Edmund Spenser's *A View of the Present State of*

Ireland: Sovereignty, Surveillance, and Colonialism

by

James William Daems

B.A., University-College of the Fraser Valley/

Simon Fraser University 1995

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of English

© James William Daems 1997

Simon Fraser University

September 1997

0-612-24116-5

Canadä

APPROVAL

NAME: James Daems

DEGREE: Master of Arts (English)

TITLE OF THESIS: Edmund Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland:* Sovereignty, Surveillance, and Colonialism

Examining Committee:

Chair: June Sturrock

Samuel Wong, Senior Supervisor
Assistant Professor of English

Paul Budra
Assistant Professor of English

Patricia Badir
External Examiner
Assistant Professor of English
University of British Columbia

Date Approved: *August 28/97*

ABSTRACT

Edmund Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland* is firmly situated within the Elizabethan culture of surveillance. Secrecy and surveillance are key aspects of this colonial text. By contextualizing Spenser's tract in the culture of surveillance, we are able to examine the link between sovereignty and surveillance not only within a courtly economy of secrecy, but also on the colonial periphery. In addition, we see how surveillance and sovereignty are intertwined, a conjunction that is often ignored in new historicist readings of early modern literature which have relied on Michel Foucault's dichotomous periodization of display and surveillance.

I argue that Spenser utilizes a deployment of secrecy in order to draw the attention of a potential patron. This, in turn, draws colonial Ireland into the competitive, political quest for empowering secrets. But, in doing so, Spenser's enquiry into Irish affairs reveals a critical attitude towards the sovereign. His location on the periphery of power allows Spenser to imagine the colony's relationship to the court in a challenging way. *A View*'s representation of Ireland is, ostensibly, a representation of England, a space in which the interlocutors of the dialogue negotiate sovereign power through subtle cultural exchange: the imposition of an English mode of surveillance on Ireland and the appropriation of bureaucratic and cartographic discourse, for example. Spenser's tract points to the failures of the colonial project of plantation that

are, in fact, traced to the sovereign: Elizabeth I, queen of England and Ireland. Elizabeth I, I suggest, **is** both the gendered and the Irish other of Spenser's text, and the desire to establish a male patronage bond is an attempt by Spenser to influence a process which will put an end to the Irish "troubles" as well as fashion himself against the sovereign other.

Dedication

To my parents, for all their support.

Perhaps I just make out

Edmund Spenser,

dreaming sunlight,

encroached upon by

geniuses who creep

'out of every corner

of the woods and glennes'

towards watercress and carrion.

       --Seamus Heaney, from "Bog Oak"

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Samuel Wong and Dr. Paul Budra for their time and assistance. I would also like to acknowledge Mandy Reynolds-- without her sense of humour, the process of writing this thesis would have been a far more difficult task.

Table of Contents

Introduction: Spenser and the Court

My thesis examines the central importance of secrecy and surveillance in Edmund Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland*. The tract manipulates the deployment of secrecy and demonstrates the need for a constant surveillance of subjects in order to draw attention to its author's hopes of gaining courtly preferment. What I will argue in the following chapters is that Spenser focuses his hopes on a type of patronage relationship particularly determined by the court climate in the late 1590s--that of intelligencer to spymaster. *A View* situates Spenser within the growing field of Elizabethan intelligence which became more and more important as a means of gaining and controlling political power. This developed into a distinct culture of surveillance and secrecy concerned not only with issues of national security, such as the continuing Spanish threat, Jesuit infiltration, and treason plots, but vital to the competition for influence at court.

Intelligence networks developed largely through the individual efforts of influential court figures such as Sir Francis Walsingham, the Earl of Leicester, and Lord Burghley. Intelligence gathering at this time was often haphazard, linked to the individual spymasters and their own sense of what were the most pressing threats to the state. These individual efforts gradually coalesced into a secret service through the efforts of Walsingham. Yet, as providing reliable intelligence to the queen became a means to greater influence at court,

targets of surveillance expanded beyond issues of state security. As the

opportunity of gaining preeminence at court through martial deeds

evaporated, the importance of intelligence gathering increased.

Norbert Elias states that the jostling for position by courtiers "unleashed the

only kind of conflict--apart from warlike deeds in the king's service--which

was still open to the court nobility, the struggle for position within the court

hierarchy." Elias argues that one of the primary methods used in this conflict

was surveillance of one's rivals--observing people.[1] This is evident in the

Elizabethan court of the 1590s when the contending factions of the Essex and

Cecil patronage networks developed following the death of Walsingham.

Observing people, foreigners or Elizabethan subjects, inside or outside the

court, was a political necessity. The patronage networks were an important

means of gathering observations, and as the observation of rivals became more

important, rivals' patronage networks became objects of surveillance: "the art

of observing people shaded into an intense competition for information about

immediate rivals and foreign affairs. Such knowledge meant political power."[2]

The art of human observation, the surveillance of rivals, never considers

the individual in isolation but as an individual located and observed within a

particular context, "as a person in relation to others."[3] This created

repercussions throughout the various patronage networks and is important in

relation to Spenser's hopes for courtly preferment in the 1590s. As the

individuals who created these surveillance networks died or, in Burghley's

case, withdrew from office (though he still worked behind the scenes to further his son's career), two rival networks took their place: one centered on Burghley's son, Robert Cecil, and the other gathered around the Earl of Essex. Essex was aware of the potential of intelligence as a way to political power. His career was founded on martial deeds and he felt this to be his greatest asset over his rival Cecil. However, by the 1590s, "All eyes were now on the compelling figure of Essex, because his annexation of war as the key to power began to look severely lopsided."[4] Fortunately for Essex, Anthony Bacon's return to England in 1592 allowed the earl to attempt to take advantage of intelligence as a means to Elizabeth's approval.[5] In *A View*, Spenser presents himself as one who can provide a patron with information gathered in politically tumultuous Ireland which can be of use in the courtly competition for political influence. That patron, hinted at but not named, is Essex.

Secrets became a social currency, garnered through the observation of rivals and their patronage networks. Wherever patronage extended in society, surveillance followed, producing observations and delving into secrets which were useful in the shifting power alignments of court struggles. This flux, the continual rise and fall of courtiers, often the result of intelligence, prompted a sustained search into secrets to be valorized and exchanged in this court economy. But the relationship of intelligencer to patron within this context was, at times, a dangerously unstable one for both parties. Secrets empower their possessor: "first the fact of possessing secret knowledge confers power,

and divulging that special knowledge creates a bond or feeling of intimacy between confider and confidant(e)."[6] William Slights may present a too simplistic model of the dynamics of this type of relationship. Many intelligencers continually pleaded with their patrons to receive the promised remuneration. In addition, intelligencers were often expendable--cast off when their services were no longer needed. In regards to the patron in this relationship, the fallout following the Essex rebellion is evidence of how intelligencers can turn into accusers. There was always the lurking danger that an intelligencer was a double agent planted by a rival: "Clients are the intermediaries who both link patrons together and keep them apart, and 'ill intelligence'...is a threat that gives followers a certain power in the patronage relationship."[7] Yet, certainly, the relationship at its best, from the perspective of both parties, could lead to higher status for the intelligencer and the patron. The patron's rise in status--higher court appointments--enabled him to provide higher patronage appointments to his clients, and the intelligencer who provided him with the useful information in the competitive court could expect such appointments.

This process, however, involves a profound paradox--for secrets to be empowering, one must either reveal them or at least call attention to the fact that one has secrets. In a culture of surveillance, one may invest in the strategic deployment of secrecy by cloaking an empty secret or secrets in the apparatus of secrecy in order to call attention to oneself. Richard Rambuss has argued

that "the chief investment in a secret may not be in the actual content of the secret--which may or may not be disclosed at any given moment, or may even have been known all along; rather that investment could be simply in the employment of the apparatus of secrecy. Sometimes that is all there is: the form of a secret, hollowed out, concealing nothing except its own emptiness."[8] The deployment of secrecy is a form of display, an adornment meant to draw attention to the person signalling the possession of secrets. I will argue that this is a central issue in *A View*. Spenser's deployment of secrecy draws the colonial periphery into the arena of court competition and the economy of secrecy.

Within the rhetorical arena of *A View*, Spenser fashions himself through a careful negotiation of politics. The self-fashioning of the subject as an intelligencer unifies the varied Spenserian personae of colonial bureaucrat, planter, and poet by mediating power relationships and his own career hopes. We find in the tract a conjunction of self-interest, colonial anxiety, and state apparatuses which align Spenser with a field of power. As we shall see, secrets link Spenser to the power structure through the patronage networks which were all important to his social status. Patronage is the key social relationship involved here: "The constant circulation of compliments, services, and information constituted perhaps the most important bond, after kinship ties, during the Elizabethan period."[9] Such relationships were what sustained Spenser's ambition and finding and providing an influential patron with

information was one way to attempt to ensure and enhance his status. In the next chapter, I will further develop the Irish context of Spenser's tract with particular attention to how it is entwined with Elizabethan intelligence. In doing so, I will demonstrate the link between court and colonial politics that will be developed in the chapters that follow.

Chapter two will examine the issues of sovereignty, secrets, and surveillance by reading the exchange between the colonial periphery and the court through both the Rainbow Portrait of Elizabeth I and *A View*. The portrait ostensibly attempts to anchor the gaze of a culture of surveillance in the queen, and Irish secrets are an important aspect of its empowering representation of the sovereign. But in viewing the portrait through Spenser's colonial text, important issues of display and surveillance arise, particularly in regards to the queen's Irish mantle in light of *A View*'s discussion of the mantle as a troubling, protean space filled with secrets. The portrait's symbolic appropriation of such a powerful sign of cultural difference allows us to explore both Spenser's own acquisition of Irish observations and his relationship to the monarch. My analysis in this chapter serves to foreground Spenser's critical attitude towards the queen in relationship to the present state of Ireland.

In chapter three, I continue this line of enquiry by exploring examples of bureaucratic discourse that are clearly evident in Spenser's text. Both the state's and the text's desire to impose spatial order on, what they see as, an unruly

Ireland are implicated in the quest to reveal Irish secrets and stealths. Irish secrets must be evacuated in order to successfully colonize this troubling peripheral space. But the translation of these modes of discourse on the margin of power further reveals Spenser's criticisms of sovereignty by anatomizing this shifting body politic. This political anatomy, I suggest, is the way that Spenser approaches the source of Elizabeth's power, iconographically represented by her body natural. In effect, Ireland becomes the locus of power through the decentering effect of *A View*'s appropriation of, and alignment with, bureaucratic representations of power.

The issue of writing and colonialism is the focus of chapter four. Spenser's appropriation of bureaucratic discourse is one way that the link between writing and colonialism is apparent in *A View*. By applying the developments of post-colonial theory, particularly the work of Homi K. Bhabha, to Spenser's Irish text, I argue that the self-fashioning of the subject is intimately linked to what may be called a secretarial prosaic negotiated in the act of writing Ireland. The resulting strain of attempting to produce a knowledge of Ireland clearly comes to bear on the text, which is essentially unable to imagine the colonial whole because of the continued resistance of the colonized. This process reveals not only the author's struggle with Ireland, but also his struggle to authorize and fashion himself in relation to the sovereign subject. The queen herself is subject to the ambivalence of the Irish stereotype of *A View*, and it is on this basis that the negotiation of self-fashioning is

enacted.

Finally, the Epilogue will revisit the *Amoretti and Epithalamion* volume in light of my analysis of *A View*. This brief comparison-contrast of a poetic representation and a prosaic representation of Ireland further develops the issue of self-fashioning within a culture of surveillance. I argue that the failure of the imaginative vision in *A View* is the result of its author being unable to find an appropriate metonym for colonial projection--a projection made possible in *Epithalamion*, though with some troubling undertones, by the marriage ceremony.

1   Spenser and the Elizabethan Culture of Surveillance

Spenser's existence on the "geographic margins" of the community he addressed in his writings was not necessarily disempowering in regards to his quest for patronage.[1] The role of intelligencer permits Spenser to relate his own aspirations in Ireland with both the wider colonial and court-political processes.[2] Yet, Ireland clearly presented the Elizabethans with a decidedly difficult problem in terms of its relationship with the center of power, the court. Was Ireland a kingdom or a colony? Although Ireland was part of the realm by virtue of An Act That The King And His Successors Be Kings Of Ireland (1541), which subsumed the Irish kingship in the English sovereign (while keeping the Irish king in a subservient position within the body in which it was unified), Ireland was often written of in terms of a colony. Robert Payne's *A Briefe Description of Ireland* (1589) is just one example of a contemporary Irish tract which publicized the country's bounty for the purpose of colonial plantation. In terms of representing Ireland as part of the kingdom, the shift of the English sovereign's status in Ireland from lord to monarch produced a corresponding shift in how the ongoing conflict in the country could be imagined: "Under this new dispensation a systematic war of subjugation could be presented not as an aggressive conquest of an alien people but as a defensive operation designed to secure the good order of the realm against rebels."[3] Yet, seeing Irish rebellion in these terms was also

contested by writers of the period. Spenser clearly calls for a reconquest of both an alien people and fallen subjects. Ireland's continued existence as a place unamenable to control and civility caused the English to vacillate between seeing resistance as a sign of inherent barbarism or as a sign of unruliness in terms of fallen subjects.

Even on the administrative level, uncertainty on Irish policy existed, and particularly as regards the office of Lord Deputy of Ireland. Once this office was freed of the factional struggles of the Anglo-Irish Geraldine and Butler factions, it "acquired amongst the English courtiers a status of unprecedented importance."[4] The office consisted of considerable powers and status, as John Hooker's account of the 1569 session of the Irish parliament demonstrates: "On the first day of which parliament, the lord deputy, representing her majesty's person, was conducted and attended in most honourable manner unto Christ Church, and from thence unto the parliament house, where he sat under the cloth of estate, being apparelled in the princely robes of crimson velvet doubled or lined with ermine."[5] The opportunity of representing her majesty in Ireland, however, also subjected the office to the contingencies of court competition and made the recipient's tenure a rather precarious one. A Lord Deputy found himself divided between choosing a policy which could develop a sustained and reliable support base amongst the Anglo-Irish lords in order to quell rebellion and a policy which would enable him to maintain his standing at court. Caught between the problem of colonial administration and court

politics, some Lord Deputies, according to Spenser's Irenius, chose to take the easy way out and would "only smother and keep down the flame of mischief, so as it may not break out in their time of government; what comes afterwards they care not, or rather wish the worst."[6] To institute a rigorous policy aimed at once and for all subduing Ireland could create widespread rebellion which would allow rival factions at court to tar a Lord Deputy's administration. A more determined policy of conquest, such as Lord Grey's, could lead to recall and disgrace because of "those which did backbite him" (Spenser 20). Yet, whatever policy a Lord Deputy chose to follow, his absence from court, or lack of strong patronage connections, left him open to "backbiters."[7]

This political indeterminacy and the crisis of rebellion in Ireland allowed a certain degree of freedom for writers in how they chose to represent the country. Writers and administrators could and did manipulate Ireland. Throughout the sixteenth century, English officials in Ireland increasingly began advancing their own interests over those of the crown: "The fact that they could argue that one interest served the other and that every attack on the native society was for the greater benefit of civility reveals the extent to which they had become (and saw themselves to have become) colonists rather than administrators."[8] Serving in a country of uncertain status in English perception, a colonial official like Spenser is able to fashion himself as an intelligencer by attempting to bridge this gap, to insert himself in the fissures of English power structures in Ireland as a mediating link between colony and

kingdom. This process of subjectification is, indeed, enhanced on the periphery as we shall see.

The monarch is all that holds this tenuous bifurcation together. Located at the center, Elizabeth I's body actually embodies the paradoxical status of Ireland, a problem that is also bridged by anchoring a rudimentary panoptic vision in the figure of the sovereign. In contrast to the courtly world of display that has drawn so much critical attention, more recent work on the early modern period has demonstrated the importance of surveillance in courtly culture. While visual display is an important aspect of this social context, as both a representation of power and a deflection of the general gaze, a masking, John Archer has demonstrated, through his reading of Elias, that Foucault's separation of display and surveillance into two distinct historical periods is an oversimplification of these modes of power which were actually mutually supporting.[9] Elizabeth was quite willing to exercise "visible power" while relying on her spymasters to provide the necessary intelligence that sustained the display of sovereign power.[10] Surveillance, then, and the observations that it provided, formed the dark underside of the courtly world of display.

Contextualized in this way, my work is also a development of recent Spenser criticism that examines the poet's work in light of what Rambuss has called Spenser's "secret career". Rambuss' insightful reading of Spenser's poetry through an examination of the poet's other career as secretary reveals the important link between Spenser's two careers by demonstrating how the

secretarial management of secrets infuses the poet's work. Yet Rambuss mentions Spenser's prose tract only in passing, noting how *A View* shows that Spenser, even after Lord Grey's recall, kept "himself in the thick of Irish politics"; for Rambuss, in light of his analysis of the poet's secret career, Spenser wrote *A View* as an administrator and planter rather than as a poet.[11] Curiously, while Rambuss demonstrates how Spenser embodies a poetic and a bureaucratic career, he creates a seperate Spenserian persona for *A View*. This division of Spenser moves the author of the Irish tract outside of Rambuss' focus on secretarial poetics, but many of Rambuss' insights are applicable to *A View*. Indeed, the importance of secrecy in Spenser's Irish tract enables one to extend Rambuss' notion of a secretarial poetics into an analysis of what I will call a secretarial prosaics that is developed in, and inscribed on, Ireland.[12]

Spenser's *A View*, then, raises some important and interesting issues when read through the work of Foucault and recent new historicist applications and critiques of Foucault's analysis of sovereignty and the dynamic relationship between power and knowledge. While many critics continue to analyze sovereignty in terms of its reliance on ritualized visual display, in keeping with Foucault's periodization in *Discipline and Punish*, other critics have begun to question the applicability of this periodization in a way that further develops our understanding of sovereignty. Archer convincingly argues that power and knowledge were not identical in early-modern England. Power and knowledge were mediated by intelligence within a culture of

surveillance.[13] The court model of surveillance developed and radiated out into the macrocosm of English society. As Foucault states, disciplinary models develop within closed systems and gradually expand to encompass other, finer disciplinary forms.[14] In this way, the relatively simple system of courtly observation reaches out to include the lowest reaches of society through the informants and spies that provided information that worked its way back to the center. Surveillance, then, links sovereign power and knowledge to larger social issues by operating as an "intermediary network" that "filled in the gaps."[15] As networks of surveillance widen their perspective, even the periphery is incoporated, and this is not entirely on the basis of its relation to the court in terms of colonial politics, but also because of the extension of the patronage networks and the courtly model of surveillance that they are inextricably a part of, as the office of Lord Deputy demonstrates. *A View*, then, reveals the limitations of prioritizing display over surveillance in Elizabethan England.

With these limitations in mind, Stephen Greenblatt's influential poetics of early modern power suffers by ignoring the implications of surveillance. Greenblatt writes that "this poetics...is inseparably bound up with the figure of Queen Elizabeth, a ruler without a standing army, without a highly developed bureaucracy, without an extensive police force, a ruler whose power is constituted in theatrical celebration of royal glory and theatrical violence visited upon the enemies of that glory."[16] The distinction here between the

power of the sovereign and the later development of a poetics of the modern state based on the panopticon is a bit too clear cut in its apparent reliance on Foucault's periodization. Sovereign display involves the fictionalization of power, its mystification. Display often effaces the importance, the essential role, of surveillance and secrecy. While Greenblatt defines sovereignty in terms of what it lacks, the panoptical dream already existed in early modern England. The networks of surveillance reduced the number of people necessary to exercise power and increase the number of those on whom it was exercised.

Clearly, to turn once again to *A View*, for those like Spenser on the fringes of court society in search of patronage, providing information became an important avenue into a patronage relationship. Alan Haynes states that "Without a regular army to fight in and no obvious career networks based on merit to sustain their hopes, young men with an education could only welcome an approach from the spy masters."[17] While Haynes stresses the passive role of the potential intelligencer, I will argue that Spenser actively attempts to engage the attention of a spy master in writing and, at least intending to publish, *A View*. As Daniel Javitch has argued, writers outside of the court's inner circles "had to rely on the publication of verse...in order to advertise the *beau semblant*, the cunning and other courtly refinement they possessed but could not otherwise display."[18] While Javitch specifies verse, publishing prose also allowed a writer to display these talents.

This strategy is evident in Spenser's literary career from as early as 1579. The young Spenser appears to have realized the potential of acting as an intelligencer as a means to patronage: Spenser's life, his limited association with important court figures, his years in Ireland, and his literary aspirations are all implicated in the Elizabethan culture of surveillance. Rambuss speculates on whether Spenser acted as a courier for Leicester. The evidence comes from the Spenser-Harvey correspondence. In a letter dated, ostentatiously, "Leycester House. This. 5. of October. 1579," Spenser hints at just such a commission on the Earl's behalf. He states that he has no spare time and "ere I goe: which will be, (I hope, I feare, I thinke) the next weeke, if I can be dispatched of my Lorde, I goe thither, as sent by him, and maintained most what of him: and there am to employ my time, my body, my minde, to his Honours service."[19] Rambuss points out that carrying letters was a common duty delegated to secretaries, "But Spenser's grandly enunciated claims...seem designed to suggest that something more is at issue than a routine courier assignment. One possibility would be intelligence work, and it was not at all uncommon in the period for letter carriers, messengers, and, once again, secretaries to double as spies."[20] Whether or not this commission ever occurred is debatable, yet it shows Spenser's awareness of Elizabethan intelligence and the possibility of such work for securing patronage.

Spenser has also been linked by critics to other courier assignments. All of these, excepting one, however, remain as doubtful as the Leicester issue

discussed above.[21] But one of these conjectural courier assignments ties in neatly with Spenser's later bureaucratic positions in Ireland and his self-presentation as a potential intelligencer in *A View*. Alexander Judson notes Spenser's link to the Sidney and Leicester circles and suggests that Spenser may have carried dispatch to Sir Henry Sidney, Lord Deputy of Ireland, in 1577.[22] This claim ties in with the debate of whether Spenser was in Ireland in 1577 that is centered on the description of a 1577 execution in *A View*.[23] Sidney around this time was desparately in need of trustworthy intelligence. Late in 1576, Sidney set out from Dublin to deal with a rebel force that had recently attacked Athenry. His attempts to engage the rebels, and his letters to the Privy Council lamenting a lack of reliable intelligence, demonstrates the English colonial administration's desparate need for information. Sidney and his military force soon became lost and harried in the "wild north-west" of the country:

> presently I am, in a Kinde of actuall Warre, and contynuall Searche for the Rebells; sometymes dispersing one Parte of my forces into one Parte of the Countrey, and sometymes into another, as I was directed by the best Intelligence where their Haunte was...I hope to make an Ende of the Matter, but if I cannot, whyles I shall remayne here, by Reason of their often Flitting from Place to Place, in soch secrete Sorte, as I cannot have trewe Intelligence of theim, and where they lurcke.[24]

Spenser may or may not have actually had a hand in carrying dispatch to Sidney, but Sidney's letter illustrates the vital connection between intelligence and the Irish wars. If we recall Elias' comments and Essex's career,

we see how the same dynamic operates within court rivalries: court politics is "a Kinde of actuall Warre" reliant on intelligence. Spenser's self-presentation in *A View* as one who has gathered observations would make him of use to Essex, the man he intimates is the best candidate to undertake the military campaign to subdue Ireland. Reliable intelligence would be essential in ensuring the success of any military expedition in Ireland, and it would also be of use in court factional rivalries to guard against "backbiters". Indeed, when Spenser is recommended for sheriff of Cork by the Privy Council (of which Essex was a member), he is represented as a man "endowered with good knowledge in learning and not unskilful or without experience in the service of the wars."[25] This is not surprising, as Spenser had already proven himself in the field of Elizabethan intelligence. As the Lord Deputy's secretary, Spenser personally dealt with intelligencers and messengers, paying out hundreds of pounds as "rewards" during his two year bureaucratic stint.[26] Donald Bruce asserts that "Spenser ran a mail office and rudimentary intelligence service in Dublin, where he was in charge of the transmission of official dispatches and the payment of messengers and informants."[27]

But in 1598 Spenser himself did carry dispatch to England from out of the turmoil of the Tyrone Rebellion, arriving in London on Christmas Eve with letters from Sir Thomas Norris, Lord President of Munster, to the Privy Council. In itself, this may not be a particularly important episode, but it does provide a more definite link between Spenser and the role of courier--a service

Spenser may well have carried out several times in the preceding decades. This courier assignment, however, curiously parallels another, more interesting incident involving Spenser and dispatch.

In September 1594 another courier made the crossing from Ireland to England. Sir Robert Needham, recently knighted for his service in Ireland, crossed the Irish Sea carrying dispatch--and poetry: Spenser's *Amoretti and Epithalamion*. When published, this volume was affixed with an Epistle Dedicatory by the printer William Ponsonby dedicating the work to Needham: "This gentle Muse for her former perfection long wished for in Englande, nowe at length crossing the Seas in your happy companye (though to yourself unknowne) seemeth to make the choyse of you, as meetest to give her deserved countenance, after her retourne."[28] Needham may well have known that he was carrying Spenser's poems, but if we accept Ponsonby's dedication, a couple of interesting questions arise: what is intended by this elaborate, secret transportation of poems dedicated to their unknowing courier? Did Spenser include secret instructions to Ponsonby regarding the Epistle Dedicatory?

This event, then, suggests some interesting points that link *Amoretti and Epithalamion* with *A View*, placing these texts in the context of Elizabethan intelligence. First, Spenser's volume of poetry becomes a literary award for secret service done by Needham, much like the "rewards" Spenser paid messengers and informers in his position as secretary in Ireland. In so doing,

Spenser cuts into the patronage network, giving a public reward for Needham's service. Second, the incident demonstrates an individual manipulation of the prevalent intelligence apparatus and confirms Spenser's familiarity with the passage of documents between Ireland and England as well as a grasp of their importance. And finally, *Amoretti and Epithalamion* is a very personal volume of poems. The poet manipulates the apparatus of surveillance in order to reveal himself to the court. The volume is at once both a personal and a colonial document, a revelation of the good subject. The poems reveal the author's inner, privy thoughts to his social peers and betters in a bid for patronage. But, by announcing himself through such secret means, the volume and its mode of appearance in England also demonstrates the internalization of the courlty world of surveillance: "Elias relates courtly observation to the form of self-observation that it produced, and to an idiosyncratic writing practice, which comprehended the memoir, the aphorism, and the historical example."[29] *Amoretti and Epithalamion* as self-revelation fixes the poet within a courtly world in which the observation of people is an essential aspect of power. The absent poet announces his existence through a technique of power.

Spenser's manipulation of Elizabethan intelligence methods is evident in the dispatch and publication of *Amoretti and Epithalamion*, and he once again returns to these methods as a strategy of self-presentation in *A View*. Dispatch opens a space in which we can read Spenser as intelligencer--a space

somewhere between the "here" and the "there" of *A View* itself. And dispatch also alerts us to the issue of exchange between the colony and the center of power in such a way that can provide, to adapt a comment by Greenblatt to my purposes, "insights into the half-hidden cultural transactions" that empower literary texts.[30] But we must never lose sight of the colonial implications of the exchanges that I will discuss in the following chapters, for, as Edward Said has written, "In modern times...thinking about cultural exchange involves thinking about domination and forcible appropriation: someone loses, someone gains."[31] Each of the following chapters, then, will explore an issue of cultural exchange between Ireland and England in Spenser's text.

2   The Secrets of Ireland: "who will better search into them may find more"

Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley have argued that English representations of Ireland are, in fact, reflexive. They are representations of England negotiated in the colonial space of a discursive geo-political construction called "Ireland".[1] *A View* is clearly one such example. Spenser's text brings a culturally conditioned perception to bear on Ireland, reproducing the culture of surveillance that developed at court and inscribing this culture on the colonial space. In this chapter, I will examine the role of secrets in this cultural exchange; specifically, how *A View* invites its readers to measure the text's value in terms of the amount of secrecy invested in it.[2] In doing so, it provides us with an interesting insight into sovereignty and surveillance on the periphery. Spenser's work is an example of the discursive outpouring arising from political turmoil in Ireland that prevented the smooth imposition of colonial power. The constant fissures caused by rebellion frequently laid bare the operation, and limitations, of English rule. *A View*'s investment in secrecy indirectly produces a knowledge of Ireland that, while intended to bolster English colonial power, ends up exposing the very mechanisms of sovereign power. The analysis of the Irish situation does not necessarily subvert sovereignty in the process, but, rather, highlights its workings in a critical manner through its often difficult balance of arguing for the need of an efficient mode of private surveillance in Ireland while attempting to work

within the official public fictions of power.

The Lord Deputy's susceptibility to "backbiters" juxtaposed to John Hooker's description of a Lord Deputy's ritualistic display, cited earlier, opens the whole issue of the relationship between sovereignty and surveillance as it manifests itself, and is negotiated in Spenser's tract, in Ireland. Surveillance is potentially subversive of a power that relies on display. In a now familiar new historicist equation, power creates a culture of surveillance which produces its own potential subversion which in turn is powerfully recontained. The importance of display in court society develops from "[t]he intense scrutiny of each manifestation of a person...to determine whether or not he is respecting the traditional boundaries proper to his place within the social hierarchy...[and] springs directly from the mechanism of absolute rule in the court society and the hierarchical structure of society centered around the king and the court. This sensitivity forms in the ruling class as an instrument of self-assertion and defence against the pressure from those of lower rank."[3] Yet, this bold display does not preclude surveillance. In *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault states that power is tolerable only if it masks its operation,[4] and the visual display of the monarch is perhaps the most important masking device in the early modern period. While the display of the monarch's body often takes precedence over surveillance in many new historicist accounts of sovereignty, I want to explore the deployment of secrecy in the visual display of the monarch as an attempt to recapture the subversive potential of a culture of surveillance that locates

the queen at the center of the general gaze. This deployment becomes evident

as we examine a representation of Elizabeth I which links these issues with

Ireland--the Rainbow Portrait--in order to develop our understanding of the

periphery's relationship to the center, in terms of both the colony to the court

and the subject to the queen, and to suggest a way of reading Spenser's own

deployment of secrecy in *A View*.

Daniel T. Fischlin's recent article on the Rainbow Portrait considers

several of the allegorical readings of its symbolism, and Fischlin argues that

the portrait ensures "that the covert political foundation of absolutist ideology

engage the viewer."[5] The covert mechanisms of power, here symbolized by the

eyes and ears on Elizabeth's cloak, are incorporated in a display which,

ostensibly, is meant to mask, to mystify the operation of power through the

deployment of secrecy. The portrait mystifies surveillance in terms of the

supposedly omniscient, divine knowledge of the monarch. The wide

dissemination of this mystification of knowledge is evident in texts like the

"Exhortation Concerning Good Order and Obedience to Rulers and

Magistrates." In the "Exhortation" God's omnipotence and omniscience meshes

with the power of the monarch. His omnipotent absence is made present in the

all-knowing monarch, in the visibility of the monarch's body. All

transgressions will be discovered: not only will sins be spied out, in keeping

with the "Exhortation's" use as a sermon; "treason, conspiracy, or rebellion"

will also be discovered.[6] These assertions are supported with a quotation from

Ecclesiastes: "Wish the king no evil in thy thought, nor speak no hurt of him in thy privy chamber; for the bird of the air shall betray thy voice, and with her feathers shall bewray thy words."[7] Much like the Rainbow Portrait's eyes and ears, the fable of the bird is a mystification of a pervasive surveillance in early modern England. Surveillance penetrates the privy chamber of the mind and soul and speaks the unspoken of one's secret musings. The "Exhortation" assumes the subject's internalization of its mystification of the omnipotence of knowledge. Similar to the general gaze, the observation of rivals at court, the efficiency of surveillance is dependent upon producing self-censoring subjects.

What is the monarch's function in this field of power? The Rainbow Portrait implies that the queen sees and hears all. The portrait appropriates a motif from Cesare Ripa's *Iconologia* in which the spy is represented in a cloak covered with eyes, ears, and tongues; appearing on the queen's cloak, the motif represents, "in a less censorious vein, the many servants who provided her with intelligence."[8] It is important to remember that one of the queen's mottos was *video et taceo*--"I see and keep quiet." Archer states that "In some respects it is less a matter of the queen watching from the center, than of her image serving as the central representation of the paranoia that each member of court society felt before the general gaze."[9] Archer's comment opens the possibility that the deployment of secrecy evident in representations of the queen may be just that, a deployment to call attention to her central position of power within a culture of surveillance where the secrets themselves may

simply be empty: purely an adornment intended to recapture the subversive potential of surveillance.

Yet, while the portrait clearly associates knowledge and power with the body of the sovereign and suggests the important mediating factor of surveillance, tongues are not represented on the queen's cloak. This absence may be an attempt to remove the queen from the taint of trading in court gossip, and this is also in keeping with the motto of *video et taceo*--the queen's mouth is closed. The secrets, if there really are any, are enlocked within the sovereign's body. The portrait invests in a deployment of secrecy in order to heighten the anxiety of those located within the culture of surveillance by anchoring the gaze, and secrets, in the queen's body. It is an attempt to place the monarch in a position overseeing all, managing court rivalries that depended so much on a competitive quest for secrets. But the portrait also invests in a far larger context of surveillance by drawing on the secrets of the periphery, for the queen is wearing an **Irish** mantle covered with eyes and ears. Michael Niell states that the portrait is the last of the royal icons in which Elizabeth identifies the idea of the English nation with the display of her royal body, and that the painting "is a frightening assertion of a royal power so absolute that it can absorb the very signs of barbarism into its scheme of civilizing control.... In a move that boldly appropriates the most threatening of all images of degeneration, it is now the queen who assumes the Irish cloak of inscrutability, here emblazoned, however, with the signs of her all-seeing

power."[10] Ireland is represented as firmly within the colonial gaze but also as a place of secrets that empower the sovereign.

Niell points out the Irish significance of the portrait's historical moment by reading the motto *Non sine sole Iris*: "'There is no Rainbow without the Sun', but also (since Iris was one of the ancient names for Ireland, cited by Cambden and Diodorus Siculus) 'there is no Ireland without her queen'!"[11] Niell argues that the portrait alludes to the "imminent" defeat of the Irish rebels by Mountjoy and that the mantle symbolizes the incorporation of the subdued Ireland into the gaze of sovereign power.[12] These comments are useful in situating the portrait within the contemporary Irish troubles. But Niell moves a bit too quickly past the mantle and the issue of surveillance to present the portrait as celebrating the incorporation of Ireland into the realm. Ireland was not totally incorporated into the gaze through Mountjoy's military victories, and more importantly, what have **Irish** secrets to do with this deployment of secrecy? Niell suggests this problem when he states that the queen "assumes the Irish cloak of inscrutability." This issue is important and requires an analysis that focuses on the Irish secrets gained by surveillance and how these secrets are appropriated. The secrets of Ireland empower the queen: the power of display relies on the surplus value of secrets drawn from the periphery. Elizabeth herself, in a letter to Mountjoy, instructs her Lord Deputy to extract Tyrone's secrets as a condition of his surrender: Tyrone "shall promise to you to reveal all he knows of our enemy's purpose."[13] So perhaps the portrait's

motto can be reversed: Is there a queen without her Ireland?

The Ireland of *A View* is, like the sovereign body, a place of secrets; here the divided imagination of Ireland as kingdom and colony must be adduced. The Rainbow Portrait represents, of course, not only the English monarch but also, at least in legal theory, the Irish monarch. Yet, something is intriguingly askew here: a Lord Deputy of Ireland "apparelled in the princely robes of crimson velvet doubled or lined with ermine"[14] and the queen apparelled in one of *A View*'s most powerful symbols of cultural difference, an Irish mantle. Spenser's text allows us to examine the mode of exchange between Ireland and England that may suggest one reason for this displacement of cultural symbols. The extension of colonial authority locates "the princely robes" on the periphery and, in turn, makes the queen problematically Irish.

Irenius is a "well-eyed man" (Spenser 40) who has gathered a great deal of information on Ireland--information from a very wide social base including the sexual transgressions of Irish women and the abuses of Lord Deputies. He identifies numerous points at which the state apparatuses can be brought to bear in bringing about the reformation of Ireland that he espouses. The observations discussed by Irenius and Eudoxus are an attempt to make her majesty's Irish subjects (including the Old and the New English) visible and audible to the colonial power structure, preparing the way for the imposition of a normalizing concept of English law and customs. The first step in this process is to deprive those located in the colonial space of their secrets.

Approaching the Irish troubles by employing an apparatus of secrecy demonstrates the permeation of society by the culture of surveillance. The Irish, like the queen, are seen as inscrutable: their secrets, like their mantles, cloak them.

The relationship between surveillance, secrets, and sovereignty becomes problematic, however, if we focus on the Irish mantle and keep in mind the Rainbow Portrait. Irenius and Eudoxus' discussion of mantles occurs early in the dialogue and serves as an essential part of the argument put forth by Irenius that the Irish are barbarous, that they are of Scythian descent. Irenius establishes this by reference to the mobile Irish lifestyle, a mobility facilitated by the mantle:

> Moreover, the people that live thus in these Bollies grow thereby the more barbarous and live more licentiously than they could in towns, using what means they list, and practising what mischiefs and villanies they will, either against the government there generally by their combinations, or against private men, whom they malign by stealing their goods and murdering themselves, for there they think themselves half exempted from law and obedience, and having once tasted freedom do, like a steer that hath been long out of yoke, grudge and repine ever after to come under rule again. (50)

Irenius demonstrates that the mantle is perfectly suited to the Irish lifestyle that is conceived as existing outside of civil boundaries. He associates the mantle with outlaws, thieves, and rebels, to those "wandering in waste places far from danger of law...[far] from the sight of men" (51). The mantle sustains these unruly activities, as the thief can conceal his stolen goods under

his mantle and, like the outlaw and the rebel, use it as a "house" to lay in wait for his victims: "Besides all this he or any man else that is disposed to mischief or villainy may, under his mantle, go privily, armed without suspicion of any" (52). In terms of gender specific transgressions, the mantle is a convenient cover for the "lewd exercise" of the monashut; she can hide her "bastard" under her mantle (53). The mantle even transforms "good" women into lazy women. Eudoxus, who had at first believed the mantle to be perfectly suited, in a positive way, to the Irish lifestyle, eventually agrees with Irenius' argument that the mantle should be abolished.

The mantle is a powerful symbol of cultural difference, a symbol that conflates a variety of transgressions as well as gender. It is a symbol of "a protean, masculine and warlike yet feminine and seductive, intimate, veiling, nurturing, protective space.... As a fluid, changeable and property-less place, the space facilitated by the mantle represents everything that is alien and threatening to Spenser and the English forces."[15] The mantle is also a symbol of both the degeneration of the Old English and of English colonial frustrations-- its space must be colonized; its secrets must be revealed. This protean space is fundamentally different from that of "sedentary state-forming cultures."[16] It is a privy, self-enclosed space, allowing a certain degree of troubling autonomy to the Irish within a terrain contested as colonized. Power must be brought to bear on these bodies, on the Irish body politic. Scott Wilson states that sedentary space is a clearly demarcated, enclosed space in contrast to the space

inhabited by nomads. Adapting the concept of nomadology from the work of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, Wilson writes, "nomad space is smooth, marked only by 'traits' that are effaced and displaced along the nomadic trajectory. The latter, smooth space is exterior to the enclosed, striated space of the State."[17] The exteriority of this space, paradoxically, allows the state to demarcate its own interior space. The exterior space is "waste" against which the civil space is constructed. This contrast is evident even in the Rainbow Portrait: the mantle enwraps the queen's striated, civil body--a body demarcated by legal and gender ideology. The exteriority of the transgressive space of the other gives the sovereign body its definite shape and its cultural significance. There is no queen without her Ireland.

As Lord Deputy Sidney's 1576 trek around the island demonstrates, the nomadic space is really nowhere, unlocatable within the colonial structure. Much like the displacement of the princely robes and the mantle, Ireland seems to turn England inside out. The space symbolized by the mantle dissolves colonial power structures (laws, boundaries, etc.) of the striated space of the State and encloses it within its own shifting, protean space where things are hidden, transgressions committed, and rebellious conspiracies developed-- at least from the English perspective. If the nomadic trajectory cuts across what has been established as a demarcated, civil space, it leaves in its wake a spectacle of traces: "waste". Sidney describes these traces in a letter to the Privy Council: a "'horrible and lamentable Spectacle there are to beholde, as the

Burninge of Villages, the Ruyn of Churches, the Wasting of such as have ben

good Townes and Castells: Yea, the view of the Bones and Sculles of the ded

Subjectes.' As Sidney traverses Ireland, the country presents itself to him as a

jumble of relics, what is left after random insurrection has exploded the realm

into spatial chaos."[18] *A View* is riddled with similar examples of "spatial chaos".

Secrecy is intricately entwined with the control of social space, with

order and disorder. The colonial space must be evacuated of its secrets in

order to strengthen colonial power. The space that is so threateningly

symbolized by the mantle must be hollowed out and, as the Rainbow Portrait

suggests, occupied by the empowered icon of the sovereign's body. The result

of such a process, the central military strategy that Irenius puts forward, is the

"void" left by famine. Ironically, the "waste" must be "wasted":

> Out of every corner of the woods and glens they came creeping forth upon their
>
> hands, for their legs could not bear them. They looked anatomies of death, they spake
>
> like ghosts crying out of their graves, they did eat of the dead carrions, happy were
>
> they could find them, yea and one another soon after in so much as the very carcasses
>
> they spared not to scrape out of their graves, and if they found a plot of water cress or
>
> shamrocks, there they flocked as to a feast for the time, yet not able long to continue
>
> therewithal, that in short space there were none almost left and a most populous and
>
> plentiful country suddenly left void of man or beast. Yet sure in all that war there
>
> perished not many by the sword, but all by the extremity of famine, which they
>
> themselves had wrought. (104)

These, then, are the opposing poles of secrecy/surviellance: the Rainbow

Portrait's empowered display of sovereignty and the void of those deprived of

secrets. Yet, while this space remains a site of conflict, the queen's mantle, and the secrecy it displays, is a problematic signifier of not only her Irish realm, but also of her sovereignty. Anne Fogarty writes that in the famine passage "The negative presence of the Gaelic tribes becomes transformed into an absence and what is left behind is the free space within which the plot of colonialism can unfold itself."[19] But this is still only a possibility in the text. Only the defeat of the rebels, particularly if we recall that the portrait may have been painted at the time of Mountjoy's defeat of Tyrone, allows this space to be at least represented as colonized. This was not possible in 1596. Spenser appears to realize how empowering Irish secrets can be, and, in *A View*, he clearly attempts to align himself with a patron by signalling his own possession of Irish secrets.

What I am suggesting is that Spenser's *A View* is located in the shift in Spenser's later works that Rambuss has identified. Rambuss argues that the 1596 edition of *The Faerie Queene* turns away from taking the queen's dictation to dictating to the queen. The subversive potential of a culture of surveillance, centered in the body of the queen, is important in this respect. The poet attempts to unlock the empowering secrets "enlocked" in the sovereign breast and moves, in this process, away from writing in the service of the female monarch to stressing the important patronage bonds of "more highly-valued male ties."[20] This relationship is established through secrets that circulate within a culture of surveillance, empowering their possessor as they work their

way through the hierarchy and increase in exchange value. The dynamic of the discussion between Irenius, who possesses secrets, and Eudoxus, who wants to know, demonstrates the important aspects of the circulation of secrecy. To state the obvious, we see the bond between possessor and confidant that Slights mentions, and this is a male bonding, mediated by secrets. But the dialogue also reveals that the interlocutors, located within a culture of surveillance, are also being observed: when discussing the faults of high colonial administrators, Irenius states "under Benedicte I do tell it to you"; in fact, at Eudoxus' cautionary statement--"Take heed what you say, Irenius"--Irenius repeats this interdiction: "To you only, Eudoxius, I do tell it" (90).

All are located within the general gaze. Not only are the Irish objects of surveillance in the power-knowledge dynamic; Eudoxus and Irenius are also under observation. The dialogue and the Rainbow Portrait both reveal the power of secrets and the mediation of surveillance that encompasses both Ireland and England. The text and the portrait demonstrate not only the importance of intelligence; they also demonstrate the very paradox of secrecy. One that possesses secrets has to, somehow, signal their possession or the secret(s) is not empowering. Doing so in a text intended for publication, the reader is also an observer, witnessing the deployment of secrecy as well as garnering information.

The danger involved in a competitive culture of surveillance which attempts to anchor the gaze in the female monarch, who must manage court

rivalries and realms by garnering intelligence herself through servants, is that these male ties can actually subvert her power. Located at the center of the gaze herself, the queen may become an object of surveillance for her male courtiers. All eyes are, in turn, on her. While representations of power, such as the Rainbow Portrait and the "Exhortation", are attempts to deflect the gaze through a deployment of secrecy, Spenser's text makes it clear that the queen does not know all, that the official fictions are, indeed, fictions. Secret information in the hands of either the Irish, the Old English, or her male courtiers which is concealed from the queen is a potential threat to her sovereignty.

A View, in fact, decenters the queen, reacts against the general gaze and attempts to turn it back on the queen by focussing on the secrets of this unruly half of her body politic. Spenser's search into Irish secrets, in terms of both their use in the colonial context and the court-political context, as well as in his own patronage hopes (the establishment of a male bond), is an attempt to find the secret of Elizabeth's political power--a woman who had ruled for some forty years at the time Spenser wrote his Irish tract. The gender ideology that demarcates her civil body, and which she associates powerfully with the nation, is important here. Louis Adrian Montrose states that, on one level, Elizabeth is the focus for her subjects' national identity; however, in relation to the male subject, this devotional identification may involve a profound tension, a divided desire to worship and to resist: "Within this configuration of relation

and identity, the stance of *The Faerie Queene* toward what Greenblatt calls 'the autocratic ruler' of the Elizabethan state becomes necessarily ambivalent--alternating or simultaneously adoring and contestatory--because, for the male subject, the authority and the other are now one and the same."[21]

The stakes involved in this economy of secrecy are clearly raised by seeing the queen as other, in terms of both gender ideology and cultural difference as represented by the portrait. Spenser's construction of an Anglo-Irish identity is, in fact, constructed against the queen. Maley makes an interesting comment in light of this: "Is it not ironic that the utter extirpation of the Irish desired by Spenser under his beloved Gloriana could only be attained when the English throne was vacant, and unqualified executive power was placed in the hands of the viceroy?... The persistent myth of the unerringly loyal courtier is a fiction which ought to be exploded for once and for all."[22] The next two chapters will in some ways be a response to Maley's suggestive question, as Spenser approaches the issue of the queen's power through both her body natural and her split body politic. Elizabeth I is the other, in terms of gender and cultural difference, of *A View*.

3   Spatializing Elizabeth I's Irish Body Politic

Edward Said has suggested that culture and the imperial contest are both closely related to the land: "At the moment when a coincidence occurs between real control and power, the idea of what a given place was (could be, might become), and an actual place--at that moment the struggle for empire is launched."[1] The opening exchange of *A View* is good evidence of Said's claim. Spenser's text immediately alerts us to the importance of land--Eudoxus asks, "But if that country of Ireland whence you lately came be so goodly and commodious a soil as you report, I wonder that no course is taken for the turning thereof to good uses, and reducing that savage nation to better government and civility" (1). We are launched directly into the colonial struggle, a struggle over social space that is reaffirmed by Eudoxus in a later exchange when he encourages Irenius to inscribe his plot for the reformation of Ireland on the "fair champion" laid open before him (37).

The Elizabethan state had been attempting to impose its colonial structure on Irish land since the mid-sixteenth century. In 1557 and again in 1569, acts to convert "waste grounds" into shire grounds were passed in the Irish parliament. The 1557 act authorized a commission,

> to view, survey, and make inquiry of all the towns, villages, and waste grounds of this
>
> realm, now being no shire grounds, and upon the said view, inquiry, and survey, to
>
> limit, make, nominate, and divide by certain limits and bounds, all such towns,
>
> villages, and waste grounds within this realm, being presently no shire grounds, nor

county, into such and as many several counties, shires, and hundreds, as to the said

commissioners shall be thought most meetest and convenient.[2]

The act asserts that diverse crimes are committed within these places and that

these crimes are not only harmful to the monarch's subjects, but also that these

crimes, by escaping punishment and thereby encouraging like offences, are in

turn causing the loss of "diverse and sundry true subjects."[3] Waste grounds are

clearly represented as outside of an operating view of power. Through

spatializing the landscape, social control will be ensured, it is hoped, by

enabling the state to locate its subjects and, if need be, to bring other

apparatuses to bear on a transgressive subject or subjects. Spatialization is an

attempt to constrain subversive potential in order to produce "subjects", to

colonize space through the imposition of normative social relations. But once

again, the transcription of English colonial desires on Ireland goes askew in the

exchange between colony and center.

The state imposes limits, demarcates space, and encloses it within

structures that facilitate its operation. These boundaries are not strictly

repressive; they are also productive boundaries that invest colonial bodies with

a system of domination and transform the unruly energy of the Irish in order

to produce colonial power.[4] But the process is a difficult one. As we have seen

in the previous chapter, the Irish space so threateningly symbolized by the

mantle for Irenius evades these totalizing English social structures, is always

outside, always transforming itself. The mantle is, paradoxically, everywhere

yet nowhere due to the troubling mobility of the Irish lifestyle and the colonial

administration's inability to locate both the colonized and itself in this space.

The problem is evident if we consider the bureaucratic intention of the act to restructure the geography of Ireland along with another closely linked project--cartography. At the same time that Spenser began his published literary career, Christopher Saxton's atlas of Britain was published, allowing the English to take "effective visual and conceptual possession of the physical kingdom in which they lived."[5] Saxton's maps, however, included Ireland only on their margins as "a nearly blank outline which provided the site for the cartographer's elaborately framed commentary (the inscription of an English text on Irish terrain)."[6] Throughout the sixteenth century, no detailed map of Ireland existed even though Lord Deputy Sidney, in 1568, had a London cartographer in his entourage who was to "'take a view'" of Ireland.[7] Sidney's attempt to track the rebel force that attacked Athenry in 1576 clearly demonstrates the inadequacy of the existing Irish maps. If the project of defining the striated space of the state is accomplished, and enabled, against the smooth space of the nomad, it would appear that this can only be accomplished if the colonial power structure can locate itself within the nomad space. This could not be done because the Irish rebels roamed within the ever shifting colonial terrain. At any time, they could transgress the boundaries of the striated space. Rebel attacks were often directed at vulnerable points of the colonial structure, and these acts were not of "unthinking violation":

> Wherever the line was drawn--along the banks of a river, around the precincts of a

town--they attacked. But this disregard was mixed, we should note, with a shrewd appreciation for the transgressive uses to which those boundaries could be put.... By toppling its [Athenry's] gates and walls, and trying to smash its revered emblems, they subversively entered into the discourse by which the English were trying to organise the space of their colony. They demonstrated that colonial power could not determine how its demarcations would be received by the natives, who slipped in and out of the symbolic terrain the colonisers had mapped as easily as they doffed English clothes and assumed their 'wonted **Irish** Weede.'[8]

Spenser's Irish tract shares the enabling visual trope of these bureaucratic functions in offering a "view." Julia Reinhard Lupton points out the important links between the title of Spenser's work, its political content, and its mode of representation in relation to cartography. Lupton states that *A View* offers "a view, re-view, and pre-view of Ireland's present, past, and future; in each case, Spenser's work remains a survey **of the land**, a fundamentally geographical perspective in which the topographic, synchronically systematising, and visually ordering connotations of 'view' comprehend and organise the text's chronological moments."[9] The denotations of a "view" also imply that such a work is not only a survey but also a plan or plot, as is apparent in the relationship between surveying the Irish landscape and plotting a plan for the realm's reformation.

The spatialization of the realm demarcates the monarch's power, represents her authority over the land, writes her presence on it. Yet, as Richard Helgerson has shown, the cartographic project can be read as working

against this goal. Cartography strengthened national identity by relating it to the land, but did this at the expense of a national identity based on the monarch: "Maps let them see in a way never before possible the country--both county and nation--to which they belonged and at the same time showed royal authority--or at least its insignia--to be a merely ornamental adjunct to that country. Maps thus opened a conceptual gap between the land and its ruler."[10] Spenser's text, I suggest, by employing these bureaucratic modes of discourse, is located within this conceptual gap. As Helgerson states, the need to represent the land, Ireland in Spenser's case, in all of its geographical features, place names, etc. necessarily decenters the monarch's central importance.[11] Cartography involves a conflict of representation pitting the land against the sovereign where the land wins. This victory was facilitated by the realization of historical discontinuity in relation to ruling dynasties, even in relation to the monarch's body natural--the land remains essentially the same in its outlines. It is a stable icon, in the form of a map, of national identity.[12] The impress of the sovereign is quite literally pushed out to the margins of the cartographers national icon. This decentering is all the more easily accomplished in Ireland because the view occurs on the periphery. The contest for representation that is involved in Ireland, between land and monarch, reveals a certain degree of ambivalence on the part of the Elizabethan subject in the act of cultural production. This is evident if we look closely at Irenius and Eudoxus's call for a geo-political restructuring of Ireland that puts forth very similar ideas to

those of "An Act to Convert Waste Grounds to Shire Grounds".

The purpose of spatialization in *A View* reflects the colonial administration's desire to locate its Irish subjects (including the Old English) within a recognizable structure of social relations which allows for the observation of every social nuance. Spatialization imposes boundaries that facilitate surveillance in order to produce and maintain civility: "One goal of Spenser's policy is to get the Irish out of their 'waste places far from danger of lawe'...and into the **English** desert of pure visibility."[13] Lupton, too, while pointing out the importance of visibility--of both the sovereign and the subjects--effaces the importance of the modes of surveillance that underlies it. Visibility alone does not ensure, and does not produce, "true subjects". Spatialization imposes a matrix of visibility on the land, but it cannot, of itself, uncover those troubling secrets that Irenius claims are everywhere. Indeed, the imposition of a normalizing social matrix on Ireland actually invites further, more threatening transgressions within the body politic. The problem is a profound one: "As English colonialism strove to impose itself on Ireland's recalcitrant terrain--and **because** it thus strove to impose itself--it found itself in (literally) uncharted space, drawn beyond the limits of its own plausibility."[14]

Even as Irenius provides an example of how such a system of spatialization would work, at least ideally, in Ireland, it breaks down, revealing "the limits of its own plausibility" by associating Irish with English

subversion. He recalls the England of King Alfred to clarify his understanding of the Irish situation at Eudoxus's promptings of just how one might ensure containing all subjects in obedience. King Alfred's realm, states Irenius, much like Ireland, was "greatly infested with robbers and outlaws which lurked in woods and fast places" (143). Irenius delineates a complex division of the realm into smaller and smaller units for the purposes of dealing with this problem which is suited to the limited resources of the monarch to police his or her subjects. Alfred divided his realm into shires, the shires into hundreds, the hundreds into rapes or wapentakes, and the wapentakes into tithings (ten tithings making a hundred and five tithings making a wapentake). In addition, an elder, or an upstanding subject, called a boroughman or tithingman, was responsible for the obedience of his tithing.

The logical progression of Irenius' description is interesting. He moves from the king, as ensuring the good order of the realm, down through to the tithingman, as ensuring good order in a smaller local social unit. Yet, as power focuses down in its attempt to ensure order, when Irenius discusses how an unruly person affects and is dealt with in this structure, the imposition of social boundaries quickly collapses: the transgressor causes the smallest local division to expand with repercussions within a larger unit of surveillance. As the transgression reverberates outward from its locality, from tithing to shire, for example, subjects are expected to join together and "not rest till they had found out and delivered in that unlawful fellow which was not amenable to

law" (144). At its most subversive, those unamenable to law could quite possibly exceed and encompass the realm if those within each demarcated space did not carry out their role of finding out and delivering the unlawful subject. This is clearly the danger addressed in the waste grounds of Ireland where transgressions may well draw true subjects to rebellion. Power brings itself to bear within this system, through a variety of mechanisms operating in conjunction, on increasingly smaller, more manageable units. Within these units "neighbours or next kinsmen" are "privy" to the transgressor, "the which institution, if it were observed in Ireland, would work that effect which it did then in England, and keep all men within the compass of duty and obedience" (144). The creation of ever finer divisions, divisions which gradually focus down on the body and the subject's privy thoughts, is in effect dividing in order to reconstitute a political whole. As Irenius states, "this manner of tithing the polls will work also in Ireland, for by this the people are broken into many small parts like little streams that they cannot easily come together into one head, which is the principal regard that is to be had in Ireland, to keep them from growing into such a head and adhering unto great men" (147).

The contrast here between the rebel attack on Athenry and the symbols and boundaries of English colonial presence and this spatial model of social control are interesting. Irenius' model presents transgression as coming from within the operative boundaries of the hundred division and radiating, potentially, outward. Yet, the rebel attack presents a different picture--

transgression comes from outside of the constructed civil boundaries. The rebels that attacked Athenry wore English garb before crossing the established colonial boundary of the River Shannon when they changed into Irish clothing. Here, then, the shifting boundaries that mark the inside and the outside of the colonial structure are fascinatingly fluid. The other point of note here is that, in the example of Alfred's England, the breaking down of the body politic concentrates determined local points of contact in terms of power relations--the possibility of being "privy" to the thoughts of others in the hundred. This possibility does not exist in the nomad space outside of civil bounds, a space defined by the way in which it can be turned inside out.

The dialogue utilizes a number of strategies for evacuating the Irish space of its secrets in order to colonize it with its own techniques of power. Much of the discussion of Irish social relations and the secrets that these entail "has the function...of repressing disorder by revealing invisible structures of fealty in the country."[15] Irenius employs both the discourse of bureaucratic spatialization and linguistic means, among others, to locate the Irish within a rudimentary panoptic gaze. First, sight lines must be created, opening the landscape, revealing the hidden. Irenius calls for the "cutting down and opening of all places through woods, so that a wide way of the space of a hundred yards might by laid open in every of them for the safety of travellers"; the construction of strategically placed bridges "so as none might pass any other ways"; the construction of wooden castles to overlook "straits

and narrow passages"; the construction of fences on either side of the highways, "leaving only forty foot breadth for passage, so as none should be able to pass but through the highway"; and the creation of market towns to prevent the Irish from making "their secret bargains amongst themselves" (164-5). The plan becomes one of disciplinary space, the geo-political reorganization of Ireland: "the very act of making Ireland a governable place means that it will have to become like England."[16]

This process is an intricate one which leads the dialogue to delve into a coupling of the idea of civility and labour--an open circulation of both civility and labour; for example:

> And moreover, at every of these forts I would have the state of a town laid forth and encompassed, in the which I would wish that there should inhabitants of all sorts of merchants, artificers and husbandmen to be placed to whom there should charters and franchises be granted to incorporate them, the which as it will be no matter of difficulty to draw out of England persons which would very gladly be so placed, so would it in short space turn those parts to great commodity, and bring ere long to Her Majesty much profit. (128)

Towns enrich the country and the realm and they also produce civility "by reason that people repairing often thither for their needs will daily see and learn civil manners of the better sort". Market towns bring trade into the open, putting an end to the "secret bargains" amongst the Irish (165); for example, cattle would be branded and traded in an open market (166). Peace brings profit, and only when "no part of all Ireland shall be able to dare so much as

quinch" will Irenius' reformation begin for the good of the realm (140). The process of civilizing the Irish in this manner is, in a startling way, also linked to the cartographic project. Both Irenius and Eudoxus see the need not only to restructure and rename geographical locations in order to eradicate an Irish identity; they also see a need to rename the Irish, including the Old English who have degenerated to the point of taking on Irish names (155).

The attempt to make Ireland governable by imposing English systems of surveillance, however, poses a significant problem in the text. This problem is linked to the relationship between Ireland and England in a way that adds to Hadfield and Maley's assertion that English representations of Ireland are representations of England. Terry Eagleton has identified this problem of English representations of Ireland as an indecision on the part of the English as to whether the Irish other is antithesis or mirror-image, arguing that, at the point where Ireland is recognized as England's mirror image, the danger of alienating one's civil identity becomes paramount to the writer.[17] This is the problem highlighted by Irenius' claims, much to Eudoxus' consternation, that the Irish are not the only problem--the Old English are backsliding. They "are degenerated and grown almost mere Irish, yea and more malicious to the English than the very Irish themselves" (48). The Old English clearly mark out the bounds of the current Irish crisis; according to Irenius, they are not really English anymore--they have grown as Irish as O'Hanlan's breech (66). Ciaran Brady calls this realization a humanist crisis: "Ireland confronted England's

over-confident humanists as a harsh reminder of the resilience of barbarism

and the vulnerability of civility; it defied their most basic assumptions that

reason and order could overcome chaos."[18] The realization of the abyss of

Ireland and the alienation of civil identity leads to the dialogue's revealing of

the mechanisms of power that keep civil identity in check, even in England--

surveillance. The text reveals the possibility that the "English" character may

simply be a result of a functioning system of surveillance that is traced back to

the time of King Alfred.[19]

The map that plays such an important part in the last half of the

dialogue is a tool of this power. As Bruce Avery states, a map is an

"institutional apparatus" which, in *A View*, enforces a single perspective of

Ireland in the developing dialogue.[20] The single perspective is both ideological

and material in its function. This perspective allows Irenius and Eudoxus to

pinpoint areas of strategic importance at which the colonial administration can

focus the state apparatuses. The appearance of the map is the culmination of

the romance rhetoric that Irenius often uses. The dialogue opens with a

discussion that laments that "so goodly and commodius a soil" should be put

"to good uses" by reducing "that savage nation to better government and

civility", according to Eudoxus (1). Irenius, however, presents the problem in

very idealistic terms: "the fatal destiny of the land", "the very genius of the

soil", the "influence of the stars, or that Almighty God hath not yet appointed

the time of her reformation, or that He preserveth her in this unquiet state still,

for some secret scourge which shall by her come unto England" (1). Ireland is, for Irenius, a "Pandora's box" (2). For the pragmatic man of state, Eudoxus, however, such explanations are not useful. They are the "vain conceipt[s] of simple men": "I would rather think the cause of this evil, which hangeth upon that country, to proceed rather of the unsoundness of the counsels and plots" (1). He clearly attributes such mystical explanations to men who have failed in their purposes and "are ready always to impute the blame thereof unto the heavens" (1). The wise man, says Eudoxus, "shall rule even over the stars, much more over the earth" (2). The map, then, as a technology of power, provides visual proof of this last assertion (or, at least, projects this claim onto Ireland, though it isn't really successful in terms of the present state of Ireland) "that the object represented could be commandeered and captured in its entirety."[21] Following the map's appearance in the dialogue, the discussion becomes more material. Irenius and Eudoxus can further express the colonial desire for possession through a great deal of statistical data regarding the land.

However, as Helgerson suggests, this necessarily involves decentering the monarch. The map, as an iconic representation of the land, enables Eudoxus to see the boundaries which contain subjects geographically, producing a dialectic of self and territory. Indeed, Irenius' plan is to break the Irish identification with their land in order to create a new Anglo-Irish identification between land and subject.[22] The official fictions of power, the theory of the monarch's two bodies in particular, becomes significantly

strained by such an identification. If, as the Rainbow and Ditchley portraits suggest, the queen's body is representative of the land and its geo-political boundaries, then Spenser's attempt to represent the land, to a certain degree freed of this association, results in an anatomization of the royal body. The secrets discovered in this process do not empower the queen--rather, the use of the map as an icon of power by Irenius and Eudoxus redirects the secrets of Ireland toward a more bureaucratic representation of power. Irenius may be, ironically, correct. The problem of Ireland is one with "the very genius of the soil" (1). Bureaucratic strategies can deal with this problem by demarcating and textualizing the land, but the apparent discontinuity of royal policy prevents this. In Spenser's text, English dynastic struggles are, at least partly, to blame for the Irish situation by adding "fatal mischief[s]" to the colonial troubles; for example, at "the time that the division between the two houses of Lancaster and York arose for the Crown of England: at which time all the great English lords and gentlemen which had great possessions in Ireland repaired over hither into England...to strengthen their party for to obtain the Crown" (14). The War of the Roses allowed the Irish to overrun and reclaim their land. Dynastic conflict enhances the difficulties of continuity for the colonial project. The antithetical becomes the mirror image: the Irish troubles are entwined with the "troubles of England" (Spenser 14).

In terms of the colonial and court utility of the Irish information discussed in *A View*, we see a competition for representation which decenters

the authority of the sovereign and attempts to relocate power in the periphery by aligning itself with these bureaucratic strategies and a figure capable of enacting the called for reformation. The problem here is one of gender and the boundaries that this imposes on the body--both in terms of the feminization of Ireland and the queen. Here, again, we can briefly return to the portraits of Elizabeth I to examine the gender issue involved. The Rainbow Portrait, in its confined representational space, is very much like the Armada Portrait which represents "Elizabethan power in the queen's virginal self-containment."[23] Montrose's reading of the Armada Portrait alerts us to the intricate modes of representation in Elizabethan iconography, and he states that the virginity of the royal body "transforms the problem of the monarch's gender into the very source of her potency" by identifying the corporeal body natural with the nation's geo-political boundaries.[24] While Elizabeth was wonderfully adept at managing the boundaries that constrained her by virtue of her gender, her body natural was never entirely free of her society's views of women. Power impacts on the body and produces subjects, including the queen, whose body is representative of her society's "risks and problems."[25]

This connection was an Elizabethan commonplace. We need only recall "An Act for provision to be made for the surety of the Queen's Majesty's most royal person and the continuance of the realm in peace" which asserts that the continued peace of the realm is dependent on the preservation of the queen's natural body: "Forasmuch as the good felicity and comfort of the whole estate

of this realm consisteth (only next under God) in the surety and preservation

of the Queen's most excellent Majesty."[26] The connection is also clear in the

Ditchley portrait. As Anne Fogarty states, the portrait subsumes the entire

political order in the iconic figure of the queen "while the map which acts as a

synecdoche for her subject people effectively cancels their presence from the

scene."[27] She does, indeed, dominate the scene. Yet, in a fascinating way,

having Elizabeth's civil, striated body represent the land is problematic. The

jewels on her dress echo the place markers on the map; or, perhaps the place

markers echo the jewels, curiously subverting the royal icon by prioritizing the

map as defining the royal body. The demarcation of space that is involved in

the project of cartography marks out the queen's body in a challenging way,

allowing for the queen herself to be mapped through the anatomization of her

body politic. Not only does the map allow Spenser to imagine Ireland in a new

way, but it also allows him to construct a challenging imagination of political

power.

The symbol of the sword in the tract is important in this respect. Only

through the exercise of the sword can the reformation of Ireland be achieved,

according to Irenius. But the problem of gender must be overcome. Annabel

Patterson argues that even in portraits Elizabeth is not represented as holding

the sword of justice, not even in *The Faerie Queene*, Book 5 does Mercilla hold

the sword. In *A View*, "Spenser acknowledged that those lines were inevitably

a metaphor for the military agency of others. The pamphlet requires the

existence of a male figure who would wield the sword of victory and pursue the hunt if the queen would only let him: Robert Devereaux, second earl of Essex, who, though unnamed, is clearly indicated."[28] While the queen's virginity is mirrored in her Irish body politic, this is no longer the source of her potency. Indeed, in terms of the cartographic project and its identification with the land rather than the discontinuity of dynastic rule, the queen's virginity can be seen as a potential source of further discontinuity in colonial policy in terms of the uncertainty of the succession question. A View's anatomization of the body politic shows the monarch's gender to be both a source of impotence in dealing with the present state of Ireland as well as a potential threat in terms of her dynastic title. The Irish troubles require male agency to exercise the sword that she can not wield herself. Essex's martial deeds will mollify, in Rambuss' terms, both the feminized Irish and the queen. The reconquest of Ireland must be undertaken and accomplished immediately. Gloriana, recalling Maley's comment on the irony that A View's policies were only carried out after Elizabeth's death,[29] is, on one level the Irish problem, as Spenser had already suggested in The Faerie Queene, Book 5: "In certain respects this disruption within the civilised centre results from the controlled masculine Artegall being unable to finish his work in subduing the savage margins in Eirena's kingdom. The reason for this failure seems ultimately to lie with the ideology of the Faerie Queene herself."[30] But the problem is even more complex, as the queen's gendered body is not the only reason that makes her

the source of the Irish problem--she is, in fact, as the Rainbow Portrait suggests

in its appropriation of the mantle, the Irish other of Spenser's text.

4   Theorizing Spenser's Irish Prose: "more troublous matters of discourse"

Leonard Tennenhouse has argued that throughout the Tudor and Stuart dynasties different forms of political opposition prompted different aesthetic strategies which were meant to sustain the monarch's display of authority. The distinction between political and literary language is a modern dichotomy that mistakes the Renaissance social purpose of writing--it was not a text's transcendence of issues into an autonomous realm of the aesthetic that was important, but rather its idealization, the aestheticization of sovereign power. Tennenhouse concludes that "during the Renaissance political imperatives were also aesthetic imperatives."[1] This chapter will explore the connection between politics and aesthetics in Spenser's Irish tract by drawing on Wlad Godzich and Jeffrey Kittay's work on the emergence of prose as well as Homi K. Bhabha's discussion of the racial stereotype. Godzich and Kittay analyze the ways that prose works as prose, the strategies involved in writing and reading prose in relation to poetry. In their analysis of French medieval and renaissance texts, they closely associate prose with political functions of managing social change in ways relevant to *A View*. Bhabha's analysis of the stereotype reveals the difficulties produced by the colonizers' own desire to define the other. The insights of Godzich and Kittay and Bhabha can enhance a reading of Spenser's text and recent critical work on *A View*. If we conceive of prose as significantly implicated in state functions, the problem of the other, its

opposition to power, in the colonial text ostensibly strains the conjunction of the political-aesthetic imperative.

As we have already seen, the colonial space of Ireland in *A View* is transgressive, shifting, and threatening. It is in a state of flux, of proliferating barbarism: "every day we perceive the troubles growing more upon us, and one evil growing upon another, insomuch as there is no part sound nor ascertained, but all have their ears upright, waiting for when the watchword shall come that they should all rise generally into rebellion" (Spenser 94). Spenser's prose itself bears the signs of this anxiety. In the previous chapter, I examined some of the ways in which *A View* is involved in both the bureaucratic and the cartographic inscription of Ireland. These links can be extended to include Spenser's inscription of the Irish troubles. Mapping Ireland, much like Spenser's text, is "not a one-sided affair, but a complex attempt to create coherence in a space populated by antagonistic and elusive 'others' who...[leave] their traces, their erasures on every chart."[2]

Writing Ireland involves a complex negotiation of discursive issues. *A View* engages with its colonial context, with a world in a state of flux. In *The Emergence of Prose*, Godzich and Kittay contrast prose and poetry in terms of their relation to historical process:

> In relation to verse or indeed any other form, prose assumes the position of matter.... Matter is the unavoidable, the indestructible, *l'incontournable*, 'that around which you cannot get.' It is there from the beginning...and it is what will remain after the destruction of whatever forms may have been imposed on it...prose is not inert: it does

not wait for the inspirational breath to set it in motion, it animates and motivates, disposes, arranges, assembles, and orders by itself. This is a position that prose has staked out for itself, or, if you will, that culture has demanded. It is a position of considerable power, for in a world of change, a world that acknowledges and demands change, prose, unsubstantial though it may be, holds.... Prose is much more heraclitan, it begins with change and seeks only to find ways of managing it. We have seen that in the social sphere it is the function of the state to be the manager of change, the holder of conflicts, the definer of limits.[3]

The connection here between writing and the state compliments the connection that Said has developed between culture and imperialism; in particular, the hegemonic impulse of representing the colonized as a knowable entity.[4] By developing these connections in relation to Spenser's text, *A View* allows us to see the development of what I call a secretarial "prosaic", linked to, but distinct from, the secretarial poetics of Rambuss. This is accomplished through the modes of bureaucratic discourse that the text appropriates in writing Ireland as a colonial text and the positionality this affords the speakers of the dialogue in relation to Irish events. Spenser's social position in Ireland provides him "with a discursive practice" that has a "shaping effect" on this late reconfiguration of his literary career. The management of secrets, as I have been arguing, occurs in the prose text as a means of achieving a patronage bond.[5] But this process is fraught with difficulties because of the nomadic transgressions that occur within both the colonial-geographic and the discursive landscape. The secretarial "prosaic", implicated in a state function of managing Ireland, is, in

turn, a particularly fascinating example of the process of self-fashioning which is worked out within this troubling colonial arena.

The form of the dialogue is of central importance to my reading of *A View*. Avery points out that many critics fail to take notice that the text is polyvocal.[6] Avery states that the presence of aporia as one of the text's master tropes allows a speaker to articulate a number of different perspectives without being aligned with any one in particular: "Clearly, the prevalence of such a trope in a political text indicates an uncertain, or at least contested, perspective on events." Avery also argues that Irenius does not wish to implicate himself with the ideas he articulates because he is uncertain of his relationship with the English authority represented by Eudoxus.[7] While Avery's reading is insightful, I wish to suggest that the undecidability and the contested perspective of Irish events are related to the problems of writing Ireland as well as to Spenser's own self-fashioning. Certainly, Irenius' arguments are refined through Eudoxus' questions and requests for some clarification of issues, yet it is clear that, by the end of the discussion, Eudoxus is swayed by Irenius' argument. Irenius is one who has a first hand knowledge--has gathered observations--of Ireland. Through these verbal exchanges, Irenius attempts to bring Eudoxus, and the reader, into an awareness of a particular political position in regards to Ireland, one which will allow Eudoxus to align himself with the historical process of subjection from a position, an understanding gained from within the protean Irish space.

Irenius and Eudoxus are aligning themselves with a viewpoint which attempts to accelerate the historical process towards a particular English colonial goal.

The issue of alignment involves a prose literacy and the positionality afforded Eudoxus and the reader of the text. According to Godzich and Kittay, prose readers "are the observers--participants who can block, accelerate, redirect, invert, or even abort processes. Thus they do have at their disposal a form of agency commensurate with their powers; they do not transform the world through heroic deeds, but they see the potential directions and can channel change that will occur anyway."[8] The historical process requires direction, management; this is something that writing the "troubles" and the frequent appeals to a power outside of the text seek to accomplish. Godzich and Kittay's comments on the French courtier Commynes and his attempt to align himself within factional interests are important in light of this prose literacy. They argue that Commynes' writing recognizes the flux of events but does not necessarily seek to master them; rather, the courtier attempts to understand the direction of historical flow in order "to formulate the mode of one's participation in them."[9] The flow of history is formless as is prose: "And in such a world, if history is not to be construed as imposing a form, then it must be an attempt to give us the world in its prosaic state."[10] The prose text can only formulate a participation in relation to events, can only motion outside of itself by suggesting an alignment of power that will direct change towards a desired end: the state's own managerial function, evident in the

techniques of power employed in the attempt to structure the colonial landscape. Spenser's text, the dialogue between Irenius and Eudoxus, acts out the mediation of interests as a means of defining one's participation in events.

This becomes clear if we focus on Irenius' attempts--employing etymology, geneology, and anthropology--to delineate an Irish identity and textually fix this identity as antithetical to his idea of Englishness. Here, the colonial text becomes a form of bricolage: "a discourse which is patched together by borrowings from other linguistic systems and sub-systems.... Thus, the proliferation of codes in Spenser may be attributed to the failure of language to encapsulate total meaning, while at the same time it can be recognized as a defensive strategy designed to by-pass this inadequacy."[11] The problem met with here is double-edged--the problem of attempting to fix the other in the colonial text causes language to reveal the ideological strain created by the imposition of power. This failure is evident in the text's grasping for linguistic means to "by-pass" its own "inadequacy."

Hadfield argues that the need for executive power is key to the rhetorical strategies of the text: "it is what authorizes the political discourse of the text and is thus its vanishing-point." The sword, based on the power of the monarch, is, then, the master trope of the text: "The 'sword' must reassert its right to rule Ireland and clear the ground for the legal reform which cannot take place without its effective sanction.... Vanishing-point of discourse the power of the prince may be, but it has to appear as a part of those political

discourses it authorizes. There can, of course, be no illusion of presence without representation."[12] This is, however, the very problem that Spenser works himself into, finding the adequate means of representation. Both men agree that the sword is "the most violent redress". Irenius agrees with Eudoxus' fear that to eliminate all the people is going too far, yet, the policy of famine doesn't seem very selective of its victims. What Irenius suggests is that the sword should cut off the evil Irish institutions that he has argued against earlier in the dialogue, "for evil people by good ordinance and government may be made good, but the evil that is of itself evil will never become good" (95). The text once again encounters a proliferating, self-generating evil which runs up against the plot. This flux causes the tidy inscription of juridico-political discourse to be set in motion in an attempt to curtail it: "the strains within justice as a theory are exhibited as strains on the allegorical system itself, an internal critique of the way allegory, by setting static emblems in narrative motion, is bound to reveal their inherent failures of logic or truthfulness."[13] As Wilson argues,

> Law doesn't work for the English in Ireland. In Ireland, the force of Irish resistance cannot be contained by the ideological inscriptions of power. Similarly, in Ireland, the repressive power of the English cannot be covered up by juridico-political discourse.... When the multiple forces of Irish resistance become too complex, varied, violent and effective, the notion of constraint through law becomes untenable; it is purely a question of power.[14]

The colonial text cannot contain the Irish; indeed, the text itself generates Irish

evils.

Much of this problem is contained within the very Irish stereotype that *A View* constructs. Paul Brown argues, using the work of Bhabha to critique Said's view of the stability of the other, that colonial discourse voices demands for both order and disorder, "producing a disruptive other in order to assert the superiority of the coloniser." But once the other as disruptive is so produced, the text struggles with restricting the other's disruptiveness. The colonial text does not simply affirm the triumph of civility, it is forced, by continually struggling with the other, to continually produce civility.[15] Bhabha's insights into colonial discourse can help illuminate Spenser's construction of the Irish other. Bhabha states that "An important feature of colonial discourse is its dependence on the concept of 'fixity' in the ideological construction of otherness. Fixity, as the sign of cultural/historical/racial difference in the discourse of colonialism is a paradoxical mode of representation: it connotes rigidity and an unchanging order as well as disorder, degeneracy and daemonic repitition." Bhabha calls this problem of the stereotype **ambivalence**. Ambivalence is essential to the stereotype's value in colonial discourse. It gives the stereotype its value, its iterability. Ambivalence informs the stereotype's "strategies of individuation and marginalization; produces that effect of probabilistic truth and predictability which, for the stereotype, must always be in **excess** of what can be empirically proved or logically construed."[16] Paradoxically, excess works against the desire

to fix the other and produces ideological strain within Spenser's text. He attempts to idealize authority in the face of the other's opposition, but, this cannot be achieved in the text because both sovereign authority and the other are subject to the excess of the ambivalent stereotype. Thus, the Irish "troubles" are really English "troubles."

Spenser attempts to maintain the empowering difference of an antithetical Irishness in order to produce a civil identity which is mutually sustaining within the spatial context established by the text. But doing so is, indeed, fraught with difficulties. The disruptive potential of the Irish, by necessity remains an ever present threat that will manifest itself if the productive bounds of civility are not sustained and extended in Ireland. This is clearly the case during the moments when Irenius and Eudoxus discuss previous English failures to subdue Ireland which are related to the fact that the initial imposition of normative concepts of English laws and customs was relaxed. This, of course, leads the discussion to reveal the necessity of policing boundaries through surveillance. In the current context of widespread rebellion, the call for a reconquest is a call to recontain the ruptured textual identity of the Irish--a move which would manage the crisis but cannot do away with the paradox locked within the stereotype.

Irish identity is always already defined by this English stereotype. Rebellion may somewhat rupture this fixed, yet unstable, identity; but the stereotype works both by continually justifying English repressive and

ideological control in Ireland and by making use of each rebellion, or even each individually transgressive act, to reaffirm this textual identity and produce an antithetical civility. But another problem exists here: the Old English. Irenius particularly singles them out as "degendered" subjects. They have alienated their civil identity, and the guage by which Irenius and Eudoxus measure this process is that of the other. As Patricia Coughlan states, Spenser gradually blurs the distinctions between the Old English and the "mere" Irish in order to tar both with the same brush.[17] Irenius comments that all men love liberty. Ireland permits, and in fact encourages, the English to exercise a far greater freedom than in England where they were "brought up...under a strait rule of duty and obedience, being always restrained by sharp penalties from lewd behavior" (152).[18]

The present crisis in Ireland, the release of rebellious energy which reaffirms the English construction of Irishness, in fact strains the English identity as civil--rebellion creates a crisis in which the antithetical becomes a mirror image. This mirroring poses a problem in the dialogue. At times, it seems that Irenius and Eudoxus see the other as reflecting an early, "barbaric" stage of an English identity that has progressed, through the "restraint" of law, to civility. But at other times, both men suggest that the "degendered" subject is not mirroring a pre-civil human state, but rather a subjectivity produced by Irish social relations--in effect, an Anglo-Irishness. Either way, however, releasing the disruptive potential contained within the stereotype brings with it

wider repercussions in terms of the identity of all located within the protean

Irish space.

Yet, as Baker states, the attempt to delineate the other is not a one-sided

process.[19] Resistance, the disruptive potential of the stereotype, makes itself

known. This occurs despite Irenius' attempt to efface the voices of the Irish,

even despite his appropriation of their voices. As Fogarty writes,

> Irenius may be regarded as the voice of the conquered land itself, which raises a plea
>
> for its own subjection.... By arrogating to himself the opinions of an entire people,
>
> Irenius inverts the rebelliousness symbolized by Ireland and turns it into submission.
>
> He does this, in particular, by collapsing his vantage point as omniscient colonist with
>
> his twin role as an allegory of the country itself. It is as if he becomes the only
>
> medium through which the land can express itself.[20]

The Irish do, however, leave traces of their presence in the dialogue: the

account of an old woman at a rebel's execution, a paraphrased bard's tale, an

Irish proverb (used against the Old English), women keening for the dead,

battle cries, Irish terms (i.e. tanistry), and the general Irish "hubbub". These

Irish traces cut a subversive trajectory across *A View*'s discursive landscape,

preventing their easy incorporation into the colonial text. Their presence is felt

in the very flux of the present state of Ireland as it comes to bear on Spenser's

writing of the "troubles".

The dialogue is frequently led off its "course" by Irish circumstances, in

the narrative drift of the text. The attempt to write the chaotic Irish, the

ambivalence of the stereotype, breaks into the very structure of the narrative

and disrupts its progress: "As a result, many of the altercations between Eudoxus and Irenius revolve around narrative control."[21] Eudoxus' prompting of Irenius to explain a brief reference made to Edward Le Bruce, a name dropped into an account of Irish rebel attacks that reclaimed areas under English control, is one such example. Irenius is immediately aware of the dangers in regards to the course he has set for the dialogue several pages earlier: "I would tell you, in case you would not challenge me anon for forgetting the matter which I had in hand" (16). The difficulty here, met with so early in the dialogue, is related to both the problem of Ireland's proliferating evils which so frequently lead the interlocutors afield as well as to the very problem of just what is useful information. What does a knowledge of Ireland encompass? Oddly, the Edward Le Bruce digression leads the dialogue back to England through Scotland. Eudoxus, however, assures Irenius that he will "not forget afterwards to call you back again thereunto" (17) the original course of the discussion, yet the drift continues: Eudoxus leads Irenius ever further afield--"But since we are thus far entered into the consideration of her mishaps..." (19); "Go to, then, in God's name, and follow the course which you have purposed to yourself: it fitteth best, I must confess, with the purpose of our discourse" (21); "Tell us, then, I pray you further" (25). Irenius and Eudoxus are carried away with the flow of events, the historical process of Ireland which leaves its imprint on the narrative. Much of this is, most certainly, the result of English colonialism confronting itself and its own

failures in the colonial text. The dialogue must always be wrestled back to its course, most often by Eudoxus who often prompts the digressions in the first place. Yet, the dialogue does not remain on course for long before further digressions occur. Ireland imposes itself on their discussion, defines the limits, the boundaries of Irenius and Eudoxus' discourse--it is, like the mantle, enclosing them in a protean space. Perhaps Irenius' assertion is ironically appropriate--Ireland is a "Pandora's box" (2). Wrestling with this excess, released from containment, mirrors the restrained vigilance of the civil subject. Losing complete control of their discourse would be, for both men, a loss of civil identity.

Yet, Fogarty states that there "is also a suggestion that the drift of narrative is deliberately protective of his [Irenius'] designs and that the hither and thither of his sinuous discourse is an elaborate play or feint which is needed in order to cover up the internal contradictions in his political designs for Ireland. The hidden effects of ideological strain are thus articulated by the disputes between Eudoxus and Irenius concerning the ordering and import of the discourse of colonialism which they are setting in motion."[22] These narrative wanderings, as I have already suggested, are linked to ideological strain that is implicated in the ambivalence of the Irish other. This problem is not one that Irenius and Eudoxus have any control over. Fogarty is correct in stating that the problem arises from "setting in motion" the discourse of colonialism--the present crisis has forced the interlocutors to trace the

paradoxically fixed other in the motion and formlessness of historical events. But this desire to reign in and contain the other is also involved in the colonial and individual desires expressed in the text.

The attempt to fix the other is an attempt to produce a knowledge of Ireland that is capable of leading to the reformation called for in *A View*. The disruptive potential, once realized, gives rise to an ever widening enquiry into the Irish identity. And what prompts this enquiry in Spenser's text is the author's own position in Ireland. The crisis of English officials in Ireland, suspended between cultures and political regimes, prompted them to justify their positions in writing. They did so not only to justify the monarch's prerogatives but also to promote their own interests.[23] Clare Carroll argues that Spenser's own class identity was insecure enough, in respect to the English aristocracy and the Irish feudal lords, that his text becomes a defensive strategy which enables him to align himself with his superiors and separate himself from the Irish and the Old English: "Spenser...was subject to the consequences of the Elizabethan social order."[24] Both Fogarty and Carroll see the text as a prime example of self fashioning. *A View* enables Spenser to give vent to his frustrations and voice his desires; thus, the text becomes the expression of thwarted ambition and a committed belief in an authoritarian order.[25] The persona of intelligencer that develops in the text mediates, on the one hand, between colonial flux and colonial power structures. On the other hand, it mediates between Spenser's own status in Ireland (including his

patronage hopes) and his status as an Elizabethan subject through a process of negotiation that highlights, as Archer states, the mediation of power and knowledge by surveillance.[26] Spenser attempts to manage change, to align himself within a field of power that at least appears to have "control over certain things that...[the subject] might either need or desire."[27] The ambivalence of the Irish stereotype is essential to the process of self-fashioning, for in struggling with the other, Spenser's text produces an empowering knowledge of the self as it unfolds in historical process, in the **prosaic** state of the world.

The struggle of producing the civilized self is involved in a negotiation of authority with the sovereign subject. Spenser's position in Ireland, in its historical particularity, negotiates political and cultural authority on the periphery. Foucault's manipulation of Von Clausowitz's dictum "that politics is war pursued by other means" compliments Elias' discussion of war, surveillance, and transgression in court society.[28] Elias states that courtly competition released a war-like struggle among courtiers for preferment which relied on observing court rivals.[29] The monarch is also located within this general gaze of the court, and the monarch may prompt divisions and monitor, manage these in order to bolster his or her own power, much like the bureaucratic restructuring of the social space: ever finer divisions facilitate centralized surveillance. Spenser's own patronage hopes are part of this struggle. Indeed, in relation to the monarch, this competition "only lightly

masks a competition for the possession of a part of his or her authority."[30]

This competition for authority is clearly evident in the text. In *A View*, Spenser aligns himself far more closely with bureaucratic forms of power that decenter the monarch and align him with another, martial authority--a desired male patronage bond with Essex. Spenser's bureaucratic positions in Ireland and the social status he achieved there are implicated in a split between his class origins and the ideology that he served. Locating himself firmly within this gap in his Irish text, permits Spenser a degree of political autonomy in his Irish tract: "the role of the state servant, because of its structural specificity, may promote a distinctive political awareness. It is one of the positions from which the Elizabethan state might be criticized if not subverted."[31] The Irish crisis does, indeed, prompt "radically discontinuous political strategies for idealising political authority"[32]; however, the need to stabilize the political and aesthetic imperative can only be achieved by anchoring it to the sovereign. This is not possible in *A View*. The "secretary function", involved in formulating a possible mode of participation in events and the management of change by managing secrecy, allows Spenser to realign himself from within the conceptual gaps of the text: class origin and ideology, land and monarch, colony and court.

The ambivalence of the stereotype is key to this awareness. Bhabha argues that the stereotype is always constructed in excess. This excess is also an issue in Greenblatt's examination of Spenser in *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*.

When discussing the Bower of Bliss episode in *The Faerie Queene*, Book 2,

Greenblatt writes,

> 'Excess' is defined not by some inherent imbalance or impropriety, but by the
>
> mechanism of control, the exercise of restraining power. And if excess is virtually
>
> invented by this power, so too, paradoxically, power is invented by excess: this is why
>
> Acrasia cannot be destroyed, why she and what she is made to represent must
>
> continue to exist, forever the object of the destructive quest. For were she not to exist
>
> as a constant threat, the power Guyon embodies would also cease to exist.[33]

Power and excess are interdependent; both are locked into the ambivalence of

the racial stereotype. This relationship is nowhere more striking in its existence

than in the central signifier of Elizabethan society--Elizabeth I herself, queen of

Ireland **and** queen of England. The queen is subject to the ambivalence of the

Irish stereotype and its excess against which Elizabethan subjects fashion

themselves. The queen is, on one level, the Irish other. There is, indeed, no

queen without her Ireland. The struggle to authorize the civilized self in

Spenser's text, in fact usurps the surplus energy, the excess, of the ambivalent

stereotype embodied in the queen's bifurcated body.

Epilogue: Metonymy, Colonialism, and Spenser

I want now to turn to Spenser's *Epithalamion* and compare it with *A View* in order to elaborate some of the insights offered here on the last few years of Spenser's life in colonial Ireland. Reading *Epithalamion* as a colonial text illuminates both how Spenser imagines Ireland and how he envisions the role of the author. Like *A View*, *Epithalamion* is implicated in the Elizabethan culture of surveillance: "the art of human observation is applied not only to others but to the observer himself. A specific form of *self-observation* develops.... This self-observation and the observation of other people are complimentary. One would be pointless without the other."[1] Spenser, as we have seen, employs an apparatus of secrecy in the volume's transportation to England, and the poet-groom carefully observes his bride within a social context and invites others to participate in this gaze; but, in doing so, he also reveals the subject's internalization of surveillance by presenting his inner, privy thoughts in the text.

Epithalamion, as several readers have observed, is haunted by the allusion to Orpheus in its opening stanza: "So Orpheus did for his own bride, / So I unto my self alone will sing, / The woods shall to me answer and my Eccho ring."[2] Many critics note the positive implications of this allusion by developing the contrast between the Thracian bard's loss of Eurydice and the poet-groom's "triumph...of victory" (*Epith.* 243). This reading accords with

Hieatt's discovery of the poem's complex numerological structure and its implications of cosmic harmony. However, even in some of these positive readings, critics have recognized an unsettling aspect in the allusion to Orpheus. Celeste Marguerite Schenck writes, "Invoking the archetypal bard at the outset of a marriage poem, Spenser claims competitively that he will accomplish what Orpheus failed to do: he will reverse that poet's unsuccess."[3] Yet, recognizing the possibility of "unsuccess" reveals that the bardic competition implied is fraught with the dangers of failure and dismemberment encapsulated within the Orphic narrative. I will read this unsettling danger of dismemberment as a gateway into the troubled colonial context of Spenser and his wedding poem. In doing so, I argue that *Epithalamion* imagines Ireland as an arena of colonial spectacle. This involves wedding *Epithalamion* and *A View* in their Irish context in order to draw the implications of union-- kingdom and colony.

We should not be surprised to meet with an appropriation of Orpheus in this early-modern Irish context, particularly if we recall that Horace "speaks of Orpheus as a civilizer, a harmonist of culture, in the *Ars Poetica*."[4] Orpheus is an apt figure to invoke in what is, for the English in Ireland, represented as a struggle of civility versus barbarism. This is certainly the significance of the Orpheus that Fynes Moryson, secretary to Lord Deputy Mountjoy from 1600 to 1603, invokes when discussing the faults of Irish bardic culture--"Alas! how unlike to Orpheus, who, with his sweet harp and wholesome precepts of

poetry, laboured to reduce the rude and barbarous people from living in woods to dwell civilly in towns and cities, and from wild riot to moral conversation."[5] Moryson contrasts Orpheus to the bard who labours not for civility and who, as is certainly the case in *A View*, prompts the barbarous Irish to continue in their lifestyle of "wild riot." For both Moryson and Spenser, the unsettling conclusion of the Orpheus narrative, though unacknowledged, haunts their appropriation of this civilizing force. These invocations are destabilized by the context in which their words are recorded.

If we take this displacement of the colonial struggle in sixteenth-century Ireland seriously, and understand that in the use of Orpheus what is really at issue is "civility", then the appropriation of Orpheus in the colonial periphery reveals the resistance that works against the extension of English colonial power.[6] A profound anxiety is clearly evident, although any particular author (even any critic) may attempt to efface the inherent dangers of colonial entrenchment: Orpheus loses his bride; he is dismembered. Effacing this fact is re-membering Orpheus.

The contrast between the poem and the prose tract is striking. The Ireland of *A View* is chaotic, caught in the flux of time. *Epithalamion* tenuously attempts to transcend and efface this context. The flux of time is frozen in celebration, in what Joseph Loewenstein has called the poem's "over-determined structure."[7] Yet this celebration is on the verge of collapse: Orpheus, the English bard in Ireland where "every day we perceive the

troubles growing more upon us" (*View* 94). There is no distance here from the troubles, no master of ceremonies who is "so central to his civilization that he can command echoes from every corner of his world."[8] The proliferating threat can not, ironically, be taken in in a view.

The contrast between the poetic and the prosaic politics of representation can be further developed in relation to colonialism. In *Marvellous Possessions*, Greenblatt discusses the European dream of possession in the New World and argues that one of the important ways that possession is gained is through language. The colonizer is reliant on metonymy. The place in which he is physically located allows for the imaginative expansion of his dominion:

> Everything in the European dream of possession rests on witnessing, witnessing understood as a form of significant and representative seeing. To see is to secure the truth of what might otherwise be deemed incredible.... The discoverer sees only a fragment and then imagines the rest in the act of appropriation. The supplement that imagination brings to vision expands the perceptual field, encompassing the distant hills and valleys or the whole of the island or an entire continent, and the bit that has actually been seen becomes by metonymy a representation of the whole.[9]

The marriage celebrated in *Epithalamion* is the metonymy for a colonial vision in which imaginative projection incorporates the whole colonial and cosmic order. The poet-groom establishes an imaginative, stable anchoring point for the colonial project of plantation in Ireland. This poetic view of Ireland, and the poet-groom's request for fruitful progeny, is clearly "dependent upon the

the perceived character and destiny of a particular geography."[10] *Epithalamion*'s

complex structure works to expand and reinforce the imaginative vision of the

colonial project.

A *View*, however, is unable to do this, unable to provide the imaginative

anchoring point--the Pale is not sufficient, nor, apparently, is the monarch. The

flux of the historical process calls for the exercise of the sword to trim back its

proliferation. The sword of "justice" must be put into motion and enter into a

world recognized as heraclitan, a world in need of a state power capable of

managing the flux. The text can only align itself with a power structure and

hope to accelerate the historical process because the bard is not a sufficient

agent capable of advancing civility through the creative act, an act, much like

Orpheus', which is in danger of being drowned out by the Irish "hubbub".

Most of Spenser's literary production occurs within a colonial arena of

spectacle, an arena of flux and violence. In *Epithalamion*, he creates a spectacle

of harmony, an imaginative anchoring point for a colonial vision. However, in

A *View* cultural violence is enacted in its regenerative horror: whether it be the

"anatomies of death" crawling out of the woods on their hands and knees, or

the execution of Murrogh O'Brien at which "an old woman which was his

foster mother took up his head whilst he was quartered and sucked up all the

blood running there out, saying that the earth was not worthy to drink it, and

therewith also steeped her face and her breast, and tore her hair, crying and

shrieking out most terribly" (62). The colonial arena is witnessed spectacle, a

metonymy of colonialism, yet one which does not allow for imaginative projection because the writer's words alone cannot efface resistance. The quartering of O'Brien does not crop the proliferation; indeed, it essentialy fails to be a symbol of order restored because of the woman's disruption of the display of sovereign power. Only the horrific, complete eradication of Irish culture by a worthy, heroic agent who will submerse himself into the flow of the historical process can allow the bard to turn these events into poetry. Only by removing the threat of dismemberment facing the bard can he stand back from the proliferation of the troubles and transcend them, give them the form that they lack. For the time being, Spenser must engage the present state of Ireland in its unruly, heraclitan form. He must take the prosaic world as is, threatening and indeterminate.

Notes

Notes to pages 1-9.

Introduction: Spenser and the Court

1. Norbert Elias, *The Court Society*, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Basil Blackwell, 1983), 91.

2. John Archer, *Sovereignty and Intelligence: Spying and Court Culture in the English Renaissance* (Stanford University Press, 1993), 125.

3. Elias, 104.

4. Alan Haynes, *Invisible Power: The Elizabethan Secret Service, 1570-1603* (Alan Sutton Publishing Ltd., 1992), 151.

5. Haynes, 97.

6. William Slights, *Ben Jonson and the Art of Secrecy* (University of Toronto Press, 1994), 18.

7. Archer, 129.

8. Richard Rambuss, *Spenser's Secret Career* (Cambridge University Press, 1993), 53.

9. Archer, 45.

1 Spenser and the Elizabethan Culture of Surveillance

1. Louis Adrian Montrose, "The Elizabethan Subject and the Spenserian Text," in *Literary Theory/Renaissance Texts*, eds. Patricia Parker and David Quint (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), 318.

2. I am not suggesting an absolute identification of Irenius and Spenser;

rather, we can see the fictional speaker, endowed with secrets and a plan for the reformation of Ireland, as demonstrating, by association, Spenser's possession of these attributes. Cf., for example, Daniel Javitch for a discussion of Gascoigne and self-presentation in "The Impure Motives of Elizabethan Poetry," in *The Power of Forms in the English Renaissance*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (Norman, Ok.: Pilgrim Books, 1982), 225-238. Donald Bruce discusses the name Irenius in relation to Spenser in "Spenser's Irenius and the Nature of Dialogue," *Notes and Queries*, Sept. 1992, 355-357.

3. Michael Niell, "Broken English and Broken Irish: Nation, Language, and the Optic of Power in Shakespeare's Histories," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 45 (1994), 5.

4. Ciaran Brady, "Court, Castle and Country: the framework of government in Tudor Ireland," in *Natives and Newcomers: Essays on the Making of Irish Colonial Society, 1534-1641*, eds. Ciaran Brady and Raymond Gillespie (Irish Academic Press, 1986), 43.

5. *Irish Historical Documents*, eds. Edmund Curtis and R. B. McDowell (London: Methuen, 1968), 89.

6. Edmund Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, ed. W. L. Renwick (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), 91. All further citations of Spenser's *A View* will occur parenthetically in the text.

7. Lord Deputy Mountjoy expressed his fears of being criticized at court in

Notes to pages 11-13.

letters to Elizabeth. Cf. Elizabeth's response to Mountjoy, addressed to

"Mistress Kitchenmaid" in *The Letters of Queen Elizabeth I*, ed. G. B. Harrison

(New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1968), 279-280. Ciaran Brady states that the

commonwealth men of the 1570s were a challenge to the Dublin

administration: direct appeals "to the queen and the London government

seriously weakened the credibility of the Irish viceroy at court and rendered

him vulnerable to all manner of intrigues." "The Road to the *View*: On the

Decline of Reform Thought in Tudor Ireland," in *Spenser and Ireland: An*

Interdisciplinary Perspective, ed. Patricia Coughlan (Cork University Press, 1989),

32-33. Brady also states that Barnaby Riche, author of *The Irish Hubbub or the*

English Hue and Cry (1619), who was obsessed "with the ubiquity of scandal

and corruption...informed against, and made enemies among, both native and

New English groups." "Spenser's Irish Crisis: Humanism and Experience in the

1590s," *Past and Present* 111, 23.

8. Nicholas Canny, *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World, 1560-*
1800 (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988), 28.

9. Archer, "Introduction."

10. Haynes, xiii.

11. Rambuss, 26-7.

12. Rambuss states that, "In short, even as a poet, Spenser writes as a

secretary" (28). I will argue that the "secretary function" that Rambuss

identifies as providing a discursive practice and professional model for Spenser is clearly evident in *A View*. The more direct engagement with the threatening Irish context in the tract results in a fascinating configuration of discursive stylistics. Chapter four will develop the notion of a secretarial "prosaic".

13. Archer, 2.

14. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: the birth of the prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Books, 1977), 26.

15. Ibid., 215.

16. Stephen Greenblatt, "Invisible Bullets: Renaissance authority and its subversion, *Henry IV* and *Henry V*," in *Political Shakespeare: Essays in cultural materialism*, eds. Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, 2nd ed. (Cornell University Press, 1994), 44.

17. Haynes, 46.

18. Javitch, 232. See note 11 above.

19. Edmund Spenser, "To the worshipfull his very singular good friend, Maister G. H. Fellow of Trinitie Hall in Cambridge," *The Oxford Spenser*, eds. J. C. Smith and E. De Selincourt (Oxford University Press, 1912), 635.

20. Rambuss, 17.

21. Charles Nicholl argues that Spenser acted as a courier as early as 1569 while still a student at Cambridge. *The Reckoning* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1992), 172. Nicholl's source for this claim is Charles Henry and Thompson

Notes to page 17.

Cooper, *Athenae Cantabrigienses*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1858-61). Another interesting conjectural association of Spenser and Elizabethan intelligence is made by Rambuss, who suggests that Spenser may have come into contact with Sir Francis Walsingham through the Sidney circle. Walsingham "had turned his home into a school for forgery and cipher composition.... Sidney (and perhaps Spenser too?) may have attended some of Walsingham's classes." Walsingham's own secretarial career was, of itself, an example of how one could rise in influence through the use of intelligence (129).

22. Alexander Judson, *The Life of Edmund Spenser, The Works of Edmund Spenser*: A Varorium Edition, 11 vols., ed. Edwin Greenlaw, et al. (John Hopkins University Press, 1966), 11:47.

23. Donald Bruce believes that the reference in *A View* to the execution of Murrough O'Brien "should not be regarded as authorial" because no other textual evidence places Spenser in Ireland in 1577. "Edmund Spenser and the Irish Wars," *Contemporary Review*, Mar. 1995, 266:1550, 129-138. On the other hand, W. L. Renwick believes that the account of the execution is a "personal reminiscence." Commentary, *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970). See note 11 above.

24. quoted in David J. Baker, "Off the map: charting uncertainty in Renaissance Ireland," in *Representing Ireland*, eds. Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley (Cambridge University Press, 1993), 76-77.

25. *Irish Historical Documents*, 104.

26. Judson, 86.

27. Donald Bruce, "Edmund Spenser and the Irish Wars," *Contemporary Review*, Mar. 1995, 266:1550, 133.

28. Edmund Spenser, *Amoretti and Epithalamion*, *The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser*, eds. William A. Oram, et al. (Yale University Press, 1989), 598.

29. Archer, 18.

30. Stephen Greenblatt, *Shakespearian Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 4.

31. Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), 195.

2 The Secrets of Ireland: "who will better search into them may find more"

1. Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley, "Introduction: Irish representations and English alternatives," in *Representing Ireland*, 1-2.

2. Rambuss, 54. Rambuss discusses this investment in secrecy only in regards to Spenser's poetry, but it is clearly evident in the Irish tract.

3. Elias, 55.

4. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1990), 86.

5. Daniel T. Fischlin, "Political Allegory, Absolutist Ideology, and the

Notes to pages 24-33.

'Rainbow Portrait' of Queen Elizabeth I," *Renaissance Quarterly* (Spring 1997), 50:1, 180.

6. *The Past Speaks: Sources and Problems in English History*, 2 vols., 2nd ed., eds. Lacey Baldwin Smith and Jean Reeder Smith (D. C. Heath and Company, 1993), 1:244.

7. Ibid., 1:244.

8. Archer, 4.

9. Archer, 42.

10. Niell, 30.

11. Ibid., 30-31.

12. Ibid., 32.

13. *The Letters of Queen Elizabeth I*, 299.

14. *Irish Historical Documents*, 89.

15. Scott Wilson, *Cultural Materialism: Theory and Practice* (Blackwell, 1995), 81.

16. Ibid., 79.

17. Ibid., 79-80.

18. Baker, 84.

19. Anne Fogarty, "The Colonization of Language: Narrative Strategy in *A View of the Present State of Ireland* and *The Faerie Queene*, Book VI," in *Spenser and Ireland: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*, 90.

Notes to pages 33-42.

20. Rambuss, 103.

21. Montrose, 330.

22. Willy Maley, "How Milton and some contemporaries read Spenser's *View*," in *Representing Ireland*, 201.

3 Spatializing Elizabeth I's Irish Body Politic

1. Said, 78.

2. *Irish Historical Documents*, 109.

3. Ibid., 109.

4. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 26.

5. Richard Helgerson, "The Land Speaks: Cartography, Chorography, and Subversion in Renaissance England," in *Representing the English Renaissance*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 327.

6. Baker, 82.

7. Ibid., 77.

8. Ibid., 83-4.

9. Julia Reinhard Lupton, "Mapping mutability: or, Spenser's Irish plot," in *Representing Ireland*, 95.

10. Helgerson, 332.

11. Ibid., 332.

12. Ibid., 340.

13. Reinhard Lupton, 100.

Notes to pages 42-53.

14. Baker, 78.

15. Anne Fogarty, 88.

16. Andrew Hadfield, "Spenser, Ireland, and Sixteenth-Century Political Theory," *The Modern Language Review*, 89 (Jan. 1994), 8.

17. Terry Eagleton, *Heathcliff and the Great Hunger: Studies in Irish Culture* (Verso, 1995), 127, 130.

18. Ciaran Brady, "Spenser's Irish Crisis: Humanism and Experience in the 1590s," *Past and Present*, 42.

19. Bruce Avery, "Mapping the Irish Other: Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland*," *ELH* 57 (1990), 276.

20. Ibid., 269.

21. Fogarty, 88.

22. Avery, 271-272.

23. Montrose, 314.

24. Ibid., 315.

25. Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An analysis of concepts of pollution and taboo* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966), 121.

26. *Selected Statutes and Other Constitutional Documents Illustrative of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I*, ed. G. W. Prothero (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 80.

27. Fogarty, 87.

28. Annabel Patterson, "The Egalitarian Giant: Representations of Justice in

Notes to pages 53-58.

History/Literature," *Journal of British Studies* 31 (April 1992), 126.

29. Maley, 201.

30. Thomas Healy, *New Latitudes: Theory and English Renaissance Literature* (London: Edward Arnold, 1992), 102.

4 Theorizing Spenser's Irish Prose: "more troublous matters of discourse"

1. Leonard Tennenhouse. "Strategies of State and Political Plays: *A Midsummer Night's Dream, Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VIII,*" in *Political Shakespeare*, 110, 125.

2. Baker, 79.

3. Wlad Godzich and Jeffrey Kittay, *The Emergence of Prose: An Essay in Prosaics* (University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 197.

4. Said, 226.

5. Rambuss, 28. Rambuss writes, "But more than indicating the points of contact between these careers, I will suggest...that Spenser's career as a secretary provided him with a discursive practice and professional model that had a shaping effect both on his poetry and on the role he envisioned for himself as a poet. In short, even as a poet, Spenser writes as a secretary." I am extending his notion to include this late work of Spenser's and its implications for seeking a patronage relationship that is mediated by shared secrets and its connection to colonial state apparatuses.

6. Avery, 265. Other critics have seen the text as essentially monologic. See,

Notes to pages 58-62.

for example, Patricia Coughlan's "'Some secret scourge which shall by her come unto England': Ireland and Incivility in Spenser" in *Spenser and Ireland: An Interdisiplinary Perspective*, 46-74, especially pages 62-67; Annabel Patterson provides a critique of the work of Nicholas Canny, Brendan Bradshaw, and Ciaran Brady on this issue, "The Egalitarian Giant: Representations of Justice in History/Literature," *Journal of British Studies* 31 (April 1992), 97-132. See also Stephen Greenblatt's "To Fashion a Gentleman: Spenser and the Destruction of the Bower of Bliss," *Renaissance Self Fashioning* (University of Chicago Press, 1980), 157-192; and Louis Adrian Montrose's critique of Greenblatt in "The Elizabethan Subject and the Spenserian Text," in *Literary Theory/Renaissance Texts.*

7. Avery, 266-7.

8. Godzich and Kittay, 199.

9. Ibid., 161.

10. Ibid., 175.

11. Fogarty, 83.

12. Hadfield, 4-5.

13. Patterson, 112.

14. Wilson, 70.

15. Paul Brown, "'This thing of darkness I acknowledge mine': *The Tempest* and the Discourse of Colonialism," in *Political Shakespeare*, 58.

Notes to pages 62-69.

16. Homi K. Bhabha, "The Other Question: Stereotype, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism," *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 66-67.

17. Coughlan, 49.

18. This passage is, however, one of the many contradictions that occur in the dialogue. In relation to this claim, see pages 142-3.

19. Baker, 79.

20. Fogarty, 89. Cf. note 11, pages 77-78.

21. Ibid., 79.

22. Ibid., 81.

23. Ibid., 78.

24. Clare Carroll, "The Construction of Gender and the Cultural and Political Other in *The Faerie Queene* and *A View of the Present State of Ireland*: the Critics, the Context, and the Case of Radigund," *Criticism* 32 (Spring 1990), 167.

25. Fogarty, 79.

26. Archer, 2.

27. Thomas Wartenburg, quoted in Joseph Rouse, "Power/Knowledge," in *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, ed. Garry Gutting (Cambridge University Press, 1994), 105-106.

28. Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* 93.

29. Elias, 91.

Notes to pages 70-74.

30. Alan Sinfield, "Power and Ideology: An Outline Theory and Sidney's *Arcadia*," *ELH* 52 (1985), 264.

31. Ibid., 271.

32. Tennenhouse, 110.

33. Stephen Greenblatt, "To Fashion a Gentleman: Spenser and the Destruction of the Bower of Bliss," *Renaissance Self Fashioning*, 177.

Epilogue: Metonymy, Colonialism, and Spenser

A version of this epilogue was presented for a Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies session at the 1997 Congress of Learneds Societies in St. John's, Newfoundland.

1. Elias, 104-5.

2. Edmund Spenser, *Epithalamion, The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser*, eds. William A. Oram, et al. (Yale University Press, 1989), ll. 16-18. All further references to the poem will occur, by line number, parenthetically in the text.

3. Celeste Marguarite Schenck, "'Sacred Ceremonies': Spenser's *Epithalamion* and *Prothalamion*," *Mourning and Panegyric: The Poetics of Pastoral Ceremony* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 1988), 62.

4. Joseph Loewenstein, "Echo's Ring: Orpheus and Spenser's Career," *ELR* 16:2 (Spring 1986), 290.

5. quoted in Roy Foster, *Modern Ireland, 1600-1972* (Harmondsworth:

Notes to pages 74-76.

Penguin, 1989), 28.

6. Deborah Shuger has recently argued that the "trite and pernicious binarism of 'Us' versus 'Demonic Other'" in relation to Spenser's tract misses the fact that *A View* presents a critique of the ethos of the English aristocratic warrior code (495). Shuger argues that the binary of barbarism/civility in *A View*, and other Irish tracts, presents an evolutionary civilizing process that outlines "a general theory of the socio-economic processes underlying the transition from aristocratic to civil society" (507). Once again, then, Ireland is the mirror image of England. Shuger's definition of barbarism as "the violence endemic to an aristocratic warrior society" (513), however, tends to efface the colonial implications (and the horrible cost of these for the Irish) of inscribing this civilizing process on Ireland. Shuger, "Irishmen, Aristocrats, and Other White Barbarians," *Renaissance Quarterly* 50:2 (Summer 1997).

7. Loewenstein, 300.

8. Schenck, 60.

9. Greenblatt, *Marvellous Possessions: the Wonder of the New World* (University of Chicago Press, 1991), 122.

10. Said, 78.

Works Cited

"An Act for Provision to be Made for the Surety of the Queen's Majesty's Most Royal Person and the Continuance of the Realm in Peace." In *Selected Statutes and Other Constitutional Documents Illustrative of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I*. Ed. G. W. Prothero. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913. 80-81.

"An Act to Convert Waste Grounds to Shire Grounds." In *Irish Historical Documents, 1172-1922*. Eds. Edmund Curtis and R. B. McDowell. London: Methuen, 1968. 109-110.

"An Exhortation Concerning Good Order and Obedience to Rulers and Magistrates." In *The Past Speaks: Sources and Problems in English History*. Eds. Lacey Baldwin Smith and Jean Reeder Smith. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1993. 1:243-244.

Archer, John. *Sovereignty and Intelligence: Spying and Court Culture in the English Renaissance*. Stanford University Press, 1993.

Avery, Bruce. "Mapping the Irish Other: Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland*." *ELH* 57 (1990): 263-279.

Baker, David J. "Off the Map: Charting Uncertainty in Renaissance Ireland." In *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660*. Eds. Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley. Cambridge University Press, 1993. 76-92.

Bhabha, Homi K. "The Other Question: Stereotype, Discrimination and the

Discourse of Colonialism." *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994. 66-84.

Brady, Ciaran. "Court, Castle and Country: the Framework of Government in Tudor Ireland." In *Natives and Newcomers: Essays on the Making of Irish Colonial Society, 1534-1641*. Eds. Ciaran Brady and Raymond Gillespie. Irish Academic Press, 1986. 22-49.

---. "The Road to the *View*: On the Decline of Reform Thought in Tudor Ireland." In *Spenser and Ireland: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Ed. Patricia Coughlan. Cork University Press, 1989. 25-45.

---. "Spenser's Irish Crisis: Humanism and Experience in the 1590s." *Past and Present* 111: 17-49.

Brown, Paul. "'This thing of darkness I acknowledge mine': *The Tempest* and the Discourse of Colonialism." In *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*. Eds. Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield. 2nd ed. Cornell University Press, 1994. 48-71.

Bruce, Donald. "Spenser and the Irish Wars." *Contemporary Review* (March 1995) 266: 1550, 129-138.

---. "Spenser's Irenius and the Nature of Dialogue." *Notes and Queries* (Sept. 1992): 355-357.

Canny, Nicholas. *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World, 1560-1800*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Carroll, Clare. "The Construction of Gender and the Cultural and Political

Other in *The Faerie Queene* 5 and *A View of the Present State of Ireland*: the Critics, the   Context, and the Case of Radigund." *Criticism* 32 (Spring 1990): 163-191.

Coughlan, Patricia. "'Some secret scourge which shall by her come unto England': Ireland and Incivility in Spenser." In *Spenser and Ireland: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Ed. Patricia Coughlan. Cork University Press, 1989. 46-74.

Douglas, Mary. "External Boundaries." *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966. 114-128.

Eagleton, Terry. *Heathcliff and the Great Hunger: Studies in Irish Culture*. Verso, 1995.

Elias, Norbert. *The Court Society*. Trans. Edmund Jephcott. Basil Blackwell, 1983.

Fischlin, Daniel T. "Political Allegory, Absolutist Ideology, and the 'Rainbow Portrait' of Queen Elizabeth I." *Renaissance Quarterly* (Spring 1997) 50:1, 175-206.

Fogarty, Anne. "The Colonization of Language: Narrative Strategy in *A View of the Present State of Ireland* and *The Faerie Queene, Book VI*." In *Spenser and Ireland: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Ed. Patricia Coughlan. Cork University Press, 1989. 75-108.

Foster, R. F. *Modern Ireland, 1600-1972*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1989.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan

Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1977.

---. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction.* Trans. Robert Huxley. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.

Godzich, Wlad and Jeffrey Kittay. *The Emergence of Prose: An Essay in Prosaics.* University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

Greenblatt, Stephen. "Invisible Bullets: Renaissance Authority and its Subversion, *Henry IV* and *Henry V.*" In *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism.* Eds. Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield. 2nd ed. Cornell University Press, 1994. 18-47.

---. *Marvellous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World.* University of Chicago Press, 1991.

---. "To Fashion a Gentleman: Spenser and the Destruction of the Bower of Bliss." *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare.* University of Chicago Press, 1980. 157-192.

Hadfield, Andrew. "Spenser, Ireland, and Sixteenth-Century Political Theory." *The Modern Language Review* 89 (Jan. 1994): 1-18.

Hadfield, Andrew and Willy Maley. "Introduction: Irish Representations and English Alternatives." In *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660.* Eds. Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley. Cambridge University Press, 1993. 1-23.

Haynes, Alan. *Invisible Power: The Elizabethan Secret Service, 1570-1603.* Alan Sutton Publishing Ltd., 1992.

Healy, Thomas. "Civilisation and Its Discontents: The Case of Edmund

    Spenser." *New Latitudes: Theory and English Renaissance Literature.*

    London: Edward Arnold, 1992. 84-109.

Heaney, Seamus. "Bog Oak." *New Selected Poems, 1966-1987.* London: Faber and

    Faber, 1990. 19-20.

Helgerson, Richard. "The Land Speaks: Cartography, Chorography, and

    Subversion in Renaissance England." In *Representing the English*

    Renaissance. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Berkeley: University of California

    Press, 1988. 327-361.

Hooker, John. "An Account of the 1569 Session of the Irish Parliament." In *Irish*

    Historical Documents, 1172-1922. Eds. Edmund Curtis and R. B.

    McDowell. London: Methuen, 1968. 89-90.

Javitch, Daniel. "The Impure Motives of Elizabethan Poetry." In *The Power of*

    Forms in the English Renaissance. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Norman, Ok.:

    Pilgrim Books, 1982. 225-238.

Judson, Alexander. *The Life of Edmund Spenser. The Works of Edmund Spenser: A*

    Varorium Edition. Ed. Edwin Greenlaw. 11 vols. Johns Hopkins

    University Press, 1966. Volume 11.

The Letters of Queen Elizabeth I. Ed. G. B. Harrison. New York: Funk and

    Wagnalls, 1968.

Loewenstein, Joseph. "Echo's Ring: Orpheus and Spenser's Career." *ELR* 16:2

    (Spring 1986), 287-302.

Maley, Willy. "How Milton and Some Contemporaries Read Spenser's *View*." In *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660*. Eds. Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley. Cambridge University Press, 1993. 191-208.

Montrose, Louis Adrian. "The Elizabethan Subject and the Spenserian Text." In *Literary Theory/Renaissance Texts*. Eds. Patricia Parker and David Quint. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986. 303-340.

Niell, Michael. "Broken English and Broken Irish: Nation, Language, and the Optic of Power in Shakespeare's Histories." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45 (1994): 1-32.

Nicholl, Charles. *The Reckoning*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1992.

Patterson, Annabel. "The Egalitarian Giant: Representations of Justice in History/ Literature." *Journal of British Studies* 31 (April 1992): 97-132.

"Privy Council Recommendation of Spenser for Sherrif of Cork." In *Irish Historical Documents, 1172-1922*. Eds. Edmund Curtis and R. B. McDowell. London: Methuen, 1968. 104.

Rambuss, Richard. *Spenser's Secret Career*. Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Reinhard Lupton, Julia. "Mapping Mutability: or, Spenser's Irish Plot." In *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660*. Eds. Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley. Cambridge University Press, 1993. 93-115.

Rouse, Joseph. "Power/Knowledge." In *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*.

Ed. Gary Gutting. Cambridge University Press, 1994. 92-114.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

Schenck, Celeste Marguerite. "'Sacred Ceremonies': Spenser's *Epithalamion* and

Prothalamion." *Mourning and Panegyric: the Poetics of Pastoral Ceremony*.

Pennsylvania State University Press, 1988. 55-71.

Shuger, Deborah. "Irishmen, Aristocrats, and Other White Barbarians."

Renaissance Quarterly 50:2 (Summer 1997): 494-525.

Sinfield, Alan. "Power and Ideology: An Outline Theory and Sidney's *Arcadia*."

ELH 52 (1985): 259-277.

Spenser, Edmund. *A View of the Present State of Ireland*. Ed. W. L. Renwick.

Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

---. *Epithalamion. The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser*. Eds.

William A. Oram, et al. Yale University Press, 1989. 659-679.

---. "To the Worshipfull His Very Singular Good Friend, Maister G. H. Fellow

of Trinitie Hall in Cambridge." *The Oxford Spenser*. Eds. J. C. Smith and

E. De Selincourt. Oxford University Press, 1912. 635-638.