., from *Gryll Grange* (1861). Concludes that "Wolfe's appropriation of the word from Spenser (and perhaps others) is a manifestation of the genius he displays on every hand in the creation of a figure who is arguably the most vividly realized character in all his books."

38.70

Myers, Benjamin P. **"Pro-War and Prothalamion: Queen, Colony, and Somatic Metaphor Among Spenser's 'Knights of the Maidenhead.'"** *English Literary Renaissance* 37.2 (Spring 2007): 215-49.

Charts the points of contact—or the "overlay"—between Spenser's gender ethics, his experience of the Irish landscape, and his singular reception of the Petrarchan literary heritage. In *FQ* II.ii, Spenser makes use of the term "froward" in a specifically Petrarchan context: "All for their Ladies *froward* love to gaine, / Which gotten was but hate." Here the Petrarchan lady is described as "froward" because she scorns rather than pities. Spenser's analogy positions "the Queen as Petrarchan lover against the background of a male-driven conquest of the feminized landscape, a juxtaposition in which the love-frowardness of the Petrarchan lady is translated into the frowardness of a queen hesitant to take expensive and potentially devastating steps necessary for the expansion of her empire." Drawing on the oft-used trope of the land as female body, Spenser links the colonial approaches to land with staunchly Protestant conceptions of marriage, working a double sense of "husbandry" to criticize the Queen for her reluctance in supporting English endeavors in Ireland. Thus as "woman," Ireland had to be courted; as "virgin," she stood in need of husbandry. According to Myers, "[s]uch a metaphor works by importing the cultural values surrounding gender into the colonial discourse, creating a similitude between gender and colonial relations." Thus "the values inherent in the two discourses are fused in a pattern of radiating meaning," so that "when one speaks of the land in gendered terms, one speaks of *both* the land and gender at once and in the same ethical terms."

38.71

Sanchez, Melissa E. **"Fantasies of Friendship in *The Faerie Queene*, Book IV."** *English Literary Renaissance* 37.2 (Spring 2007): 250-73.
Argues that the seemingly private quality of Chastity that Spenser upholds in *FQ* III "goes beyond sexual continence to signify the relinquishment of self-interest—expressed in the control of unruly passions—which is essential for stable and equitable relationships with others." This ability to rechannel egoistic urges into altruistic actions is crucial to the ideal of friendship in *FQ* IV, which Spenser, drawing on Aristotle, Cicero, and Thomas Elyot upholds as a model of political allegiance. In the 1596 version of *FQ*, Spenser situates Friendship as the gateway to the explicitly public virtues of Justice and Courtesy. "In so privileging 'the blessed and stable connexion of sondrie willes, making of two parsones one in having and suffringe' that Elyot has placed at the center of a reformed commonwealth, Spenser champions a theory of mixed monarchy even as he depicts its elusiveness."

Announcements and Queries

38.72

CFP: Spenser at Kalamazoo, 8-11 May 2008

Two sessions on Edmund Spenser
43rd International Congress on Medieval Studies, Western Michigan University (Kalamazoo, Michigan), 8-11 May 2008

Abstracts may be submitted on any topic dealing with Spenser. (Papers on Spenser's shorter poems are particularly welcome.) As always, we encourage submissions by newcomers and by established scholars of all ranks.

Reading time for papers should be no more than twenty minutes. According to rules established by the Congress, those submitting abstracts for one session may not submit abstracts for other sessions in the same year. Because Kalamazoo has traditionally encouraged experiment, preliminary exploration, and discussion, papers submitted should not have been read elsewhere nor be scheduled for publication in the near future.

Email submissions are encouraged. Please include home and office phone numbers, complete mailing address, and e-mail address along with your attachment. If you need equipment, let us know now when you submit the abstract.

Minimum length of abstract: 300 words.
Maximum length: 750 words.
Deadline: 14 September 2007.

Please direct questions and abstracts to:

David Scott Wilson-Okamura
Department of English
Bate Building 2201
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC 27858
email and phone: david@virgil.org,
252-328-6714 (office)

Organizing Committee for Spenser at Kalamazoo:
Clare Kinney (U. of Virginia), William Oram (Smith College), Ted Steinberg (SUNY Fredonia), Beth Quitslund (Ohio U.), David Scott Wilson-Okamura (East Carolina U.) (chair)

For complete conference Call for Papers, see:
http://www.wmich.edu/medieval/congress/

38.73

There will soon be a new digital library of core printed materials on Ireland. JSTOR is collaborating with Queen's University of Belfast to provide a unique set of Irish e-resources from the print collections of Queen's University, The Linen Hall Library, The Robinson Library, and CELT the Corpus of Electronic Texts. For more information, visit http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/programme_digitisation/ireland.aspx

38.74

The following Spenser events will occur at the 2007 MLA Conference:

Session 1: Spenser's Useless Loves
Jeff Dolven (Princeton U.), Organizer and Chair
Heather James (U. of Southern California),
"Spenser's Narcissism"
Sean Keilen (U. of Pennsylvania),
"Sweet Infusion"
James Kuzner (Johns Hopkins U.),
"Without Respect of Utility"

Session 2. Spenser and the Continent
Barbara Fuchs (U. of Pennsylvania), Organizer
Anne Prescott (Barnard College), Chair
Joseph Campana (Rice U.),
"Tasso's Tree, Spenser's Trauma"
Melissa Sanchez (U. of Pennsylvania),
"Chivalry, Seduction, and Huguenot Theory in *The Faerie Queene*, Book V"
Roland Greene (Stanford U.),
"Edmund Spenser Invents Europe"

The Hugh Maclean speaker at the annual luncheon of the International Spenser Society will be Gordon Teskey (Harvard U.).

The Spenser Review
c/o Sheila Cavanagh
Emory University
Department of English
537 Kilgo Circle, Callaway N302
Atlanta, GA 30322

Address Service Requested