SPENSER · NEWSLETTER

TO OUR READERS

86.119 The editors and staff want, first, to thank all those readers who wrote to offer such generous praise of the new format and overall appearance of the *Newsletter*. As we mentioned in the previous issue, the print style became available through the University's acquisition of an Apple Laser printer, which the Microcomputer Support Center allowed us to use. The current issue has been printed on an identical machine, this one made available to the English Department on a trial basis, directly through the generosity of the Apple Computer Corporation.

We welcome two new people to the staff. One, an exceptionally able Subscriptions Manager, Deborah Price, has come to rescue us from this overwhelming task through the generosity of the Work-Study program, administered by the University's Student Aid Office. Three cheers, ultimately, to those in Congress who protect financial aid for college students. The second, Kevin Farley, is an especially well-read and devoted graduate student, whose work focuses on Spenser. Kevin has generously volunteered to assist the editor in preparing abstracts of articles bearing on Spenser and his cultural contexts.

86.120 As is appropriate, most of the article abstracts printed below derive from *Spenser Studies*, volume 6. Because the new volume of *SSt* has not yet appeared, the abstracts -- helpfully made available by Patrick Cullen -- appear without page references. According to Mr. William Long of AMS Press, *SSt* 6 is scheduled to appear in January, 1987. We print the abstracts now in order to give our readers advance notice of the contents of what promises to be another fine issue. For an announcement of changes in editorial policy and of attractive new publication opportunities *SSt* is making available, please see our ANNOUNCEMENTS, item 86.138.

BOOKS: REVIEWS AND NOTICES

86.121 Gilman, Ernest B. *Iconoclasm and Poetry in the English Reformation: Down Went Dagon.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986. xi + 227 pp., 20 illus. $19.00.

Gross, Kenneth. *Spenserian Poetics: Idolatry, Iconoclasm, and Magic.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985. 271 pp. $24.95.

Students of English iconoclasm have tended to treat the Reformation campaign to extirpate "idolatry" as an effort to destroy plastic and graphic images. They have seen the movement to redirect devotion from the created to the creator largely as an attack against roods and rood screens, statues of the Madonna and Child, images of saints in stained glass and other media, medieval Dooms and other wall paintings, and woodcuts in devotional texts. This cultural phenomenon manifested itself most violently during the outbursts of mob action that accompanied two intervals when an effort was made to

impose radical ecclesiastical reform as the model for the Church of England: the reign of Edward VI and the Civil War that began almost one century later. In *The Reformation of Images: Destruction of Art in England, 1535-1660* (Chicago, 1973), the most valuable study of English iconoclasm available until now, John Phillips perpetuates the mistaken notion that the movement to destroy works of art that were substituted for God as objects of worship had little if any impact on poetry and literature.

A small explosion of recent studies has undertaken to correct this imbalanced view of iconoclasm by demonstrating its impact on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century literature, notably the poetry of Edmund Spenser. Outside of the province of the present review are James R. Siemon's *Shakespearean Iconoclasm* (Berkeley, 1985), which convincingly relates "certain features of Shakespearean drama . . . [to the] struggles over imagery and likeness that vexed post-Reformation England" (30), and Michael O'Connell's "The Idolatrous Eye: Iconoclasm, Anti-Theatricalism, and the Image of the Elizabethan Theater," *ELH*, 52 (1985), 279-310. Of the authors whose books are the subject of this review, Kenneth Gross examines iconoclasm, idolatry, and magic as motive forces in *FQ*, whereas Ernest Gilman analyzes the impact of iconoclasm on "pictorial" poetry between the time of Spenser and Milton. Both build upon and extend Stephen Greenblatt's insight (*Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*, Chicago, 1980) that Guyon's assault on Acrasia's domain is motivated by "iconoclasm" and that "a close parallel [exists] between the evils of the Bower [of Bliss] and the evils attributed to the misuse of religious images" (189).

The studies of Gilman and Gross make it clear that English iconoclasm involves a complex dialectic in which a destructive attack on "false" images is connected to a countervailing effort to construct acceptable forms of "true" literary and visual art. No one has argued this point better than Patrick Collinson (*From Iconoclasm to Iconophobia: The Cultural Impact of the Second English Reformation*, Reading, 1986):

> Iconoclasm implies a spirited attack, verbally violent or actually violent, on certain unacceptable images, but not the total repudiation of all images, which on my terms is Iconophobia. Indeed, Iconoclasm in this sense may imply the substitution of other, acceptable images, or the refashioning of some image for an altered purpose. It is hostile to false art but not anti-art, since its hostility implies a true and acceptable art, applied to a laudable purpose. As George Herbert asked: "Is there in truth no beautie?" (8).

(See also the discussion of "Iconoclasm and Art" in John N. King, *English Reformation Literature: The Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition*, Princeton, 1982, pp. 144-60.)

How is iconoclasm relevant to the poetry of Spenser and his contemporaries? Just as the responses of Ernest Gilman and Kenneth Gross depend upon their critical assumptions, Spenserians and other readers will make use of these studies in line with their own critical presuppositions. Gilman is systematically diachronic and iconographical in his approach, whereas Gross is radically synchronic and, for the most part, non-iconographical. Gilman abstracts an iconoclastic poetics out of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century controversy over "image-breaking" (31), whereas Gross admits that his "analysis slights the immediate, material aspects of iconoclasm in the sixteenth

century" (11). Although Gilman is conversant with modern literary theory, his readings tend to be concrete and practical. Gross, on the other hand, allows his interest in "the larger theory of poetic expression" (9) to extend well into his "pragmatic" commentary on specific passages of *The Faerie Queene*. Gilman marries close reading to "new historicist" methodology in a study that always displays a rich contextual understanding. Gross has drunk deeply of structuralist and post-structuralist perspectives (notably those of Harold Bloom and the Yale school of criticism) in evolving his "skeptical," "de-idealizing," and largely ahistorical approach to Spenser. In adding a major contribution to our knowledge of distinctively English, Protestant poetics, Gilman pays homage to the "now canonical studies of Protestantism and poetry in the seventeenth century" by William Halewood and Barbara Lewalski (193, n. 2).

Although Gross states that his "Spenser may at first glance appear to be a strongly Protestant poet" (10), he announces his discomfort "with the work of recent critics who have tried to make English Renaissance literature into a predominantly Protestant or Calvinist phenomenon" (20). Gross's ahistorical approach avoids the discriminations that Gilman makes between literary strategies that typify the early and late phases of the English Reformation. Gilman's Spenser is a poet *of* the English Reformation, whereas Gross presents him as "a post-Reformation poet" (116, 202) whose thinking is in line with "the displaced, diffused, demystified, ironic, and hyperbolized Protestantism we have learned to call Romanticism" (10).

Ernest Gilman's *Iconoclasm and Poetry in the English Reformation* should prove useful to Spenserians through its demonstration of "the deep affiliation of literary and pictorial art" in the Protestant literature of the Renaissance (1). Although his findings place Spenser and Milton at opposite ends of a movement originating in the Henrican and Edwardian reforms of the 1530s and 1540s, this study is not a literary history as such. His subject is instead "the continuous interplay, and the occasional major collision, between strongly iconic and strongly iconoclastic principles" in Reformation poetry (3). He aptly observes that by calling into question "the very imaging power of the mind," the iconoclastic controversy creates a poetic "dilemma [that] may seem to be a formula for poetic paralysis" (1). Two introductory chapters on the "Poetics of the Sister Arts" and the "Poetics of Reformation Iconoclasm" prepare the way for Gilman's detailed examination in succeeding chapters of how four paradigmatic poets -- Spenser, Quarles, Donne, and Milton -- wrestle with this dilemma. Their work is in line with the general Protestant shift away from external and sensational visual images toward the internalized imagery of metaphor and poetic language. Gilman's devaluation of "persistent cliches" concerning "the stifling impact of a dour Puritanism on an exuberant Renaissance imagination" is particularly helpful (11), as is the genuine contribution that he makes to our knowledge of Protestant emblem theory (17-22, et seq.).

Gilman's chapter on "Spenser's 'Painted Forgery'" is of particular use to Spenserians in its citation of the interplay of Phantastes and Eumnestes as a paradigm for the incorporation into *FQ* of the "deeper debate between pictorialism and iconoclasm" (61). He ably extends Barbara Lewalski's contention that *Theatre for Worldlings* "is arguably the first English emblem book" into a consideration of Spenser's assimilation of the iconography of Revelation into *FQ* I (63-70). Future Spenser studies should bear out Gilman's perception of the paradoxicality of Reformation iconoclasm in Archimago's

"creation of a false 'Una' and a false 'Red Crosse,' by an art that exactly replicates Spenser's own" (75). His observation that "in its violence Guyon's attack [on Acrasia's bower] verges upon all the monstrous predations in the poem, from the fury of Error in Book 1 to the assaults of the Blatant Beast in Book 6" (74) should prove to be equally influential. Succeeding chapters make note of important links between Spenser and later authors, Milton in particular.

In *Spenserian Poetics: Idolatry, Iconoclasm, and Magic*, Kenneth Gross addresses Spenser's apparent conflict between iconoclastic and idolatrous motives, which results in "the nearly obsessive repetition of scenes in which icons, statues, phantasms, illusions, and so on are first elaborately described and then summarily transgressed, broken, dissolved" (16). He argues that iconoclasm is "entangled in the very sorts of symbolic action that may issue in idolatry" (19), and he concludes that by the end of *FQ* "iconoclasm itself becomes just as much of a threat as idolatry" (18). He gives the first half of the book over to an "opening diptych" containing an introductory chapter on the "poetics of idolatry" and a second chapter that offers a commentary on Spenser's 1596 *Vewe of the Present State of Ireland* in order "to give a firmer historical locus to the problems opened up in . . . [his] ahistorical and speculative first chapter." The second half of the book offers "four essays in commentary" that attempt "to explore a mode of criticism" that is "both analytic and theoretical but nonsystematic, pragmatic but also recreative." His way of reading Spenser may shift "at times quite abruptly, among close reading, philosophical reflection, and literary-historical collage" (20-21). The four chapters in the second part focus on critical episodes in *FQ*: the battle between Arthur and Orgoglio (I.vii-viii); Britomart's encounter with Merlin's mirror and her visits to the House of Busyrane and Isis Church (III.ii, III.xi-xii, and V.vii); the Garden of Adonis (III.vi); Mount Acidale (VI.x); the Blatant Beast (V.xii.37-43 and VI.xii); and the *Cantos of Mutabilitie*, especially the Faunus episode.

Among the valuable aspects of Gross's study are his application of biblical texts as literary contexts and his placement of "idolatry and iconoclasm within a theory of allegory" (28). He aptly observes that Spenser "displaces the problem of idolatry into secular -- political, erotic, and aesthetic -- realms with a freedom that no ascetically theological discourse could allow itself" (31). He lodges a well-taken critique concerning the problems raised by "the Reformation's extreme and often self-blinding myth of textual authority" (73). Among his more helpful contributions is his heuristic strategy of analyzing the *Vewe of the Present State of Ireland* as an introduction to the "treatment of landscape, myth, law, and religion" in *FQ* (80, et seq.). His interesting psychosexual view that Orgoglio represents the "tumescence that is the synecdochic symbol of male pride" is grounded in the biblical image of idolatry as "spiritual fornication," and he intriguingly contends that the "sexualizing" of the landscape of the giant's battle with Arthur takes on a "more redemptive form in the Garden of Adonis" (118-20). His relation of the idolatrous rites at the House of Busyrane to Reformation theology is convincing in the extreme (160-62). He finds what may be the strongest support for his view that "iconoclasm itself remains entangled in the very sorts of symbolic action that may issue in idolatry" (19) in the Blatant Beast's depredations as both "a demonic iconoclast, ravaging through corrupt monasteries" and "an agent of Envy and Detraction" (224).

Gross has not written a book that is easy to read. He is fond of critical jargon ("de-idealizing," "problematize," "thematize"), obsolete words ("surd," "justicer"), obscure diction ("theomachic," "apophatic," "theurgic," "oneiric," "apotropaic"), and neologisms ("mythify," "mythicize," "teacherly," "ironize," "psychomachic," "psychopoetic," "Mammonish," "fetishize," "perspectivize," "narrativistic," "antiutopia"). He likes to employ litotes ("the not un-Spenserian imagery of the flood and the labyrinth" and "a not un-Machiavellian document" [74, 88]). His audience will have to deal with sentences like the following:

> The poet's obsessively contrived verbal and allusive polyvalence keeps the narrative from being cast into a single apocalyptic framework, just as it keeps the reader from literalizing the always duplicitous tropes of eschatological myth (57).

and

> What bothers Spenser is the work of a kind of corrupting poetry or literalizing metamorphosis, a metonymic infection of herders by the herded that Spenser brings out at the close of the following speech by Irenius in a sly countersimile . . . (90).

and

> Without pushing a de-idealizing hermeneutic of suspicion too strongly, we may sense that this image of erotic ending evolves (or collapses) into a form of rigid, senseless death, a sexual death undoubtedly but one that is given a strange, concrete form in the allusion to the bisexual statue in the Roman bath (172).

This study is generally free of factual error, but one may wonder whether it is appropriate to term Spenser "the unofficial, unpatronized, and often disapproved of prophet of Elizabeth's *imperium*" (79). Spenser's 1591 award of a life annuity of fifty pounds represented an uncharacteristically generous reward from a notoriously stingy queen.

Anyone familiar with my own work will recognize an affinity with Gilman's study. I am in sympathy with his approach and find in his book the fruit of mature scholarship that builds upon his previously published analysis of Renaissance literary pictorialism. In speaking of "Milton's iconoclasm," Gilman rejects as a too "tidy conclusion" the view, argued by Gross, that "idolatry is itself iconoclastic" (Gilman, 151; Gross, 160). Instead Gilman finds (*pace* Carol Kaske) that Spenser is "engaged in a process of continued self-correction" that typifies the "agonism of the pictorial poet writing in the climate of the Reformation" (81-82). Gross, in turn, has written a stimulating "exploratory" study that is clearly the work of a youthful and clever critic who has posed many provocative questions.

John N. King
Bates College

86.122 Goldberg, Jonathan. *Voice Terminal Echo: Postmodernism and English Renaissance Texts*. New York and London: Methuen, 1986. 194 pp. $26.00, cloth; $13.95, paper.

It is difficult to respond neutrally to the recent work of Jonathan Goldberg. Since the publication of *Endlesse Worke*, he has been fully established as a provocative critic whose works exert a certain immediate pressure to embrace or resist. *Voice Terminal Echo* is no exception, and it insures that the debate will continue over the merits of Goldberg's ongoing project to forge a Renaissance hermeneutic based on current critical theory. Goldberg himself recognizes his difficulty in cultivating an audience for his project. In his Acknowledgements, he is concerned that his book will alienate two kinds of readers -- Marxist critics and mainstream practitioners of "humanistic criticism" (ix), both of whom perceive a kind of decadence in the exercise of Derridean theory. The resistance from the "humanists" will surely arise from Goldberg's preference for Derrida, Lacan, Blanchot, and Foucault as sources of appropriate means for enhancing our understanding of Spenser, Shakespeare, Marvell, Herbert, and Milton -- all of whom are interpreted within a matrix derived from structuralist, deconstructionist, and psychoanalytic theory and in a writing style which, as Goldberg warns in his first chapter, "is not structured as an argument and resists . . . the critical impulse to totalize" (4).

Goldberg's aim is to use Derridean theories of supplementarity and loss of origin to demonstrate the intertextuality of a poet's works. His general thesis is to treat Renaissance texts as the re-presentation of loss, to expose the poetic "I" as existing only in language. The poetic subject does not own language but exists only as an echo (an Ovidian Echo) that loses its voice in other (poetic) voices (hence the McLuhanesque metaphor of the computerized voice terminal of the book's title). Virgil and Ovid loom large as prior poets whose texts rob the Renaissance voice of its primacy, forcing the poet into a process of "always beginning again" (158). In particular, the figures of Echo, Narcissus, Philomela, Syrinx, and Orpheus are recurring mythopoeic metaphors which Goldberg uses to illustrate the loss of poetic voice. Interpreting "echo/Echo" as the origin of iterability, Goldberg argues for the poet as both a Narcissus unable to rejoin himself, and as an Echo, denying Echo to preserve voice but losing his voice in an intertextual maze of other (poetic) voices.

In his chapter on Marvell's "The Nymph complaining for the death of her Faun," Goldberg analyzes the poem as being "about" nothing more than how the poem relates to prior texts in the pastoral tradition, itself being a record of loss. For Goldberg the nymph is nothing more than a "nameless voice" doomed to iterate puns of wounding and loss: "hart/heart -- deer/dear." In his chapter on Shakespeare, Goldberg devotes much of his discussion to *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, demonstrating how Silvia's and Valentine's exchange of letters exposes the characters as texts who can find each other only through exchanging letters which reduce them to literal "characters" in a text -- characters as exchangeable as the letters they convey. Goldberg's chapter on Herbert denounces New Critical approaches to *The Temple*, which create false isolations of individual poems from Herbert's larger corpus and ignore the loss of the poet's voice in the other voices of the text. "Who speaks in Herbert's texts?" is the central question recurring in the chapter, the answer being that the poet presents no voice which can be identified as the locus of awareness. Capitalizing on recent interest in Milton's struggle for a poetic prominence

within literary history, Goldberg's chapter on Milton provides, among other things, a provocative reading of the poet's sonnet "On Shakespeare" as "putting Shakespeare in his place by taking on the voice of Spenser" (140).

Of primary interest to Spenserians, however, is Goldberg's chapter on the *October* eclogue of *The Shepheardes Calender*, which represents a further contribution to a growing interest in *The Shepheardes Calender* as Spenser's self-conscious presentation of a poetic career (see, for example, recent articles by Harry Berger, Richard Helgerson, Michael McCanles, David Miller, and Louis Montrose). Again, Goldberg attacks much previous scholarship on *The Shepheardes Calender*, which he sees as rooted in authorial intention, wrongly presenting the eclogues as debates in which one voice clearly emerges as representing the position of the poet. Goldberg argues that Spenser finds himself limited by Virgilian pastoral (the genre of loss in Goldberg's critical system) even as he attempts to progress to epic. Thus the "English poete" of *The Shepheardes Calender* remains nameless as the songs of Colin are sung by others (in *Aprill* and *August*). Goldberg demonstrates how in *October* the characters of Cuddie and Piers fail to emerge as "distinct voices" in the text. He argues further that *The Shepheardes Calender*'s accompanying woodcuts and E.K.'s gloss redistribute the poetic voice(s) of the poem in a network of allusions to other texts, supplementing rather than integrating the authority of the text. Goldberg sees E.K. as both editor and reader, whose reading of *The Shepheardes Calender* in effect ends up rewriting the text.

Before impatiently dismissing *Voice Terminal Echo* as an irrelevant exercise in Derridean frivolity, the "humanist" critic needs to consider how Goldberg's hermeneutics of loss is a successful, and not a merely anachronistic application of current critical theory to the Renaissance and to Spenser. First, Derridean theories of supplementarity and Lacanian theories of language as desire provide a richly flexible method for teasing out the many profoundly resonant levels of meaning inherent in the recurring use of Ovidian and Orphic myths of loss (and loss of voice) in the Renaissance. Second, because Spenser and Milton were self-consciously involved in "over-going" their predecessors, current theories of writing as positing a loss in the prior text can yield productive ways of evaluating intertextuality in the Renaissance.

But there remain potentially unbridgeable chasms between current critical theory and its successful application to the Renaissance, chasms which *Voice Terminal Echo* has not yet crossed. Goldberg's heavy emphasis on the self-referentiality of Renaissance texts depends on a poetics of despair and loss which has reductive consequences. One worries, for example, about an approach that concentrates on viewing Marvell's fawn as the "place of antithesis and negation" (20) at the expense of examining the rich iconography of the deer throughout literary history. In the myths of Actaeon transformed into the stag and of the wounded Adonis, the harts that heal and wound collapse into each other in ways which suggest that the blood of Marvell's wounded fawn could just as readily be interpreted as the blood of martyrs, a symbol of life. I offer this as an alternative deconstructive interpretation of Marvell's poem to make the point that current critical theory can be a useful tool for interpreting Renaissance texts, but only if the critic first labors to isolate and recombine the complex matrices of symbol and image within their Renaissance context. This is where Goldberg falters at times as *Voice Terminal Echo*'s synthesis of Freud, Lacan, Foucault and others threatens to overleap the

Renaissance (con)text at hand, trivializing at once both theory and Renaissance studies. Goldberg's book has earned our attention, but the reader must decide whether it has moved us beyond the preliminary stages of a hermeneutic that still has a long development ahead.

Elizabeth J. Bellamy
University of Alabama, Birmingham

86.123 Low, Anthony. *The Georgic Revolution.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985. xii + 369 pp. $32.50.

In *The Georgic Revolution*, Anthony Low has written the first book-length study of the influence of the *Georgics*, or, more accurately, of what he calls the "georgic spirit" upon the literature of the English Renaissance. Unlike Durling and Chalker, whose treatment of the georgic has a different chronological emphasis, Low attempts to chronicle a social and cultural revolution as well. "The aim of this book," he writes in his introduction, "is both to describe a social history as it is revealed in the barometer of poetry and in turn to elucidate that poetry by placing it more accurately in a living context" (12). Though the book is framed by chapters on Spenser and Milton, Low does dabble in social history and, more substantially, in cultural history in chapters entitled "New Science and the Georgic Revolution," "Georgic and Christian Reform," and "Georgic and the Civil War" -- though even these chapters naturally gravitate to discussions of Chaucer and Langland, or Herrick and Marvell.

The book begins with a reference to "the great enemy of the georgic spirit," that is, "the courtly or aristocratic ideal -- a fundamental contempt for labor, especially manual and agricultural labor" (5). Pastoral, with its preoccupation with "leisure, grace, and *sprezzatura*," is the literary genre that best expresses such aristocratic ideals, whereas georgic celebrates "what a later generation, whether rightly or wrongly, would think of as the middle class virtues of effort, care, and labor" (42).

Low is indefatigable in pointing out the pervasive and pernicious influence of pastoral in the Renaissance. Some authors -- Donne is an example -- he describes as frankly "anti-georgic" because of their persistent refusal to think of work as more than a burden or a curse. Others, like Herbert, or Jonson, or Herrick, seem more promising but, whether for reasons of conservative theology, royalist politics, or the baneful influence of Horace, fail to fulfill their promise as true georgic celebrants of manual labor, technological progress, and national destiny. Low's disappointment in these authors disappears when he talks about the less ambiguous attitudes of Francis Bacon (a hero) or Samuel Hartlib, or even the Puritan radical, Winstanley. These figures -- philosophers, reformers, and ideologues of a sort -- possess in a purer and more obvious form the attitudes that Low prizes. Nevertheless, the discussion continually returns, despite the excursions into social and intellectual history, to *belles lettres*, and Low takes comfort in the fact that "at length, Milton would fulfill what Spenser first undertook, and bring English georgic to its fullest potential" (293-94).

A statement as apparently hyperbolic as that needs some proving, and Low devotes a full chapter to each of these authors. The chapter on Spenser, "Poet of Work,"

acknowledges its debt to William Sessions' "Spenser's Georgic," (*ELR*, 10 [1980]), which Low calls a "well-nigh definitive article on Spenser and georgic" (38n). The tribute is a generous one since Low borrows less from Sessions than he implies. He does share, inevitably, Sessions' emphasis upon the "proper cultivation of human action toward the revealed ends of history . . . plural communal labor as a means of transforming the trials of time" (Sessions, 221), though he does so in prose that is a bit less knotty and unyielding. Low is more of a social historian and, unlike Sessions, is more likely to speak of Spenser the man, the courtier, and the Irish colonist than of Spenser the poet or the narrative speaker. We are spared, in *The Georgic Revolution*, any discussion of poet as plowman (at least as far as Spenser is concerned -- Jonson is another matter). Low's discussion is also more narrowly focused than Sessions', which ranges widely over both *FQ* and Virgil's *opera*. (Despite its title, in fact, Sessions' article says more about the *Aeneid* than about the *Georgics*.) Low, for his part, stays pretty much behind the plow and lacks (or takes for granted) Sessions' synthetic vision of the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*. He also -- and this seems an advantage -- concentrates on Book VI for his discussion of georgic vs. pastoral, art vs. nature, and civilization vs. rudeness. In this way, like the husbandmen whom he admires, Low strengthens his achievement by limiting his ambitions.

The chapter on Milton which closes the book is an expansion of Low's article "Milton, *Paradise Regained*, and Georgic," (PMLA, 98 [1983]). Despite the added material, the heart of the chapter remains Low's attempt to prove that *Paradise Regained* is a georgic both in form (four books, and some rather far-fetched correspondences with the Aristaeus episode) and, more importantly, in spirit. "Like the *Georgics*," Low writes, "*Paradise Regained* does not describe a pastoral retreat from responsibility but instead dwells on small, recurrent actions, often trivial and inglorious in themselves, that nevertheless converge toward a turning point in the world's history that will prove to be truly apocalyptic" (351). The added material consists largely of attempts to show that there are georgic materials in *Paradise Lost* as well. Given the obvious focus on prelapsarian life, the devils' predilection for ingenuity, invention, and the ability to "work ease out of pain/ Through labor and endurance," and Milton's contempt for "nice art," this is a difficult thesis to sustain. Despite Adam and Eve's tentative essays in horticulture, we do not really see either as a *durus arator*.

The success of a book like this one depends upon three things: the depth and comprehensiveness of the author's interpretation of the *Georgics*, the skill and subtlety with which he applies this to other authors and other works, and the breadth of learning and reading which can alone enable him to make significant statements about social, intellectual, or cultural history. It is difficult to find fault with Low on this last point. His reading has been wide-ranging and intelligent, and when he speaks of changes in literary matter or manner, he speaks with authority. The chapter on "Georgic and Christian Reform" especially benefits from the author's extensive reading. He is as familiar with obscure polemical works of the 1640s as with the great works of the Christian tradition.

The Georgic Revolution is not, however, just a history of attitudes toward labor and agriculture in England. It ties itself specifically to Virgil's poem, and therefore its interpretation of that poem is a matter of importance. Low is familiar with recent studies,

and there is little in his interpretation of the *Georgics* that could not be found in Wikinson, Miles, or Patricia Johnston. For Low, the *Georgics* is first and foremost a public poem, imbued with and celebrating "the spirit of labor and of social reform" (31). Virgil's "georgic vision includes," according to Low, "the hope of worldly progress and civil evolution" (98). It is also amenable to a more specific nationalism. "The georgic vision," he writes, "has at least potential affiliation with the imperial vision" (68). Though the *Georgics* celebrate *labor improbus*, it is in the hope that such "labor may contribute to national progress" (114), however insignificant the labor may seem to be. "The *Georgics* emphasize painstaking attention to detail, constant labor, deeds that are trivial and take place in obscurity; yet the sum total of these deeds over time will be to transform the nation irresistably" (39). For Low, the *Georgics* fairly radiate "commitment to political change and historical progress" (272). It is little wonder that Low seems to find Francis Bacon the reincarnation of "the georgic spirit." Had he written about the eighteenth century, he would have bestowed the accolade on Defoe; for Virgil, as Low presents him, is a recognizable Whig.

There is considerable truth and even more convenience in this reading of Virgil, and it would be ungenerous to call it simplistic. Yet one looks in vain here for more than a perfunctory sense of the *Georgics'* complexity or of its dialectical nature. The poem which Low describes as optimistic *is* optimistic in Books II and IV, but Book I ends with the sense of a world out of control and Book III with a natural disaster. In these moods, Virgil can write "sic omnia fatis / in peius ruere," and all man can hope to do is to keep chaos momentarily at bay. The poem which Low finds consistently public spirited celebrates a way of life whose happiness depends upon ignorance of great events: "illum non . . . flexit . . . coniurato descendens Dacus ab Histro, non res Romanae perituraque regna." The poem which extols the common life and public spiritedness of the bees also praises the private self-sufficiency of the *Corycium senem* in Book IV, a classic example of the "self-containment and self-sufficiency" that Low attributes to Horace and Martial. Even Aristaeus, the hero of technical innovation, is also an embodiment of rapine and greed.

This narrow conception of "the georgic spirit" enables Low to pursue his thesis more clearly and more neatly, but it also calls into question some of his judgments. If some seventeenth-century readers took Virgil's husbandmen as examples of self-sufficiency, or even as simply another variation on the theme of "pastoral ease," it was not without some justification in the text. Virgil consistently qualifies what he celebrates, and the *labor* which is admittedly at the heart of the *Georgics* and which Low praises as dignified and noble, Virgil calls *improbus*.

In applying the georgic spirit and values to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writers (especially the latter), Low sometimes seems like a *judex omnipotens*, separating the sheep from the goats and doing so rather mechanically. Donne's preference for love over worldly success and his stubborn insistence on viewing "labor and sweat as evils to be endured" (86) establishes him as "temperamentally conservative and backward -- or inward -- looking" (88). Herbert is hobbled by his "otherworldly theology" (91), Herrick by his distrust of "trade and acquisition" (266) and "Denham's views were too typically royalist to have inclined him toward either a georgic spirit or a georgic subject matter" (73n). There is a strong sense in most of these rather Procrustean judgments of

disappointment in the failure of these authors to measure up to a standard of georgic purity which Virgil himself would have difficulty sustaining.

In order to establish general laws, one must be prepared to run roughshod over specific instances; and in order to achieve a panoramic view, one must be prepared, on occasion, to sacrifice the accuracy of precise observation. If it seems too much of an offense to our literary sensibilities to characterize an attack on "the Puritan abolition of religious holidays and Sunday play" (281) as anti-georgic, we must admit that, on the whole, Low has acutely discerned and copiously chronicled an important intellectual and cultural shift, a shift which he chooses to call, with excusable hyperbole, *The Georgic Revolution.*

Thomas A. Stumpf
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

ARTICLES: ABSTRACTS AND NOTICES

86.124 Baker, David J. "'Some Quirk, Some Subtle Evasion': Legal Subversion in Spenser's *A Vewe of the Present State of Ireland.*" *SSt* 6 (1985).

Contrary to a recent claim, Spenser's *Vewe of the Present State of Ireland* was not suppressed by the Privy Council because it revealed the terrorism of official policy in the colony. Instead, official readers suspected this treatise because it exposed the vulnerability of English law to internal manipulation and subversion. Even within the precincts of the courts, the covertly rebellious Irish could exploit the indeterminacies inherent in common-law procedure to evade or reconstrue the "truth" as officials saw it. For Spenser, no solution was possible but the immediate and definitive re-establishment of English law on the ground of absolute royal prerogative. Though later, under James, official hegemony could seem plausible, Spenser's proposal was a desperate denial of the conditions he faced in Ireland, and he offered the *Vewe* to Elizabeth as a last plea for the direct imposition of her transcendent authority. [D.J.B.]

86.125 Benson, Pamela J. "Florimell at Sea." *SSt* 6 (1985).

The fisherman's sexual assault on Florimell in *FQ* III.vii and viii and her rescue by the lecherous Proteus are presented as the result of the direct intervention of Providence and Grace respectively. In both cases God's action is problematic because it puts Florimell in a dangerous situation; however, she is able to withstand Proteus' challenge to her virtue, whereas she clearly would have been defeated by the fisher had Proteus not appeared. The difference in Florimell's response to the sexual challenge of her assailants is due to the action of grace. Just before Florimell enters the fisher's boat, she is determined to commit suicide to escape the witch's rapacious beast. Providence rescues her from this desperate spiritual and physical situation and removes her from her social context, only to confront her with male sexuality in its roughest form. This time she abandons self-reliance and calls on God for aid. As a result, grace intervenes and, like an Ovidian god, transforms her. But the metamorphosis is spiritual, not physical,

and is due to Florimell's recognition that she is not capable of achieving virtue on her own.

The outer sign of the efficacy of her prayer is the arrival of Proteus; the inner sign is her ability to withstand his spiritual attacks without fear. She has been changed from a terrified female fleeing male passion to a steadfast lady confidently resisting attack. Protected by Providence, Florimell can be initiated into male sexuality and fecundity without being in any real danger. The intervention of grace in this episode demonstrates that chastity depends on the gift of grace and not on the will of the individual, just as the intervention of grace in the eighth canto of each other book of *The Faerie Queene* indicates the dependence of each virtue on grace. [P.J.B., adapted by D.J.G.]

86.126 Brady, Ciaran. "Spenser's Irish Crisis: Humanism and Experience in the 1590s." *Past and Present*, no. 11 (May 1986): 17-49.

Close attention to the text of *Vewe of the Present State of Ireland* reveals that the harsh, confused, and illogical dialogue cannot be made acceptable by critical, biographical, historical, or religious approaches and apparently caused even contemporary embarrassment. It mirrors partly the growing bitterness of the poet and the fragmented, incoherent, and frustrated approach to Ireland shared by many Elizabethans. [J.L.]

86.127 Cartmell, Deborah. "'Beside the shore of siluer streaming *Thamesis*': Spenser's *Ruines of Time*." *SSt* 6 (1985).

Spenser models his *Ruines of Time* not on Du Bellay's *Antiquitez* but on 'Super Flumina,' Psalm 137, the song of the exiles who refuse to sing in Babylonian captivity. Spenser's persona's refusal to sing the lament which Verlame asks of him equates him with the speaker of the 137th Psalm. However, unlike the Psalmist, Spenser's persona ultimately sings in his own voice, and the final visions concluding *The Ruines of Time* suggest that he has overcome Verlame's domination and is able to produce an alternative lament to Sir Philip Sidney. Like his much missed patron, Spenser begins his own translation of the Psalms, but the 137th is translated into a contemporary context: *The Ruines of Time* reenacts the movement from Babylon to Sion or from Marian to Elizabethan England. Rather than a poem lamenting the fall of Roman England in the manner of Du Bellay's *Antiquitez*, Spenser's poem ultimately celebrates the English *break* with Rome as foretold by the Psalmist: "And Babilon, that did'st us waste, Thy self shalt one daie wasted be." [D.C.]

86.128 Frantz, David O. "The Union of Florimell and Marinell: The Triumph of Hearing." *SSt* 6 (1985).

The ending of Book IV of *The Faerie Queene* can best be understood in terms of the neoplatonic debate over which sense is more elevated in apprehending beauty, the sense of hearing or the sense of sight. What Spenser gives us at the end of Book IV is a muted, momentary victory for the sense of hearing, for Florimell wins Marinell's love not when he sees her but when he overhears her complaint in Proteus's cave. This victory is fittingly ironic in Florimell's case, since she is one of the females so

persistently pursued and assailed for the physical beauty that males see. Florimell and Marinell become exemplars for other lovers, most notably Britomart and Amoret, and their union embodies the three loves of Book IV, love of kindred, lover, and friend. The episode also prepares the reader for further investigation of seeing and hearing in Books V and VI, culminating in Calidore's encounter with Colin Clout on Mt. Acidale, a moment that is both auditory and visionary, enabling us to gain access to the worlds of love, cognition, and art. [D.O.F.]

86.129 Hannay, Margaret P. "Unpublished Letters by Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke." *SSt* 6 (1985).

Three holograph letters by Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke, have recently come to light. Overlooked by Frances Young in her 1912 listing of Mary Sidney's correspondence, the basis for subsequent references to her letters, they have never been published. The first is an undated letter written to Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, on behalf of her husband, Earl of Pembroke, which sheds some light on the tortuous relationship between the two great Welsh lords. It was probably written just prior to Essex's Cadiz expedition in 1596 and may indicate that young William Lord Herbert accompanied Essex on that voyage. The other two unpublished letters, written in 1603 and 1604, evidence the increasing frustration Mary Sidney felt in her attempts to obtain justice against her former employee Edmund Mathew. Written to Sir Julius Caesar, Knight of His Majesty's Requests, and to her son's prospective father-in-law, the Earl of Shrewsbury, these letters clearly establish Mary Sidney's administrative duties in Cardiff and the difficulties of the widow caught up in the town's struggle to abolish the seigneurial hold of the Earls of Pembroke.

Although she was eulogized primarily as "Sidney's sister, Pembroke's mother," those roles demanded more than has so far been recognized. We have long known that as Sidney's sister, she edited his work, completed his Psalm translation, and encouraged the hagiography which established him as a Protestant martyr. We now know that as Pembroke's mother, she held the castle and borough of Cardiff until his majority, a position which involved this literary woman in struggles with determined advocates of self-rule, and with vandals, pirates, and murderers. [M.P.H., adapted by D.J.G.]

86.130 King, John N. "Was Spenser a Puritan?" *SSt* 6 (1985).

It is inaccurate and anachronistic to label the ecclesiastical eclogues of *The Shepheardes Calender* (*May*, *July*, and *September*) as a manifestation of Puritan zeal. Language that in modern times may seem to have an unorthodox tinge often fell into the broad area of consensus shared by moderate Puritans and English Protestants loyal to the Elizabethan Settlement. Spenser's thought was compatible with that of the progressive faction led by the Earl of Leicester and Sir Francis Walsingham. To ignore that Protestant commitment to continuation of church reform both in England and on the Continent flattens the dialectical interplay of the eclogues to one-dimensional tractarian argument. Protestant ideology governs Spenser's use of the language of biblical pastoral, his imitation of the "Chaucerian" tradition of native bucolic satire, the introduction of anagrams and nicknames identifying a circle of reform-minded bishops close to Edmund

Grindal, and the narration of fables concerned with religious issues facing the mid-Elizabethan church. [J.N.K.]

86.131 Miller, David Lee. "Spenser's Poetics: The Poem's Two Bodies." *PMLA* 101, no. 2 (March 1986): 170-185.

Spenser's *FQ* is constituted by the fiction of a single transcendental body that is at once spiritual, politic, and aesthetic. The poem's allegorical structure reflects an implicit doctrine of "the poem's two bodies." Its poetics is an aesthetic theology based on the motifs Kantorowicz discerned in Tudor "political theology": perfect wholeness, secular perpetuity, and a doctrine of "assimilation." Analysis of the negative moment in the dialectic of this theology shows allegory to be a strategy for summoning the poem's ideal body into representation as a sublimated negative image of its natural, or written, body. Spenser's image for this ideal body, the veiled hermaphrodite, confounds not only sexual difference but also the difference between metaphor and catachresis, or between mimetic and iconoclastic decorums. No purely mimetic critical reading can do justice to this structure, which demands that a reader "overgo" the text in the production of a historical or political "truth." [D.L.M.]

86.132 Morgan, Gerald. "The Idea of Temperance in the Second Book of *The Faerie Queene*." *RES* ns 37, no. 145 (1986): 11-39.

What holds the fables and the "notions" expressed by them together in romance is the *idea* of the work which unifies it. Only by reading in the light of this idea will one recognize the "significance" of each element of the work. The idea of *FQ* II is temperance, but this has been misunderstood. Defined from Aquinas as having "two integral or component parts . . . shamefastness . . . sense of honour"; "three species or subjective parts . . . abstinence, sobriety, and chastity"; and seven potential or virtual parts, continence, gentleness, clemency, humility, moderation of the desire for knowledge, of external conduct (manners), of dress. This idea of temperance should control and unify analysis of *FQ* II. [J.L.]

86.133 Patterson, Annabel. "Re-Opening the Green Cabinet: Clement Marot and Edmund Spenser." *ELR* 1 (Winter 1986): 44-70.

The Shepheardes Calender's echo of Marot's phrase "vert cabinet" is but one of many indications that the French poet stood as a more important model for Spenser than has hitherto been perceived. His value as a model was in having himself rewritten the primary pastoral pretext, Vergil's first eclogue, in the light of his own experience as a Lutheran poet alternately protected and persecuted by Francis I. As Marot's own eclogues constitute a "subtle and continuous meditation" on Vergilian pastoral, with "its opportunities for insight into the ethical problems of dependency and privilege," so they also showed Spenser how classical humanism could be modified to speak for a Protestant intellectual when his circumstances dictated both outspokenness and circumspection. Because of the French poet's personal history, we can understand how the echoes of Marot in *January*, *November*, and *December* serve to frame Spenser's pastoral project in a winter of cultural anxiety, if not actually of discontent. Its oblique treatment of the Queen's threatened French marriage into a family associated with the massacre of the

Huguenots, and its introduction of Elizabeth's own harsh treatment of Archbishop Grindal are both integral to an English Protestant pastoral of church and state.

The series Vergil-Marot-Spenser, therefore, requires an adjustment in contemporary accounts of pastoral, differently represented by Thomas Rosenmeyer and by Louis Montrose. The *Calender* certainly does not display the ideological innocence Rosenmeyer considers definitive of pastoral. And although the *Aprill* eclogue supports Montrose's hypothesis that Elizabethan pastoral was designed "to create illusions which sanctify political power," as Montrose argues, the *Calender's "other* subject . . . is the poet's responsibility to suggest *latenter* what is wrong with the system, and the dangers he may incur by doing so." "It is a tribute to Spenser's intelligence and his courage that he conceived a way . . . to publish the unspeakable criticism alongside the celebration." [A.P.]

86.134 Prescott, Anne Lake. "The Thirsty Deer and the Lord of Life: Some Contexts for *Amoretti* 67-70." *SSt* 6 (1985).

Spenser's love sonnets, now widely believed to refer to the church calendar, can be shown to have additional ties to the Christian liturgy. The hind of *Amoretti* 67 has many relatives in scripture and in biblical commentary, deer which appear also in the liturgy at the end of Lent, especially in the Sarum rite; one commentary on Psalm 42 even anticipates Spenser's wording. Spenser was not the first to show a deer giving itself up just before Easter or to follow this immediately with a poem in some way associating the Resurrection with erotic love. Marguerite de Navarre had done the same in a sequence of lyrics with striking parallels to *Amoretti* 67-70. Finally, there may be an indirect liturgical allusion in the number of Spenser's sonnets, for the 1559 prayer book also has 89 "days" in its set of communion readings. [A.L.P.]

86.135 Schleiner, Louise. "Spenser and Sidney on the *Vaticinium.*" *SSt* 6 (1985).

Both Spenser and Sidney included the *vaticinium* concept in their thinking about the importance of inspiration in poetic creation. In the *Apology for Poetry* and in *The Shepheardes Calender's October* eclogue, Sidney and Spenser's glossarist "E.K." both follow Scaliger in fencing off a region of 'higher' from one of 'lower' genres. And both designate as corresponding kinds of poet the *vates* or poet of lofty divine inspiration and the "maker" or "right" poet. But "E.K." and Sidney differ markedly in the number of genres they consider vaticinally inspired (fewer for Sidney) and in their ways of reimporting inspiration into the lower region. "E.K." -- and Spenser in the eclogue -- follow Scaliger still further in declaring the "maker" to be inspired by Bacchic power, so that for him as for the *vates* poetic matter is through "enthousiasmus . . . powred into the witte" and "adorned . . . with laboure and learning." Sidney, by contrast, pays inspiration a more grudging but therefore notable tribute, imaging it not as a liquid but as a necessary airy force puffing Icarus the "maker" into flight, where he must then rely on skill and rules as he creates a poem. [L.S.]

86.136 Weatherby, Harold L. "*AXIOCHUS* and the Bower of Bliss: Some Fresh Light on Sources and Authorship." *SSt* 6 (1985).

Whether Spenser translated the 1592 (Pseudo-Platonic) *Axiochus* (attributed by Cuthbert Burbie to "Edw. Spenser") is a question still to be answered. After Padelford presented his case for Spenser's authorship, several critics used external evidence to argue that the translator was Anthony Munday. In the *Variorum*, Rudolf Gottfried defended Padelford's view by presenting parallels between the language of *Axiochus* and Spenser's poetry. Gottfried overlooked, however, the most striking resemblance in phrasing -- between a description of the climate in Elysium (in *Axiochus*) and the weather in Acrasia's bower in *FQ* II.xii. 51. The similarities both in language and syntax are sufficiently exact as virtually to prove: (1) that if Spenser did not translate the 1592 *Axiochus* he was influenced by it; (2) that the translator of *Axiochus* (if not Spenser, presumably Munday) was influenced by *The Faerie Queene*; or (3) that Spenser wrote the translation as well as the poem. Since we cannot date the translation (only its publication), neither of the first two possibilities can be eliminated from consideration. The third, however, seems the most probable, not only because of the traditional ascription but also because in the Bower of Bliss Spenser demonstrates knowledge not only of the 1592 English *Axiochus* but also of the Latin version of the dialogue by Rayanus Welsdalius, on which the English version was based. Spenser's combining peculiarities of both Latin and English phrasing in his poem argues strongly for his having an intimate acquaintance with both. The stanza in *FQ* is best explained as a composite of Welsdalius's Latin, Spenser's (perhaps school-boy English), his mature knowledge of Greek, and of course his equally mature poetic English. [H.L.W., adapted by D.J.G.]

86.137 Wilson, Robert R. "Narrative Allusiveness: The Interplay of Stories in Two Renaissance Writers, Spenser and Cervantes." *ESC* 12, no. 2 (June 1986): 138-162.

Contemporary literary theory normally accepts the distinction between story and discourse, or *fabula* and *sjuzet*, but it assigns an empirically empty position to "story" as a "conceptualization" (Lodge) or a "heuristic fiction" (Culler) based upon inferences from actual narratives. It is possible to redefine "story," consistently with ordinary usage, as a number of colligatory motifs: a "story" is so many motifs that normally belong together and can be recognized as such. Given this redefinition of "story," it becomes possible to consider untold stories and their different narrative functions. *FQ* and *Don Quijote* illustrate the wide range of narrative uses to which untold (that is, never narrated) stories may be put.

The ekphrases in *FQ* II.xii.44 and III.i. 34-39 indicate Spenser's command of this traditional rhetorical convention. In both cases the significance of the ekphrastic story, as well as its narrative force, depends upon the reader's capacity to recognize the separate motifs as belonging together and as being powerfully narratable (though, as described, they are only weakly narrated). In the final two cantos of Book III, when Britomart enters the castle of Busirane, there are three instances of untold story, each depending upon the recognition of colligatory motifs, and each more abstract (non-narrated) than the one preceding it. In each of these incidents there is no actual narrative, but the possible

narratability of the motifs is suggested. In general, Spenser achieves considerable narrative force by alluding to stories that are not actually, but certainly could be, narrated. [Abstract supplied by M.L. Scott, adapted by D.J.G.]

ANNOUNCEMENTS

86.138 The editors of *Spenser Studies* announce the addition of a section called *Gleanings*. The name derives from the "glanes" which appear in French journals. The editors' announcement reads in part as follows:

> We prefer this name to the more traditional "Notes" because we do not wish to limit ourselves to the format of *ELN* or *N&Q*. Over the years most readers have doubtless made little discoveries or speculations that do not warrant the space of a brief article or even a note; some have been left with paragraphs after they had reached the word limit of the *Spenser Encyclopedia*; others have brief addenda or corrigenda to work (theirs or others') published with us or elsewhere; and surely all Spenserians have their marginalia -- apercus on obscurities or puzzles in the text, intertextual echoes and foreshadowings, notes on wordplay, and such -- that deserve an audience larger than the classroom. These are instances of what we mean by your "gleanings," and we would appreciate your permitting us to see them.

Moreover, the editors wish to remind potential contributors that all manuscripts should now be submitted to: Patrick Cullen, 300 West 108th Street, Apt. 8D, New York, NY 10025.

86.139 The PACIFIC NORTHWEST RENAISSANCE CONFERENCE will meet on April 2-4, 1987 at Banff, Alberta, Canada. Papers are invited on the theme "Theory and Practice in the Renaissance," but submissions on other topics are also welcome. Send twenty-minute papers (or abstracts) to Ronald B. Bond, Department of English, The University of Calgary, 2500 University Dr. N.W., Calgary, Alberta, Canada, T2N 1N4.

86.140 The NEWBERRY LIBRARY CENTER FOR RENAISSANCE STUDIES announces their *1987 Summer Institute: Theory and Practice of Sixteenth Century Music*, July 6 - August 14. Co-directed by Professors Howard Mayer Brown (University of Chicago) and Benito V. Rivera (Indiana University), the institute will attempt to establish a vocabulary in which to teach and write about the controversial subject of sixteenth-century music. The institute will also include a weekly choral laboratory. Some financial support is available. The application deadline is March 1, 1987. For more information and application forms, please contact the Newberry Library Center for Renaissance Studies, 60 West Walton Street, Chicago, IL 60610, (312) 943-9090.

86.141 The John Carter Brown Library at Brown University announces the September publication of Foster Provost's tragic poem on Christopher Columbus entitled *Columbus: Dream and Act*. The poem is heavily influenced by Edmund Spenser though written in entirely modern idiom. The handsomely bound 70-page book may be ordered for US

$15.00 (please include US $1.50 for postage and handling for orders in the U.S. and Canada, $3.00 elsewhere). Libraries will be accorded a 20% discount. Address orders to The John Carter Brown Library, Box 1894, Providence, RI 02912.

86.142 Correction. In item 86.115, we inadvertently misplaced John C. Ulreich, Jr. He is at the University of Arizona, Tucson, not at Duquesne. In item 86.118, our announcement of the edition-in-progress of Spenser's shorter poems, Professor Einar Bjorvand's name was transformed into Bjorgson. The editor regrets these errors.

86.143 The following item continues the project inaugurated with Item 80.29 (*SpN* 11.1) and continued in later issues.

SPENSER BIBLIOGRAPHY UPDATE, 1984

John W. Moore, Jr., The Pennsylvania State University

The following checklist includes Spenser items published during 1984 plus a number of earlier items not included in previous updates. Items reviewed in the *Spenser Newsletter* are referred to by year and item number; 84.10 refers to the tenth item in the 1984 volume.

I. Works: Selections

1.   Spenser, Edmund. "E. K." (1579) [The Epistle Dedicatory prefixed to *The Shepheardes Calender*]. In *The Pastoral Mode: A Casebook*. Ed. Bryan Loughrey. London: Macmillan, 1984, pp. 29-33.

II. Collections of Essays

2.   Cullen, Patrick and Thomas P. Roche, Jr., eds.   *Spenser Studies: A Renaissance Poetry Annual V, 1984.* New York: AMS Press, 1985. xiv + 331pp. 85.120 [Essays listed separately below.]

3.   Greco, Francis G., ed. and pref. *Spenser at Kalamazoo, 1984.* Proc. of Spenser Sessions at the 19th Internat. Cong. on Medieval Studies, Western Michigan Univ. 10-13 May 1984. Clarion, PA: Clarion Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1984. iv + 143pp. 84.92-118 [Essays listed separately below.]

III. Bibliographies

4.   Moore, John W., Jr. "Spenser Bibliography Update, 1982." *SpenN*, 15 (Fall 1984), 76-85. 84.162

5. Sipple, William L. with the assistance of Bernard S. Vondersmith. *Edmund Spenser 1900-36*: *A Reference Guide*. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1984. xxxviii + 244pp. 84.135

IV. General Spenser Criticism

6. Beckwith, Marc Allan. "A Study of Palengenius' *Zodiacus Vitae* and Its Influence on English Renaissance Literature." Ohio State, 1983. *DAI*, 44:277-A. 84.119

7. Bednarz, James P. "Imitations of Spenser in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*." *RenD*, 14 (1983), 79-102.

8. Bono, Barbara J. "From Vergilian Epic to Romantic Epic: Three Transvaluations." In her *Literary Transvaluations: From Vergilian Epic to Shakespearean Tragicomedy*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1984, pp. 41-82.

9. Burnett, Archie. "'Wandering Steps and Slow' and 'Vast Profundity Obscure': Two Miltonic Adjective Formations." *ELN*, 21 (March 1984), 25-38.

10. Embry, Thomas J. "Sensuality and Chastity in 'L'Allegro' and 'Il Penseroso.'" *JEGP*, 77 (1978), 504-29.

11. Fowler, Alastair. "Edmund Spenser." In *William Langland to the English Bible*. *Vol. I of British Writers: Edited Under the Auspices of the British Council*. Gen. Ed. Ian Scott-Kilvert. New York: Scribners, 1979, pp. 121-44.

12. Gleckner, Robert F. "Blake's 'I Saw a Chapel All of Gold.'" *CLQ*, 15 (March 1979), 37-47.

13. Helgerson, Richard. "The Kingdom of Our Own Language: Greek or Goth?" *Spenser at Kalamazoo, 1984*, pp. 68-79. Response by Humphrey Tonkin, pp. 80-90. 85.110-11.

14. Hume, Anthea. *Edmund Spenser: Protestant Poet*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1984. vi + 202pp. 85.60

15. Mulryan, John. "Recent Trends in Spenser Studies: 1981-83." *Cithara*, 23 (May 1984), 38-42. 84.144

16. Norbrook, David. *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984. x + 345pp. 85.62

17. Tung, Mason. "Spenser's 'Emblematic' Imagery: A Study of Emblematics." *SSt*, 5 (1984), 185-208. 85.142

74

V. General Criticism of The Faerie Queene

18. Ashworth, Ann. "Two Notes on Milton and Spenser." *N&Q*, 31 (September 1984), 324-25. 85.10

19.   Bednarz, James Peter. "Celestial Thief: Spenserian Paradox in the Elizabethan Age." Columbia, 1981. *DAI*, 44:3069-A.

20. Beston, Rose Marie. "C. S. Lewis's Theory of Romance." *Ariel*, 15 (January 1984), 3-16.

21. Carney, Jo Eldridge. "Female Friendship in Elizabethan Literature." Iowa, 1983. *DAI*, 44:2151-A. 84.120

22. Craig, Joanne. "Double Nature: Augmentation in Spenser's Poetry." *ESC*, 9 (December 1983), 383-91. 84.13

23. Fox, Alice. "'What right have I, a woman?': Virginia Woolf's Reading Notes on Sidney and Spenser." In *Virginia Woolf: Centennial Essays*. Ed. and pref. Elaine K. Ginsberg and Laura Moss Gottlieb. Introd. Joanne Trautmann. Troy, NY: Whitson, 1983, pp. 249-56.

24. Giamatti, A. Bartlett. "Spenser: From Magic to Miracle" (1971), pp. 76-88; "Primitivism and the Process of Civility in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*" (1976), pp. 89-100. Rpt. in his *Exile and Change in Renaissance Literature*. New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press, 1984. xi + 172pp. 84.66

25. ----. "A Prince and Her Poet." *YR*, 73 (April 1984), 321-37. 86.13

26. Gossman, Ann. "Satan: From Toad to Atlas." *MiltonQ*, 10 (March 1976), 7-11.

27. Grossman, Marshall. "Augustine, Spenser, Milton and the Christian Epic." *NOR*, 11 (Fall-Winter 1984), 9-17. 85.133

28. Heckel, David Calvin. "Literacy, Consciousness, and the Transformation of the Epic into Modernity." St. Louis Univ., 1984. *DAI*, 45:1741-A. 86.50

29. Knight, W. Nicholas. "Equity in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries." *ISJR*, 56 (August 1981), 67-77.

30. Krieg, Joann Peck. "The Transmogrification of Faerie Land into Prairie Land." *JAmS*, 19 (August 1985), 199-223. 86.17

31. Leslie, Michael. *Spenser's "fierce warres and faithfull loves": Martial and Chivalric Symbolism in* The Faerie Queene. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer; Totowa, NJ: Barnes and Noble, 1984. 215pp.

32. MacInnes, Deborah L. "Nature and Grace in Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queene*: The Theme Reconsidered in Light of Its Historical Background." Cornell, 1983. *DAI*, 44:2774-A. 84.124

33. MacLean, Kenneth D. "Faces of the Alien: The Ideology of the Wild Man in Some English and American Writers." Indiana Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1984. *DAI*, 45:1741-A. 86.53

34. Manning, John. "Notes and Marginalia in Bishop Percy's Copy of Spenser's *Works* (1611)." *N&Q*, 31 (June 1984), 225-27. 85.19

35. Miller, Jacqueline. "The Status of Faeryland: Spenser's 'Vniust Possession.'" *SSt*, 5 (1984), 31-44. 85.137

36. Oram, William A. "Characterization and Spenser's Allegory." *Spenser at Kalamazoo, 1984*, pp. 91-122. 84.112-17

37. Pereira, Ernest. "The Poet as Critic: A Reading of John Keats." *KSMB*, 29 (1978), 1-17.

38. Radcliffe, John G. "'*A New Canto of Spencer's Fairy Queen*' (1747)." *N&Q*, 31 (September 1984), 396-97. 85.23

39. Stillman, Carol A. "Politics, Precedence, and the Order of the Dedicatory Sonnets in *The Faerie Queene*." *SSt*, 5 (1984), 143-48. 85.141

40. Spear, Jeffrey L. "'The Garden of Proserpina This Hight': Ruskin's Application of Spenser and Horizons of Reception." *SSt*, 5 (1984), 253-70. 85.140

VI. *Criticism of Individual Books of* The Faerie Queene

1. *The Faerie Queene*, Book One

41. AlKaaoud, Elizabeth Furlong. "'What the Lyon Ment': Iconography of the Lion in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser." Rice, 1984. *DAI*, 45:1118-19-A. 84.155

42. Bellamy, Elizabeth. "Pagan Prophecy and Christian Revelation: A Reassessment of Virgilian Parody in *The Faerie Queene*, I.v." *Spenser at Kalamazoo, 1984*, pp. 21-22 [abstract]. Response by John D. Bernard, pp. 23-29. 84.97-98

43. Crossett, John M. and Donald V. Stump. "Spenser's Inferno: The Order of the Seven Deadly Sins at the Palace of Pride." *JMRS*, 14 (Fall 1984), 203-18. 85.128

44. Cunningham, Merrilee. "The Interpolated Tale in Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*, Book I." *SCB*, 43 (Winter 1983), 99-104. 85.129

45. Doerksen, Daniel W. "Recharting the *Via Media* of Spenser and Herbert." *Ren&R*, 8 (August 1984), 215-25. 85.130

46. DuRocher, Richard J. "Arthur's Gift, Aristotle's Magnificence, and Spenser's Allegory: A Study of *Faerie Queene* 1.9.19." *MP*, 83 (November 1984), 185-90. 85.131

47. Jordan, R. D. "Spenser's 'Holinesse' and Brunetto Latini's Concept of Beatitude." *N&Q*, 31 (June 1984), 175-78. 85.15

48. Ladd, Gwen Ellen. "'The Novice of His Art': Spenser's Poetic Typology in Book I of *The Faerie Queene*." Kansas, 1983. *DAI*, 44:3389-A. 85.107

49. Pheifer, J. D. "Errour and Echidna in *The Faerie Queene*: A Study in Literary Tradition." In *Literature and Learning in Medieval and Renaissance England: Essays Presented to Fitzroy Pyle*. Ed. John Scattergood. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1984, pp. 121-74. 85.73

50. Sandler, Florence. "*The Faerie Queene*: An Elizabethan Apocalypse." In *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance Thought and Literature: Patterns, Antecedents, and Repercussions*. Ed. C. A. Patrides and Joseph Wittreich. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, pp. 148-74. 85.139

51. Viswanathan, S. "A Context of Spenser's Episode of Despair." *Aligarh Journal of English Studies*, 9, No. 1 (1984), 1-9. 85.143

52. Walls, Kathryn. "Abessa and the Lion: *The Faerie Queene*, I.3.1-12." *SSt*, 5 (1984), 1-30. 85.144

53. ----. "Spenser's Kirkrapine and John Foxe's Attack on Rome." *N&Q*, 31 (June 1984), 173-75. 85.26

54. Weatherby, Harold L. "Una's Betrothal and the Easter Vigil: The Probable Influence of the Sarum Manual." *Spenser at Kalamazoo, 1984*, pp. 6-16. Response by John Mulryan, pp. 17-20. 84.94 and 96.

2. *The Faerie Queene*, Book Two

55. Barasch, Frances K. "Definitions: Renaissance and Baroque Construction and Deconstruction." *MLS*, 13 (Spring 1983), 60-67.

56. Harman, Barbara Leah. "Refashioning the Renaissance." *Diacritics*, 14 (Spring 1984), 52-65. [Review article]

57. Kane, Sean. "The Paradoxes of Idealism: Book Two of *The Faerie Queene*." *JDJ*, 2, No. 1 (1983), 81-109.

58. Kaske, Carol V. "Augustinian Psychology in *The Faerie Queene* Book II." *HSL*, 15, No. 3 (1983) and 16, No. 1 (1984), 93-98. 85.135

59. Schlobin, Roger C. "The *Locus Amoenus* and the Fantasy Quest." *KanQ*, 16 (Summer 1984), 29-33.

60. Silberman, Lauren. "*The Faerie Queene*, Book II: A Surfeit of Temperance." *Spenser at Kalamazoo, 1984*, pp. 49-60. Response by Theresa M. Krier, pp. 61-67. 84.104-05.

61. Woodbridge, Linda. "'Fire in Your Heart and Brimstone in Your Liver': Towards an Unsaturnalian *Twelfth Night*." *SoRA*, 17 (November 1984), 270-91.

3. *The Faerie Queene*, Book Three

62. Buncombe, Marie W. "Faire Florimell as Faire Game: The Virtuous, Unmarried Woman in *The Faerie Queene* and *The Courtier*." *CLAJ*, 28 (December 1984), 164-75. 85.125

63. Cheney, Patrick. "Love and Magic in *Doctor Faustus*: Marlowe's Indictment of Spenserian Idealism." *Mosaic*, 17 (Fall 1984), 93-109. 85.127

64. Coyle, Martin. "*King Lear* and *The Faerie Queene*." *N&Q*, 31 (June 1984), 205-07.

65. Ehmke, Ronald. "Crystal Gazing: Spenser's Cinematic Approach." *NOR*, 11 (Fall-Winter 1984), 28-42. 85.132

66. Hiramatsu, Tetsuji. "Spenser's Myths of Venus and Cupid in *The Faerie Queene* and *Fowre Hymnes*: The Emergence of Marriage as a Romantic Ideal." Michigan State, 1983. *DAI*, 44:3695-A 86.51

67. Tajii, Hirakawa. "Britomart and Venus' Looking Glass in *The Faerie Queene*." *SELit*, 60 (September 1983), 3-13.

68. Verbrugge, Rita Maria Vander Steen. "Spenser's 'Antique Praises' for Chastity as an Ideal." Michigan, 1984. *DAI*, 45:3649-A. 86.54

69. White, R. S. "Metamorphosis by Love in Elizabethan Romance, Romantic Comedy and Shakespeare's Early Comedies." *RES*, 35 (February 1984), 14-44.

4. *The Faerie Queene*, Book Four

70. Burchmore, David W. "Triamond, Agape, and the Fates: Neoplatonic Cosmology in Spenser's Legend of Friendship." *SSt*, 5 (1984), 45-64. 85.126

71. Sessions, William A. "Is Closure Possible in Spenser? Spenser's Venus and the Deconstructionists." *Spenser at Kalamazoo, 1984*, pp. 30-44. Response by David L. Miller, pp. 45-48. 84.101-03

5. *The Faerie Queene*, Book Five

72. Manning, R. J. "'Deuicefull Sights': Spenser's Emblematic Practice in *The Faerie Queene*, V, 1-3." *SSt*, 5 (1984), 65-90. 85.136

6. *The Faerie Queene*, Book Six

73. Beard, M. M. "Pastoralism as a Statement of Value: *The Faerie Queene* Book VI." *ESA*, 27, No. 2 (1984), 77-92. 85.124

74. Bond, Ronald B. "Vying With Vision: An Aspect of Envy in *The Faerie Queene*." *Ren&R*, 8 (February 1984), 30-38. 85.66

75. Cheney, Patrick and P. J. Klemp. "Spenser's Dance of the Graces and the Ptolemaic Universe." *SN*, 56, No. 1 (1984), 27-33. 85.69

76. Cheney, Patrick. "Spenser's Dance of the Graces and Tasso's Dance of the Sylvan Nymphs." *ELN*, 22 (September 1984), 5-9. 85.68

77. Halperin, David M. *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*. New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press, 1983. xiv + 289pp.

78. Kay, D. C. "A Spenserian Source for Shakespeare's Claribel?" *N&Q*, 31 (June 1984), 217.

79. Liberman, Lauren Recknagel. "A Moral Virtue as Ground and Root of Spenser's Legend of Courtesy." Northwestern, 1983. *DAI*, 44:3390-A. 85.108

80. McRae, Murdo William. "Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*." *Expl*, 42 (Spring 1984), 7-8. 85.72

81. Stewart, Stanley. "Sir Calidore and 'Closure.'" *SEL*, 24 (Winter 1984), 69-86. 84.145

82. Ulreich, John C. "'Diuine Resemblaunce': Colin Clout's Vision of Grace." *JRMMRA*, 3 (January 1982), 199-207.

83. Weiner, Seth. "Minims and Grace Notes: Spenser's Acidalian Vision and Sixteenth-Century Music." *SSt*, 5 (1984), 91-112. 85.146

7. *Two Cantos of Mutabilitie*

84. Eade, J. C. "Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, VII.vii.52." *Expl*, 42 (Winter 1984), 3-5. 85.71

85. Weatherby, Harold L. "The Old Theology: Spenser's Dame Nature and the Transfiguration." *SSt*, 5 (1984), 113-42. 85.145

VII. *The Minor Poems*

1. *The Shepheardes Calender*

86. Berger, Harry, Jr. "The Mirror Stage of Colin Clout: A New Reading of Spenser's *Januarye* Eclogue." *Helios*, 10 (Fall 1983), 139-60.

87. Brown, Marianne. "Spenserian Technique: *The Shepheardes Calender*." *REALB*, 2 (1984), 55-118. 85.67

88. Ettin, Andrew V. *Literature and the Pastoral.* New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press, 1984. 199pp. 85.121

89. Hamilton, A. C. "The Argument of Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender*" (1956). Rpt. in *The Pastoral Mode: A Casebook.* Ed. Bryan Loughrey. London: Macmillan, 1984, pp. 189-98.

90. ----. "The Philosophy of the Footnote." In *Editing Poetry from Spenser to Dryden.* Papers Given at the Sixteenth Annual Conference on Editorial Problems, Univ. of Toronto, 31 October-1 November 1980. Ed. A. H. DeQuehen. New York: Garland, 1981, pp. 127-63.

91. Krieg, Joann Peck. "Whitman and Spenser's 'E. K.'" *WWR*, 1 (September 1983), 29-31.

92. Loewenstein, Joseph. *Responsive Readings: Versions of Echo in Pastoral, Epic, and the Jonsonian Masque.* Yale Studies in English, 192. New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press, 1984. xi + 191pp.

93. Otten, Charlotte F. "Primrose and Pink in 'Lycidas' (lines 142, 144)." *N&Q*, 31 (September 1984), 317-19.

94. Wittreich, Joseph. "From Pastoral to Prophecy: The Genres of *Lycidas*." *MiltonS*, 13 (1979), 59-80.

2. *Complaints*

95. Vecchi, Linda M. "Spenser's *Complaints*: Is the Whole Equal to the Sum of Its Parts?" *Spenser at Kalamazoo, 1984*, pp. 127-38. 84.148

A. "The Ruines of Time"

96. Ferguson, Margaret W. "'The Afflatus of Ruin': Meditations on Rome by DuBellay, Spenser, and Stevens." In *Roman Images: Selected Papers from the English*

Institute, 1982. New Series, No. 8. Ed. and introd. Annabel Patterson. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1984, pp. 23-50. 82.108

B. "Mother Hubberds Tale"

97. LeJeune, Susan Gardiner. "The World Up-So-Doun: Fabular Satire in the English Language." Southwestern Louisiana, 1983. *DAI*, 44:2464-A.

98. Steadman, John M. "'Teeth will be Provided': Satire and Religious or Ecclesiastical Humor." *Thalia*, 6 (Spring-Summer 1983), 23- 31.

C. "Ruines of Rome"

99. Marder, Louis. "New Source for *Sonnets* Discovered in Spenser's *Ruines of Rome*." *ShN*, 32 (Fall 1982), 17-18.

3. *Amoretti and Epithalamion*

100. Leonard, Celine Anne. "Flora's Bargain: A Study of Gender Relations in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser." California at Santa Cruz, 1984. *DAI*, 45:1122-23-A. 86.52

A. *Amoretti*

101. Cheney, Patrick. "Alcestis and the 'Passion for Immortality': Milton's *Sonnet XXIII* and Plato's *Symposium*." *MiltonS*, 18 (1983), 63-76.

102. Fowler, Alastair. "Elizabethan Conceits -- Spenser, Sidney and Drayton" (1975). Rpt. in *Elizabethan Poetry Lyrical and Narrative: A Casebook*. Ed. Gerald Hammond. London: Macmillan, 1984, pp. 178-95.

103. Hill, Geoffrey. "Our Word Is Our Bond." In his *The Lords of Limit: Essays on Literature and Ideas*. London: Andre Deutsch, 1984, pp. 138-59.

104. Stull, William L. "Sonnets Courtly and Christian." *HSL*, 15, No. 3 (1983) and 16, No. 1 (1984), 1-15. 85.76

105. Sypher, Wylie. "The Ornamental Surface--Spenser" (1956). Rpt. in *Elizabethan Poetry Lyrical and Narrative: A Casebook*. Ed. Gerald Hammond. London: Macmillan, 1984, pp. 110-18.

106. Tuve, Rosemond. "Renaissance Logic and Images -- Cause" (1947). Rpt. in *Elizabethan Poetry Lyrical and Narrative: A Casebook*. Ed. Gerald Hammond. London: Macmillan, 1984, pp. 95-103.

107. Wells, R. Headlam. "Poetic Decorum in Spenser's *Amoretti*." *CahiersE*, 25 (April 1984), 9-21. 85.147

B. *Epithalamion*

108.   Anderson, Douglas.   "'Vnto My Selfe Alone': Spenser's Plenary Epithalamion." *SSt*, 5 (1984), 149-68. 85.123

4. *Fowre Hymnes*

109.   Singer, Irving.   "Neoplatonism and the Renaissance."   In his *Courtly and Romantic*. Vol. 2 of *The Nature of Love*. Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1984, pp. 165-208.

5. *Prothalamion*

110.   Auberlen, Eckhard.   "Spenser's 'Old Woes' and the Epithalamic Convention."   In his *The Commonwealth of Wit: The Writer's Image and His Strategies of Self-Representation in Elizabethan Literature*.   Studies and Texts in English: 5. Tubingen: Narr, 1984, pp. 93-106.

6. *Prose*

111.   Frechet, Rene.   "From 1979 to 1596 and Back: A Look at Edmund Spenser's 'A View of the Present State of Ireland.'"   *Threshold*, 31 (Autumn-Winter 1980), 43-52.

112.   Hulse, Clark.   "Spenser und Bacon. Die Wahrheit der Dichter und die Weisheit der Antike."   In *Mythographie der fruhen Neuzeit: Ihre Anwendung in den Kunsten*. Ed. Walther Killy. Wolfenbutteler Forschungen: Band 27. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1984, pp. 115-26.

INDEX TO VOLUME 17

Numbers refer to pages, not items.

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
GREENLAW HALL 066A
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHAPEL HILL NC 27514

David L. Miller
Dept. of English, Drawer AL
Univ. of Alabama
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487   17.