Imagining Voices in *A View of the Present State of Ireland*: A Discussion of Recent Studies Concerning Edmund Spenser's Dialogue

JOHN M. BREEN

Edmund Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland* was entered in the Stationers' Register on 14 April, 1598.[1] Permission to publish was not granted and the *View* was first published in 1633, edited by Sir James Ware. He edited out material that he considered may reflect pejoratively on Spenser, observing in his preface, "although it sufficiently testifieth his learning and deepe judgement, yet we may wish that in some passages it had bin tempered with more moderation."[2] Implicit to Ware's comment is an association between the views expressed by the fictive characters, Irenius and Eudoxus, and Edmund Spenser. Ware is an early representative of an interpretative community which disregards the generic complexity of the *View* and insists upon positioning Spenser as Irenius, the fictive figure that promotes an uncompromising political solution to England's apparently intractable problems in Ireland.[3] This critical approach to the *View* is reductive as it is inattentive to the author's poetic strategies and the text's generic complexity. I am not suggesting that the political contexts for reading the *View* should be disallowed, but that there is a case for a more complex consideration of the relationships between Renaissance aesthetics and politics.[4] Although I consider Spenser as author of this text, Jean R. Brink in a recent and substantial contribution to *Spenser Studies* questions the authority of attributing the *View* to Spenser.[5] This further undermines the critical practice that automatically assumes that the voices of the *View* are not fictive, but that they provide a direct access to Spenser's views on Ireland. I will argue that dialogue as text is always fictive (that is polysemous) for it registers and modulates voices other than that of the author: as well as an author's adoption of fictive personas, the text

will inevitably correspond with voices in other texts. It is my intention to provide a review of the various generic approaches which the *View* has engendered and to reappraise the *View's* aesthetic contexts. I will argue that the imagined voices created by Spenser are not deferred to with the appropriate critical respect.

I

Spenser's *View* has been variously read as autobiography and as a "policy paper."[6] In the half century spanning these polarised readings the *View* has largely been neglected as a subject of critical analysis. Stephen Greenblatt and David Norbrook have both provided radical readings of the *View* that have sought to site the text politically. Greenblatt, situating the text within a colonial context, argues that "the colonial violence inflicted upon the Irish is at the same time the force that fashions the identity of the English"; Norbrook argues that "the 'View . . .' is almost unique amongst Elizabethan political treatises in advocating, not a mere defence and consolidation of the status quo, but radical innovation, a conscious and ruthless process of social trans-formation," elevating Spenser's status by focusing on his transformative role.[7] However, both Greenblatt and Norbrook pay little regard to Spenser's historiography or his role as poet.[8] Even with the caveats concerning methodological approach, which are to the fore in contemporary critical theory, both critics deploy interpretative strategies that are untenable. Greenblatt claims that Spenser advocates violence when this is an argument given to Irenius, and Norbrook's subsequent claim that "Spenser and his allies were increasingly bitter because they believed their views were censored and misrepresented by conservative courtiers" is speculative.[9] Norbrook provides no textual evidence to support such categorical claims. These are versions of old historicism: untenable positions are held based on denying Spenser's historical contexts or by invoking, without evidence, a historical context.

Virginia Cox has provided the following salient and sensitive definition that outlines the genre's complexity:

> The oral exchange depicted in a dialogue acts as a kind of fictional shadow
> to the literary transaction between the reader and the text, conveying at least
> some of the same information, with a similar intent. The relation between the
> two may be distanced by irony or intimate to the point of symbiosis. But the
> parallel between them remains: each word, each argument in a written dialogue
> is simultaneously part of a fictional conversation and an actual literary
> exchange.[10]

Cox refuses to simplify the role of the speakers: the authentic voice of
the author oscillates between absence and presence for the voice of the
dramatic character is never wholly conterminous with the voice of the
author. Thomas Healy seems to demonstrate an appreciation of the *View's*
generic complexity when he calls it "a piece of writing which does not
purport to be a fiction . . . yet which uses the generic and rhetorical
conventions of literary writing."[11] However, his subsequent comment
that Irenius "is Spenser" undermines Healy's new historicist attitude
towards Renaissance literature and places him in company with
Raymond Jenkins who is categorical: "Irenaeus is not merely Spenser's
mouthpiece but . . . he is Spenser and the 'Veue' therefore becomes an
autobiographical account of several of the poet's Irish experiences."[12]
To read the *View* as autobiography is to marginalise the dynamic
relationship between Irenius and Eudoxus and the double-voiced
discourse that shifts from authority to subversion: the text promotes
Elizabeth's legitimate authority to govern Ireland, but it implicitly
questions the political strategies applied by Elizabeth's government.

The new-historicist critics whose readings I have discussed provide
a reductive approach that is similarly evident in the work of traditional
historians. Ciaran Brady is intent on foregrounding the *View's*
ambivalence between "opposing moral and political imperatives":

> Far from being a clear and rational statement of some dominant political theory,
> or of some prevalent ideological disposition, the *View* is riddled with ambiguity.
> It has defeated all attempts to identify it as a contribution to English political
> thought concerning Ireland because it is itself a symptom of a profound crisis
> in the English experience of that country.[13]

According to Brady there is a dilemma between the moral and the
political embedded in the text. Although he locates the *View's* ambiguity

as emerging out of Renaissance culture, he appears to be unaware that
he may be projecting his reading of "crisis" on to the text. Brady's
provocative reading of the *View* is itself ambiguous as it shifts between
the intellectually insightful ("Its subtly occlusive polemic, moreover,
renders it entirely unsuitable for use, as so many historians have used
it, as a cache of interesting descriptions and observations concerning
the state of Ireland") and the intellectually naive ("Hitherto Spenser had
sought merely to inspire his world, but now the point was to change
it").[14] Hostile to Nicholas Canny's opinion that the *View* was a kind
of consensus report for the dissatisfied New English, Brady claims that
it is an "ethical defence of brutality."[15] The root of Brady's analysis
is that "cultural trauma" was the "necessary precondition to all social
and political reform"; he emphasises Spenser's need to promote
intellectual and moral argument so that killing would be justified in
terms of the "highest humanist discourse"—as if Spenser was anxious
about the reception of his ideas and, more pertinently, that Spenser was
Irenius.[16] Brady concludes that the *View* is incoherent, unsatisfactory
and fails as a "contribution to English political thought concerning
Ireland." Spenser, as geographically border-line and symbolically central,
deploys both the voices of the poet-historical and historiographer in his
characters Irenius and Eudoxus. The paradox of self-promotion and self-
effacement that emerges from Spenser's position, and is a typical
Spenserian poetic strategy (see especially "The Shepherd's Calendar"),
seems to have escaped Brady.

In contrast to Brady's concern with "crisis," Canny promotes a
pragmatic reading:

> Spenser's *View*, composed in 1596, has long been accepted as a fundamental
> contribution to the theory of colonization, but it has not been adequately
> appreciated as a political text because commentators have at once exaggerated
> and diminished its originality . . . . When Spenser's *View* is analysed in this
> fashion it immediately becomes evident that it was a tract designed to serve
> the interests of those engaged upon the conquest and colonization of Ireland
> at the end of the sixteenth century.[17]

There is little "immediately evident" in the *View* and Canny seems to
be positioning himself perilously close to Renwick who saw the *View*

as "a political document of practical and immediate intention."[18] In the same way that Eudoxus would like to see the Irish reduced to civility, so too would Canny like to see the *View* reduced to coherency. This is revealing of Canny's methodology. Commenting on the differences between historians and literary critics, he has argued that "the most striking difference is that literary scholars devote almost exclusive attention to the text itself and seek to ascertain the author's meaning from the drift of argument and, when that fails them, from the form of the texts. Historians also devote attention to the text but they always reach beyond it for other evidence which will assist them in determining the purpose of the author."[19] This insistence upon distinguishing between methodologies of historians and literary critics is no longer tenable and is indicative of Canny's insistence upon classification, evident in his certainty in his treatment of the *View*.

Canny's argument is grounded in colonisation and politics; conversely, Brendan Bradshaw's argument is grounded in making Spenser coherent by reference to "Protestant moral theology."[20] Bradshaw emphasises that the text belongs to the genre of religious reform literature, that Spenser's *View* finds its "intellectual source in his Protestant world-view."[21] This ignores the broader influences and concerns of the Renaissance poet, which become apparent when one considers the aesthetic form of the *View*.

Greenblatt, Norbrook, Healy and Canny focus on the political, Brady and Bradshaw on the moral and the ethical. This lack of sensitivity to the contexts of the moment of cultural production, which is a failure to investigate aesthetic form, produces political readings that separate art from politics. According to Louis Montrose this is a dubious practice:

> During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the separation of "Literature" and "Art" from explicitly didactic and political discourses or from such disciplines as history or moral and natural philosophy was as yet incipient.[22]

The generic category of the *View* incorporates both art and politics: it can be read as both cultural icon and colonialist text, pronounced in the way it, in part, imitates the representational mode of Tudor Cartography.[23] It is a reformist text and thus dynamic, and it is a

staging of the self by Spenser, made coherent by keeping the political and the artistic simultaneously in focus. Having indicated that the *View* is generically diffuse and fashioned for aesthetic as well as material ends, I now intend to reorientate Spenser's *View*, by placing it in the context of Renaissance dialogue and historiography.

II

The dialogue between Spenser's Irenius and Eudoxus is designed to complicate the authorial responsibility for what is spoken. Similarly, More in *Utopia* (1516) and Erasmus in *The Praise of Folly* (1511) deploy speech in the guise of another figure, the rhetorical trope *prosopopeia*. Dialogue is a standard humanist formal device deployed to disguise the speaking voice, what George Puttenham names as the "*Aporia*, or the Doubtfull," and this allows a speaker to articulate a number of different perspectives without aligning himself to any of them; thus, authorial responsibility is ambiguous.[24] The author's voice is always refracted through that of a fictive polyvalent speaker. The difficulty encountered in reading the genre of the *View* is itself a response to the generic complexity of dialogue.

In *Utopia*, the shifting presence of the author (who is vicariously present as narrator, Hythloday and Morus), provokes Erasmus, I would argue, to suggest that the *Utopia* exhibits "some inequality in the style."[25] Erasmus in *The Praise of Folly* similarly revels in the generic complexity of dialogue. When Erasmus claims that it is "Folly who speaks," the responsibility for the seditious voice becomes ambiguous.[26] The indeterminacy of the speaking voice is exploited by Erasmus who delights in the opportunity to deploy a free voice (*liber-vox*) during Folly's critique. Spenser similarly demonstrates a playful delight in the perception that readers outside the dialogue, beyond the boundaries of the text, are being addressed:

> *Eudoxus*: Is it possible, take heed what yow say, *Irenius*:
> *Irenius*: To yow onelye *Eudoxus*: I doe tell yt. (117)

Irenius: I will vnto yow *Eudoxus*: In privitie discover the drifte of my purpose I meane (as I tould yow) and doe well hope hereby both to settle an eternall peace in that Countrie. (181)

For Spenser, as for More and Erasmus, the author oscillates between engagement and disassociation. There is no opportunity for the critic to categorically define Irenius as Spenser.

Patricia Coughlan claims that Spenser chose a genre with such "strong classical and humanist associations of civility and urbane philosophical reflection" so as to promote the sense of learning and to demonstrate the efficacy of argument."[27] This could be substantiated by Irenius' claim that "learninge hath that wonderfull power of yt self that yt can soften and temper the most stearne and salvage nature" (205).[28] Coughlan is sensitive to the aesthetic tradition in which Spenser wrote, arguing

> for a fuller awareness of the fictive mode of existence of the *View*, and against the treatment of it as an expository document, viewing Spenser's, and by implication all writing, as simultaneously textual and political, fictive and discursive, and of refusing any disjunction between the realms of symbolic representation and social practice.[29]

Coughlan's refusal to reductively classify Spenser's *View* invites a broader consideration of the text's aesthetic as well as political contexts. Similar to Coughlan, Renwick in his edition of the *View* also points towards the classical tradition of dialogue:

> It was convenient for his purpose, and well understood among men trained on Cicero. Spenser was a man of letters, and would adopt it as naturally as he adopted pastoral and epic. (239)

This is a promising beginning; unfortunately, Renwick fails to provide any analysis and is, if anything, opaque in his interpretation. Coughlan directs us towards Spenser's sustained references to Lucian, a classical writer who used dialogue to humorous effect, a writer who "merges the dialogue form with more frankly fictive genres, such as the imaginary or otherworld journey, and the description of the ideal state."[30] The Lucian text that Coughlan claims is structural to Spenser's *View* is the

Toxaris and she adds that "Erasmus and Thomas More both practised their Greek and their literary skills in making Latin versions of it" (64). Although Lucian is an influential figure, Renaissance commentators on poetics also shaped Spenser's *View*.

The poet's capacity to invent commonwealths, as depicted in More's *Utopia*, is a characteristic of the age. Thomas Lodge argued in his *Defense of Poetry* (1579) that "the framing of common welthes, and defence therof, proceedeth from poets."[31] In the *View* we find that Eudoxus praises Irenius for "that perfect establishment and newe common wealth which ye haue Conceyved" (156). Both Irenius and Eudoxus bear traces of Spenser's voice as they map out a geographical and intellectual landscape; Spenser is the authority removed from the text as Erasmus was in *The Praise of Folly* and More in *Utopia*. Sidney, who stressed the poet's inventive capacity, provides us with penetrating insight into Spenser's methodology. Sidney claims that Plato was a poet because of his deployment of "Dialogues":

> And truly even Plato whosoever well considereth shall find that in the body of his work, though the inside and strength were Philosophy, the skin as it were and beauty depended most of Poetry: for all standeth upon dialogues wherein he feigneth many honest burgesses of Athens to speak of such matters, that, if they had been set on the rack, they would never have confessed them.[32]

Sidney suggests that dialogue is an indeterminate genre as to feign a speaker is a poetic strategy that belongs to discourses other than the poetical. The play of voice styles and tones, and thus the significance of the content, is misread if Spenser is categorically determined as Irenius. Cox's observation that "dialogue is simultaneously part of a fictional conversation and an actual literary exchange" should always be kept in focus.

The relationship between content and aesthetic form is, in part, historically determined. Eudoxus functions as a representative of Spenser's intended audience, primarily the Elizabethan government whom Irenius is intent on persuading that English policy towards Ireland needs changing. Thomas Wilson in the "Epistle" to his *Arte of Rhetorique* (1560) comments on the ability of rhetoric to negotiate political advantage and declares that the pleasures of language can even outdo in impact

the effect achieved by violence: "For if the worthinesse of Eloquence maie mooue vs, what worthier thing can there bee, then with a word to winne Cities and whole Countries? If profite maie perswade, what greater gaine can we haue, then without bloudshed achiue to a Conquest?"[33] This debate about the aesthetic (humanist persuasion) and the material (martial strength), which in part foregrounds the tension between the rhetorical and the empirical, has implications for Spenser's historiography.

III

Frank Covington surveyed Spenser's use of Irish history in the *View* and concluded that Spenser's sources were eclectic. Further,

> We find that he employs Irish history in the *Veue* in three ways, more exactly, in connection with three divisions of his discussion: as explanation of existing conditions in Ireland, as justification for English policies in Ireland, and as support for his own theories.[34]

To explain, to justify and to persuade—these considerations inform Spenser's use of Irish history and his deployment of dialogue. What emerges from Covington's survey is insight into Spenser methodology. Covington claims that Spenser used more than one authority in a single passage by conflating stories; he also argues that Spenser was "careless," "misread," "relied on memory" and was "uncritical." This criticism may be valid for a contemporary historian but it ignores Spenser's role as a poet-historical who is inventive as he "faineth" a commonwealth. Michael O'Connell calls the *View* a "fusion of legend and history, fact and fiction."[35] Wyman Herendeen argues that

> At the end of the sixteenth century, poets (historical or otherwise) had to reconcile Tudor myth to the generic requirements of history, and in the process had to make specific decisions about genre, and larger ones about the nature of poetry and writing.[36]

Spenser's attitude towards Tudor myth may be revealing. David Lee
Miller observes that in the *View* Spenser demonstrated a sceptical attitude
towards Tudor myth, specifically that concerning the tale of Brutus, that
"Spenser practised a historiography that was modern for its time."[37]
In the *View* Irenius appears to cast doubt upon the authenticity of the
story concerning Britain's mythic origins:

> our vayne Englyshemen doe in the tale of Brutus, whome they devise to haue
> firste conquered and inhabited this lande, it beeinge as impossible to prove
> that ther euer was anie suche Brutus of Albanye, as it is, that ther anie suche
> Gathelus of Spaine. (261)[38]

However, it would be rash to suggest that, based on Irenius' comment,
Spenser did not believe in the Brutus myth's romantic and nationalistic
import. Spenser belonged to a historiographical school governed by
poetry, not empiricism, and described his meaning in *The Faerie Queene*
as "clowdily enwrapped in Allegorical deuises."[39]

Spenser's strategy of arbitrarily sliding between the roles of
historiographer and poet historical, his methodological double-voice,
is grounded in Renaissance poetics. This I intend to demonstrate by,
principally, reference to Philip Sidney's *An Apology for Poetry* (1595) and
George Puttenham's *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589). When Spenser in
his letter to Raleigh concerning *The Faerie Queene* writes of the "Poet
historical," he is assigning a role of historian, of chronicler, to the poet.[40]
This is not to be confused with the historiographer who is not a poet:

> For the Methode of a Poet historical is not such, as of an Historiographer. For
> an Historiographer discourseth of affayres orderly as they were donne,
> accounting as well the times as the actions, but a Poet thrusteth into the
> middest, euen where it most concerneth him, and there recoursing to the thinges
> forepaste, and diuining of thinges to come, maketh a pleasing Analysis of all.

This distinction between "Historiographer" and "Poet historical" is a
commonplace in Elizabethan poetics. The "Poet historical" is perceived
as possessing a superior status; he is according to Sidney, "monarch"
and according to Spenser aspires to a "kingdome of oure owne

Language"; thus, the "historiographer" is portrayed as an empiricist and the "Poet historical" as a rhetorician.[41]

Puttenham claims that for the "Poesie historicall" (39) there are histories of "three sortes: wholly true and wholly false, and a third holding part of either" (41). Puttenham eschews the truth category of feigned examples, as does Sidney who argues that "for the poet, he nothing affirms, and therefore never lieth" (123). For Sidney the poet is the bearer of the "fore-conceit," the "*Idea*" (101). A consequence of this is that the poet has the responsibility to give form to the abstract—to imagine and to invent so that narrative becomes the "imaginative ground-plot of a profitable invention" (124). History is remembered by a process of "Mimesis":

> a representing, counterfeiting, or figuring forth—to speake metaphorically, a speaking picture—with this end, to teach and delight. (101)

The role of the poet as "representing" and "counterfeiting" arising from the poet's role as "imitator" is similarly endorsed by Puttenham—"both a maker and a counterfaitor" (3). Spenser adopts voices that are different in tone and character to that of the (empirical) historiographer.

IV

It is naive and methodologically flawed to treat the opinions expressed by Irenius and Eudoxus as simply belonging to Edmund Spenser. I have argued for placing Spenser's *View* in the context of Renaissance dialogue and historiography so as to demonstrate the generic complexity of the *View*. My critique of the various writers on the *View*, with notable exceptions, demonstrates a failure to read the *View* within its generic as well as political contexts. I accept that the choice of genre is a political event, but this choice can only be adequately appreciated by situating the *View* among the multiple forms of writing which circulated within the Renaissance. The imaginary voices which Edmund Spenser created are overlooked by critics who imagine that they hear Spenser's voice,

loud and clear, whilst Spenser's "I" elides (is never fully present) as he scans his intellectual landscape and projects his symbolically central aesthetic vision.

The Queen's University
Belfast

NOTES

[1] All references are from W. L. Renwick's edition of *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1934), hereafter referred to as the *View*. The *View*, argues Renwick, was probably written by 1596 (224).

[2] *The Historie of Ireland* (Dublin, 1633; *STC* 25067a).

[3] For a full bibliography on Spenser and Ireland see Willy Maley, "Spenser and Ireland: A Select Bibliography," *SSt* 9 (1988): 227-42. For an account of how the *View* was received in the seventeenth century see Willy Maley, "How Milton and some contemporaries read Spenser's *View*," *Representing Ireland*, ed. Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley (Cambridge: CUP, 1993) 191-208.

[4] For a recent consideration of the political character of the *View*, see A. D. Hadfield, "The Course of Justice: Spenser, Ireland and Political Discourse," *SN* 65 (1993): 187-96, and "Spenser, Ireland, and Sixteenth-Century Political Theory," *MLR* 89 (1994): 1-18.

[5] "Constructing the *View of the Present State of Ireland*," *SSt* 11 (1994): 203-28.

[6] Raymond Jenkins, "Spenser with Lord Grey in Ireland," *PMLA* 52 (1937): 338-53; Clark Hulse, "Spenser, Bacon, and the Myth of Power," *The Historical Renaissance: New Essays on Tudor and Stuart Literature and Culture*, ed. Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988) 315-46.

[7] Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980) 87-88; David Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (London: Routledge, 1984) 155.

[8] For a recent account of British historiography in the early modern period and its relationship to Spenser's *View*, see A. D. Hadfield, "Briton and Scythian: Tudor representations of Irish origins," *Irish Historical Studies* 28 (1993): 390-408.

[9] Norbrook 15.

[10] *The Renaissance Dialogue: Literary Dialogue in its Social and Political Contexts, Castiglione to Galileo* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992) 7. See also on dialogue, Katherine Wilson, *Incomplete Fictions: The Formation of English Renaissance Dialogue* (Washington, DC: Catholic UP, 1985).

[11] Thomas Healy, *New Latitudes: Theory and English Renaissance Literature* (London: Edward Arnold, 1992) 84. Healy's comment on "literary writings" is a tautology. According to Raymond Williams, in the Renaissance *literature* referred to "a condition of reading," for "in its modern form the concept of 'literature' did not emerge earlier

than the eighteenth century and was not fully developed until the nineteenth century" (*Marxism and Literature* [Oxford: OUP, 1977] 46).

[12]Healy 8; Jenkins 2.

[13]Ciaran Brady, "Spenser's Irish Crisis: Humanism and Experience in the 1590s," *Past and Present* 111 (1986): 33.

[14]Brady 49, 47.

[15]Canny had claimed that the *View* was "a consensus report of the ruthless and frightened New English," "Edmund Spenser and the Development of an Anglo-Irish Identity," *YES* 13 (1983): 1.

[16]Brady 18, 30, 38.

[17]Canny 1-2.

[18]The historiography of Renwick's edition of the *View* has been criticised at length by Roland M. Smith, "Spenser, Holinshed, and *The Leabhar Gabhála, JEGP* 43 (1944): 390-401. Smith maintains that this edition is "inadequate and misleading in many respects, [and] is perhaps least satisfactory in its remarks upon Spenser's sources . . . . Renwick's notes, which frequently hinder the reader instead of helping him, are woefully lacking in documentation. His references to Buchanan are to the 1582 edition; those to Camden's *Brittania* are unfortunately to Holinshed's English translation of 1610, when Spenser had been dead for more than ten years! . . . Similar editorial defects appear on almost every page of Renwick's commentary" (391).

[19]Nicholas Canny, "Introduction: Spenser and the Reform of Ireland," *Spenser and Ireland: An Interdisciplinary Perspective,* ed. Patricia Coughlan (Cork: Cork UP, 1989) 10.

[20]Brendan Bradshaw, "The Elizabethans and the Irish: A Muddled Model," *Studies* 70 (1981): 242.

[21]Brendan Bradshaw, "Edmund Spenser on Justice and Mercy," *The Writer as Witness: Literature as Historical Evidence,* ed. Tom Dunne (Cork: Cork UP, 1987) 78.

[22]Louis Montrose, "Renaissance Literary Studies and the Subject of History," *ELR* 15 (1986): 12.

[23]See John Breen, "The Empirical Eye: Edmund Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland,*" *The Irish Review* (forthcoming).

[24]*The Arte of Rhetorique* (1560), ed. Gladys Doidge Willcock and Alice Walker (Cambridge: CUP, 1936) 226.

[25]Cited in *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More,* vol. 4, ed. Edward Surtz and J. H. Hexter (New Haven: Yale UP, 1965) xv.

[26]*The Praise of Folly,* trans. Clarence H. Miller (New Haven: Yale UP, 1979) 1.

[27]Patricia Coughlan, "'Some Secret Scourge which Shall by Her come unto England': Ireland and Incivility in Spenser," *Spenser and Ireland: An Interdisciplinary Perspective,* ed. Patricia Coughlan (Cork: Cork UP, 1989) 47.

[28]This is an echo of Eudoxus' earlier allusion to Ovid: "*Emollit mores nec sinit esse feros*" (53), [learning] softens manners, nor suffers them to be wild.

[29]Coughlan 71.

[30]Coughlan 65. Lucian is, according to Cox, "the most unequivocally fictitious" writer of dialogue (10); also John Manning argues for Spenser's familiarity with Lucian's *Amores* by reference to the *Faerie Queene* IV.x.40.3-6 ("Spenser and Lucian," *N&Q* 34 [1987]: 201-02).

[31]G. Gregory Smith, ed. *Elizabethan Critical Essays* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1904) 1: 77.

[32]Philip Sidney, *An Apology for Poetry*, ed. Geoffrey Shepherd (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1965) 97. Hereafter *An Apology*. All quotations from *An Apology* are from this edition.

[33]G. H. Mair, ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1909) A.ij.

[34]Frank F. Covington, Jr., "Spenser's Use of Irish History in *The Veue of the Present State of Ireland*," *Texas Studies* 37 (1924): 25.

[35]Michael O'Connell, "History and the Poet's Golden World: The Epic Catalogues in *The Faerie Queene*," *ELR* 4 (1974): 258.

[36]Wyman H. Herendeen, "Wanton Discourse and the Engines of Time: William Camden—Historian among Poets-Historical," *Renaissance Rereadings: Intertext and Context*, ed. Maryanne Cline Horowitz, Anne J. Cruz, and Wendy A. Furman (Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1988) 144.

[37]*The Poems Two Bodies: The Poetics of the 1590* Faerie Queene (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1988) 197.

[38]Renwick includes this passage in the commentary to his edition, prefaced by the following remarks: "The MS in the Public Record Office (*S.P.Ir.* 202. pt. 4.58) contains a version of the historical disquisition varying so considerably from that found in the other texts that I append it here" (258).

[39]For an insightful account of Spenser's deployment of secrecy see Richard Rambuss, *Spenser's Secret Career* (Cambridge: CUP, 1993) 3: "Secrecy circulates through and traverses nearly all of Spenser's texts, and it provides the deep structure of those texts."

[40]"A letter of the Authors expounding his whole intention in the course of this worke [*The Faerie Queene*]," in *The Faerie Queene*, ed. A. C. Hamilton (London: Longman, 1980) 738. Raleighs's letter is dated 23 January, 1589. It is appended to the first edition of the *Faerie Queene* (1590) and included in the second edition (1596) which added Books IV-VI.

[41]This quotation, which reads in full, "For why, a Gods name, may not we, as else the Greekes, haue the kingdome of oure owne Language," is from a Spenser letter to Gabriel Harvey reprinted in G. Gregory Smith, 1: 99. Richard Helgerson provides a stimulating analysis of the multiple interpretations which can be attached to this comment in *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992) 19-62.