

---

Fall 2016

## Temperance, Interpretation, and “the bodie of this death”: Pauline Allegory in *The Faerie Queene*, Book II

David Lee Miller  
*University of South Carolina - Columbia*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/engl\\_facpub](https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/engl_facpub)



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

---

### Publication Info

Postprint version. Published in *English Literary Renaissance*, Volume 46, Issue 3, Fall 2016, pages 376-400.

© The Author(s) English Literary Renaissance 2016, English Literary Renaissance Inc.

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article, which has been published in final form [here](#). This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

This Article is brought to you by the English Language and Literatures, Department of at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact [digres@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:digres@mailbox.sc.edu).

David Lee Miller  
University of South Carolina

Temperance, Interpretation, and “the bodie of this death”:

Pauline Allegory in *The Faerie Queene*, Book II

The allegorical relation between Holiness and Temperance in Spenser’s *Faerie Queene* has puzzled many critics since A. S. P. Woodhouse in 1949 tried to sort the orders of nature and grace.<sup>i</sup> Guyon and his Palmer seem nominally Christian—the Palmer’s name indicates that he has made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and Guyon recognizes “the sacred badge of my Redeemers death” (i.27.6)<sup>ii</sup> on the shield of Redcrosse—yet together they give Mortdant and Amavia a pagan burial,<sup>iii</sup> and their conception of Temperance seems more Aristotelian than Pauline.

These mixed signals point to a deeper rift between the virtues. The Letter to Raleigh glosses Redcrosse’s armor with a reference to Ephesians 6:11: “Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the assaults of the deuil” (line 64).<sup>iv</sup> The next verse reads, “For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, and against the worldlie governours, the princes of the darkenes of this worlde, against spirituall wickednesses, which are in the hie places.” Guyon’s name means, among other things, “wrestler,”<sup>v</sup> but he does not inherit “the whole armour of God” from the Redcrosse knight, nor does he quite grasp the distinction between flesh and blood as adversaries, and spiritual wickednesses.<sup>vi</sup> Guyon is a hero from a world without revelation, tragically and comically captive to the Law, straining to

make out a horizon beyond which lies a redemption he cannot imagine.<sup>vii</sup> Key episodes in the narrative, from Guyon's discovery of Mortdant and Amavia to his first encounter with Furor, Arthur's battle with Maleger in canto xi, and Guyon's destruction of the Bower of Bliss in canto xii, show repeatedly that classical Temperance unaided is no match for flesh and blood, let alone spiritual enemies. The allegory in these episodes challenges readers to seek a recognition that eludes the protagonist.

Interpretations of Book II since Woodhouse have tended to be either theological or secular in emphasis.<sup>viii</sup> But Spenser calls both perspectives into play, narrating the struggles of a hero from the world of pagan epic who has wandered into a Reformation allegory he cannot comprehend. The result is an exploration of both the value and the limitations of classical Temperance, dramatized in a clash of perspectives that is powerfully staged in the opening canto and then anatomized in later episodes.

### 1. *Contaminatio*

Guyon and the Palmer, passing by the side of a forest "for succour from the scorching ray" (i.35.6), are surprised by cries of anguish. The knight rushes into "the thick" (39.2), where he finds a young woman on the ground "halfe dead, halfe quick" (39.4), a knife in her breast, while blood from the wound flows into the fountain beside her like a purple stream, staining its waves. A "louely babe" (40.5), unconscious of the surrounding horror, plays in her streaming blood, and beside them reclines the corpse of an armed knight, still smiling. The pink flush of youth lingers in his cheeks, in stark contrast to the blood that spatters his armor.

This episode has riveted critical attention as much for its enigmatic meaning as for the power of its tragedy, and commentary has struggled to reconcile the affect of the

scene with its allegory. Scholars from A. C. Hamilton and Alastair Fowler to Carol Kaske have worked to clarify biblical and patristic resonances that point to a Pauline allegory of Mosaic law, but their accounts do not explain why an allegory of the Law and the flesh should be personified as a dying husband and wife, or why the Law's generative effect, creating the knowledge of sin, should be drenched in the pathos of Dido's death-scene from the *Aeneid*.<sup>ix</sup> Together these allusions constitute a powerful *contaminatio*,<sup>x</sup> sounding a strange keynote for an aesthetic of Temperance—especially if Spenser conceives of this virtue as the art of blending refractory impulses. Perfect concord and harmony are the topoi of *intemperance* in Book II, lovingly elaborated both times the narrative visits the Bower of Bliss (v.28-31, xii.51, 70-72).<sup>xi</sup>

Dissonance is a central concern of the scriptural passages (especially Romans 5-7) that inform the episode, coded into the names “Mortdant,” he who gives death, and “Amavia,” she who loves life (i.55.5-6).<sup>xii</sup> In Romans, Paul grapples with the challenge of living in the spirit while sunk in the flesh: “How shal we, that are dead to sinne, liue yet therein?” (6:2). He goes on to explain that believers become “dead to sinne” through baptism: “Know ye not, that all we which haue bene baptized into Iesus Christ, haue bene baptized into his death?” (6:3). “Grafted” with Christ “to the similitude of his death,” the faithful await the completion of this similitude: “we beleue that we shal liue also with him” (6:5, 8).

The theological allegory thus locates the action of Book II, the “moment” of Temperance, partly in the world of the virtuous pagan, who apprehends the Law through the workings of human reason, and partly in the interval between baptismal “death” and the resurrection it waits upon: Guyon is, so to speak, a virtuous pagan called to witness

Paul's vision of Mosaic law as deadly, responding with shock and incomprehension.<sup>xiii</sup> Kaske has rightly dismissed the idea that the washing of Ruddymane's hands in canto ii is baptismal,<sup>xiv</sup> but this does not mean that baptism has no bearing on the allegory: in Paul's account, the struggle between sin and the Law both precedes *and* follows baptism. This is another sense in which Guyon begins where Redcrosse has ended: the well that signifies baptism is not the cold Ovidian spring of II.ii but the "*well of life*" that restores Redcrosse in his battle with the dragon of sin (I.xi.29-34).

Book II opens with the knight backtracking from Eden and the bliss he attained there, and with the loosing of Archimago from his chains. No sooner do we glimpse the consummation that awaits the faithful than the narrative steps back, relocating us in the moment *between* baptism and resurrection, the interval in which the Pauline "inner man" struggles with the law of his members. In effect, Temperance *resumes the dragon-fight*, now in an allegory of the flesh.<sup>xv</sup> This sense of backtracking may explain why Guyon and the Palmer seem to regress from their initial Christianity into Aristotelian rectitude.

The opening of Book II asks us to reverse Guyon's perspective. If he is a virtuous pagan unable to grasp the mystery of baptism, we are positioned as Pauline subjects called to witness both the value and the limitations of classical Temperance as a response to the inherent sinfulness of human nature. The context for this witnessing is established in Romans. Chapter 6 speaks of baptism "into death" as a liberation from both sin and the Law: "for ye are not vnder the Law, but vnder grace" (14; cf. Col 2:11-14). In the next chapter Paul complicates the distinction, acknowledging, "we knowe that the Lawe is spiritual, but I am carnal, solde vnder sinne" (7:14). He lives not simply under grace, then, but also under the Law, "for I delite in the Law of God, concerning the inner man:

But I see another Law in my members, rebelling against the law of my minde” (22-23). This internal war of the mind against the members builds to the poignant lament, “O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death!” (24). The answer, of course, is that God through Christ will deliver the faithful, but the answer is also, not yet: the condition Paul evokes is one of suffering in hope.<sup>xvi</sup>

Luther’s commentary on Romans acknowledges this deferral:

. . . it is not necessary for all men to be found immediately in this state of perfection, as soon as they have been baptized into a death of this kind. For . . . they have begun to live in such a way that they are pursuing this kind of death and reach out toward this as their goal. For although they are baptized unto eternal life and the kingdom of heaven, yet they do not all at once possess this goal fully. . .

.<sup>xvii</sup>

The Pauline lament “O wretched man that I am” expresses the difficulty of living toward but not in “this state of perfection.” Luther goes on to imagine three classes of the faithful, of whom the second class “endure it [the death of baptism], but with great feeling, difficulty, and groaning; yet they are finally overcome, so that at least they die with patience” (312). This vision of dying with patience while suffering in hope is unavailable to Amavia, who takes her own life because she has neither hope nor patience (etymologically, the ability to endure suffering). Guyon will eventually identify the scene before him as “the ymage of mortalitie” (57.2), but he greets Amavia at first as “deare Lady, which the ymage art / Of ruefull pittie, and impatient smart” (44.4-5).

Spenser takes from Paul not just a body of doctrine but also a set of metaphors.

Paul speaks of two deaths: one into which baptism inducts the believer, freeing him from

sin and the Law, and another—its opposite—that arises from sin under the Law, “for sinne toke occasion by the commandement, and disceiued me, and thereby slew me” (7:11). There are two versions of life in this scheme as well. First there is a life prior to the Law: “For I once was a liue, without the Law” (7:9); later there is the life of the spirit, for “if Christ be in you, the bodie is dead, because of sinne: but the Spirit is life for righteousnes sake” (8.10). The sequence of these states carries the Pauline subject from life (1), in which sin is unknown because there is no Law, to death (1), brought by the commandment; then to death (2), in which the baptized subject dies with Christ, and finally—but not yet—to life (2), in which the believer who has died with Christ will rise with him in the spirit. The middle states in this chiasmic sequence, the two deaths, overlap in the subject who is at once carnal (dead under the Law) and spiritual (dead to sin and awaiting resurrection).

What we call life is thus figured by Paul as an almost unbearable tension between opposed, concurrent states of death. Spenser evokes this reversal often, beginning with the coupling of he who gives death with she who loves life, and extending into the details of the scene, Amavia “halfe dead, halfe quick” (i.39.4), Mortdant’s corpse still smiling and flushed with color (i.41). At the same time Spenser heightens the pathos of Paul’s cry, “who shal deliuer me from this bodie of death,” confronting both Guyon and the reader with a scene as shocking as it is opaque. It will be several stanzas before verbal echoes of Romans begin to suggest the allegory of sin and the Law. In the meantime Spenser turns not to Romans but to Virgilian Rome: Guyon’s blood freezes, he groans from deep within himself (42.3, 5), and clustering allusions to the immolation of Dido build pathos to the breaking point.

The allusions to Virgil appear in the first dozen stanzas of the episode, and they all hark back to a stretch of 30 lines near the end of Virgil's Book 4 describing Dido's suicide. A couple of these allusions are relayed through Ariosto; Spenser appears to be overgoing the Italian poet's recourse to the same scene in Virgil. Shakespeare apparently recognized the strategy Spenser is pursuing here, for his knowing mockery of the elder poet in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* includes a parody of Mortdant and Amavia's death scene in the deaths of Pyramus and Thisbe.<sup>xviii</sup>

We first hear an echo of Dido in Amavia's amorous wooing of death: "Come then, come soone, come sweetest death to me" (36.6) dilates the rhythm of Dido's *Sic, sic iuvat ire sub umbras* ("Thus, thus I go gladly into the dark!").<sup>xix</sup> Shakespeare hears the echo too, and does his own turn on it, adding a reminiscence of Ruddymane in the invitation to the Fates to lay their pale hands "in gore":

*O sisters three*  
*Come, come to me*  
*With hands as pale as milk;*  
*Lay them in gore,*  
*Since you have shore*  
*With shears his thread of silk.*<sup>xx</sup>

The next Virgilian echo in Spenser appears in stanza 43, as Guyon repeats Anna's gesture in trying to stop Amavia's bleeding:

Out of her gored wound the cruell steel  
 He lightly snatcht, and did the floodgate stop  
 With his faire garment: . . .

(i.43.1-3)

In the *Aeneid*, Anna embraces her wounded sister, *atros siccabat veste cruores* (“stanching with her robe the dark streams of blood,” 4.687). Once again, Shakespeare is close on Spenser’s trail: the couplet immediately following Spenser’s lines in stanza 43 is skewered in the opening of Pyramus’s prolonged death-speech:

. . . then gan softly feel

Her feeble pulse, to proue if any drop

Of liuing blood yet in her veynes did hop;

(43.3-5)

*Ay, that left pap,*

*Where heart doth hop:            [Stabs himself.]*

(V.ii.287-8)

Shakespeare embeds the parody of Spenser’s Virgilian imitation within his own imitation of Ovid, resuming in this way Ovid’s irreverent casting-off of an older poet’s sage and serious ethos.

As we read on in Spenser, the echoes of Virgil quicken. When Guyon kneels by Amavia,

Thrise he her reard, and thrise she sunck againe,

Till he his armes about her sides gan fold.

(II.i.46.3-4)

The repeated thrice-rising-and-falling imitates (by way of Ariosto) a pair of lines from Virgil that closely bracket the line echoed earlier (687, “stanching with her robe the dark streams of blood”):

*semianimemque sinu germanam amplexa fovebat*

. . . .

*ter sese attollens cubitoque adnixa levavit;*

*ter revoluta toro est.*

. . . and, throwing her arms round her dying sister . . . .

Thrice rising, she [Dido] struggled to lift herself upon her elbow; thrice she rolled back on the couch. . . .

(686, 690-91)

Spenser's stanza 47 then follows with another striking reminiscence of the Virgilian scene:

Then casting vp a deadly looke, full low

Shee sight from bottome of her wounded brest,

And after, many bitter throbs did throw

With lips full pale and foltring tong opprest,

These words she [Amavia] breathed forth from riuen chest;

(47.1-5)

In the *Aeneid*,

*illa gravis oculos conata attolere rursus*

*deficit; infixum stridit sub pectore volnus.*

She [Dido], essaying to lift her heavy eyes, swoons again, and the deep-set wound gurgles in her breast.

(4.688-9)

Finally, stanza 48 finds Guyon echoing Anna's wish to join her sister in death:

Tell then O Lady tell, what fatall priefe  
 Hath with so huge misfortune you opprest:  
 That I may cast to compas your reliefe,  
 Or die with you in sorrow, and partake your grieffe.

(48.6-9)

. . . *comitemne sororem*

*sprevisti moriens? eadem me ad fata vocasses;  
 idem ambas ferro dolor atque eadem hora tulisset.*

In thy death didst thou scorn thy sister's company? Thou should have called me to  
 share thy doom; the same sword-pang, the same hour had taken us both!

(4.677-9)

These allusions not only identify Amavia with Dido, but also align Guyon with Anna—in effect compounding Anna with Aeneas. This heightens the emotional tension of the scene even further, as Guyon veers between Aeneas's repression of feeling and Anna's passionate empathy. Only then, in stanza 52, do the echoes of Romans begin with Amavia's invocation of the Pauline keyword "flesh."

Spenser's extended recourse to Virgil as a counterpoint to Paul yokes these pretexts as violently as a metaphysical poet wrenching the terms of a metaphor. The horror of Dido's suicide strains against the scripture's need to affirm the Law in its death-dealing aspect, much as, in the *Aeneid*, it strains against the uncompromising demands of imperial destiny. Guyon comes upon Amavia like another Aeneas, turning back now to witness the suicidal widow's desperate end and voicing Anna's heartbroken wish to join her sister in death.

This is the scene overtaken by scriptural allusion. The innocence of the infant Ruddymane (i.40, ii.1), set off against Guyon's shock and tears, offers an appalling image of life "without the Law," blissful in its ignorance of death and oblivious to the stain on its hands (Rom 5:14). Amavia as a type of Dido, the widow who destroys herself for love in the flesh, merges with the widow in the opening verses of Romans 7: "if the man be dead, she is free from the Law" (3). Amavia refuses to be delivered from "the law of the man," and so she remains bound to Mortdant under the Law even after his death. Theologically, then, she figures the flesh in love with sin.<sup>xxi</sup> This allusion suspends her between the two Pauline deaths mentioned earlier: because she is "one flesh" with a husband who has died in sense (1), she cannot recognize her freedom to espouse Christ through baptism—dying in sense (2) along with "him that is raised up from the dead" (Rom 7:4). In this way Spenser's mingling of scriptural and Virgilian allusions locates his "ymage of mortalitie" (57.2) at a strange impasse, where Pauline suffering-in-hope collides with the impatient self-destruction of Virgil's Dido and where the sorrow of Virgil's Aeneas blurs into the grief of Anna. It is a stark vision of mortal anguish, stranded at the crossroads between states of death.

In the first book of *Confessions*, Saint Augustine remembers his own sorrow over "the death of Dido dying for Aeneas" in a passage that offers a useful gloss on Spenser's allusive strategy. "What is more pitiable," he asks, "than a wretch without pity for himself who weeps over the death of Dido dying for love of Aeneas, but not weeping over himself dying for his lack of love for you, my God."<sup>xxii</sup> This is precisely the reading of the scene before him that Guyon cannot attain—the dual recognition that Amavia dies because she loves Mortdant more than God, and that he himself is reflected in her error

(“himself dying”).

And so Guyon fails to see himself in this vision, even as he feels the impulse to die with Amavia. Caught between horror and compassion he steps back, in stanza 57, distancing himself from the tableau to pronounce on it in terms “more sanctimonious than sanctified.”<sup>xxiii</sup> The Palmer’s retort compounds the inadequacy of Guyon’s response: “But temperance (saide he) with golden squire / Betwixt them both [infirmity and bold fury] can measure out a mean” (58.1-2). Significantly, Guyon and the Palmer pronounce their reductive judgments just as the theological allegory comes into focus. The ambience of the moment is distinctly classical—the burial they give the couple is pagan rather than Christian, and the reasons they give evoke another passage from the *Aeneid*, about shades who go unburied.<sup>xxiv</sup> Set against the emerging allegory of Pauline theology, this passage dramatizes the inadequacy of classical Temperance to recognize or grapple with the inherent sinfulness of the fallen flesh. It insists on this inadequacy without minimizing the humanity of the well-meaning knight and Palmer, even as it deepens the pathos of the sinner’s spiritual death.

This invocation of Aristotelian virtue as the mean between vices of excess and deficiency prepares us for the mild absurdities of Medina’s house in canto ii, but more than that it heralds a series of confrontations in which classical virtue will fail to grasp the mysteries of sin.

## 2. Allegory and Misrecognition

Classical virtue fails in Book II because it places too much faith in the power of reason and will to control the passions.<sup>xxv</sup> The Pauline understanding of “flesh” undermines this program of self-discipline by reaching beyond the physical body and its impulses to

include the reason and will, corrupted by the body they would govern.<sup>xxvi</sup> This is why Reformation writers insist on justification by faith alone: “carnal wisdom” (Rom 3.5, Geneva gloss) is overmatched in the battle against sin, which can be conquered, even provisionally, only with the aid of divine grace. An ethics founded on the ideal of human self-sufficiency will never grasp the nature of this battle, in which the body’s resistance to the rational will is subordinate to a prior struggle between spirit and flesh: “the whole man is himself both spirit and flesh,” writes Luther, “and he fights with himself until he becomes wholly spiritual,” that is, until he dies.<sup>xxvii</sup> Tyndale expands Luther’s formulation: “every man is two men, flesh and spirite, which so fight perpetually one agaynst an other, that a man must go either back or forward, and cannot stand long in one state.”<sup>xxviii</sup> Guyon and the Palmer, ensconced in the discourse of classical virtue, misrecognize this struggle, and so Guyon’s response to Mortdant and Amavia recalls that of Redcrosse to Fradubbio and Fraelissa in Book I: like Redcrosse, Guyon fails to discover himself in the spectacle before him.

Spenser’s allegory formulates such failures of self-knowledge as failures of interpretation—sometimes subtly, but quite explicitly in the Furor episode in canto iv. Guyon and the Palmer come upon a strange “vprore,” a madman dragging a “handsome stripling” by his hair and beating him mercilessly, followed by a lame hag who provokes the madman with “outrageous talke” and occasionally lends him her staff as a cudgel (iv.3-5). This scene is flagged for us as an allegory about allegory. There are hints from the moment Guyon enters that things are not as they appear: “He saw from far, or seemed for to see . . . A mad man, or that feigned mad to bee” (3.2, 5). The repeated equivocation anticipates the Palmer’s later warning to Guyon that (in effect) he only “seems to see”

Furor (10.4-7). These hints are reinforced by the literary self-consciousness of the tableau, which alludes to Lucian's description, in a widely known essay, of a painting by Apelles that shows Slander "dragging by the hair a young man."<sup>xxix</sup> Lucian explains that Apelles—falsely accused of conspiracy and nearly executed—transformed his experience into an allegorical painting. The allusion provides a key to the allegory, since slander is the "occasion" that provokes rage, but by pointing to a story about the production of allegorical images it also brings the technique of personification forward as one of the episode's themes.

The themes of personification and interpretation become explicit when Guyon, grappling with Furor, "overthrew him selfe vnwares, and lower lay" (8.9). The Palmer steps in to reinterpret the combat. The allegory has personified both Furor and Occasion as agents whose features, actions, and accoutrements call for interpretation, but the interpretation they call for is one that insists they are not *really* embodied agents after all: "He is not, ah, he is not such a foe," warns the Palmer, "As steele can wound, or strength can ouerthroe" (10.4-5). The way to defeat Furor is through an interpretation that effectively *undoes* the personification, working back from uncontrolled rage to its cause: "his aged mother, hight / *Occasion*, the roote of all wrath and despight" (10.8-9).

The portrait of this "wicked Hag" in stanzas 4-5 draws on a complex array of literary and iconographic traditions, but at the heart of the labyrinth lurks a joke. Occasion in the emblem books is a naked young woman with winged heels,<sup>xxx</sup> but the hag who bears this name in Spenser combines features associated in various sources with Calumny, Regret, and Punishment. The joke is that a figure identified with the causes of wrath appears to characters in the episode as an opportunity to be grasped. So

Pyrrhochles, when he intervenes in canto v, will misconstrue the binding of Occasion as an invitation to chivalric rescue (st. 17).

Through such comedies of misreading, the allegory in this episode circles back upon itself, identifying the literary technique of personification with the misrecognition that displaces an emotional state outward, into (or onto) the form of an adversary.<sup>xxx1</sup> This misrecognition mistakes another for the self, and so Guyon overthrows “him selfe vnwares” (8.9); it also mistakes causes for effects, since to disentangle self from other in dealing with rage is also to clarify the relation of causes to consequences.

Along with its self-conscious undoing of personification, therefore, the episode also plays repeatedly with *hysteron proteron*—beginning in stanza 4 with Occasion, Furor’s source, following “him behynd” (4.1), and extending into the elaborate series of reversals set forth in Phedon’s self-exculpatory tale of woe. Phedon—the unfortunate stripling dragged along by Furor—repeatedly displaces his own guilt onto others, as when he calls Pryene “my woes beginner” and insists on an emphatically *sequenced* program of revenge: “she did first offend, / She last should smart” (31.4-6).<sup>xxxii</sup> A stanza later, this linked reversal of self and sequence catches up with Phedon as he, pursuing Pryene to kill her, finds himself pursued by his own rage, which has emerged, seemingly out of nowhere, as a character in the action:

Feare gaue her winges, and rage enforst my flight;  
Through woods and plaines so long I did her chace,  
Till this mad man, whom your victorious might  
Hath now fast bound, me met in middle space. . . .  
(32.1-4)

This “middle space” is the point of origin for Furor, the figure Guyon will control not through “victorious might” but by calming down enough to read the allegory. Rage both arises and is dispelled in a space that is psychological, interior to the characters, but also representational—a “middle space” where the internal and external, like cause and consequence, trade places in the acts of displacement or interpretation that constitute rage and understanding. The episode turns into an unrecognized encounter between the self and its alienated rage, mirrored in the chiasmic syntax and heavy alliteration of “mad man . . . me met in middle.”

The Palmer’s successful diagnosis of Furor shows that reason and restraint do have some value. We are reminded just how limited their value is, however, by the inept moralizing with which Guyon and the Palmer respond to Phedon’s narrative (33.8-36). Their tag-team counsel that his “hurts may soone through temperance be easd” lacks the subtlety of the allegory, which has demonstrated with precision how easily the mind can work to inflame passion instead of disarming it.

### 3. The Action of Grace

The second half of Guyon’s legend takes him through Mammon’s underground cave, the anthropomorphic castle of Alma, and the Bower of Bliss. Each of these episodes in its way marks the limitations of his virtue, while the intervening battle scenes make the same point in a different way, figuring the need for divine grace. When Guyon descends without the Palmer into the Cave of Mammon, his relative success in fending off temptation has been seen as an imitation of Christ’s sojourn in the wilderness or of the descent into hell.<sup>xxxiii</sup> The contexture of scriptural allusion certainly keeps these analogies in view, but the differences are as important as the similarities. Guyon enters in canto vii

feeding on “his owne vertues, and praise-worthie deedes” (2.4-5) and ends by collapsing from lack of nourishment<sup>xxxiv</sup>; if he has recapitulated the Temptation in the Wilderness, he shows no awareness of having done so, and his collapse suggests that unaided human nature cannot survive such a test.<sup>xxxv</sup> His self-sufficiency is an illusion. And so canto viii finds him suspended between life and death. The battle that follows, in which Arthur defeats Cymochles and Pyrrhochles, has been aptly characterized as a psychomachia, but Guyon, attended by prevenient grace in the figure of an angel and then in the person of Arthur, remains as pure as the spring of canto ii in his ignorance of it. As Hugh MacLachlan has shown, the curious equivocation in this episode as to whether the fallen Guyon is dead or alive directly echoes the language of the book of Homilies denying the value of works without faith: “Hee that doeth good deedes, yet without faith *hee hath no life*.”<sup>xxxvi</sup> “In his confrontation with the god of worldlings,” writes MacLachlan, “Guyon misunderstands the nature of the test, so that, although he is capable of refusing to put his trust in the world, he mistakenly puts his trust in his own magnanimity—his own human strength. In other words, morally he passes the test, but spiritually he fails it” (108).

In canto xi, Guyon will set forth from the castle to seek the Bower of Bliss while Arthur, remaining behind, engages the armies of Maleger. This battle gathers up motifs from a number of preceding episodes, including the deaths of Mortdant and Amavia, Guyon’s combat with Furor, Arthur’s defeat of Pyrrhochles and Cymochles, and the tour of Alma’s castle. Luther and Tyndale, quoted earlier, provide a succinct gloss on the paradoxes of this battle, for both emphasize that in the encounter between flesh and spirit, the protagonist “fights with himself.” The techniques of allegory stage this as an encounter with an adversary—a Furor, a Maleger—but Spenser’s text cues us repeatedly

that to defeat an allegorical foe the protagonist must first decode the allegory, in effect undoing the work of personification—re-placing what has been displaced into the adversary by recognizing that it belongs to the self.

Early in canto xi, the description of Maleger's battle-plan offers such a cue:

Them in twelue troupes their Captein did dispart,  
 And round about in fittest steades did place,  
 Where each might best offend his proper part,  
 And his contrary obiect most deface,  
 As euery one seem'd meetest in that cace.

(6.1-5)

We have been told that the attacking forces are “huge and infinite” (5.6), but now the poem enumerates the troops, disposing them into an order that both mimics and parodies the organization of the body so that “each might best offend his proper part.”<sup>xxxvii</sup> The episode draws upon an allegorical tradition that reaches back through medieval texts such as *The Castle of Perseverance*, *Piers Plowman*, and the *Ancrene Riwe* to Philo Judaeus in antiquity—fables in which deadly sins besiege the soul by way of the senses. Spenser invites us to be unusually self-conscious about this tradition and its conventions; he asks us at once to enjoy them as fable *and* to regard them as textual strategies.

Here again we recognize a version of the motif that underlies so much of Book II, that of misrecognition. Guyon fails to locate himself in the “ymage of mortalitie”; he overthrows himself wrestling with Furor because he mistakes the nature of the struggle. He and Arthur both are bemused by encounters with their animas in the castle: direct self-awareness dismantles self-possession so thoroughly that they must turn aside, pretending

not to notice what they know. As the climactic battle of Book II gets underway, these moments come back to remind us that the fable of a well-ordered castle besieged by monstrous armies involves similar kinds of misrecognition. However weirdly alien Maleger and his armies seem, they are an image of the flesh, and like the husband and wife of Romans 7:2-4, must be “considered within our selues” (Geneva gloss). To combat them is to resume the wrestling-match between flesh and spirit described in scriptural passages like Ephesians 6:12, quoted earlier. The enemy attacking the body-castle from without is already within the gates—indeed, within the walls and foundations, “not built of bricke, ne yet of stone and lime, / But of thing like to that *Ægyptian* slime” (ix.21.4-5). For this reason, the enemy has no real body of his own: “For though they bodies seem, yet substaunce from them fades” (ix.15.9). Their body is our flesh, “the bodie of this death.”

Arthur therefore defeats Maleger not by force of arms but by solving a string of riddles:

Flesh without blood, a person without spright,  
 Wounds without hurt, a body without might,  
 That could doe harme, yet could not harmed bee,  
 That could not die, yet seemd a mortall wight,  
 That was most strong in most infirmitee. . . .

(40.4-8)

The solution to these riddles is the Pauline body of death. Maleger’s strength is *nothing but* Arthur’s infirmity, his body a mere fiction; he is the flesh with which the spirit must wrestle. Arthur’s fall in this battle (st. 29) therefore recalls Guyon’s self-overthrow in

grappling with Furor (iv.8.9), even as his victory-by-interpretation recalls the Palmer's warning to Guyon, "He is not, ah, he is not such a foe, / As steele can wound, or strength can overthrow" (iv.10.4-5). Guyon and the Palmer apply this lesson in a limited way to the story Phedon tells later in the same canto, but Arthur, returning now to the "middle space" in which Phedon's illusions are generated (iv.32.4), undoes those illusions through an act of understanding.<sup>xxxviii</sup>

Arthur's insight does not quite break the surface of the fiction. It is mediated by the myth of Antaeus, commonly interpreted in Medieval and Renaissance texts as Hercules' victory over the lusts of the flesh: Arthur decodes Maleger by remembering "how th'Earth his mother was" (45.2). The allusion asks us to complete Arthur's interpretation by remembering that the castle of Alma, because it is composed of flesh, "Soone . . . must turne to earth" (ix.21.9); it asks us to see this return to earth mirrored in the rebounding-aloft of Maleger's dead body when Arthur casts it to the ground (42.5-8).<sup>xxxix</sup> Polar opposites, the castle's fall and Maleger's bounce are nevertheless contrasting images of the *same event*.

Arthur's decoding of Maleger resembles earlier recognition scenes on the Mount of Contemplation and in the turret of Alma's castle—scenes in which Spenser's protagonists approach perfect self-knowledge. They never achieve it, but their partial recognitions are oriented toward this horizon, a hypothetical moment in which a character within the narrative manages to read himself allegorically. If Arthur were to carry out the interpretation I have sketched, he would approach that horizon, a knowledge of himself as both victim and adversary, identified at one and the same time with Maleger and with the castle under siege. This recognition hovers just out of reach, veiled by the allusion to

Antaeus and calling upon us to finish the interpretation—to identify with Arthur, and through him to recognize ourselves in the narrative. To do so is to respond to the challenge of Prays-Desire: “How is it, that this word in me ye blame, / And in yourself doe not the same aduise?” (ix.38.2-3). It is to become the protagonist who reads himself allegorically and thus to rectify, in and for ourselves, Guyon’s initial failure to recognize *himself* in the “ymage of mortalitie.”<sup>xli</sup>

#### 4. Entering the Bower

The strategy of recreating a protagonist’s struggle within the reading experience has long been recognized as a key feature of Spenser’s style. Nowhere is it more vividly displayed than in the final canto of Book II. Just as Arthur’s victory over Pyrrhochles and Cymochles enables Guyon to rise up and resume his struggle with the flesh, Arthur’s victory over Maleger settles a “firme foundation”<sup>xli</sup> on which the house of Temperance can arise:

Now ginnes this goodly frame of Temperaunce  
 Fayrely to rise, and her adorned hed  
 To pricke of highest prayse forth to aduance,  
 Formerly grounded, and fast setteled  
 On firme foundation of true bountyhed;  
 And this braue knight, that for that vertue fightes,  
 Now comes to point of that same perilous sted,  
 Where Pleasure dwelles in sensuall delights,  
 Mongst thousand dangers, and ten thousand Magick mightes.

(xii.1)

The triumphant opening lines of the final canto offer a visionary image of ascent, in which the castle and the allegory of Temperance rise up in a single “goodly frame” during the moment of reading. But like Guyon in canto viii, they arise not to transcend the flesh but to reenter the fray, for as Luther reminds us, “the whole man fights with himself until he becomes wholly spiritual.” Short of death, all resurrections are provisional.

And so the visionary opening lines salute the ascent of the “goodly frame” in language and imagery remarkable for their sexual suggestiveness. Resurrection is conflated with tumescence, foreshadowing Guyon’s response to “sights, that corage cold could reare” (68.9): the head advances to the prick, and as it does so the knight “comes to point of that same perilous sted, / Where Pleasure dwelles,” a literary precursor to Walt Whitman’s “treacherous tip of me.” These incipient fantasies are very much beside the “point” the narrator wants to make, and that is precisely the point. They are very much present, too, but they are present as conspicuous distractions, not just irrelevant to the narrator’s meaning but inimical to it, tempting the concupiscent reader into misconstructions that play to the “infirmitee” from which erotic fantasies arise. As such, these double entendres are the textual equivalents of what Aquinas calls *fomes peccati*, the incipient motions of sin arising from the flesh.<sup>xliii</sup> They recreate concupiscence as a temptation to be resisted—or not—in the moment of reading.

Spenser embodies this strategy in Phaedria when she reappears a few stanzas later. The voyagers pass by an island so sweet “That it would tempt a man to touchen there” (14.6), whereupon—as if summoned by the sexual innuendo—“a daintie damsell” appears, “bidding them nigher draw . . . / For she had cause to busie them withall; / And

therewith lowdly laught” (14.8-15.4). Calling and then laughing loudly at her own remark, Phaedria behaves as if she too has launched an innuendo, as indeed she has: “cause” plays both etymologically and homophonically with *case*, *cosa*, and *chose*, echoing the wife of Bath’s “*bele chose*.”<sup>xliii</sup> Through double entendre calling attention to itself as such, a sexually explicit fantasy has unfolded out of the phrase “tempt a man to touchen there.”

To enter into such a fantasy is, allegorically, to pass into the Bower of Bliss. The gate that leads into the Bower, “wrought of substaunce light” (43.8), is therefore designed not to keep intruders out but to draw them in. It is carved with images of Jason and Medea, but as much as the represented story, the medium itself is the message:

Ye might haue seene the frothy billowes fry  
 Vnder the ship, as thorough them she went,  
 That seemd the waves were into yuory,  
 Or yuory into the waves were sent;  
 And otherwhere the snowy substaunce sprent  
 With vermell, like the boyes blood therein shed,  
 A piteous spectacle did represent,  
 And otherwhiles with gold besprinkeled;  
 Yt seemd th’enchanted flame, which did *Creusa* wed.

(st. 45)

Natale Conti observes that to some writers, “Medea represented Art, the sister of Circe or Nature; for Art tries its best to imitate Nature, and the closer it gets, the better art it’s supposed to be.”<sup>xliv</sup> Spenser takes the association a step further, describing an artistic

representation of Medea that is so mimetically potent, it blurs the distinction between nature and art, or between represented content and the medium of representation. In a characteristic twist of Spenserian wit, the Medea story ends up standing for “nature” in this analogy.

As a work of art, the Bower’s gate *enacts* (rather than depicts) a metamorphosis, one in which the medium and the scene represented seem to fade into each other by turns. As Leonard Barkan has observed, Renaissance poetry’s reception and transformation of Ovid consisted in just such a displacement of metamorphosis from event into technique: “what most essentially characterizes the Renaissance is a metamorphic aesthetics” in which “the true connective tissue . . . is the poetic technique itself.”<sup>xlv</sup> Here the result of this displacement is not only an ekphrasis, it is a description that enacts the rhetorical trope of *hypallage*, the figure of exchange. Exchanging the image for the thing becomes a way of passing through the gate, as if one were entering into the depicted scene (“Ye might have seene the frothy billowes fry”). This temptation is insinuated throughout the garden in the motif of veiling, as Antoinette B. Dauber has shown: “The area it [the veil] fills is illusory and paradoxical, at once a metaphor for the separateness of things and a transitional zone in which they may mingle.”<sup>xlvi</sup> To enter this zone is to become the most deluded of voyagers, mistaking the nature and reality of the landscape one beholds.

Illusions of this kind are the stock in trade of the Bower’s Genius, “That secretly doth vs procure to fall, / Through guilefull semblants, which he makes us see” (48.5-6). Throughout the description of the Garden, Spenser’s verse simulates the work of this evil genius, bringing the vegetation to life with orgiastic fantasies: “bowes and braunches . . . did broad dilate / Their claspings armes, in wanton wreathings intricate” (53.8-9); grapes

hang in bunches from “an embracing vine . . . As freely offering to be gathered” (54.2-6); artificial ivy “Low his lasciuious armes adown did creepe,” dipping its flowers into the water so that they “seemd for wantones to weep” (61.6, 9) in a mocking image of post-coital *tristesse*. In this sense, the gateway into the garden *is* the garden’s description.

Erotic fantasy shares with rage this propensity for projecting itself outward, onto others or the environment. Maleger’s arrows arrive from outside their targets, but as yet another image of the *fomes peccati* or kindlings of sin, they arise *within* the flesh they appear to penetrate. Acrasia’s concupiscent vegetation appears as invitation rather than assault, but like the castle’s return to earth and Maleger’s return *from* the earth, these seeming opposites figure the same thing—and indeed Guyon reacts to solicitation as if it were an assault. The underlying mechanism in either instance is that of projection: what appears to arrive from outside the subject arises within his own flesh. In attacking the Bower, then, Guyon again misreads his relation to the scene before him, acting as if concupiscence were lodged in the bowers, groves, gardens, arbors, cabinets, banquet houses, and buildings he destroys. Syrithe Pugh, in an original and persuasive rereading of the Bower’s Ovidian intertexts, captures this dynamic: “The Bower” she writes, “shows love as *felt* by a follower of the anti-erotic, martial ethos of Virgilian epic.”<sup>xlvii</sup>

It is his own desire that Guyon would destroy.

In this way the culminating “tempest of his wrathfulnesse” (83.4) offers a precise contrast to Arthur’s victory, repeating on a much larger scale the error with which Guyon began his quest—tempted by Archimago and Duessa into an unprovoked, if aborted, attack on Redcrosse. There too he was repressing lust, converting it to anger, and turning that anger against external adversaries. Now instead of attacking Redcrosse he trashes the

landscaping, furniture, and décor of the Bower, “And of the fayrest late, now made the fowlest place” (83.9).<sup>xlviii</sup>

But Guyon’s Bower is not the only one. Neither Pugh’s analysis nor mine would be possible if the Bower we respond to were the one Guyon sees.<sup>xlix</sup> There is Guyon’s Bower and there is Spenser’s—nature and art—and the difference between them is everything. With Verdant and Acrasia caught up in a fowler’s net, the poet returns to his touchstone myth, the seduction of Mars by Venus. Alluding both to Homer, who treated the love of Mars and Venus as a coarse anecdote, and to Lucretius, who treated it as a divine mystery, Spenser finds that the inmost recess of the Bower mirrors his invocation to the Muses: “Come both, and with you bring triumphant *Mart*, / In loues and gentle iollities arrraid, / After his murderous spoyles and bloudie rage allayd” (I.pr.3.7-9). *The Faerie Queene* regularly returns to versions of this image, beginning with the scene Archimago fabricates to deceive Redcrosse in Book I (ii.3-5). Like Redcrosse, Guyon reverses the sequence described in the invocation, for loves and gentle jollities provoke rather than allay these knights’ fury. But as Book II has taught us carefully and repeatedly, building to this moment, the Bower “is not, ah, . . . [it] is not such a foe.”

Critics from C. S. Lewis to Stephen Greenblatt agree in taking the description of the Bower—“A place pickt out by choyce of best alyue / That natures worke by art can imitate” (42.3-4)—to mean that it is, in the droll phrase of Robert Durling, “an actual place which has been chosen, as it were, by a committee of experts, as most suited to their purposes.”<sup>1</sup> But those who use art to imitate nature include poets as well as magicians, and the context may remind us that a “place” is also a commonplace (*loci communes*), a topos—as Berger puts it, “a Tasso place, for example, or a Chaucer place,

or a Homer place.”<sup>li</sup>

The Bower of Bliss is a Spenser place. If we think only of “actual” space we will indeed find “The art, which all that wrought” appearing, as the narrator teasingly informs us, “in no *place*” (58.9, emphasis added). But if we attend to its literariness we will find that art everywhere, for as Paul Alpers remarks, it is “in some sense his [Spenser’s] own.”<sup>lii</sup> Indeed we may say that Spenser anticipates Alpers on this point. At a playful moment in the *Amoretti* (1595) he will invoke his beloved’s bosom as “the bowre of blisse, the paradice of pleasure” into which his thoughts (like Guyon in stanzas 63-69) have been “too rashly led astray.”<sup>liii</sup> The Bower of Bliss is where you find it. But already in 1590, the same stanza that describes “a place pickt out by choyce of best alyue” goes on to say that its pleasures are “poured forth with plentifull dispence” (42.8). This pun identifies Spenser as the artist of the Bower, inflecting the ancestral name *De Spencier* as a nominalized verb of sexual release: what Shakespeare would call “th’expense of spirit in a waste of shame” is here the *dispense* of pleasure in erotic fantasy. It is an authorial signature hidden in plain sight.

The Bower over which Spenser’s punning signature asserts ownership is not the fictional space Acrasia inhabits: to identify them would be to miss the difference between Durling’s imagined “actual space” and Spenser’s “tropical” paradise, which keeps undoing in its own way the illusion Guyon thinks he can destroy.

---

*I am grateful to Joseph Loewenstein and Patrick Cheney for insightful comments on an earlier draft of this essay, and to Esther Gilman Richey for help with Luther’s theology.*

<sup>i</sup> “Nature and Grace in *The Faerie Queene*,” *ELH* 16 (1949): 198-228.

<sup>ii</sup> *Spenser: The Faerie Queene*, ed. A. C. Hamilton et al. (London: Pearson Education, 2001). On the Palmer as one who has been to Jerusalem, see William Nelson, *The Poetry of Edmund Spenser* (New York: Columbia UP, 1963), 179.

<sup>iii</sup> Hugh MacLachlan, “The Death of Guyon and the Elizabethan Book of Homilies,” *Spenser Studies* 4 (1983) refers this seeming inconsistency to the distinction made in the book of Homilies between knowledge of revealed truth and “true lively” faith in the promise of salvation; he also distinguishes the Dwarf as natural reason from the Palmer as “right reason” (103-7).

<sup>iv</sup> Biblical passages are quoted from *The Geneva Bible, a Facsimile of the 1560 Edition*, ed. Lloyd Berry (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969).

<sup>v</sup> For the link between *gyon* and wrestling, see Susan Snyder, “Guyon the Wrestler,” *Renaissance News* 14 (1961): 249-52. John Wesley, “The Well-Schooled Wrestler: Athletics and Rhetoric in *The Faerie Queene*, Book II,” *RES* 60 (2008): 34-60, links Spenser’s use of wrestling throughout Book II with the topos of the “learned wrestler” in rhetoric and dialectic.

<sup>vi</sup> The Geneva gloss explains that “The faithfull haue not only to striue against men and themselues, but against Satan the spirituall enemie . . . ,” who can be resisted only with the aid of divine grace.

<sup>vii</sup> For a useful epitome of the Book’s classicism, see Nelson, *The Poetry of Edmund Spenser*, 178-9. Isabel MacCaffrey, *Spenser’s Allegory: The Anatomy of Imagination* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), remarks that “Guyon, making his affectionless way through the cyclical processes of pagan temporality, is denied the visions of Gloriana and Una that give meaning to the quests of the Christian knights” (93). He is not denied the spectacle of Mortdant and Amavia, but his uncomprehending response to it demonstrates the limits of his perspective. This view of the protagonist and his legend may be traced back to Harry Berger, Jr., *The Allegorical Temper: Vision and Reality in Book II of Spenser’s Faerie Queene* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957), still the only book-length study of Book II. A contrasting view is offered by Paul Suttie, “Moral Ambivalence in the Legend of Temperance,” *Spenser Studies* 19 (2004): 125-33, who sees Guyon’s quest as structured by the double-bind between an ethos of passionate heroism and one of self-restraint. Syrithe Pugh’s incisive analysis of the limitations of Guyon’s Stoicism in *Spenser and Ovid* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005), chapter 3, comes closest to my view, although her frame of reference is Ovidian (with a touch of Augustine) rather than Pauline.

<sup>viii</sup> In part this is because interpretation tends to be selective: Carol Kaske’s *Spenser and Biblical Poetics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999), steeped in Reformation theology and the commentaries of the Church Fathers, is not bound to work out the episode’s debt to classical epic, while readers like Theresa Krier, *Gazing on Secret Sights: Spenser, Classical Imitation, and the Decorums of Vision* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), and Syrithe Pugh (see n. 7), attuned to the classical decorums in play and to the allusive texture of the verse, do not take up the theological allegory. The same is true of David Quint, “The Anatomy of Epic in Book 2 of *The Faerie Queene*, *SpR* 34.1 (Winter, 2003): 28-45, which delivers an excellent synopsis of the legend’s engagement with the epic tradition from Homer to Tasso, and Gail Kern Paster,

“Becoming the Landscape: The Ecology of the Passions in the Legend of Temperance,” in *Environment and Embodiment in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, England: Palgrave, 2007), 137-52, who illuminates Amavia’s place in an “ecology of passions” in Book II. Richard McCabe, *Spenser’s Monstrous Regiment: Elizabethan Ireland and the Poetics of Difference* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), a shrewd guide to the poem’s Irish and New World contexts, cites Upton on the allusion to the heraldic badge of the O’Neills in Ruddyman’s blood-stained hands, but is not obliged to assimilate the cycle of revenge set in motion by the English conquest of Ireland to classical and Biblical revenge motifs that the episode also invokes. Upton, by contrast, notes all these elements—the historical allusion to the O’Neills, the echoes of Virgil, and the scriptural allusions—in *Notes upon the Faerie Queene* (1758). Among modern critics, Berger, *Allegorical Temper*, is an exception; he sees Book II as divided between seven cantos on classical Temperance and five on Christian Temperance, with the appearance of the guardian angel at the opening of canto viii marking the divide.

<sup>ix</sup> A. C. Hamilton, “A Theological Reading of *The Faerie Queene*, Book II,” *ELH* 25 (1958): 155-62; A. D. S. Fowler, “Emblems of Temperance in *The Faerie Queene*, Book II,” *RES* 11 (1960): 143-9; Carol Kaske, “The Bacchus Who Wouldn’t Wash: *Faerie Queene* II.i-ii,” *RenQ* 29 (1976): 195-209, “‘Religious Reverence Doth Buriall Teene’: Christian and Pagan in *The Faerie Queene*, II.i-ii,” *RES* 30 (1979): 129-43, and *Biblical Poetics*. For Amavia as a “sympathetic” Dido, see John Watkins, *The Specter of Dido* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 120; Pugh, *Spenser and Ovid*, persuasively describes Amavia’s death-scene as analogous to that of Lucretia, as well (92-7).

<sup>x</sup> For a discussion of *contaminatio* as the “eclectic mingling of heterogeneous allusions,” see Thomas Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 40-2. My use of the term here differs from Greene’s insofar as Spenser’s episode corresponds more closely to the type of imitation Greene distinguishes as “heuristic” rather than “eclectic” (41). Greene later cites Spenser’s imitation of Lucretius at IV.x.44 as the work of a poet “unconcerned with the exercise of bridging a rupture and playing with the differences between the separated worlds” (274)—as precisely the reverse, in other words, of the Mortdant and Amavia episode as I describe it here. For an alternative, complementary response to Greene’s view, see Theresa Krier, “The Mysteries of the Muses: Spenser’s *Faerie Queene*, II.3, and the Epic Tradition of the Goddess Observed,” *Spenser Studies* 7 (1986): 59-91, esp. 75 and 89n16.

<sup>xi</sup> For a comprehensive discussion of the Homeric context for Spenser’s complex attitude toward strife, see Jessica Wolfe, “Spenser, Homer, and the Mythography of Strife,” *RenQ* 58 (2005): 1250, who notes that in *The third part of the Countesse of Pembrokes Yvychurch*, Abraham Fraunce expounds Circe, the Homeric prototype for Acrasia, as a symbol “of mingling and tempring” (1592: sig. 47v).

<sup>xii</sup> For the likelihood that the characters of Mortdant, Amavia, and Ruddymane are developed out of hints in the Geneva glosses to Romans 5-7, see David Lee Miller, [“A Neglected Source for the Mortdant and Amavia Episode in \*The Faerie Queene\*,”](#) *Notes and Queries*, New Series 61.2 (June, 2014): 229-31.

<sup>xiii</sup> The overlapping of Mosaic law with classical philosophy is based on the assumption that God's law is inscribed in the human conscience, and that reason unaided by revelation is therefore able to know it. See the Geneva gloss to Romans 1:31: "Which Lawe God writ in their consciences, and the Philosophers called it the Law of nature: the lawyers, the law of nations, whereof Moses Lawe is a plaine exposition."

<sup>xiv</sup> Kaske, *Biblical Poetics* 167.

<sup>xv</sup> Kaske notes that Romans 7 provides an intertextual link between the episodes of the dragon-fight and the Nymph's well, both of which she interprets as allegories of Mosaic law (*Biblical Poetics* 134-5). Richard Mallette, *Spenser and the Discourses of Reformation England* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), describes Book II as "a legend of the flesh" (51); Kenneth Borris, "Flesh, Spirit, and the Glorified Body: Spenser's Anthropomorphic Houses of Pride, Holiness, and Temperance," *Spenser Studies* 15 (2001), demonstrates the general importance of "sanctification and related Pauline doctrines of the flesh, spirit, and glorified body" to an understanding of the relation between Holiness and Temperance (17). James Schiavoni, "Sacrament and Structure in The Faerie Queene," *Reformation* 6 (2002), observes succinctly that "Book One is about what baptism can do, and Book Two is about what it cannot do" (117).

<sup>xvi</sup> Susannah Brietz Monta, *Martyrdom and Literature in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2005), clarifies the importance of suffering to Spenser's redefinition of Protestant sainthood in Book I; see ch. 4, "En route to the New Jerusalem."

<sup>xvii</sup> Martin Luther, *Works*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (Saint Louis: Concordia, 1955), 25:312.

<sup>xviii</sup> Shakespeare's engagement with Spenser in *Dream* is widely recognized. It has been discussed by James P. Bednarz, "Imitations of Spenser in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*," *Renaissance Drama* 14 (1983): 79-102; Robert L. Reid, "The Fairy Queen: Gloriana or Titiana?" *The Upstart Crow* 13 (1993): 16-33 and "Spenser and Shakespeare: Polarized Approaches to Psychology, Poetics, and Patronage," in *Shakespeare and Spenser: Attractive Opposites*, ed. J. B. Lethbridge (Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 2008), 79-120; and Patrick Cheney, *Shakespeare's Literary Authorship* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 80-4. Shakespeare's careful tracking of Spenser's Virgilian allusions in this episode seems to have gone unnoticed.

<sup>xix</sup> *Virgil*, ed. with an English translation by H. Rushton Fairclough, rev. ed. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1922), vol. 1; *Aeneid* 4.660.

<sup>xx</sup> *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. Harold F. Brooks (London: Methuen, 1979; rpt. Bloomsbury Arden, 2013), V.ii.323-8.

<sup>xxi</sup> See the Geneva gloss to Romans 7:2: "the first housband was Sinne, and our fleshe was the wife: their children were the fruits of the flesh."

<sup>xxii</sup> *Confessions*, trans. Henry Chadwick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), Oxford World Classics, 15. Rebecca Helfer argues that Spenser incorporates from Augustine a strong and comprehensive counter-imperial perspective; see *Spenser's Ruins and the Art of Recollection* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012).

<sup>xxiii</sup> Mallette, *Discourses of Reformation England*, 55.

<sup>xxiv</sup> The Virgilian association, linking *FQ* II.i.59.7-9 to *Aeneid* 6.329-30, is suggested by Kaske, "'Religious reuerence,'" 130-3, cited in Hamilton's gloss on the lines.

<sup>xxv</sup> Persuasive variations on this thesis are offered by Madelon S. Gohlke, “Embattled Allegory: Book II of *The Faerie Queene*,” *ELR* 8 (1978): 123-40; Lauren Silberman, “*The Faerie Queene*, Book II and the Limitations of Temperance,” *MLS* 17 (1987): 9-22; Mallette, *Discourses of Reformation England*; and Harry Berger, Jr., “Narrative as Rhetoric in *The Faerie Queene*,” *ELR* 21 (1991): 3-48, rpt. in *Situated Utterances: Texts, Bodies, and Cultural Representations* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2005), 173-217.

<sup>xxvi</sup> For a useful gloss on the Pauline terms flesh (*sarx*), body (*soma*), and spirit (*pneuma*), see Borris, “Flesh, Spirit” (21). Norman K. Farmer (despite his combative tone) usefully explains how the symbolism of *sarx* and *soma* underpins the allegorical narrative of Book II in “The World’s New Body: *Spenser’s Faerie Queene* Book II, St. Paul’s Epistles, and Reformation England,” in Jean R. Brink and William F. Gentrup, eds., *Renaissance Culture in Context: Theory and Practice* (Aldershot, England: Scholar, 1993), 75-85. For a recent and more detailed exploration of the Greek phrase translated as “bodie of this death,” and especially of its relevance to the Maleger episode, see Judith H. Anderson, “Body of Death: The Pauline Inheritance in Donne’s Sermons, Spenser’s Maleger, and Milton’s Sin and Death,” in Anderson and Jennifer C. Vaught, eds., *Rhetorics of Bodily Disease and Health in Medieval and Early Modern England* (Surrey, England: Ashgate, 2010), 171-91.

<sup>xxvii</sup> *Works* 35: 377.

<sup>xxviii</sup> *The Work of William Tyndale*, ed. G. E. Duffield (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1965), 187.

<sup>xxix</sup> “Slander,” in *Lucian*, ed. with an English translation by A. M. Harmon (New York: Putnam, 1913), 1:365.

<sup>xxx</sup> See e.g. Whitney’s *In occasionem*, in *A choice of emblems* (1586, no. 181), available online through the English Emblem Book Project, accessed 6/3/14 at (<http://collection1.libraries.psu.edu/cdm/ref/collection/emblem/id/502>)

<sup>xxxi</sup> This form misrecognition may be distinguished from the one illustrated in Guyon’s failure to locate himself in the death-scene of Mortdant and Amavia. Both are failures to know the self accurately in relation to others, but here the emphasis falls not on the defensive distancing-of-self Guyon practiced in the earlier episode, but on the dynamics of projection and displacement.

<sup>xxxii</sup> Cf. the analysis of this passage by Silberman, “Limitations,” who concludes that Phedon “is attacked by a trope” (14).

<sup>xxxiii</sup> For a careful exposition of this perspective together with a useful review of the criticism from Woodhouse (1949) to 1970, see Patrick Cullen, “Guyon Microchristus: The Cave of Mammon Re-Examined,” *ELH* 37 (1970): 153-74. For the resonances of Christ’s descent into hell—especially in Langland’s retelling—see Christopher Bond, “Medieval Harrowings of Hell and Spenser’s House of Mammon,” *ELR* 37 (2007): 175-92, and Leo Russ, “Medievalism without Nostalgia: Guyon’s Swoon and the English Reformation Decensus ad Infernos,” *Spenser Studies* 29 (2014): 105-47.

<sup>xxxiv</sup> The precise physiological cause of Guyon’s faint is identified by James Broaddus, “Renaissance Psychology and the Defense of Alma’s Castle,” *Spenser Studies* 19 (2004): 135-57, as a too-sudden access of cooling air: “Weak from hunger and a lack of sleep, Guyon faints from Galenic hyperventilation” (137). Broaddus sees the faint anticipated in

the description of Guyon's shocked response to the sight of Mortdant, Amavia, and Ruddymane at i.42.1-4 (141). The moral significance of the faint is diagnosed by Berger, *Allegorical Temper*, as a form of pride (quoting Burton on self-love: "commend his Temperance, and he will starve himself," 29). Jonathan Goldberg, *The Seeds of Things: Theorizing Sexuality and Materiality in Renaissance Representations* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2009), offers an intriguingly different take on Guyon's faint, or death, in the course of a powerful reading of "Christian materialism" in the 1590 *Faerie Queene* (102-5).

<sup>xxxv</sup> Berger observes, "Guyon is not the Christian relying upon God but the [Aristotelian] megalopsychos relying on himself" (*Allegorical Temper*, 16). This contrast will be stressed again when Guyon rebukes the classical figure Tantalus (vii.60) but does not respond at all to Pilate (62).

<sup>xxxvi</sup> "The Death of Guyon" 97-8 (see note 3). In "'Send your angel': Augustinian Nests and Guyon's Faint," *Spenser Studies* 28 (2012): 107-32, G. Hubbard argues persuasively for a complex Augustinian network of references to baby birds falling from the nest as an additional source for the imagery of this episode; it does not necessarily follow that Guyon is to be understood as a fledgling Christian.

<sup>xxxvii</sup> Cf. James Carscallen, "The Goodly Frame of Temperance: The Metaphor of Cosmos in *The Faerie Queene*, Book II," *UTQ* 37 (1968): 136-55: "if these somehow combine into an army, we must be witnessing the very order of disorder, just as we are witnessing the very power of impotence" (149).

<sup>xxxviii</sup> Cf. Berger: "It is not in Guyon's nature to be aware of Maleger" (*Allegorical Temper*, 87).

<sup>xxxix</sup> Helen Cooney, "Facie ad Faciem: Reader, Protagonist, and Self-Reflection in Spenser's Legend of Temperance," in *Enigma and Revelation in Renaissance English Literature: Essays Presented to Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin*, ed. Helen Cooney (Dublin: Four Courts, 2012), offers an analogous discussion of the reader's implicit involvement at this moment in the allegory (109-10).

<sup>xl</sup> My description of allegorical recognition converges with Jane Grogan's analysis of Spenserian allegory in *Exemplary Spenser: Visual and Poetic Pedagogy in The Faerie Queene* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009). Grogan is focused specifically on the uses of ekphrasis in allegorical narrative, but her account of the way "the experience of the literal level of Spenser's narrative induces critical distance at the moments of maximum absorption" (109) may apply more broadly to moments of allegorical recognition within the narrative.

<sup>xli</sup> The contrast is to Maleger as "most strong in most infirmitee" (xi.40.8), although this Pauline keyword (Rom 6:19, "the infirmitee of your flesh") tracks back to Mortdant in canto i: "The strong it [passion] weakens with infirmitee" (57.7).

<sup>xlii</sup> See, e.g. *Summa Theologica*, Supplement, Question 12, Article 3, Objection 1: "It would seem that the definition of satisfaction given in the text (Sent. iv, D, 15) and quoted from Augustine [Gennadius Massiliensis, De Eccl. Dogm. liv] is unsuitable—viz. that 'satisfaction is to uproot the causes of sins, and to give no opening to the suggestions thereof.' For the cause of actual sin is the fomes. ['Fomes' signifies literally 'fuel,' and metaphorically, 'incentive.' As used by the theologian, it denotes the quasi-material

- 
- element and effect of original sin, and sometimes goes under the name of ‘concupiscence.’ [Cf. I-II, 82, 3]. But we cannot remove the ‘fomes’ in this life. Therefore satisfaction does not consist in removing the causes of sins.” Online, accessed 6/4/14 at <http://www.newadvent.org/summa/5012.htm>.
- <sup>xliii</sup> “The Wife of Bath’s Prologue,” in *The Riverside Chaucer*, Third Edition, ed. Larry D. Benson et al (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987), line 510.
- <sup>xliv</sup> *Natale Conti's Mythologiae*, trans. John Mulryan and Steven Brown (Tempe, Arizona: ACMRS, 2006), 489.
- <sup>xlv</sup> *The Gods Made Flesh: Metamorphosis and the Pursuit of Paganism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 242.
- <sup>xlvi</sup> “The Art of Veiling in the Bower of Bliss,” *Spenser Studies* 1 (1980): 165.
- <sup>xlvii</sup> *Spenser and Ovid* 103.
- <sup>xlviii</sup> Commentators have long disagreed about Guyon’s destruction of the Bower. Cf. the conclusion of Gerald Morgan, “The Idea of Temperance in the Second Book of *The Faerie Queen*,” *RES* 37 (1986): “To describe Guyon’s destruction of the Bower of Bliss as an act of intemperance is to subvert the principles on which Spenser’s great poem has been constructed” (39). Jessica Wolfe, tracing Spenser’s revision of the Homeric canons of hospitality and gift-exchange in Books I and II, compares the destruction of the Bower to “Odysseus’s slaughter of the suitors in *Odyssey* 22,” arguing that both are “often misconstrued as excessively violent” (“Mythography of Strife,” 1256). Kasey Evans, *Colonial Virtue: The Mobility of Temperance in Renaissance England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), seeks to move beyond praise or blame with a historicist thesis asserting that “The dissonance of Guyon’s ‘tempest’ therefore attests neither to a lapse in character nor to a failure of readerly rigour, but instead to an expansion of the concept itself into uncharted and challenging territory” (4).
- <sup>xlix</sup> For an account of the ways in which the complex play of perspective in descriptive passages serves to emphasize “how distinctly literary is the version of place presented,” see Andrew Mattison, “The Indescribably Landscape: Water, Shade, and Land in the Bower of Bliss,” *Spenser Studies* 25 (2010): 79-108; quoted phrase from p. 94.
- <sup>1</sup> Robert M. Durling, “The Bower of Bliss and Armida’s Palace,” *CL* 6 (1954): 335-47, rpt. in A. C. Hamilton, ed., *Essential Articles for the Study of Edmund Spenser* (Hamden, Conn.: Archon, 1972), 121.
- <sup>li</sup> “Wring Out the Old: Squeezing the Text, 1951-2001,” *Spenser Studies* 18 (2003): 85.
- <sup>lii</sup> “The Bower of Bliss,” *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, 107.
- <sup>liii</sup> *Amoretti* 76.3, 6, in *Edmund Spenser: The Shorter Poems*, ed. Richard A. McCabe (New York: Penguin, 1999).