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Utilizing the strategies of feminist criticism, this study seeks to define masculinity and the issues confronting it as presented in Books III and IV of Edmund Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene*. The thesis analyzes the means by which Spenser’s poem challenges conventional notions of violence as inherent to masculinity. This includes examining the tropological use of rape to represent masculine lust as animalistic, as seen in the various male pursuers and aggressors of Florimell and Amoret, and the metaphorical conceptualization of love as a violent conquest as a means of contributing to homosocial status elevation. Thus this study contributes to the understanding of the didacticism of Spenser’s allegory concerning the fashioning of a proper gentleman.
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Introduction: Toward a Masculine Criticism

From the very first line of Edmund Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene*, the narrative voice of the poem is presented as fundamentally masculine: “Lo, I the man” (1.1). That the gender of the implied speaker is given such prominence at the onset of the poem is not insignificant; it informs the lens through which readers can approach the text and the manner in which both genders are presented and understood. The poem itself is dominated by men of various moral standing attempting to understand their proper social positions, whether they are grooms, husbands, warriors, or knights. Five of the six books are devoted to the quests of male knights and even Spenser states that the purpose of the poem is to instruct men in becoming gentlemen. If we accept then that in *The Faerie Queene* we are confronted with an explicitly male speaker speaking about men to a presumed male audience, why is it that we have rarely asked what the poem says about masculinity, what it means to be male or what the problems facing the maturation of masculinity are?

The implied maleness of the speaker’s voice provides the foundation for much of the feminist criticism concerning Spenser. Feminist approaches have been one of the key branches of Spenserian scholarship over the last half century and there is little question why.¹ The world of Faeryland is populated with dozens of difficult female characters, difficult in the sense that they are either so plainly stereotypical, such as Una, or so

---

ambiguously situated between conventional notions of femininity, that taken together they present a unique and often times inconsistent view of what it means to be female in the Early Modern Period. What they share, however, is a common presentation of femininity as controlled by traditional patriarchal structures, one which heavily prescribes proper social roles and which punishes deferral from this constricted model. Perhaps the single consistent accomplishment among feminist criticism on Spenser is in interpreting the plight of one female character as an assault on a collectivized femininity. For example, the violation of Amoret in Busirane’s castle is not simply an instance of violence, but a manifestation of patriarchal domination of femininity. This is a perspective which is not typically extended to masculinity. As Celovsky’s study on masculinity in The Faerie Queene notes, “Men’s adventures tend to read locally -- as the experiences of particular individuals or as the allegories of particular episodes” (Celovsky 1). Rarely do critics consider the tribulations of a male character, the forces which challenge or subjugate him, as representative of a common masculine issue. Yet the men of The Faerie Queene do

---


operate within a shared cultural system of etiquette that dictates and prescribes proper roles to men as much as it does to women.

In respect to the other books of Spenser’s epic, Books III and IV are the most concerned with the presentation of gender, and as such, have been the location of much of feminist criticism. They include the only book of the epic which concerns a female knight as its primary character, Britomart of Book III, and the bulk of her adventure spills into the following Book IV more than that of Spenser’s other central knights who usually offer no more than cameos in books not devoted to them. Most significantly, the central books feature two complementary stories of sexualized male violence against femininity in the struggles of Florimell and Amoret. Taken together, the plight of these two characters against reprehensible male figures offers a comprehensive window into Spenser’s interpretation of femininity and the dangers which surround. Moreover, it offers a means to critique Spenser’s masculine perspective on such women. Since these books are those which are the most concerned with femininity they are also the ideal location in which to figure masculinity. The central books of *The Faerie Queene* are plagued with instances of inappropriate male conduct toward women and are therefore the most suitable location in which to understand masculinity. It is in these books that the struggle

---

for masculine self-control and the commission of sexualized violence, whether it be literal or metaphoric rape, are the collective terms through which to define the male condition. However, just as feminist criticism should be critical of representations of femininity as the victim of sexualized violence, so should a masculinist perspective be critical of representations of masculinity as violent.

A consideration of the central books reveals that a gender criticism from the masculine perspective is not simply an ancillary branch of Spenserian scholarship, but a primary and central means by which to interpret *The Faerie Queene*. In the early 1950’s and 60’s, mythological and historical criticism divided Spenserian scholarship. Largely inspired by Joseph Campbell’s theory of the Hero’s Journey in *Hero With a Thousand Faces*, Northrop Frye proposed a mythological interpretation of Spenserian imagery, one which was later adopted by A.C. Hamilton and others. Frye identifies *The Faerie Queene* specifically, and the romance genre in general, as one which is founded on an interpretation of Christian and Classical mythology which provide a communal language in which to explore significant cultural ideals. In a Christian perspective, the most significant cluster of symbols are those which surround the quest-motif, “a sequence of minor adventures leading up to a major climactic adventure” (*Anatomy* 174). Frye calls such experiences the “general scheme of the game of Twenty Questions” (130), in which

---

conflict is used as a means of moving a character and his reader towards spiritual understanding, a revelation. Understanding the Bible in this way, wherein the protagonist is mankind, presents a three-act structure involving Genesis, the Gospels and Revelation, or in other words, the creation of the world, the redemption of man, and the return to grace.\(^6\)

Generally speaking, Frye mostly focuses his mythological criticism on an interpretation of Book One which he calls, “perhaps the closest following of the Biblical quest-romance theme in English literature” (\textit{Anatomy} 180). Within \textit{The Faerie Queene} itself it is the most overtly Christian experience relative to the other Legends in that its explicit purpose is in confronting Catholicism and depicting the Reformation as a Revelation. Book One provides a one-to-one interpretation of Biblical archetypes; the Redcrosse Knight is a Messiah figure who must defeat a Satanic dragon in order to rescue Una’s parents, Adam and Eve, and return them to their Edenic homeland. Book One is biblical both in its symbolism and in its structure, but while the symbolism may shift in Spenser’s following books, the same biblical quest structure remains. In Frye’s own words, the three phases of the Biblically-inspired Romance genre are “\textit{agon} or conflict, the \textit{pathos} or death struggle, and the \textit{anagorisis} or discovery” (174). This pattern of dialectical opposition leading to revelation which defines the Bible and Book I can also be found in Book III for example, but here it serves a gendered purpose. Throughout the Legend of Chastity, Britomart faces threats to her personal chastity in many forms. At the

\(6\) The patriarchal terminology of “Man” and “Mankind” have been retained here as specific reference to the definition of these concepts in the Biblical sense only.
end of Book III, she encounters a threat to chastity in general, in the figure of Busirane, and must reverse Amoret’s physical and psychological violation of her chastity; the result leads Britomart to witness a new gender paradigm in the form of the hermaphrodite. The original structure of Book III is plotted to adhere to the same pattern of conflict, victory and epiphany which characterizes the Biblical quest, but yields a divergent thematic result. In Book I and Book III the epiphany stage is concerned with their titular virtue, which yields a spiritual and thus biblical lesson in the Legend of Holiness, but a gender-oriented and sexual lesson in the Legend of Chastity. While Book III does not employ the central archetypes of the Bible such as the messianic or demonic figures, it utilizes what Frye calls the “analogy of innocence” which includes using fire as a purifying force (140), as in the entrance to Busirane’s Castle (III.xi:25-6), the use of paradisal or Edenic locations (141), such as the Garden of Adonis (III.vi) and an emphasis on the “innocent virtue” of chastity (140). These symbols of the analogy of innocence are all biblical interpretations of gender representation, a means of figuring traditional--and indeed patriarchal--conceptions of femininity and masculinity, which Spenser uses and subverts throughout Book III.

Frye’s conception of *The Faerie Queene* as primarily mythologically and biblically informed is one which is mostly accepted, but which is challenged based on the conclusions Frye derives from this analysis. One of the most prominent of Frye’s critics is
Frank Kermode, who argues that, while Spenser utilizes myth, he does so as a method of interpreting the most significant historical events of his time. As he states:

The achievement of Spenser in that heroic First Book is not to have dived into the archetypes, but to have given them a context of Virgilian security -- to have used them in the expression of an actual, unique, critical moment of a nation’s culture and history. He looks backward only to achieve ways of registering the density of the central situation: the reign of Elizabeth. *Iam redit et Virgo*. He does not convert event into myth, but myth into event. (‘Allegorists’ 22)

According to Kermode, the Redcross Knight’s vulnerability to error is typical of English history in reference to their religious and political feuds (43). Una, his bride-to-be, is the one true faith of the Church of England, which Redcross, representing the salvation of man (as a saint), as well as a representative of his country (as a knight) must protect.

Kermode extends this apocalyptic imagery associated with the history of the Church of England throughout the text, including Archimago, whom he likens to the papacy, stating:

Archimago, as is generally agreed, corresponds to the false prophet and the beast from the land, and so to antichrist. But it is worth observing that Spenser gives him a name which suggests that he is a magician; and this is a charge incessantly made against popes (“I and V” 44).

Although Frye has little comment on the character of Archimago, his *Notebooks* describe him as the “fake old wise man” who contains the “Protestant fear of hidden knowledge & control of elemental creatures, v.s. plain sense of (daylight) revelation” (*Notebooks* 12), thus likening him, as Kermode does, to the false prophet of Revelation. Yet for Kermode,

---

such archetypal analysis is insufficient, as he completes this argument by presenting the Middle Age and Early Modern Age conviction of the papacy being involved in supernatualism or necromancy, with specific reference to Pope Gregory VII and Sylvester II. For Kermode it is the role of the critic to uncover the conscious historical reference which Spenser introduced into the dialectical structure of Romance in order to find meaning in the apocalyptic imagery he uses: to understand Spenser, not simply as a poet utilizing Revelation as an aesthetic choice, but as mythologizing his period, “now and England,” as the location of the Tutor apocalypse.

This historical analysis is, much like Frye’s mythological criticism, mostly concerned with Book I, although it can also be adequately applied to Book V which represents Spenser at his most political. Extended into the central books, however, a historical criticism becomes, by necessity, a study in early modern contemporary femininity and masculinity. Perhaps the most poignant example of Spenser interpreting history through poetry in the central books is the story of Timias, whose relationship with the virginal Belphoebe interprets that of Sir Walter Raleigh and Queen Elizabeth. As Broaddus states, “Belphoebe’s care of Timias allegorizes Elizabeth’s love for those of her subjects -- such as Sir Walter Raleigh -- under her immediate supervision” (Broaddus 99). However, Timias’ love of the virginal huntress is, solely by virtue of her social position, destined to be unrequited, as was Raleigh’s possible courting of Elizabeth during the 1580’s. Later, when they save Amoret from the Man-Beast, Timias accidentally wounds Amoret in the tussle and “all her silken garments did with bloud bestaine” (IV.vii: 27.9).
When Belphoebe finds him “by that new louely mate” kissing her “atweene” the eyes and “handling soft the hurts, which she did get,” the huntress interprets Timias’ actions as sexually charged and inappropriate; Timias can seemingly not love Belphoebe nor can he show affection for another. All of this, Broaddus states, “can be read to allegorize an initial sexual encounter in the marriage bed and would consequently seem to shadow the marriage of Raleigh and Elizabeth Throgmorton” (105) one of the Queen’s ladies in waiting. Just as Timias’s perceived lust for Amoret causes a divide between himself and Belphoebe, so does Raleigh’s marriage to a second Elizabeth anger the first, resulting in his imprisonment in the Tower of London.

When Timias returns to Belphoebe from his exile, the reader is given little insight into Belphoebe’s position on the matter. Spenser leaves ambiguous whether Timias is actually forgiven, and if he is, for what reason, possibly because the historical inspiration for the subplot had not itself ended at the time of Spenser’s writing. It is because of this that the Belphoebe/Timias and Queen Elizabeth/Raleigh relationships are symptomatic of a new gender paradigm which exists in England as a result of female rule. The central books of the epic are thus an investigation into the new gender dynamics of England and a defense of Elizabeth’s position in them, all of which is a way of approaching the

---

fundamental question of Spenser’s time: how do we conceive of masculinity when a
woman is on the throne? What constitutes proper contemporary masculinity? Thus, a
Kermodian historical analysis of the central books leads directly into a feminist and
masculinist perspective, just as Frye’s archetypal structures can be extended in service of
answering gendered questions. When considering Book I, Frye’s and Kermode’s
approaches differ in that the former suggests Spenser uses history to describe myth and
the latter argues that he uses myth to describe history; in the central books, however, it is
more accurate to state that Spenser utilizes both myth and history to define gender,
feminine and masculine.

Whether Spenser articulates his position through an interpretation of the myth of
Venus and Adonis or the history of Elizabeth’s courtiers, the central books are focused on
the exploration and definition of proper social roles as determined by gender. These
portrayals, of men specifically, are presented in didactic terms. *The Faeire Queene* is thus
a narrativized conduct book, and while conduct books gained the height of their
popularity in later centuries, texts such as Castiglione’s *The Book of the Courtier* were
highly influential in the period.⁹ These books sought to codify proper etiquette of the
upper classes and Spenser’s text is no different. In dedicating the poem to his Queen,
Spenser situates *The Faerie Queene* as a defense of Elizabeth’s reign and decades
preceding its writing, the greatest threat to Elizabeth’s legitimacy was the question of

marriage and those who sought to disempower the queen by forcing her to marry. The heterosocial relationships of the poem thus become permutations of the Belphoebe/Timias relationship. Belphoebe is clearly the height of her gender’s virtue in the poem but surprisingly, so is Timias, whose self-control and virtue exceed even that of his master Arthur in the central books. Timias and Belphoebe represent one pole of a spectrum of proper masculinity and femininity; the rest of Spenser’s characters provide lessons through their failure to achieve or adhere to their standard of virtue. For men this failure is located in their dual motivations for sexual gratification and control and it is through these negative examples that Spenser critiques the critics of Elizabeth and presents his diagnosis of the problems with contemporary masculinity.

This thesis examines the representations of masculinity in Books III and IV of The Faerie Queene, specifically through the evaluation of three principal heterosocial and heterosexual experiences common across several pairs of characters. Chapter One concerns the pursuit of sexual gratification and analyzes the list of potential male rapists who pursue Florimell across Book III. This pursuit manifests either as a physical chase or struggle, as is the case with Arthur, the forester and the fisherman, or a conventionalized scene of attempted chivalric courting, as is the case with the witch’s son and Proteus. From this analysis it becomes clear that both chasing and courting pursuits are metaphorically interpreted in similar manners: through narratives of male metamorphosis. Whether linguistically or literally, each of these male figures experiences a form of metamorphosis into an animalistic or monstrous creature as he pursues a female target.
What is significant in this study, and what distinguishes it from the findings of Chapter Two, is that none of these male-beasts successfully commits his violent intentions; the focus here is on the representation of the pursuit. From this it is clear that, in *The Faerie Queene* and its Early Modern context, masculine lust is interpreted as a negative, dangerous, and most importantly, beastly, force, one which must be contained through the systems of courtly love.

Chapter Two considers sexual violence which extends beyond intention and into either literal or metaphorical violation. Principally this concerns Amoret’s dual kidnappings in Books III and IV by Busirane and the Man-Beast respectively. The Man-Beast episode is a literal example of the violence inflicted on Amoret during her imprisonment by Busirane. Specifically, these violations include both rape and cannibalism which are metaphorically identical in the Busirane episode. As these episodes are linked through Amoret, their narrative connection is made possibly only by the cancellation of the hermaphroditic union present in the original ending to Book III. As the only example of masculine lust as a beastly force in Book IV--the metaphor which dominates Book III--the Man-Beast episode becomes a second articulation and allegorical purification of the themes which dominate the House of Busirane. These episodes are also framed by the Jovian crimes in Busirane’s tapestry and represent the unseen aspects of the Roman myths in which the majority of Jove’s lovers are destroyed in one way or another as a result of their violation.
The third chapter of this thesis tracks the presence of the themes found in the second room of Busirane’s castle. The core concepts of this room, filled with the plunder of war, is in expressing the pervasive metaphorical understanding of love as a war between the sexes and more importantly, between men. While this is present in the House of Busirane, it more effectively anticipates the thematic thrust of Book IV, specifically the revelation of Scudamour’s violent quest to obtain Amoret and use of tournaments and jousting as a means to effectively control male violence and structure social status. Thus, while Chapters One and Two focus on experiences of sexualized violence, the principal heterosocial experience of note in Chapter Three is the use of violence as a means of social advancement and control. By exploring The Faerie Queene’s representations of masculinity concerning beastly lust, cannibalistic sex and warlike love, this thesis provides a suitable framework in which to discuss the gendered didacticism of Spenser’s central books.
Chapter One: Metaphorical Metamorphosis

Western myth is replete with stories of sexual violence. Spenser’s antecedents in the epic tradition, Ovid, Virgil and Homer, utilize rape as a narrative tool, a visual code to express the dominance of one ideology or symbol over another. In *The Faerie Queene*, Spenser inherits this metaphorical representation, as well as all of its problematic baggage, by constructing a world in which the primary relationship between genders is enacted through sexual violence. Indeed, throughout Faerieland, specifically in Books III and IV, the threat of rape is ever-present. Northrop Frye’s summation of the epic, that “On practically every page there is either a good rape, or a good try” (*Notebooks* 44), is only slightly hyperbolic, and Camille Paglia’s statement that “In *The Faerie Queene*, the ability to fend off rape is a prerequisite of the ideal female psyche” (Paglia 186) is remarkably accurate. There is much to say, and much that has been said, on the implications this construction of gender relations has on the portrayals of women during the early modern period; much less has been said on the ramifications this conceptualization has on our understanding of masculinity. Why does Spenser choose to continue the tradition of narrativizing sexualized violence in the central books of *The Faerie Queene*? As a kind of conduct book, *The Faerie Queene* is written for the purposes of improving the manners of its readers. Thus, Spenser’s focus on the sexual deviancy of

---

men, from the time of myth to the present, functions as a diagnosis of the major obstacle impeding the growth of fashioning “a gentleman or noble person in virtuous and gentle discipline” (“Prefatory Letter”). While Spenser purposefully inherits the language of a sexual economy from earlier epic poets, he uses these tropes to critique Early Modern understandings of gender, specifically of proper masculinity.

At the centre of this debate are the tapestries and artifacts Britomart observes in the first two rooms of Busirane’s castle.11 As a thematic set piece, the House of Busirane is the hinge on which the entire scope of The Faerie Queene pivots. Chronologically it occurs at the centre of the poem’s six books, but more importantly it provides the conclusion of the original 1590 publication of Books I-III. Spenser is a highly schematic poet, expressing his opinion on a particular concept or idea by physically mapping it and its relationship with other concepts; the fact that Busirane’s castle links the two most narratively similar Legends is not insignificant. Both books essentially follow the pursuit of love by several pairs of lovers, the principal ones being Britomart/Artegall, Florimell/Marinell, Amoret/Scudamour and Timias/Belpheobe. All four plots are, for the most part, resolved by the end of Book IV. A few loose ends are attended to in Book V, such as the actual marriage of Florimell and Marinell, but these four relationships encompass the

majority of the narrative focus of the central books. Yet despite their close narrative links, comprising a two-part story of the search and attainment of love, Books III and IV operate on entirely different ideological allegories concerning gender relations. Where Book III is filled with examples of the pursuit of rape and the control of women through physical strength, Book IV shifts this conversation to the domination of women through social means, specifically the systems of courtly love and the politics of tournaments and jousting. Spenser’s books function as essays as much as they do stories, with each book working through a particular intellectual problem by confronting a thesis (in the guise of a character) with its dialectical antithesis and narrativizing the conflict. In this manner of thinking, the theses of Books III and IV are complementary in that they focus on a topic which has less importance elsewhere in the poem, but each does so by pursuing different approaches of argumentation. Busirane’s castle is of primary significance in this because, even in the original publication of 1590, Spenser offers a window into the dual nature of masculinity and love through the two chambers Britomart traverses. The artistry of these two rooms provides a statement of Spenser’s assessment of the problems of love and, generally speaking, helps to illustrate and define the way Book III presents love in comparison to Book IV; in short, the tapestries of the first room are more thematically suited and allegorically relevant to Book III, while the antiques of the second chamber anticipate the later publication of Book IV. There are significant exceptions to this, as concepts of one book also bleed into the other, but the manner in which these exceptions
are handled helps to promote this separation of themes as will be discussed in Chapter Two.

This chapter, however, will focus on the significance of the tapestries as they relate to Book III, particularly to the story of Florimell. Busirane’s tapestries provide an encyclopedic portrayal of rape throughout the epic canon, specifically that of Ovid’s treatment of the sexual deviancy of Roman gods.12 Over the course of several stanzas, Spenser reminds us of the exploits of Jove, Phoebus, Neptune, Saturn, Bacchus and Mars13 in their quest to seduce mortal women. Consistent throughout these myths is the necessity for metamorphosis, usually into an animalistic, bestial form, in order to succeed in seduction. The “seduction” is rarely consensual and often involves violent abduction achieved only as a result of the disguised advances of an animal. In other words, for the gods of Rome, animal transformations are used because they are considered less physically threatening than masculine forms which would signal their sexual intent. Spenser writes of Jove, “Now like a Ram, faire Helle to peruart/Now like a Bull, Europa to withdraw” (III.xi:30.5-6). The metamorphosis of Jove in both cases physically disguises his male prerogative for sexual gratification, while metaphorically revealing its animalistic nature. Notice also the verbs which conjoin Jove to his loves, which state


13 Spenser uses the anglicized name of the Roman God Jupiter, which is a version of the Greek God, Zeus. All three characters are narratively identical. The rest of the gods cited are the Roman names for the Greek Gods of Apollo, Poseidon, Cronus, Dionysus and Ares respectively.
explicitly or imply violence: “pervert” and “withdraw,” by which is meant “kidnap.” In the following stanzas, Jove subsequently transforms into a swan to “invade” Leda, a satyre to “snatch” Antiopa, a serpent for Prosperina and abducts both Asterie and the Trojan hero, Ganymede, as an eagle. Jove’s tactic of bodily transformation is repeated in the tapestries of Phoebus (as a lion, a stag and a falcon), Neptune (ox, dolphin, pegasus), and Saturn (centaur). Other myths involving these gods are incorporated into the tapestry in which their transformations are not animalistic, but remain consistent with the concept of metamorphosed masculinity as a means of articulating violent sexual gratification. The majority of these stories are inherited from Ovid (although some are inventions of Spenser himself), and are used to acknowledge the tradition of rape and transformation as the primary weapons of men against women.

The images of Busirane’s tapestries help to codify the primary perspective of sexual relations as presented through the classical epics. The common theme among the tapestries is, as Leslie Brill states, “the perversion of love between unequals, the degradation of gods and men by the demonic Dan Cupid” (Brill 21). It is precisely our assessment of who the lesser party is in this situation which is at question when considering the tapestries of Roman myth as they exist in a Christian world. Christian ideology is consistent in its hierarchical structure of all living things through the philosophy of the Great Chain of Being. In this schematic ladder of spiritual purity in

---

14 The philosophy of the Great Chain of Being was originally introduced as the _scala nature_, latin for “ladder of nature,” by Aristotle in his _History of Animals_. Aristotle’s zoological study ranked creatures in an eleven part gradient including plants, animals and men. During the Middle Ages, Christian theologians adapted this scientific scale to include divine and satanic figures. For the seminal study of this concept, see Arthur O. Lovejoy, _The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea_, (Cambridge, MA., 1936).
which God is placed at the top, animals are clearly situated on a rung beneath that of humans. The classical tradition, while it shares many of the same assumptions about the relative power between gods, humans and animals, does not philosophically codify these relationships and positions as distinct and different in the same manner as Christianity later does. The capacity for physical change, for metamorphosis, is a concept that is ever-present in the Ovidian world. Greco-Roman mythology is built around various transformations and hybrid creatures, concepts which are sacrilegious in the Christian mindset as they offend the sanctity of the body, and therefore, the spirit. As Thomas P. Roche says of the tapestries, “The love of a god and a mortal brings debasement for the god and possible destruction for the mortal” (“Challenge to Chastity” 196). This is true of the classical world, but when considering the Virgin Birth of Christianity, the concept of a union between god and mortals is sacred, not debasing, and is crucial to the core of that faith. Moreover, Roche’s statement makes little distinction between the kind of transformation the god undertakes in his love of a mortal, as the end result of the romance is not contingent on whether he takes a human or an animal form; in other words, the adoption of an animal form is just as debasing to the gods of classical myth as is the adoption of a human form. In the Christian framework, the former is clearly more spiritually debasing than the latter. While the Holy Spirit of Christianity is often represented as a dove, this form is symbolic of the spiritual purity of the figure. This helps to avoid confusing the religious purpose of the virgin inception with the obvious sexual connotations of the scene. Conversely, the penetrations featured in Busirane’s tapestries
carry no religious significance, but present the problematic nature of masculine desire which infects both humans and the gods. The shift from classical to Christian philosophy provides a dual interpretation of the unequal party featured in Busirane’s tapestry. In the classical tradition, the god is clearly in the superior position and the woman, the clear victim. In a Christian reading of the tapestry, the woman remains the victim, but she also retains her moral superiority as the male god degrades himself by adopting a lower corporeal form on the Great Chain of Being. He becomes a secondary victim to his own uncontrollable animalistic desire.

Defining Metaphorical Metamorphosis

The abundance of animal-centric myths of lust present in the tapestries highlights *The Faerie Queene*’s use of the concept of bestiality, how these myths of inappropriate male conduct pervade the text, and in what ways they contribute to the larger allegory of fashioning the perfect Renaissance gentleman. What I will argue is that the tapestries presented in the first room of the House of Busirane establish the primary relationship between men and women in the world of Faeryland as it is presented in Book III. In this conception of gender relations, male and female interaction is mediated through the guises of animals which attempt to question and subvert the system of courtly love. The literal metamorphoses of the gods in these tapestries echo several other metaphorical transformations present throughout Spenser’s central books. It is through this refrain of symbolism that a coherent metaphorical structure can be discovered. In their seminal text
on the subject of metaphor, *Metaphors We Live By*, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson construct a theory of language as metaphorically structured in a systematic manner. Because of this internally consistent system, broader metaphorical concepts are ingrained into culture, and by extension, the method in which that culture thinks about particular subjects. For example, in western culture, it is appropriate to say that the metaphor “time is money” is an accepted belief. This can be inferred through common and pervasive phrases which belong to this family of metaphors, statements such as:

```
You’re wasting my time.
This gadget will save you hours.
I don’t have the time to give you.
How do you spend your time these days? (Lakoff and Jonson 8)
```

All of these phrases utilize terminology associated with financial transactions in order to describe temporal situations. In fact, the frequency with which these metaphors are used disguises our ability to identify them as metaphors; we are no longer able to conceptualize different manners of description. From this, it is possible to postulate what the significance of money in Western culture is and how it influences our conceptualization of daily routine. A Lakoffian/Johnsonian analysis of *The Faerie Queene* would seek out the broader metaphorical structure inherent at the linguistic level of the text to evaluate the socially constructed, ideological and subconscious core from which the text is authored. In Book III of Spenser’s text, the central metaphorical system is built out of the Roman lust myths interpreted through the lens of Christian ideology, which results in a conceptualization of sixteenth-century Early Modern masculine sexual desire as beast-like.
Spenser first establishes this metaphorical foundation in the ending of Book II when Guyon ventures into the Bower of Bliss. There he discovers men who have been physically transformed by Acrasia into beasts (II.xii). The sexual deviancy of these men, their focus on the excesses of pleasure, causes their literal metamorphosis into animalistic figures which Acrasia and Spenser’s England associate with lust. This is significant, not only in that it establishes the tradition in which elements from the ending of one book anticipate the themes of the following book, but also because it establishes the metaphorical link between lustful desire and the instinctual sub-human elements of animals. The connection of these two concepts develops a language with which the entire concept of masculine desire is considered in the following books, using the framework of animalistic metamorphosis to describe the male reaction to female presence. In Book III, this metaphor from the Bower of Bliss pervades every sexual, or potentially sexual, encounter between men and women. While the overarching plot goal of the Legend of Chastity is Britomart’s quest to find her true love, Artegall, and later to defeat the antithetical challenge to her virtue, Busirane, Book III is narratively dominated by various subplots involving the separation and reunion of several lovers. This list includes: Timias and Belphoebe, Amoret and Scudamour, Malbecco and Hellenore, and, most importantly to this discussion, Florimell and Marinell.

What is fascinating about each of these couples is that, observed together, they present the entire spectrum and progression of love. They represent four distinct ages or phases of love, and each requires a different code of proper conduct both for the female
and male parties. The reader witnesses love at first sight with Timias and Belphoebe, and observes the proper social role of a man when interacting with a figure representing virginity. Florimell and Marinell represent the next stage of love, engagement, but Marinell is less suited to his position as a fiancé and future head of a household, relying on his mother to negotiate the return of his bride-to-be. Even less suited to his position is Scudamour, whose relationship with Amoret is stuck in the undefined and uncomfortable space of unconsummated marriage. The final couple, Malbecco and Hellenore, are the most ill-suited to their positions as husband and wife, as Spenser dramatizes the dissolution of their relationship. In this spectrum of lovers, there is a clear descent in the ability of the male participants to fulfill the expectations of their positions relative to the amount of responsibility those positions hold; in the Faerieland of Book III, the length of time a relationship has existed is directly proportional to its unhealthiness. To add to this bleak picture of love is that Spenser skips a step in his portrayal of love, presenting no pair of lovers who are both content and in a consummated marriage.

The reason for the strife and separation which plague each of these couples stems from a masculine flaw, the desire for lustful domination--whether this exists in the potential husband, or from an exterior threat. The exception to this is Hellenore who is jointly responsible for the dissolution of her relationship to Malbecco as he himself is of losing her, but even in this case, Malbecco and Hellenore find their relationship assaulted from the outside by a constant barrage of monstrous forces, beastly men and male beasts who seek to defile the purity of love. In the Hellenore story, cavorting with saytres, a half-
man, half-beast creature officiates the dissolution of her marriage; nevertheless, the physical presence of an actual beast is not necessary to threaten the chaste relationships of the other lovers. Instead, *The Faerie Queene* provides a stream of characters who oppose love, symbolize lust, and undergo literary, metaphorical metamorphosis akin to (yet distinct from) the transformations depicted in the tapestries of Jove. Their capacity for change is, as Camille Paglia suggests in *Sexual Personna*, what qualifies them as sources of virtuous oppositions:

> In the human realm, formlessness or wanton metamorphosis is amoral. Only evil characters (Archimago, Duessa, Guyle, Proteus) change shape. The heroic Prince Arthur can transform other things but never alters himself. Hybrid beings (part dog, fox, dragon, hag) are always bad. (Paglia 176)

Here, Paglia only comments on the characters who possess the supernatural ability to change their shape. This is a simple and common conceit in Spenser’s works to identify a character’s morality solely through their physical description. Yet the characters which threaten these pairs of lovers are not solely those who have supernatural powers, nor is it only those who are physically hideous. The true threat throughout Book III stems from characters who experience momentary lapses into secondary, monstrous forms within the linguistic descriptions of the poem. In these instances of inner revelation and exposure, the latent qualities of masculine beasts spring to the forefront of the poem when awakened through the desire for immediate sexual gratification.

**The Effect of Female Presence**
The most readily apparent examples of literary, but not literal metamorphoses are those experienced by the male characters pursuing Florimell across the Legend of Chastity and into the Legend of Friendship. Florimell is, like Britomart, on a quest to find her lover; however, what differentiates the manner in which they are treated is solely dependent on their outward appearance. Britomart, on the one hand, is disguised in male armour and is immune from the male gaze throughout most of her adventures. Florimell, on the other hand, is immediately described in the conventionalized language of the courtly love sonneteer:

Whose face did seeme as cleare as Christall stone,  
And eke through feare as white as whales bone:  
Her garments all were wrought of beaten gold  
And all her steed with tinsell trappings shone. (III.i:15.4-7)

Her appearance transcends literal language and relies heavily on simile and metaphor, a trope which is used to elevate Florimell as an observed idealistic object. This kind of poetic attention is afforded almost exclusively to the women of Spenser’s epic; male description relies on his active qualities, such as courage or bravery, while female descriptions are restricted to passive physical attractiveness.

In her groundbreaking analysis of the male gaze used in modern film, *Visual and Other Pleasures*, Laura Mulvey described this scopophilic tendency as a product of the male gaze in which both the narrator and intended audience of a work are assumed to be male. As she states:

The determining male gaze projects its fantasy onto the female figure, which is styled accordingly. In their traditional exhibitionist role women are simultaneously looked at and displayed, with their appearance coded for
strong visual and erotic impact so that they can be said to connote to-be-looked-at-ness. (Mulvey 19)

The asymmetrical attention given to the visual impact of a female character in the poem, in contrast to male characters, reveals the patriarchal lens through which the poem invites the reader to view the characters. While it is clear the majority of Spenser’s audience at the time of its composition was male, the first and foremost intended reader of the poem is Queen Elizabeth according to the poem’s preface. While the passage retains its problematic status from a feminist perspective, it can be read not only through a male perspective in general, but also through Arthur’s perspective specifically, thus emphasizing the presentation of the female effect on inappropriate male desire.

Florimell’s entrance into the poem is unique in that her presence immediately pauses the frantic action of the scene while Spenser is occupied in fully describing her idealized beauty. During this elongated moment, the action only halts for Arthur and Guyon, while time moves forward around them. As Spenser writes, “So as they gazed after her a whyle/Lo where a griesly foster forth did rush” (III.i:7.1-2). The rest of the stanza then segues into a full description of the forester while the reader is left to presume that the noble Arthur and Guyon remain pathetically inert in their lustful fantasies for an undisclosed amount of time. Generally speaking, there is a poetic conceit, not unique to Spenser, that time pauses while a poet works through any descriptive tangent necessary for the continuation of the action. Here, however, Spenser accomplishes a chronology entirely different in which the action of the poem moves consistently forward during his passive descriptions; it is the characters themselves, in this case limited to Arthur and
Guyon, who pause while Florimell, the forester and Spenser continue unhindered. What this temporal distinction suggests is the paradigm-shifting impact that the conventionalized and idealized female figure has on the male psyche. Arthur and Guyon, who are celebrated across the previous two books for their capacity for action, are rendered both mute and immobile when confronted with an image of female beauty.

The full effect of Florimell’s entrance into Book III is continued in further descriptions of the male response across the following few stanzas. Paired with the pause of action in Arthur and Guyon is an involuntary metamorphosis akin to that of Jove and the other Roman gods depicted in Busirane’s tapestries. Important to note here is that Florimell’s entrance into the poem is prefaced by the presence of violent animals. In stanza 14, Arthur, Guyon and Britomart travel across Faerieland: “Therein they long did ryde,/Yet tract of liuing creature none they fownd,/Saue Beares, Lyons, and Buls, which romed them arownd” (III.i:14. 7-9). All three creatures are symbolically violent, especially, in a sexual sense, bears and bulls. In Animals with Human Faces, Beryl Rowland states that “Tales of bears kidnapping and raping women and of bears becoming secret paramours of willing wives are widely disseminated in European folklore” (Rowland 32), and that “By the end of the twelfth century, the bear had become established as the pictorial motif to signify male sexuality,” (32), with the ape being its feminine counterpart. In Book I of The Faerie Queene, a lion provides the steed of wrath during the parade of the seven deadly sins, symbolically linking lions with violence throughout the poem (I.iv:33.2). Bulls are commonly also associated with sexualized
violence and are compared to lions in Psalm 22 as “a ravening and a roaring lion” (Ps. 22.12-13). The connotations of hunger in the word “ravening” and the erotic qualities of “roaring” in this description also further link the bull to sexualized violence. Thus, the animal imagery which directly precedes Florimell’s entrance repeatedly invokes the concepts of wrath, violence and sexual desire. That these are specifically identified as the only living creatures in the “full griesly” land is also symbolically significant in that it is a biological impossibility. Moreover, it is the repetition of “griesly” (horrible) which connects the animal imagery of stanza 14 with the description of Florimell’s first pursuer, “a griesly foster” in stanza 17.

The initial descriptions of the forester are as loaded with hyperbolically negative attributes as the descriptions of Florimell are with complimentary language. When he first bursts onto the scene in Canto One, Spenser immediately casts the reader’s ire against him through physical description. The forester is “Breathing out beastly lust her to defyle” (III.i:17.3), as if he himself is one of the animals of the previously discussed stanza. Spenser also exaggerates his monstrous, and thus inhuman qualities, “Large were his limbs, and terrible his look” (III.i:17.8). The poetic treatment of the man in violent pursuit of love is metaphorically understood through the language of animal instinct. Judging from the foresters actions after Florimell has been lost, there is a sense that his natural state is quite different from the animal the reader witnesses in this canto. What is

\[^{15}\text{In Classical mythology, bulls are also connected with sexuality, specifically infidelity. In the story of the labyrinth, King Minos’ wife lies with a bull and gives birth to the Minotaur. As noted previously, a bull is also the form Jove takes to kidnap Europa (III.xi: 30.6). See Ovid Metamorphosis, Book VII.}\]
most important about highlighting the forester’s actions and the representation of those actions is that his metamorphosis into a beast solely focused on lust is understood as both a natural occurrence and an immoral action. This tension between a seemingly instinctual animalistic desire and the aspiration to adhere to a civilized code is at the core of masculinity and the issue Spenser is attempting to diagnose through his representation of these actions. While the intended upper class reader of Spenser’s poem in Elizabethan England would not expect a simple country forester to exhibit a complete adherence to an idealized Christian morality, the example of the forester provides excellent contrast to a character such an audience would hold to those strictures. This can apply to all knightly characters of the poem, but principally and most significantly, it applies to Prince Arthur.

**The Unknightly Impulse**

The actions of Prince Arthur and Guyon at the beginning of Book III are highly troubling because they conflict with the allegorical consistence of their adherence to the twelve moral virtues. While Guyon, as the representative of Temperance, has never been wholly guiltless in his previous confrontation with sexual desire, it is Arthur, as the stated manifestation of all virtue, who ought to be held to the fullest degree of Spenserian

---

16 In his “Prefatory Letter to Sir Walter Raleigh”, Spenser states that “I labour to pourtraict in Arthure, before he was king, the image of a brave knight, perfected in the twelve private moral vertues, as Aristotle hath devised, the which is the purpose of these first twelve bookes.” However, several critics have called Spenser’s claim to have based his virtues on Aristotle’s misleading, as Aristotle never codifies any such list. See Jean Jules Jusserand “Spenser’s Twelve Private Moral Vertues as hath Devised,” Modern Philology (1906); W.F. DeMoss, “Spenser’s Twelve Moral Virtues ‘According to Aristotle,’” Modern Philology, (1918). Because of this confusion, the remaining six private moral virtues remain unknown. Spenser also planned twelve addition books based on the twelve public virtues represented by Arthur, the most important of which is magnificence, which Spenser states is “the perfection of all the rest, and containeth in it them all” (“Prefatory Letter”).
expectations, and it is his failure to do so which is both most alarming and most revealing of the poem’s true definition of masculinity. Arthur and Guyon’s sudden abandonment of their guiding characteristics complicates the previous, simple, two-dimensional spectrum of virtuous masculinity, a distinction which must now be qualified in light of the seemingly immoral intentions of both knights immediately following the appearance of Florimell.

After the forester and Florimell disappear from Spenser’s poetic attention, Arthur and Guyon join in the chase, but the question of who they are actually pursing, and their reasons for doing so, remains purposefully and disturbingly ambiguous:

To reskew her from shamefull villany
The Prince and Guyon equally belieue
Her selfe pursewd, in hope to win therby
Most goodly meede, the fairest Dame aliue. (III.i:18.5-8)

This passage carries with it several ambiguities. Arthur and Guyon’s initial intentions to rescue her from “villainy,” meaning a loss of chastity through rape, are complicated by their second stated objective to “win” her. As seen in Chapter Three, such language implies sexual ownership or conquest, a concept which a disoriented reader is inclined to question as it could not possibly be the reaction of Prince Arthur who has thus far been devoted to his search for the Faerie Queene. The reference to Florimell as “the fairest Dame aliue” is also suspicious, considering that Arthur ought to assume such a title would belong to Gloriana herself. Florimell is regularly described with the word “faire,” but it is rarely used as a relative distinction of superiority over other women. The thought of
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Florimell being the “fairest” belongs to Arthur in this moment, though it is one which is reversed at the end of his chase when his thoughts return to Gloriana, reinforcing the notion that his actions are instinctual and animalistic.

The schism between the reader’s perceived notions of Guyon and Arthur that have been built up by their depictions in the previous books and their present actions grows wider in the passage when Arthur and Guyon are described as “Full of great enuy and fell gealousy” (III.i:18.2), presumably of the forester should he be successful in his selfish desire for sexual gratification. This reaction is shared by Britomart who witnesses but does not join the strange pursuit. The poet attributes this to the fact that she is female: “The whiles faire Britomart, whose constant mind,/Would not so lightly follow beauties chase,/Ne reckt of Ladies Loue, did stay behind” (III.i:19.1-3). Britomart assumes that in this instance the motivation to “chase beauty” is obviously to catch it, to obtain it for oneself, not to protect it as a knight under the chivalric code ought to. Later in the poem, Britomart becomes a saviour and protectress to another woman, Amoret, demonstrating that it is within her nature and duty to protect threatened chastity in other women.

However, in the previous passage the poet attributes Britomart’s stillness to the fact that she is not “reckt of Ladies Loue:” that as a woman she is not homosexually attracted to another woman. Yet if Britomart is willing to selflessly protect Amoret from the bestial urges of men such as Busirane, why does she not aid Florimell from a similar threat to her chastity? The poem provides two reasons in the above passage, but neither is fully satisfactory. It appears more fitting that Britomart’s inactivity comes from the recognition
that the fundamental reason Arthur and Guyon pursued Florimell stems from a flawed masculinity, but a temporary one. In other words, that while the two knights may be unable to retain the constancy of mind expected of them, they will retain a purity of action which will in turn ensure Florimell’s safety and her maidenhood.

The ambiguity which remains unanswered concerning Arthur’s motivations in Canto One is further addressed and complicated by his actions in Canto Four when he reaches, but does not catch, Florimell: “Full myld to her he spake, and oft let fall/Many meeke wordes, to stay and comfort her withall” (III.iv:48 8-9). His meekly spoken words do not quell Florimell’s fear and in fact only continue her resolve to escape her new pursuer. James Grantham Turner notes that, during the Early Modern period, “‘conversation’ was not only a general term for social intercourse but also a legal and colloquial term for copulation” (Turner, 205). That Arthur uses words to explain away his erotic intent contradicts his actions in continuing to chase her and further feeds the notion that his motivation is not entirely altruistic. The poetic voice, however, seeks to absolve Arthur a few cantos later, stating that “With no lesse haste, and eke with no lesse dreed,/That fearful Ladie fledd from him, that ment/To her no euill thought, nor euill deed” (III.iv:50. 1-3). Spenser attempts to dispel ambiguity with this line, but the implications of its presence also suggest that Arthur’s intentions, even if they are sexual, are not explicitly evil, a further complication of the dubious relationship between men and chastity. As Sheila Cavanagh states:

While there are regular indications that Florimell is presumed to possess limited powers of discernment which impede her ability to distinguish
between worthy and suspect offers of assistance or sanctuary, her refusal to tarry here seems warranted, despite the narrator’s assertions to the contrary. (Cavanagh 23)

Florimell, justified or not, continues to flee even after noticing the elevated social status of her new pursuer: “And that it was a knight, which now her sewde,/ Yet she no lesse the knight feard, then that villein rude” (III.iv:50.8-9). Here, Arthur and the forester are directly compared for the first time and although the concept of the prince being spoken of in the same breath as a lowly common man is unlikely, here they are rendered equals. Though their social positions within the male realm may differ widely, occupying two ends of the social spectrum, to Florimell, a disempowered and frightened woman, they pose equal threats. Again the animal language finds its place, “That fast she from him fledd, no lesse afrayd,/Then of wilde beastes if she had chased beene” (III.iv:51. 2-4). Within two stanzas Spenser equates Arthur with a man of lowly status, then to a creature of a lower Christian creation. The pursuing male is perceived as a sexual predator in his thoughtless pursuit of Florimell, suggesting that the disease of male desire is capable of corrupting and degrading all men.

Arthur’s reaction to his inability to convince Florimell of his selfless intent is similarly telling in the dual motivations behind Arthur’s chase. Following Florimell’s exit, Arthur lays down for rest but is possessed by erotic fantasies:

But gentle Sleepe enuyde18 him any rest;  
In stead thereof sad sorrow, and disdaine  
Of his hard hap did vexe his noble brest,  
And thousand fancies bett his ydle brayne
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With their light wings, the sights of semblants aine:
Oft did he wish that Lady faire mote bee
His Faery Queene, for whom he did complaine:
Or that his Faery Queene were such, as shee. (III.iv:54. 5-7)

In the following cantos, Arthur beseeches the unkindness of night, personified in a female form, for its length and the sorrow that it inflicts upon the mind. As A.C Hamilton’s gloss on the passage notes, Arthur’s cries belong to the tradition of medieval complaint but inverts the usual complaint that the night is too brief, as is common in the aubade poetic form. The traditional complaint stems from a desire to extend the night hours, a time of both dreams and sexual fulfillment. Arthur’s inverse aubade therefore stems from unfulfilled sexual desire -- unchaste thoughts -- which configure both Florimell and Gloriana in erotic positions, thoughts which would not be forgiven by the poetic voice were they to occur in a female mind. Cavanagh also notes that:

The knight displays an overwhelming interest in his own erotic loss, rather than Florimell’s safety, as he tosses and turns, bemoaning his hard fate. It seems unlikely that he would be presented in such a distraught state if a pleasant chat or comfort for the frightened lady were the goal. The substance of his anguished thoughts indicates how completely, though unsuccessfully, the two women were conflated through desire. (Cavanagh 23)

It is the synthesis of the two women in Arthur’s mind that removes any doubt about the sexualized, and thus unromantic, nature of his desire.

The presence and actions of Arthur in these two early passages of Book III, beginning “beauties chase” in Canto One and abandoning it in Canto Four, disrupts the pattern Spenser begins to establish prior to the Legend of Chastity, and one he returns to following it. In every other book of *The Faerie Queene*, Arthur’s role is as a saviour of
virtue. He is an aid not only to the physical struggles of Spenser’s knights, such as slaying Orgoglio in Book I, but is a guide to achieving virtuous action. Only in the Book of Chastity, the sole book to feature a female knight, is Arthur unable to fulfill either of these duties. He provides no physical aid during a time of crisis, nor does he set an example during moments of doubt. Allegorically, his ability to rescue Spenser’s other knights is meant to demonstrate his apparent mastery of the virtues they represent, his virtue of magnificence being the culmination of all other virtue; conversely, his inability to help Britomart in any way suggests that even Arthur is not a paragon of the virtue of chastity.

As Sheila Cavanagh notes:

His failure to intervene in the book could be interpreted as one result of Britomart’s inability to fall and need rescue if she is to remain chaste, but the...episodes considered here suggest that Arthur’s own relationship with the virtue of chastity is too dubious for him to credibly educate others in its essential properties. (Cavanagh 16)

It is because of the complicated nature of Arthur’s relation to the virtue of chastity that the one-to-one allegorical framework of the poem concerning proper Early Modern masculinity is complicated. The book is as much an examination of the faults of Arthur’s straying from virtue as it is a celebration of his embodiment of them, meaning that he can not be simplistically characterized as the ideal role model he might otherwise have been assumed to be. That the inability to control male desire, the inner animal of a male monster, afflicts even Spenser’s most noble example of male behaviour suggests that Spenser’s conception of masculinity is one which does not require, or see as possible, the idea of male chastity; or perhaps such a man is possible, but that his achievement is not
valued in the society of Faeryland or of Elizabethan England. Like Jove and the other
Roman gods in Busirane’s tapestries, Arthur experiences a kind of metamorphosis into an
animalistic creature. The two acts of intended sexual violence differ only in that Arthur
seems incapable of controlling his transformation or succeeding in his seduction.

The Four Pursuers of Florimell

The temporary affliction of lust in Arthur, and to a lesser extent Guyon, reveals the
pervasive nature of the poem’s metaphorical representation of masculinity. This is further
established in the remaining episodes involving Florimell, as her pursuers are regularly
thwarted and replaced, beginning with her escape from the forester (and Arthur and
Guyon) into the house of the witch and her lusty son who is described in the same
metaphorical terminology. As he conspires to court Florimell, Spenser states “And cast to
loue her in his brutish mind/No loue, but brutish lust, that was so beastly tind” (III.vii:15
8-9). Unlike the forester and Arthur, whose attempts to win Florimell amount to merely
physically chasing her through the wilderness, the witch’s son attempts to replicate the
trappings of the systems of courtly love through his primitive understanding of their
procedures:

Oft from the forrest wildings he did bring,
Whose sides empurpled were with smyling red,
And oft young birds, which he had taught to sing
His maistresse praises, sweetly caroled,
Girlonds of flowres sometimes for her faire hed
He fine would dight; sometimes the squirrell wild
He brought to her in bands, as conquered
To be her thrall, his fellow seruant vild;
All which, she of him tooke with countenance meeke and milde. (III.vii:17)

This moment of gift-giving is a token element of chivalric romance, an exchange of sentimental material for romantic and sexual reciprocation. That the witch’s son chooses gifts from his natural surroundings such as birds, flowers and squirrels, suggests that he has a primitive understanding of the custom but is limited by his material resources he can use in the exchange. His attempt to mimic the actions of knights he has most likely heard stories about is a significant departure from Florimell’s experience with the forester and Arthur in the wilderness. The two episodes juxtapose the natural and the domestic sphere, or in other words, a world in which the notions of courtly love are ignored and one in which they are acknowledged.

In “From Courtly Love to The Crying Game,” Slavoj Zizek defines the formalized practices of etiquette required by the systems of courtly love as a carefully crafted social fiction. The primary purpose of this fiction is to impede and defer sexual gratification; it is a socially accepted obstacle course which separates two lovers from recognizing the animalistic nature of their desires. Most importantly, however, the system also seeks to mask the fallacy that, without them, there would be no barrier opposing the male sexual desire. Zizek’s theory postulates a certain set of coordinates which describe the nature and purpose of courtly love and can be used to evaluate the motivation behind the attempts made by the witch’s son on Florimell. As Zizek states on the rules governing courtly love:

It is thoroughly a matter of courtesy and etiquette; it has absolutely nothing to do with some elementary passion overflowing all barriers and disregarding all social rules. We are dealing with a strictly codified fiction, a
social game of ‘as if’ where we pretend that our sweetheart is the inaccessible Lady. (Zizek 97)

In the witch’s son episode, the execution of these formalities disguises the inherently beastly machinations of the man through the deference of his sexual intent into symbolic subtext. The metaphorical meanings of these actions are silently understood while remaining publicly veiled, broaching the topic of intercourse indirectly. The gift-giving scene of Canto Seven serves as both a disguise and articulation of the son’s lust for Florimell. It seem that, solely due to his lower class, the poet labels the witch’s son’s lust as “brutish,” despite sparing Arthur from the same derogatory terminology even though there is less cause, by the witch’s son’s pseudo-courtly actions thus far, to describe him as such. Yet the distinction of the witch’s son as brutish places him in the company of the forester, who experiences a public metamorphosis into a physical beast; the witch’s son is a beast only within the poetry of the epic (at least not until his advances are stymied). Perhaps he also exists as an animalistic creature in Florimell’s mind, who both receives his gifts and understands their significance, as she immediately vacates from the hospitality of the witch.

Zizek’s definition of courtly love also allows us to recognize Spenser’s distinction between the presence and absence of its qualities. If courtly love has nothing to do with “elementary passion overflowing all barriers,” then a state of nature, an uncivilized landscape in which the normal social fictions and regulations on sexual interaction do not necessarily apply or cannot be adequately protected, is defined by the uncontrollability of elementary passion. Such a condition is symptomatic of the forester who abandons all
social precepts to engage in a mad dash directly toward the prospect of sexual 
gratification, ignoring all subtlety and tact and displaying the animalistic energy of desire. 
This is also true of Florimell’s next potential aggressor, the fisherman, whose attempted 
rape of Florimell is presented as his natural reaction to the possibility of gratification. He 
ignores Florimell’s initial rejection of him, “But he, that neuer good nor maners knew/Her 
sharpe rebuke full litle did esteeme:/Hard is to teach an old horse amble trew” (III.viii:25. 
1-3). The fisherman’s disinterest in anything resembling courting is presented as an 
engrained habit, one which belongs to a man outside of society, like the forester, and is 
thus the allegorical representation of a man unhindered by the restraints of courtly love 
and the negative implications of such freedom. Ultimately, the fisherman is interrupted 
before his violent deed is realized by yet another pursuer, but the general implication is 
that the fisherman’s dismissal of Florimell’s rejection is indicative of how the forester, 
and perhaps even Arthur and Guyon, may have acted had they been successful in catching 
her outside of society’s constraints. By Zizek’s definition, these episodes which Spenser 
deliberately sets outside a socialized atmosphere represent a collective fascination with 
the abolition, or temporary removal, of the conventionalized notions of courtly love.

From the perspective of masculine representation, the forester and the fisherman 
scene are allegorically identical, the latter providing a hint into the possible conclusion of 
what the former may have been without intervention. The juxtaposition of the witch’s 
house episode between these two attempted rapes articulates the fallacy associated with 
courtly love. As Zizek states:
The point is therefore not simply in our setting up additional conventional hindrances in order to heighten the value of the object: external hindrances which render difficult our access to the object are here precisely to create the illusion that without them, the object would be directly accessible —what they thereby conceal is the inherent impossibility of attaining the object. (Zizek 100)

Operating outside the conventions of civilization, the forester and the fisherman act as if the female body is a directly accessible object for the purposes of gratification. Their rash decision to inflict sexualized violence is what classifies them as beasts in the linguistics of the poem. What Zizek remarks on is the achievement of the systems of courtly love to sublimate the idea of the female figure, to mythologize femininity to create the illusion that a lover is more desirable precisely because of her inaccessibility. This phenomenon is the source of the myth in which Elizabeth deliberately cloaks herself in the period, positioning herself as the most inaccessible and therefore most powerful woman of her time. It is the possibility, the fantasy, of possessing the unobtainable yet still objectifiable, which motivates adherence to the etiquette structures of chivalry. In this conception of the system of courtly love and the effect it has on the male psyche, it is clear that, to Spenser, it is the idealized fiction that is romanticized and conventionalized within the social sphere. This fiction is responsible for controlling male metamorphosis into animalistic and sexually deviant forms, a system of control which, when compared to the men of nature such as the forester and the fisherman, is necessary for the removal of violence from the social realm.

Florimell’s journey in and out of spheres of courtly influence is completed when she is confronted by the most powerful of her male pursuers, the sea-god Proteus. By this
point, Florimell sees her saviour from the fisherman as yet another danger, “but chaung’d from one to other feare” (III.viii:33.2), suggesting that Florimell is acknowledging the ever-present threat to her chastity that all male figures pose. Despite his status as a god, Proteus, in his dealings with mortals, attempts to maintain the social fiction of courtly love by legitimately wooing Florimell: “To winne her liking vnto his delight:/With flattering words he sweetly wooed her, /And offered faire guifts, t’allure her sight” (IV.viii:38.5-7). His actions are a repetition of the meek words of Arthur and the gifts of the witch’s son, both courtly tactics which Florimell has already rejected and views as transparent. When these seductive strategies fail, Proteus aims to replicate the tricks of Jove and the other Roman gods depicted in Busirane’s tapestries by transforming his exterior self into what he hopes are more desirable forms to Florimell:

Sometimes he boasted, that a God he hight:  
But she a mortall creature loued best:  
Then he would make him selfe a mortal wight;  
But then she said she lou’d none, but a Faery knight  
Then like a Faerie knight him selfe he drest;  
For every shape on him he could endew. (III.viii:39.6-9; 40.1-2).

Proteus assumes that it is merely his outward appearance which requires transformation in order for him to succeed in courting Florimell. Conversely, Spenser suggests that it is his inward character, his uncontrollable sexual desire, which she despises, and that she is committed to her lover, despite the shape Proteus undertakes. Frustrated with his failure in miming the etiquette of courtly love, Proteus reveals his beastly nature by transforming himself into shapes to scare Florimell: “To dreadfull shapes he did him selfe transforme,/  
Now like Gyaunt, now like to a feend./ Then like a Centaure, then like to a
These transformations also mimic those in Busirane’s tapestries, but differ in that they are not undertaken for the purposes of disguise. Instead of veiling the violence of his sexual desire, Proteus’ metamorphosis into various beasts highlights the danger he poses to the female form and the virtue of chastity. These physical transformations achieve the same terrified reactions as the metaphorical transformations of Florimell’s other male pursuers. Together, the barrage of lustful violence against Florimell constructs a thorough diagnosis of the fundamental problem of male expressions of desire.

The four principal pursuers of Florimell (the forester, the witch’s son, the fisherman and Proteus) represent four distinct quadrants of social spheres. The four men form two pairs, one which represents a state of domestication and one which represents a state of nature. The first operates within the rules of courtly love and includes Florimell’s experience with the witch’s son and Proteus. What differentiates this pairing is the distinction between mortal and immortal male aggressors. The primary implication of this difference is the kinds of metamorphosis undertaken by each character. The witch’s son only experiences an involuntary change in the literary expression of his mental attitudes, as his thoughts turn to lustful desires in his “brutish mind.” His physical appearance remains the least threatening of the four pursuers but his disguise rests in the unstated implications of courtly procedures which allude to his masculine fantasies. Proteus treats these procedures as a sort of game which, when completed, should yield a guaranteed result. His simplification of the courtly love system fails and leaves him frustrated. It is
this sexual frustration that leads to his angered physical metamorphosis, which illustrates the inner monster that motivates the violent desires of each unknightly character throughout Book III. The second pairing, the forester and the fisherman, is reflective of Spenser’s conception of a man acting in a state of nature, outside the usually socially constructed fictions of civilization, principally that of courtly love. These two pursuers differ only in their setting, as the first pursues gratification through a forest and the second on the sea. This is clearly a play on Florimell and her true lover, Marinell’s, names, which respectively refer to plants and bodies of water. Yet the implication that outside of the social sphere Florimell is not safe on both land and sea is critical to Spenser’s evaluation of the major problem concerning male desire. Taken together, these four distinct quadrants present the issue of animalistic and violent masculinity as inescapable, that women are not safe on land, on sea, with men or with the gods.

---

Chapter Two: Negotiating Lust Between Books III and IV

The flight of Florimell across four cantos of Book III illustrates a coherent and consistent metaphorical expression of the problematic nature of masculine desire. This evaluation of male sexuality is not exclusive to the Florimell episodes but finds further allegorical weight in the second major subplot of Spenser’s central books, Amoret’s repeated capture and subjugation by domineering male figures. As Busirane’s tapestries directly precede Amoret’s entrance into the poem and codify the concept of animalistic masculinity, the metaphorical framework found in “beauties chase” can be applied to “beauties” capture in the Amoret scenes. In virtue and poetic treatment, Amoret is more or less indistinguishable from Florimell; both are considered examples of challenged chastity and are praised in the language of the poem. Yet these two characters occupy distinct allegorical positions on the subjects of masculine violence and sexuality, which stems from their capacity for action. Florimell flies across every social sphere of Early Modern England and provides a clear depiction of male desire for female objectification. Amoret, however, is stationary as a result of male dominance. She is rendered passive and is acted upon instead of being capable of action. As Spenser’s most consistently damselled female character, Amoret fulfills the archetype of the maiden in distress and is under the constant threat of the allegorically identical concepts of rape and cannibalism.20

Contrasted against Florimell’s active resistance, Amoret’s immobility and physical captivity depict the psychological effect of monstrous male domination.

Of the principal pursuers of Florimell discussed earlier, only Proteus challenges Florimell’s chastity on an intellectual level after succeeding in controlling her physical form. Yet the attempts he makes “her will to win vnto his wished end” (III.viii:41.5) are comically ineffective and no suggestion is made that Florimell ever loses the purity of thought necessary to maintain Early Modern conceptions of chastity. Proteus’s impotence in “controlling her smart” is the only parallel in the Florimell episodes with which to compare the more overt captivities of Amoret under two of the poem’s more dangerous villains: Busirane in Book III and the Man-Beast in Book IV. This can be attributed to the poetic prerogative concerning each character and how they explicitly explore distinct realms of sexualized violence. Florimell’s physical movement across Early Modern society metaphorically expresses the male desire to obtain the physical body-object of the female form. Amoret’s struggle is quite different as her captors are metaphorical illustrations of male intellectual and emotional control over women. Under the logic of the poem, this characterization is appropriate as the situations both female characters encounter are directly associated with their marital status, and therefore, their physical and emotional availability. Florimell, although engaged, is unmarried; her social

21 See Alexander Niccholes “A Discourse of Marriage and Wiving” in The Harleian Or a Collection of Scarce, Curious, and Entertaining Pamphlets and tracts, as Well in Manuscript as in Print, Found in the Late Earl of Oxford’s Library, Interspersed with Historical, Political and Critical Notes, (Oxford: R. Dutton, 1809), p. 232-288. Niccholes states: “True chastity doth not only consist in keeping the body from uncleanness but in withholding the mind from lust; and she may be more maid that hath been unwillingly forced thereto in body, than she that hath barely consented in heart” (284). This distinction keeps Florimell from judgement and explains Busirane’s motivations in attempting to manipulate Amoret’s thoughts.
value thus remains inherent within her physical chastity. Because of this, the threats she faces are challenges of the body. Even Proteus does not attempt to defer Florimell’s emotional chastity onto a figure other than her husband-to-be, but instead attempts to replicate the form she is already inclined to choose as her partner.

Amoret occupies a different and dubious social sphere as her marriage is unconsummated. Throughout the central books, the concept of chastity extends to marital fidelity, the idea that sexual union within marriage also constitutes chastity in the same way celibacy outside of it does. Yet because she has been married to Scudamour, but has not sexually affirmed their marriage, Amoret is situated in a largely unclassified social situation between two highly codified positions. It is for this reason that the barrage of masculine violence against Amoret’s chastity uses the metaphor of bodily assault to describe an emotional manipulation. Amoret does not participate in the elaborate flights from danger in the same way Florimell does because the danger to her is what happens following a physical conquest. It is the negotiation of the moment of penetration and the manner in which this moment is achieved that enslaves Amoret first to Scudamour, then to Busirane, Britomart and finally, the Man-Beast. Much like Jove’s manipulation of his victims in Busirane’s tapestries, Amoret’s struggle across the central books of *The Faerie*...
**Queene** is emblematic of the means by which animalistic masculinity attempts to control the female mind through the destruction, consumption and ownership of the body.

**The Effect of Re-Separating Amoret and Scudamour**

In any study of Amoret’s significance to the central books of Spenser’s poem, it is crucial to consider the dual endings of Book III and the implications that the thematic revision of the Legend of Chastity has on Spenser’s conception of masculinity. The initial 1590 publication of *The Faerie Queene* contained only the first three books, making the conclusion of the Amoret/Scudamour love subplot the definitive conclusion of the entire epic in its first print. The ending is narratively and thematically satisfying: Britomart, having defeated the enemy of chastity, Busirane, completes the quest Scudamour is unable to because of his “greedy will and envious desire,” safely delivering his captured lover, Amoret, to him. Amoret and Scudamour then embrace so completely that, to the onlooking Britomart and the reader, they resemble a single hermaphroditic figure representing the virtue of married chastity.\(^{23}\) The blurring of gender lines and boundaries, the unification of virginal femininity and violent masculinity, provides a rare egalitarian position on the relationship between genders, one which Spenser inverts and challenges in Book IV. This hermaphroditic union is unique across the whole of *The Faerie Queene*; the

---

other major love plots of Book III are all left unresolved, and in the case of Britomart, uninitiated.

Thus far, the third book of *The Faerie Queene* has, through Florimell, been focused on the manner in which the desire for sexual gratification is in a constant struggle against the systems of courtly love which channel them through socially appropriate deferral. The hermaphroditic reunion of Amoret and Scudamour, in contrast, is described as a relationship which operates outside of any semblance of courtly love without descending into unchecked monstrous sexuality as has been the case in every other instance of this scenario. Instead, their reunion overcomes base pleasure:

> Of huge affection, did in pleasure melt,  
> And in sweete rauishment pourd out her spright:  
> No word they spake, nor earthly thing they felt,  
> But like two senseles stocks in long embracement dwelt. (1590; III.xii: 45.6-9)

That Spenser strikes at the concept of “ravishment” suggests the related concepts in Early Modern theology of religious enlightenment as well as bodily rape. Their union balances on a paradox between sexual gratification and spiritual understanding or virtue.

Concerning sexuality, Spenser negotiates a paradox in that they “did in pleasure melt” but no “earthy thing they felt.” All of this contributes to a spiritually affirmed and not solely sexualized union, a form of chastity in which marital fidelity is both physically and religiously proper. The hermaphrodite image figured here stands in stark contrast to the clear gender divisions present throughout the rest of the poem and those of Elizabethan England as well.
In the intervening years between the original 1590 publication of Books I-III and
the 1596 addition of Books IV-VI, this crucial scene, the narrative catharsis it provides
and the ideological stance concerning the dual questions of masculinity and femininity are
erased. Instead a less thematically and narratively satisfying conclusion replaces the
hermaphrodite scene; Britomart emerges from Busirane’s castle to discover Scudamour
has, in fear, left the castle in search of further aid. Amoret and Scudamour’s reunion is
delayed for several cantos into Book IV in a scene of considerably reduced poetic weight.
Because of this, Book IV becomes a necessary conclusion to the events of Book III,
linking the two Legends in a narrative sense while isolating them thematically. As has
been noted above, the hermaphroditic ending is an appropriate thematic note on which to
conclude the Legend of Chastity; the new ending, however, is much more suited to the
world of social hierarchies that are the focus of Book IV. The Faeryland of Book IV is
incompatible with the hermaphroditic image since it is structured against the concept of
egalitarian gender positions. Even the last line of the new ending hints at the narrative
continuity of the two pieces, as the poet lays down his pen “whilest here I doe
respire” (III.xii:45-9, 1596). This kind of ending, in which the poet reverts into the first
person to note his choice to end a particular canto, is utilized at the end of nearly every
canto of the second addition, but almost never in the original print of Books I-III. The
repetition of this narrative tool further links these two parts into a continuous narrative
piece which works to highlight their allegorical differences. In other words, the
continuation of all four major love plots (Britomart/Artegall, Florimell/Marinell, Timias/
Belphoebe, and now Amoret/Scudamor) allows the reader to see the clear differences in which each of these relationships are handled in each book.

More significantly, Scudamour’s flight from Busirane’s castle also has profound implications for Spenser’s newly assumed conceptualization of masculinity. Previously, Scudamour’s inadequacies were measured by his incapacity to cross the fiery barrier into Busirane’s castle, a failure which is attributed to his “greedy will” to re-obtain Amoret. His abandonment of Busirane’s castle in the new ending of Book III, because he is “full of feare” runs counter to the established fearlessness of Scudamour and his unflinching adherence to an image of masculinity as violent and unquestionably courageous. This change in character is erased again in Book IV, when Scudamour readopts his traditionally masculine attitude, causing the reader to question the motivation behind the anomaly of his actions in the 1596 ending. It is too simple to accept that Spenser chose to fundamentally restructure the end of Book III merely to make possible the introductory plot of Book IV, that is to say, to make possible the scene in which Britomart and Amoret continue alone through the forest. Clearly any number of circumstances could have provided a simpler solution without compromising and complicating his previously published material. Setting aside the motivation of plot simplification as the primary reason for the new edition, it can only be concluded that Spenser retroactively changed Book III as a statement towards a thematic revaluation.

The changes between the first and second endings of Book III are only the most tangible and obvious examples of the manner in which the Book of Chastity is informed
by, contextualized, and rewritten through the lens of the Book of Friendship. The shift seen here signals the manner in which Book IV can be superimposed onto Book III, retroactively re-authoring the text. What I hope to do is, instead of assuming a motivation on the part of Spenser, note what the narrative effect of this change encompasses. Most obviously the separation of Amoret and Scudamour at the end of Book III allows their independent narratives to continue into Book IV. Looking at Amoret specifically, the most important scene involving her directly is her abduction by the Man-Beast. The rewriting of Book III directly leads to the narrative possibilities of Book IV, Canto vii, and it is in this canto that Spenser reverts back to the notions of monstrous masculinity which are so prevalent in Book III, but which are otherwise ignored in Book IV. Therefore, the opening up of the Amoret plot line allows Spenser to re-explore his conceptualization of violent animalistic masculinity which was the focus of Book III in a new allegorical manner.

Looking then at Amoret’s captors in both Books, and the kind of masculinity they each project, helps to elucidate the plausible effect the rewriting of Book III has on *The Faeire Queene*’s diagnosis of masculinity and the fashioning of a proper gentleman.

**Sexual Consumption**

The rewriting of Book III provides a narrative connection between Amoret’s first captor, Busirane, and her second, the Man-Beast, in a way which would not have been
possible otherwise. That they are narratively connected through Amoret is not insignificant as it suggests that the Man-Beast is a kind of repetition of the symbolism Busirane embodied, a more enunciated articulation of the concepts of violent masculinity. Unique to the other beasts of the poem, Busirane and the Man-Beast are both connected by the implications of both physical and allegorical rape and cannibalism. As Paglia argues, rape is “one of the cardinal events” (185) of the poem around which the power relations of Fairyland are interpreted. On some level, rape is central to the stories of most female characters of the poem including Una, Belphoebe, Florimell, Amoret, Samient and Serena, and is involved in the lineages of Merlin, Satyrane and Triamond and his brothers. As Paglia argues, Spenser borrows the use of poetic rape from Ovid’s *Metamorphosis*, but “intellectualizes” the concept by using it as an allegory for victory, that “Lust is the medium by which each sex tries to enslave the other” (185). As Paglia states:

Rape is his metaphor for biology, for the surges of aggression in nature. The sex war of *The Faerie Queene* is a Darwinian spectacle of nature red in tooth and claw, of eaters and the eaten. Bestial Lust and his agents, like the hyena monster stalking Florimell, literally feed on women’s flesh, devouring their bodies. Woman is meat, and the penis, symbolized in oak logs brandished by Lust and Orgoglio, is a thing, a weapon. (185)

---

24 Busirane and the Man-Beast are only two of Amoret’s potential assailers. As with Florimell, whose quadrupled pursuers were situated on the two poles of domesticated and natural pursuit of sexual gratification, Amoret experiences a similar phenomenon. As seen in Book IV, canto i, Amoret assumes Britomart, yet to be revealed as a women, to have the same possessive fantasies as Scudamour. Thus, Amoret’s transition from Scudamour, to Busirane, to Britomart, to the Man-Beast, represents a two-fold movement between a social conqueror (Scudamour and Britomart) and a physical owner (Busirane and the Man-Beast). Interestingly, both Florimell and Amoret are finally saved by women, Cymodoce and Belphoebe respectively, even though men are present in both situations (Marinell and Timias). It seems that in both cases, salvation by fellow women breaks the chain of possessive male ownership and theft.
Paglia makes no distinction between the act of sexual violence and that of cannibalism; the language of one is the language of the other. The concept which has most often been used to exonerate the rapists of Spenser’s story -- that the rape is merely representative of ideological superiority -- is extended to the act of cannibalism so that they become indistinguishable: literal cannibalism is metaphorical rape, and literal rape is metaphorical cannibalism.

The linguistic connection between these concepts touches on an ongoing conversation between Early Modern thinkers who explored gender boundaries. One year prior to the first publication of *The Faerie Queene*, two English writers, Thomas Orwin and Jane Anger, engaged in a pamphlet war over definitions of proper masculinity and femininity. Orwin’s 1588 pamphlet “Boke His Surfeit in Love, with a farwel to the folies of his own phantasie,” argues that women are the more lustful gender. The following year, Jane Anger, a common pseudonym in London, published her response, “Her Protection for Women.” Today only Anger’s work remains and the little that is known about the author is contained entirely in a single copy of this text. The work is significant in that it is the first female defense of women published in England and articulates the tension in describing male/female paradigms under a queen. In one significant passage, Anger states:

> Men being of wit sufficient to tender [consider] of these vertues which are in us women, are ravished *with that* delight of those dainties, which allure & draw the sensces of them to serve us, wherby they become ravenous haukes, who doe not onely seize upon us, but devour us. (Anger 177-8)
Anger’s description of lustful transformations of men into animals, “ravenous haukes” when in the presence of virtuous women mirrors the concept of metamorphosis throughout Spenser. In both cases, male strength becomes an uncontrolled force which results in the ravishment of women, an action that is paired with the concept of devouring. That this metaphorical structure, of transformation and cannibalization as means to understanding male sexuality, is referenced in the philosophy of Early Modern thinkers reinforces the pervasive manner in which they inform Spenser’s epic.

By framing a reading of both the Busirane and Man-Beast episodes with the concept that rape and cannibalism are metaphorically indistinguishable, the two captors become two only slightly differentiated statements on the problem of masculine sexual possession of women. For Busirane, the use of violence signifies rape and the destruction of the virtue of chastity. As such, he embodies active patriarchal power and seeks to pacify Amoret. This is clear from the moment Britomart finally sees the true Amoret trapped by Busirane:

    Saue that same woefull Lady, both whose hands
    Were bounden fast, that did her ill become,
    And her small waste girt rownd with yron bands,
    Vnto a brasen pillour, by the which she stands. (III.xii:30.6-9)

The iron bands which hold Amoret captive can be interpreted as symbolic of the bondage of sexuality and the bondage of marriage. Inappropriate sex in Book I is called by Archimago, “Venus shameful chaine,” (I.ii:4.8) which is similar to the “chaines of lust and lewde desyres” (II.i:54.3) that imprison the men of ill-temperance in the Bower of Bliss. A.C. Hamilton also relates Amoret’s iron bands to “this soft lovely band,” (396) in
Spenser’s *Epithalamion*, which are marriage rings. Taking the pillar as the phallic symbol of masculinity, Amoret is, as A.C. Hamilton notes, “Bound by what she fears to what she fears,” or in other words, the symbols of either bodily or marital surrender bind her to the source of patriarchal power, the phallus. Allegorically this is representative of the exact situation Amoret is in outside of Busirane’s castle in that her physical form must be surrendered to masculine power through marriage in her expected sexual consummation with, and consumption by, her husband, Scudamour. The destruction of the pillar following Busirane’s defeat reinforces this reading (III.xii:37.7-9). If the pillar represents the invasive power of masculinity, then its destruction, or “detumescence,” as Maclean and Prescott (1993) note in their translation of the text, signifies the defeat of this concept at the hands of virtuous chastity. Physically, this releases Amoret from Busirane’s control through the phallic pillar, but more significantly, the emotional manipulation of Busirane ends.

Busirane’s manipulation extends beyond the mere physical incarceration of Amoret but is made manifest through the symbolism of violence and metaphorical rape. The central question posed in this episode is the line “Ah, who can love the worker of her smart?” (III.xii:31.7). The question can be applied to any binary power relationship and asks how the weaker of two entities can love its master. For example, how can Amoret, as a prisoner, love Busirane, her captor? Extending this to the male/female binary relationship makes the question more complicated. In this relationship, in which the man is the worker of the female “smart”–the manipulator of her emotions and owner of her
body—how can women be capable of love in such a disempowered position? As A.C. Hamilton notes on this line, the question can equally be posed as much to Scudamour, as Amoret’s domineering husband, as it can to Busirane. In this conception of masculinity, the patriarchal forces are so powerful that they have rendered the female position entirely inactive, rendering the presence of love impossible. Busirane is a literal interpretation of the kinds of masculine forces which attempt to completely control female free will, but paradoxically expect feminine complicity, and even gratitude, for their actions.

Still unanswered is precisely how Busirane attempts to be the worker of Amoret’s smart and how these methods are comparable to the actions of rape and cannibalism. Prior to her entrance into the central chamber of Busirane’s castle, Britomart witnesses a Wedding Masque, a procession of paired personifications symbolizing various qualities antithetical to chastity such as Desire, Doubt and Fear. In this imaginary parade, a false Amoret is marched out by Despite and Cruelty with a knife already “entrenched deep” in her breast, “freshly bleeding forth her fainting spright.” The wound is attributed to “(The worke of cruel hand)... /That dyde in sanguine red her skin all snowy cleene” (III.xii:20). It is the work of Busirane’s cruel hand which has caused Amoret’s wound, and as Susan Frye notes, “The knife in Amoret’s heart is a displaced physical rape, a violent attempt at possessing Amoret” (“Of Chastity and Rape” 363). His possession of her extends to both the violence against her body and to the manipulation of her mind. The psychological effect of displaced physical rape is in causing submissiveness, as Amoret does not take any initiative in escaping her assaulter. Frye states that “the figure in the masque is
Busirane’s fantasy of the Amoret he would like to see -- the Amoret he has persuaded to love him” (365). Metaphorically, this is accomplished through the removal of Amoret’s heart in the Masque: “At that wide orifice her trembling hart/Was drawne forth, and in siluer basin layd/Quite through transfixed with a deadly dart” (III.xii:21. 1-3). That Busirane’s agents in the forms of Cruelty and Despight physically separate Amoret from her heart is meant to represent his ability to do so in a non-literal sense. That this action is accomplished with the use of a “deadly dart,” another of Busirane’s phallic symbols, and is a non-voluntary violent action against the female form, classifies it as a form of metaphorical rape; that it involves the removal of body parts and their metaphorical consumption by another being classifies them as a form of cannibalism. In these images of violent masculinity, as the symbol of the knife and the physical assault on Amoret’s heart are repeated in Busirane’s central chamber, the two actions of rape and cannibalism are present synonymously. Yet unlike the merely beastly pursuits of Florimell’s potential rapists earlier in Book III, these actions are deliberate, controlled, and meant to elicit not only physical gratification, but even more, the voyeuristic thrill of psychological domination.

Even Amoret herself is aware of the consumption of her body, as she vouches for Busirane’s safety knowing that her aggressor is needed in order to heal her; what he has consumed must be metaphorically regurgitated before Amoret can become “perfect hole” (III.xii:38.9). Yet the extent of this control is in many ways disguised through the poetic presentation of Amoret’s capture which confuses the perspective from which we
can properly judge both the criminal and his victim. Prior to entering Busirane’s castle, Scudamour says to Britomart, “My Lady and my loue is cruelly pend” (III.xi:11. 1). The line has dual connotations which describe two distinct imprisonments. The literal connotation of the words “creully pend” is that Amoret is involuntarily imprisoned, but Spenser’s repetitious use of puns suggest that Amoret is also cruelly penned, or cruelly written. Both imprisonments are those controlled by Busirane as his physical penning of Amoret, both in the Masque of Cupid and in his chambers, presents her body in an erotic tableau that satisfies the eye and which attracts poetic attention. The poetic voice is momentarily surrendered to Busirane who controls the manner in which others view Amoret, allegorically reflecting how masculine power dictates the terminology used to define women.\textsuperscript{25} The fact that this language is meant to please also involves the reader in Busirane’s violation of Amoret. As Paglia notes:

This episode, one of the most decadent in \textit{The Faerie Queene}, is a formal spectacle of eroticized masochism. The genital symbolism is lurid and unconcealed. Spenser intensifies the moral ambiguity by using a poetry so deliciously beautiful that the reader is attracted to and emotionally implicated in Busyrane’s sadism. (186)

The erotic presentation of Amoret’s form bound to phallic symbols compromises the reader’s ability to distinguish the violence of the scene from the manipulative language used to describe it. Such confusions further emphasize the psychological control of the male perspective on the female form.

\textsuperscript{25} The masculine perspective of Amoret’s reveal has many parallels to the discussion of the male gaze as discussed in Chapter One concerning Florimell. Lacking a male protagonist in this scene further reveals the masculine gaze of the poetic narration which is immediately drawn to Amoret’s erotic binding and ignores the framer of her position, Busirane. In doing so, Busirane influences the focal point of the poetry as much as Arthur’s staring does at Florimell in Book III, canto i.
Amoret’s Fears and Exonerating the Male Rapist

Amoret’s violation at the hands of Busirane is communicated through the language of rape and cannibalism, making the violent penetration of her form poetically identical to its ravishment and consumption. While Busirane’s actions can be adequately classified, Amoret’s motivation and response to her captor remain more ambiguous and are the topic of an active critical debate. Many prominent Spenserian critics of the last half century, such as Thomas P. Roche, have identified Amoret’s suffering at the hands of Busirane as a manifestation and embodiment of her primary fears at the moment directly preceding her capture. As Amoret is kidnapped moments following the ritual of marriage but prior to its consummation, Amoret’s fears are typically described in one of two ways; either she fears the upcoming sexual union with her domineering husband, or she is surprised by her own desire and anticipation for that union. The explicitly defined purpose of Busirane’s assault on Amoret, specifically the attempted removal of her heart with a “deadly dart,” is done “And all perforce to make her him to loue” (III.xii:31. 6). As Roche argues, this psychological manipulation is equivalent to death as “[Busirane’s] love is not sexual but destructive -- destructive to the will to love within Amoret herself” (“The Challenge to Chastity” 193). The elevation of the psychological damage over the physical

---

damage Busirane inflicts on Amoret is troubling, as Roche subverts the sexualized means through which Busirane violates Amoret; in this view of Busirane, physical gratification is secondary, or perhaps non-existent, to an intellectual victory. Rather, I would argue, Busirane’s “love” is both sexual and destructive: it is destructive psychologically because it is sexual physically, a condition which is symptomatic of literal rape.

The partial exoneration of Busirane’s guilt through the revision of his motivations shifts the blame for Amoret’s suffering onto her own fears regarding her social position at the precipice of marriage. Roche’s argument asserts that “Amoret is afraid of the physical surrender which her marriage to Scudamour must entail” (“Challenge to Chastity” 194) and that the wedding masque scene, in which Amoret has no physical agency, is a manifestation of this fear. The result of marriage, in Amoret’s eyes according to Roche, is equivalent to the surrender she experiences in Busirane’s castle, one which leads to a loss of the capacity for love. This perspective also seeks to explain why Scudamour is unable to rescue her, as “Unwillingly [Scudamour] is the cause of these fears, and any attempt on his part to dispel them would be self-defeating since it would mean her eventual surrender, the basis of her fears” (195). Such an evaluation ignores many significant aspects of each character involved, not the least of which being that Scudamour’s inability to save Amoret is explicitly presented as a result of his own inadequacies as a man when he is unable to cross the fiery barrier into Busirane’s castle. This failure is wholly distinct from Amoret’s fears concerning marriage and neither has any allegorical impact on the other. Most concerning about this perspective which judges Amoret as the
source of her own violation is a dismissal of the fact that, thus far in her relations with men, Amoret ought to be considered justified in her fear of violent masculinity as it has both stolen her from the edenic Garden of Venus and her own marriage. In criticizing Roche’s position, Kathleen Eggert states, “In these readings, the ‘worker’ of Amoret’s ‘smart’ thus proves to be not the sadistic Busirane, but Amoret herself” (Eggert 1). The questions which surround this debate and the ambiguity of Amoret’s position are fundamentally important to the manner in which violent masculinity is understood, the first step of which is acknowledgement of its presence. As Eggert states: “Only recently have some critics stopped blaming the victim in this episode and examined it as what Spenser’s narrator calls it: an instance of violence against women, specifically of allegorical rape” (1). The implication that Amoret either fears or desires the treatment which she eventually receives from Busirane, and that she is therefore responsible for her own violation, ignores and exonerates male guilt from the systems of control which the episode describes.

Simultaneously, however, any analysis of the Busirane episode, or other episodes involving rape throughout Spenser and other mythologically based narratives, must also recognize the significance of the metaphorical use of this trope of Western literature. As I have previously noted in reference to Paglia, rape is fundamentally a metaphor of victory. In the following passage which is worth quoting at length, Eggert sharply criticizes this metaphorical understanding:

The critics who have discussed Spenserian rape have wrongly assumed that in *The Faeire Queene* an act of rape is the subordinate half of a trope. In
their view -- the physical event -- is the vehicle of a metaphor, the tenor of which is unjustly and misogynistically supplied either by the text itself (Sansloy is not a real rapist, he is the assailant of “Una” as signifier of the one true faith) or by critics of the text (Busirane is not a real rapist, he merely reveals Amoret’s fear of losing her virginity to her husband). (Eggert 3)

Clearly there is a difference between recognizing that Spenserian rape utilizes a metaphorical structure and asserting that this is the only significant aspect of the trope. The criticism Eggert questions fully attributes the act of rape to its metaphorical connotation is discomforting in that, at some level, it exonerates the male responsibility for the action while praising Spenser for the poetic accomplishment. Conversely, the kind of analysis I am asserting avoids the trap of such criticism by recognizing that there is a tenor/vehicle relationship between the act of rape and its ideological presentation. More significantly, my purpose is not to levy blame against the socially unacceptable desires of women but to identify the monstrous quality of male actions.

**Comparing Busirane and the Man-Beast**

Classifying Busirane’s violent actions in the manner above places him in the company of Florimell’s potential rapists; his actions are the metaphorical realizations of their beastly and socially inappropriate desires. The forester, the fisherman and the rest of Florimell’s monstrous suitors are enemies of unmarried chastity; conversely, Busirane proves himself the enemy of married fidelity as he assaults the ambiguously defined social position of unconsummated marriage. Because of this, Busirane is also a challenge to the systems of courtly love because he punishes female sexuality for not maintaining
the Petrarchan ideal of the inaccessible lady. His defeat at the hands of Britomart represents Spenser’s allegorical confrontation, analysis and dismissal of the validity of masculine consumption. But what most distinguishes Busirane from the previously discussed bestial and lustful men is the lack of focus on his physical appearance. Consistent throughout Spenser’s poem is a common conceit of the epic genre and of the period which uses attractiveness/ugliness as an immediate barometer of virtue/sinfulness. This is more readily apparent in the description of female characters who are treated poetically as either angelic or demonic in which both attractiveness and virtue are implied by the former, while deformity and sin are implied by the latter. For example, in Book I, Una is “So pure and innocent” (I.i:4.9) and travels with a lamb, which is representative of Christ. Her allegorical opposite, Duessa rides on the seven-headed satanic dragon of Revelation and receives three consecutive stanzas detailing her demonic and deformed appearance, “a loathly, wrinckled hag, ill fauored, old” (I.viii:46.8). The pattern of physical description determining virtuous sensibility is maintained in the metaphorical metamorphosis of Florimell’s pursuers who suddenly become ugly when they challenge virtue. Interestingly, men’s physical deformities are not associated with religious symbolism in the same way women’s poetic descriptions are. In this sense, while women are either angels or demons, men are either humans or animals.

27 The conceit is also employed by Spenser’s contemporary, Shakespeare. For example, Richard III is hunchbacked in Shakespeare’s plan, despite the real king never having such a deformity. Further examples include Caliban in The Tempest, though his physical monstrosity can also be interpreted as racial difference and xenophobia, and the witches of Macbeth, who also connect the concept of ugliness as a symptom of witchcraft and satanic worship.
Busirane, for all the artistic description of his tapestries and elaborate processions, receives no poetic attention concerning his own physical description. Perhaps the reader is to assume his physical appearance because of the morbidity of his actions, a reversal of the tenor and vehicle of the metaphor, but this still leaves Busirane in an ambiguous position on the scale of monstrous masculinity. His presence as the \textit{de facto} enemy of chastity in the third book broadens the allegory of bestial metamorphosis governing male sexuality and physical form as defined by the tapestries in his castle. Perhaps that these are his tapestries is enough to link him to the sexual deviancy of the Roman gods despite the absence of his own transformation. However, Amoret’s second assailant, the Man-Beast of Book IV, Canto Seven, is far more transparent in the conceit of physical appearance doubling as a measurement of virtue. As the personification of masculine lust, the Man-Beast is allegorically situated in a similar position as Busirane, but unlike Busirane, Spenser spares none of his poetic ability in the description of the Man-Beast’s physical form:

\begin{verbatim}
It was to weet a wilde and saluage man,  
Yet was no man, but onely like in shape,  
And eke in statue higher by a span,  
All ouergrown with haire, that could awhape  
An hardy hart, and his wide mouth did gape  
With huge great teeth, like to a tusked Bore. (IV.vii:5.1-6)
\end{verbatim}

Spenser situates this character as one of hybridity, embodying the worst elements of both man and beast. He is first described as a “saluage man,” but is then realized to be a man “onely like in shape.” The misdirection in the description, that he appears as one thing before becoming another, is a kind of poetic metamorphosis in that he shifts shape only in
the perception of his viewer. The physical descriptions which differentiate him from a man all focus on abnormally large or disproportional body parts, including his “ouergrown” hair and “huge great teeth.” Finally, Spenser links the Man-Beast to the conventional animalistic representation of lust, the boar, whose symbolism is known from the story of Venus and Adonis, told in the poem earlier, as well as other classical myths.28

The Man-Beast also belongs to a class of characters alongside Duessa whose genital description is used by Spenser as representative of improper sexuality. Many Spenserian critics have called Spencer gynophobic for his treatment of Duessa’s “nether parts, the shame of all her kind” (1.xiii:48.1) but, as Lauren Silberman notes (57), the following description of Lust is the counterexample of Spenser’s genital symbolism:

    His nether lip was not like man nor beast,  
    But like a wide deep poke, downe hanging low,  
    In which he wont the relickes of his feast,  
    And cruel spoyle, which he had spard, to stow:  
    And ouer it his huge great nose did grow,  
    Full dreadfully empurpled all with bloud; (IV.vii:6. 1-6)

The “nether lip,” “poke” and “huge great nose” are all innuendo for the male genitalia. In this description, the genitalia are overtly described in the language of violence, defining sexual acts as “spoyles,” involving “bloud.” These descriptions are consistent with the

28 For the story of Venus and Adonis see the tapestries of Castle Joyous at (III.i:34-38) and Ovid, Metamorphosis, Book X. In both versions, the boar is connected to sexuality, specifically through dreams. See Berly Rowland, Animals with Human Faces: A Guide to Animal Symbolism” (Knoxville, 1973): p. 38: “To dream of a boar presaged misfortune, usually associated with lust.” Also, in Chaucer’s, Triolus and Criseyde, Trojan hero, Triolus, dreams of a boar after being separated from his lover: “And by this bor, fast in his armes folde./Lay kisyng ay, his lady bryght, Criseyde. (V.1240-41). Clement of Alexandria also explains that Moses forbade eating pork because the boar is associated with lust, greed and aggressiveness (Rowland 38). The boar is also the second animal hunted in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, representing Gawain’s seduction. In a more recent example, a boar kills the lustful King Robert by wounding him in the thigh, as it does Adonis, in George R.R. Martin’s A Game of Thrones.
rest of the physical descriptions regarding the Man-Beast and representative of his sexual deviancy. The rest of this stanza concerns itself with the description of Lust’s ears, which are also commonly associated as burning, or glowing, with passion, as A.C. Hamilton notes. Much like the rest of him, Lust’s ears are overgrown: “downe both sides two wide long eares did glow/And raught downe to his waste” (IV.vii:6.7). They are compared with the ears of Indian elephants, which again reinforces the animalistic nature of Lust but also introduces the concept of exoticism and xenophobia as being equatable with sexual deviancy.

The Man-Beast’s grotesque physicality immediately communicates his sinful nature, which is included as part of his beastly description. Unlike Busirane, whose violation of Amoret constituted metaphorical rape and cannibalism, the Man-Beast’s violent nature is explicitly expressed within the first stanza he appears in: “For he liu’d all on rauin and on rape/ Of men and beasts; and fed on fleshly gore,/The signe whereof yet stain’d his blody lips afore” (IV.vii:5). The sustenance of the Man-Beast’s life is based around theft: as in “rauin,” meaning plunder, rape, bestiality and cannibalism. Spenser allows no ambiguity in the description of the Man-Beast’s perversions in the way he does in the Busirane episode, thus making the Man-Beast a more obvious incarnation of the enemy of chastity. Where Busirane becomes chastity’s enemy because of his interference with the rituals of courtly love, the Man-Beast does so by ignoring them entirely, a demonic manifestation of the socially liberated, and therefore “savage,” man. Moreover, his cannibalistic habits further situate him as a parasitic creature, one who needs to
consume the bodies of the women he defiles. Allegorically, this act of consumption is consistent with the Early Modern concept of the loss of femininity through sex, as previously stated by Jane Anger. In her description of the habits of the beast, Aemylia states that “He with his shamefull lust doth first deflowre/And afterwards themselues doth cruelly deuoure” (IV.vii:12.8-9). The concept of “deflowering” and “devouring” as linked concepts is used as a means of likening the act of intercourse, specifically of virginal intercourse, to that of consumption. The strategic use of “shame” in Aemeylia’s description also connects Lust to Duessa, and to personified Shame introduced during the wedding masque in the house of Busirane. Alongside Reproach and Repentance, Shame is also identified as “most ill favourd, bestiall, and blinde” (III.xii:24.5). Both connections are to female forms, but the shameful bestial descriptions common to all three characters reinforce that the Man-Beast is the male representative of animalistic male sexuality, which Spenser has previously used to define demonic femininity.

**Conclusion**

An immediate comparison of Busirane and the Man-Beast reveals that Spenser is reinvigorating his previously expounded allegory, that the Man-Beast is an intentional caricaturization of the ideas developed in the Busirane episode. By “caricaturization,” I do not mean parody or satire, but an overemphasis of several key characteristics of the previous episode. The Man-Beast is a more physically apparent monster than Busirane, but both are personifications of the negative aspects of masculinity which Spenser
outlines throughout the epic, specifically through their violent sexual aggression.

Belphoebe, who defeats and kills the Man-Beast, is also less allegorically complicated than Britomart, who defeats Busirane. As the Knight of Chastity, Britomart is obviously suited to opposing Busirane; however, despite Britomart’s inner purity and, by the poem’s standards, her exemplary constancy, virginity and chastity, Britomart still wears the armour and exterior appearance of a man. While it is the armour which proves itself as the sole barrier protecting an assault on her chastity, it problematizes her position as allegorical chastity. Britomart’s action to save Amoret is done, not for herself, but in service of another male knight. Because of this, Britomart is a semi-androgynous figure, herself a hermaphrodite of sorts, and is therefore a problematic character for Spenser to use to oppose the breed of masculine lust which he critiques throughout the central books. According to Northrop Frye, the genre of romance is marked by a distinctly dialectical structure: “Every typical character in romance tends to have his moral opposite confronting him, like black and white pieces in a chess game” (Anatomy 195). This conception of the genre is generally adhered to by Spenser throughout most of the epic. But in Busirane’s castle, while Spenser does provide archetypically dialectical opposites concerning morality, Busirane and Britomart defy categorization concerning gender and sexuality; both are veiled by false exteriors and because of this, they are not situated at opposite poles on every spectrum.

From this analysis, it can be asserted that the Man-Beast episode is a sort of revisiting of the Busirane episode, not for the purposes of erasing the previous book, but
for contextualizing it. In the second episode, Britomart, the complicated Knight of Chastity, is replaced by Belphoebe, an allegorically pure example of virginity. As the guiding ideology behind *The Faerie Queene* is to defend and praise Queen Elizabeth’s reign, Spenser includes several characters who are representative of two distinct facets of her personality, one of which is best signified by Belphoebe. As Spenser states in his prefatory letter to Walter Raleigh:

> For considering she beareth two persons, the one of a most royall queene or empress, the other of a most vertuous and beautiful lady, this latter part in some places I doe expresse in Belphœbe, fashioning her name according your owne excellent conceipt of Cynthia. (“Prefatory Letter”)

The royal aspects of the queen are embodied by Gloriana, the Faery Queene, who goes unseen in the written six books of the poem. Belphoebe then, is the symbolic presence of the female queen’s sexuality, a sexuality which is defined by the idea of virginity and chastity, and is the most virtuous female character the reader experiences in the written half of the poem.29 Because of this connection with Elizabeth, Belphoebe is a far more allegorically pure representation of the female ideals Spenser wishes to mythologize in the poem and a more dialectically suitable opposite to monstrous masculine lust; a threat which challenges the very concept of Elizabeth’s reign. Looking only at the

---

conceptualization of gender and the problems of masculinity, the Belphoebe/Man-Beast relationship is one of complete opposition, a binary conflict which represents a fantasy of sexual justice. Conversely, the Britomart/Busirane relationship is more complicated and subtle on this spectrum, as it is more focused on the character transformation of Britomart than it is on the allegorical didacticism of masculine action.

The rewriting of the ending of Book Three then provides a narrative excuse to re-kidnap Amoret and to re-stage the scene with more allegorically evident characters. The Man-Beast episode is the only episode of Book IV which adheres to the common metaphorical understanding of masculinity, which dominate Book III as represented in the first of Busirane’s tapestries. Thematically, it is a direct sequel to the configuration of gender relations as they are presented in the Legend of Chastity. The rest of Book IV, however, is focused on a radically different conceptualization of masculine control, one which defies the concepts central to the final hermaphrodite image of Book III. Among these ideas is the achievement of an egalitarian gender relation in which the halves of the hermaphrodite are coequal powers which together form a more beautiful metamorphosed figure, the only such example of the poem. As Silberman states, “The ideal of creative harmony figured by the hermaphrodite cannot be sustained in a culture of sexual hierarchy” (5), and sexual hierarchy is the predominant concept of Book IV. As Spenser moves into the Legend of Friendship, the deletion of this scene signals the absence of such a philosophy on gender. What replaces it instead is a picture of gender relations informed by the artifacts of the second chamber Britomart enters in Busirane’s castle.
Chapter Three: Sexual Conquest as Social Status

The artistry of the two chambers Britomart encounters during her adventure through the House of Busirane codifies conflicting visions of gender hierarchy, femininity and masculinity. As has been discussed in the previous chapter, the tapestries of the first room present sexual deviancy and violence as characterized by the Gods of Roman mythology. The principal concept of these artistic interpretations is the common usage of and necessity for metamorphosis as a result of beastly instinct. Fundamentally, these images use supernatural transformation as a means of articulating a unique male/female relationship which precedes and anticipates sexual penetration. The antiques of Busirane’s second room, in contrast, mature beyond purely mythological interpretations of love and sexuality and present an entirely human hierarchy of gender. As a result, the concepts of metamorphosis and physical permeability that are central to the tapestries are replaced by the concepts of patriarchal control and self-destruction. Here, women are the spoils of conquering men, the currency in an economy of flesh controlled through homosocial male relationships, and the idea of inconvertible gender hierarchy which defines the tone of the second room is brought to the forefront of Book IV. As the Legend of Friendship, Book IV operates under a unique adherence to gender positions which problematizes the possibility of friendship between genders while highlighting its importance.

Spenser relates this metaphorically through the shift in material from the silky tapestries of the first room, to the golden weapons of the second. The tapestries are woven from both silk and gold and are distinguished by the city of their manufacture, Arras, a
French town with a medieval reputation for its textile industry and tapestry production.

Spenser spends an entire stanza detailing the relation between the two materials in the first tapestry, stating that they are woven “so close and nere/that the rich metall lurked priuily/As faining to be hidd from enuious eye” (III.xi:3-5). That the tapestry feigns to be viewed lends itself to the theme of inner monstrosity which the content of the tapestry expresses. As Hollander notes “its bad faith is deconstructed in its very manifestation” (17). The woven gold cannot fully disguise itself as “here, and there, and euery where vnawares/it shewd it selfe, and shone vnwillingly.” Just like the examples of bestial masculine transformations discussed in the previous chapters, the visibility of the tapestry’s inner material is viewed by accident, unwillingly. When Britomart moves into the second room of Busirane’s house, the ideas of hidden identity and permeability that are central to the physical presentation of the tapestries are replaced: “not with arras made in painefull loome/But with pure gold it was all ouerlayd.” That the previously hidden gold of the first room is now the primary material of the various weapons and plunder of the second room suggests that the previously implied concepts present in the tapestries, that of the inner male beast and sexualized violence, will now be on full display.

The second room in the House of Busirane is a monument to a history of violence, a history which figures itself as the masculine manifestation of love. While Busirane’s first room contained woven images of mythological feats, the second room is filled only with golden objects, objects which imply -- but do not explicitly tell -- a linear story in the same way that the tapestries do. Spenser devotes only a single stanza to the description of
the objects contained in this room, which amounts to little more than an inventory of the various war antiques, a description which pales in comparison with the imaginative breadth of the tapestries of the first room. The lack of poetic emphasis on the objects of the second room allows Britomart’s response and interpretation of the antiques’ meaning to inform the reader: “the walles were hong/With warlike spoils, and with victorious prayes\(^{30}\)/Of mightie Conquerors and Captaines strong,” but it is up to Britomart to infer that these traditionally masculine figures who previously won these objects “were whilome captiued in their dayes/To cruell loue, and wrought their owne decayes.” The immediate assumption concerning the origins of these weapons is that they originate from a war motivated by love, one which is self-destructive for the male conquerors. Firstly, this implies that while men can win battles, their attempts to make women the prizes of these battles is misguided, and secondly, it suggests that war is inherently linked to an economy of female bodies in which men, as the owners of women, attempt to increase their holdings. It is this assumption that is demonstrated and challenged in Book IV both through the conquest by Scudamour of Amoret and by the institutionalization of jousting and tournament prowess as a means of proving social dominance.

**Conquering the Female Form**

Scudamour’s story of his conquest of the Temple of Venus in Book IV, Canto x causes the reader to reevaluate their perceptions of his participation in Book III. As the

\(^{30}\) plunder
lawful and virtuous husband whose wife has been kidnapped, Scudamour initially gains the reader’s sympathy when Britomart finds him in Book III. This sympathy is reinforced by the positive image of marital fidelity represented by the hermaphrodite figure which originally closes that book. However, when these stanzas are cancelled, the egalitarian vision of the hermaphrodite is replaced by a new paradigm between Scudamour and Amoret which characterizes her as his prize for the completion of a supposedly heroic task. In this canto, Scudamour also overtakes Spenser as the poet of his own version of the epic quest-romance and in doing so, utilizes the language of the second room in Busirane’s castle. He becomes a “conqueror” while Amoret is his “spoils” for the achievement of physical superiority over other men. In doing so, Scudamour represents a misinformed ideology of figuring love as a kind of war which inherently imposes a gendered hierarchy on his relationship. Scudamour essentially transforms in the perceptions of the reader to a character as reprehensible as Busirane, who is now not merely a villain, but also a competitor on the battlefield of female possession.

That Scudamour considers his task to “obtain” Amoret as a violent quest is at least partially attributable to his reading, or misreading, of the inscription on the pillar holding the Shield of Love: “Blessed the man that well can use his bliss:/Whose ever be the shield, faire Amoret be his” (IV.x:8.8-9). After defeating the twenty men guarding the Temple of Venus, Scudamour preaches to the pillar “the read thereof for gyrdon of my paine./

31 A.C. Hamilton relates the number of men present here to the number of years Odysseus endured in his voyage home to Ithaca and his wife, Penelope’s side. When interpreted so, the presence of this number of opponents reinforces Scudamour’s interpretation of his journey to obtain love as a violent series of hurdles.
And taking down the shield, with me did it retain” (IV.x:10.8-9). He demands the second half of the promised prize, Amoret, be delivered to him as his rightfully earned property. As A.C. Hamilton notes on the passage, “In his overboldness, Scudamour interprets only the second line, limiting his ‘paine’ to his effort to gain the shield.” Yet physical pain is not the intended trial Scudamour must overcome in order to earn the reward the pillar promises; a demonstration of an ability to use his bliss is a quality which is not presented in the poem, but which suggests a temperament of nonviolence and piousness. Scudamour does not comprehend the implications of this line and instead pursues the traditional route of the questing hero and asserts his masculinity by defeating what he considers his adversaries in the pursuit of warring glory and sexual conquest. For him, both the shield and Amoret are obtainable objects and their pairing in the inscription reinforces this perspective. More importantly, Scudamour categorizes them as a very particular set of objects: wartime plunder or prizes. The shield is very much the kind of object Britomart could expect to see among the “warlike spoles, “victorious prayes,” that decorate the second chamber of Busirane’s castle. Similarly, the manner in which Scudamour refers to Amoret in his narration is akin to his descriptions of the shield. When beginning his tale, he states: “Through which this shield of loue I late haue wonne./And purchased this peerlesse beautise spoil” (IV.x:3.1-3). Amoret is literally the spoil, the physical plunder, of beauty, or femininity; he has “wonne” the shield and in winning, has “purchased” his wife. Scudamour’s language initiates the realization that he does not truly understand love
and interprets it only through the lenses of winning, controlling and dominating the female body as an objectified prize.

The warlike terminology that pervades Scudamour’s narration and his treatment of the shield and Amoret explicitly connect him to the failed love ideology defined by the conquerors of Busirane’s second room. The Latin roots of his name also invite this comparison: *scuto*, meaning shield, and *amor*, meaning love. That his name literally translates to “shield of love” is both ironic, in that he is clearly incapable of defending love, as his “love” is twice kidnapped, and appropriate, in that a shield is a weapon and prize of war. What most convincingly ties Scudamour to the principal concepts of Busirane’s second chamber, however, is not only his treatment of Amoret as physical plunder but as inherently *his* property. When he approaches the door of the Temple, Scudamour states, “I cald, but no man answered to my clame.” (IV.x:11.5) The word “clame” may be synonymous with “call,” but also implies “claim,” as in Scudamour’s claim to Amoret as his prize. This implication of ownership as inherent in the transactions of love is one which is refuted by Spenser’s more virtuous characters previously in the poem. Britomart states early in Book III that, “Ne may loue be compeld by maistery;/For soone as maistery comes, sweet loue anone,/Taketh his nimble wings, and soone away is

---

32 The name Scudamour also comes from a family of landed gentry in England, centered in Hertfordshire. Sir John Scudamore’s marriage to Elizabeth’s second cousin, Mary, was not approved by the Queen. The Queen beat and cursed Mary for her libidinousness but later forgave and returned the Scudamours to court. See W. T. MacCaffrey, “Place and Patronage in Elizabethan Politics” in *Elizabethan Government and Society* Eds. S.T. Bindoff, et. al, (London, 1961): p. 95-126, esp. 116. Comparing this with Spenser’s interpretation of Raleigh through Timias, Linda R. Galyn states, “By hinting at a parallel between the forgiven Scudamores and the unforgiven Raleghs, Spenser might be suggesting to the Queen that, like the Scudamores, the Raleghs were truly virtuous and worthy of her esteem and that their recent transgressions were just as pardonable as the Scudamores’ earlier ones.” (*Spenser Encyclopedia*, 634).
gone” (III.i:25.7-9). The moral Britomart exposes here is out of place in the context of the scene, in which she faces the six knights outside of Malecasta’s castle, but it anticipates the kinds of “maistery” both Busirane and Scudamour attempt to have over Amoret. According to Britomart, it is the introduction of hierarchy, whether gendered or not, that counterintuitively destroys the possibility of love; Britomart, despite being female, may have imposed “maistery” over Amoret in the absence of Scudamour. She chooses not to and it is because of this that she is able to have a productive friendship with Amoret at the beginning of Book IV. Arthur, who has returned to virtue in Book IV, summarizes this issue when he states the knightly duty concerning love: “That of their loues chose they might freedom clame,/And in that right should by all knights be shielded:/Gains which me seems this war ye wrongfully haue wielded.” (IV.iv:37.6-9). The right of a lady’s choice in love is a right not commonly permitted in Early Modern England, even to the queen, but is one which a knight ought to protect, especially in his own pursuits of love. Arthur accurately characterizes the attempts to do otherwise as a wrongfully waged war. Through Arthur, Spenser prefaces Scudamour’s story with a critique of the metaphorical conceit which dominates the ideology that Scudamour represents. That two of Spenser’s most virtuous knights are critical of the position Scudamour embodies relegates him to a position of an anti-role model, a character whose actions are exemplary in their conflict with the didactic thrust of the poem.

Essentially, it is Scudamour’s failure to correctly appreciate egalitarian love that separates him from the knights of virtue. Central to Scudamour’s misinterpretation
concerning the acquisition of love is his misinformed characterization of his own journey through the Temple. Scudamour believes that he is embarking on traditional quest-romance adventure equal to those undertaken by Redcross and Guyon. This is particularly evident in his initial evaluation of the Temple as he begins his approach: “So on that hard aduenture forth I went/And to the place of perill shortly came” (IV.x:5.1-2). The later descriptions of the temple will prove Scudamour’s statement false, as it is obviously not a “place of peril,” but a place of harmony, concord, peace and friendship. The characterization of the Temple in this way is significant as it links Scudamour’s adventure to the climactic enterprises of the knights of the first two books. When approaching the lair of the dragon, Una states to Redcross, “Now are we come vnto my natiue soyle/And to the place, where all our perills dwell” (I.xi:2.1-2). In Book II, the Palmer describes the Bower of Bliss as “The sacred soile, where all our perils grow” (II.xii:37.7-8). Both locations are literal manifestations of vice, demonic worship and temptation respectively, which must be overcome by the primary virtue represented by each knight. Significantly, in both instances it is the knight’s companion character, Una and the Palmer, who identify these locations as places of peril, legitimizing the heroic narrative surrounding their protagonists. Scudamour’s branding of the Temple in the language of the Dragon’s lair and the Bower suggests his desire to narrativize himself as the protagonist of one of Spenser’s legends. Instead, he is a parody of the just actions undertaken by Redcross and Guyon against legitimate and allegorically appropriate foes. Scudamour’s yearning to exhibit masculinity through violent conquest for its own sake is misguided because of its
inability to distinguish between the hives of evil represented by the places such as the Bower, and places of sanctuary, such as the Temple.

**Be Not Too Bold, Scudamour**

In pursuing a false ideology of gendered hierarchy informed by the metaphorical conceptualization of women as the prizes of war, Scudamour enters the Temple not as a liberator of Amoret, as Britomart enters Busirane’s castle, but as her conqueror; much like Busirane who tries to be “the worker of her smart,” Scudamour attempts a similar task and counter-productively eliminates the possibility of love. The signature moment of Britomart’s experience in the second chamber of Busirane’s castle is her reading of the contradictory inscriptions written above the room’s many doors. The repetitious statement “Be bold” and the single instance of “Be not too bold” highlight the dagger-thin line of proper behavior and social responsibility upon which women must balance. Spenser borrows these inscriptions from the English folk tale *Mr. Fox*. In this story, Lady Mary enters the house of her neighbor, Mr. Fox, unattended and discovers that he is a serial murderer of women.33 Above the door hiding Mr. Fox’s morbid secret is the inscription, “Be bold, be bold but not too bold/Lest that your heart’s blood should run cold.” Lady Mary’s boldness, in ignoring male instruction, initiates the crises of the story. Like
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33 The narrative of *Mr. Fox* also highly influenced the story of *Blue Beard*, the most common version being that of Charles Perrault (1687). Perrault changes many aspects of the story, including making the killer’s victims his previous wives, and the protagonist his newlywed. Stating the morals of the poem, Perrault writes that the story clearly took place in the past as “‘No husband of our age would be so terrible as to demand the impossible of his wife, nor would he be such a jealous malcontent. For, whatever the color of her husband’s beard, the wife of today will let him know who the master is.’”
Britomart, she also enters the portal beneath the cautionary inscription to find another woman in mortal peril, but because Britomart ignores the statement “be not too bold,” she is able to rescue the damsel without the assistance of a male. In doing so, this episode renders female instruction by domineering males illegitimate; in fact, it is Scudamour in the Temple of Venus who is too bold, thus reversing the gender of the instruction. As a result, where *Mr. Fox* is intended as a cautionary tale against female agency, these episodes of *The Faerie Queene* are a criticism of the type of masculinity which conceives of love as war.

The first-person narration of the canto reveals Scudamour’s self-assessment as well as his failure to recognize the real violence of his actions. Throughout the canto, Scudamour repeatedly references his actions as bold; when he first hears of the shield, “I boldly thought (so young mens thoughts are bold)” (IV.x:4.6) that he could undertake this enterprise. Scudamour characterizes his facing the knights outside the temple as those, “Whom boldly I encountred (as I could)” (IV.x:10.1). Both in his thoughts and his actions, Scudamour considers himself bold which he defines as aggressive, assertive, masculine and proper; simply put, he does not understand or sympathize with any other course of action. When his boldness finally brings him to Amoret, she chastises him for the manner in which he has accomplished his quest:

Thereat that formost matrone me did blame,  
And sharpe rebuke, for being ouer bold;  
Saying it was to Knight vnseemly shame,  
Vpon a recule Virgun to lay hold,  
That vnto Venus seruices was sold. (IV.x:54.1-5)
Amoret identifies boldness -- and by extension his violence -- and single-mindedness as improper masculine actions. Whereas Britomart, as a female warrior fighting against the patriarchal control of Busirane, must ignore the refrain of “be not too bold” in order to rescue Amoret from a legitimate threat, the situation is very different with Scudamour. On the most basic level, Scudamour’s “ouer” boldness removes Amoret from a place of safety while Britomart’s equivalent actions removes Amoret from a place of danger. More importantly, Britomart’s actions are not intended as part of the process of courting while Scudamour’s actions are presumptively and preemptively assuming a successful courtship. In mixing the mythology of war with the process of love, Scudamour renders any possible happiness with his potential wife inert. Amoret’s complaints strike at her contempt for the foundation their relationship is to be built on, and thus, at the socially prescribed warring metaphor which incubates a conception of masculinity that requires violence.

By improperly figuring his own journey as a traditional quest like those undertaken by Spenser’s central knights, Scudamour inadvertently violates the possibility of love with his non-distressed damsel. Because of Scudamour’s improper courting, Amoret resists his attempts to kidnap her from the Temple:

She often prayd, and often me besought,
Sometime with tender teares to let her goe,
Sometime with witching smyles: but yet for nought,
That euer she to me could say or doe,
Could she her wished freedome fro me wooe;
But forth I led her through the Temple gate, (IV.x:57)
The only weapon Amoret is able to employ as a means to disarm a violent masculine persona is the language of courtly love, through “witching smyles” and “tender teares.” Because she lacks the physical strength to oppose Scudamour, Amoret must resort to other methods which are here rendered powerless. By the time Britomart succeeds in rescuing her from the very real threat of Busirane, Amoret has been conditioned to fear the presence of men as all of her encounters with men thus far have only worked to jeopardize her safety and remove her free will. As she states, “Thereto her feare was made so much the greater/Through fine abusion of that Briton mayd” (IV.1.7.1-2). Amoret’s ignorance of Britomart’s gender leads her to conclude that Britomart is interested in her as a spoil of war as did Scudamour, stating “His will she feard; for him she surely thought/To be a man, such as indeed he seemed” (IV.i:8.1-2). Amoret’s fears concerning the intentions of Britomart are essentially displaced emotions surrounding both of her previous kidnappers, Scudamour and Busirane. Until she becomes aware of Britomart’s gender, and therefore her lack of male aggressive sexual impulse and desire to control, Amoret fears being thrice objectified as a victor’s plunder.

Scudamour’s overbold masculinity imposes an uncomfortable hierarchy on his relationship with Amoret that renders her consistently fearful of masculine violence or sudden seizure by another potential owner and leaves him obsessively jealous of any who might steal his spoils. As Scudamour relates when he enters the Temple he feels a magical sensation in which he is “free from feare and jealousy,” (IV.x:28.5). On this, A.C. Hamilton notes that these two qualities overwhelm Amoret and Scudamour respectively.
This is already evidenced in Amoret’s fears concerning Britomart, but Scudamour’s impassioned actions both outside Busirane’s castle at (III.xi) and when attempting to locate Britomart in (IV.i) reinforce the idea that Scudamour is the Knight of Jealousy. Moreover, possessing Amoret in this manner as promised in the second line of the pillar’s inscription makes a future of bliss impossible. Amoret states that, “For from the time that Scudamour her brought/In perilous fight, she neuer ioyed day” (IV.i:2.1-2). Even though Amoret remained loyal to Scudamour and her vow of marital chastity during her torture at the hands of Busirane, she does this for entirely personally and socially prescribed reasons, not because she has developed a true sense of love for her first captor. For Scudamour, even though he states that “sweet loue to conquer glorious bee,” he qualifies this by stating “Yet is the paine thereof much greater than the fee” (IV.x:3.8-9). When prefacing his tale, Scudamour states that “loue with gall and hony doth abound/But if the one be with the other wayd,/Four euer dram of hony therin found/A pound of gall doth ouer it redound.” This ratio of gall versus honey is about 96:1, expressing Scudamour’s belief that there is little pleasure to be found in love. In fact, he concludes that since “the day that first with deadly wound,/My heart was launcht, and learned to haue loued/I neuer ioyed howre, but still with care was moued” (IV.x:1.8-9). Again, Scudamour conceives of love in the terminology of combat, speaking of love as a battle wound. Like Amoret, Scudamour finds no joy in their relationship but pursues it, initially only as a means for warring glory, and later only because his jealousy cannot bear to allow his spoils to be
claimed by another. Like the dusty objects on display in Busirane’s second chamber, for Scudamour, the value of love is not to find joy in having it, but reputation in winning it.

Scudamour’s tale of a falsely and violently pursued epic quest articulates the results of love, or rather marriage, built without the foundations of friendship, the primary virtue of Book IV. The masculinity which Scudamour represents sees friendship between different genders as inherently meaningless; the woman is his prize for adequately mastering the masculine skill of physical prowess and violent conquest. As Hieatt states:

Scudamour has obeyed the injunction in the House of Busyrane to be bold and bold; but he has now been “too bold.” He has overstepped the bounds of love in asserting a passionate mastery incompatible with what he really wants, which is happy marriage, to be gained in Spenser’s estimate only by the superimposition of a freely yielded and mutually willed spiritual friendship. (“Scudamour’s Practice” 200-1)

Instead of becoming a saviour to Amoret, Scudamour situates himself as her captor. He is, much like Mr. Fox, the man who seeks mastery over the female body. When she is initially confronted by Scudamour, the terror which grips Lady Mary grips Amoret as well: the fright of being associated with and owned by a violent master. With Scudamour’s story, Spenser critiques not simply the violence men exert as a means to obtain women, but the root motivation which informs a certain kind of masculinity that requires control and domination. If we turn to the Tournament of Satyrane we see further evidence that this overboldness -- the desire for control as a result of a successful female conquest -- is driven by the male aspiration for status elevation.

The Parody of Tournament Politics
Satyrane’s tournament at Book IV, Canto iv, and the beauty contest which follows it demonstrate the institutionalization of jousting and other physical competitions as a means of channeling male violence into socially constructive roles. Historically, tournaments served many purposes: “By the fifteenth century...[tournaments] were used to display and assert the honor, the power, and especially the loyalty of the military class to the ruler,” (*Spenser Encyclopedia*, 695). Lacking the presence of a monarch to swear allegiance to, Satyrane’s tournament becomes more about proving the respective power of its participants, instead of the communal task of illustrating the strength of a king or queen. This tournament is one of a trio of tournaments throughout *The Faerie Queene*, but is unique in that it systemically connects competitions involving both genders in a way that reveals the superficiality of both. Typically, a knight’s victory in a tournament would prove the respective virtue and beauty of his lady; however, in the tournament of Satyrane, victory in competition secures the obtainment of the most beautiful lady, as

---


35 There are arguably two other tournaments in *The Faerie Queene*. While not officially a tournament, the jousts of Redcross and Sansloy in the House of Pride (I.v) resembles of tournament. It is observed by a royal, although wicked, audience, Lucifera, involves mock battle, and awards prizes. However, their battle inverts several traditional rules of a tournament, as the knights do not immediately begin on horseback and aim to wound, not merely to strike. Furthermore, Salsloy’s supernatural advantage breaks the trust of a fair combat in the arena. Lucifera’s tournament is a subversion of the institution of the tournament and is meant to illustrate the inherent vice of her House. The final tournament at the marriage of Florimell and Marinell (V. iii) provides the narrative conclusion to Satraynes tournament. As the primary virtue of Book V is justice, Marinell’s tournament reestablishes the chivalric order undone by Braggadocio’s victory at Satyrane’s tournament. The mock-hero is embarrassed, the False Florimell disintegrates and the girdle is returned to the real Florimell which suggests the superiority of female virtue over simple physical beauty. Marinell’s tournament thus bears the closest resemblance to the tournaments of the Elizabethan age.
determined in a separate contest. This distinction transforms Satyrane’s tournament into a competition not only about demonstrating social value but about achieving social mobility through the ownership of women. The world of the tournament becomes driven by an economy of flesh, female flesh, as a marker of masculine dominance.

As with Scudamour’s quest to win Amoret from the Temple, the less virtuous male characters involved with the tournament adhere to the language of figuring sexual gratification as a conquest. Prior to the tournament, Paridell and Blandamour engage in an argument over the latter’s recent acquisition of the False Florimell from another man, Braggadocchio. For Blandamour, False Florimell is a “glorious theft” (IV.ii:4.8), which “This hand her wonn” (IV.ii:14.6). Paridell tries to court her in plain sight of Blandamour, hoping to “win theretoo” (IV.ii.8.9). Arguing over her, Paridell references a pact the two men once shared: “The covenant was that euery spoyle or praye/Should equally be shard betwixt us tway” (II.ii:13.4-5). In demanding Florimell as partly his, Paridell confuses the acquisition of women with an economy of plunder and gold; to him, winning a woman is identical to earning any other luxury. Their disagreement over female property is noted as a symptom of their illegitimate friendship, but instead of confronting the issue of improper homosocial relations, their problems are channeled through the mediating force of the tournament which is ostensibly able to impose a logical structure to disagreement and provide certainty concerning social status.

---

36 The four false friends include Paridell, Blandamour, Duessa and Ate. Their inconstancy and disloyalty ironically mimics the group of true friends which includes Cambell, Triamond, Canacee and Cambina.
Initially, the prospect of the tournament solves the immediate problem of intensified masculine violence surrounding the ownership of Venus’s girdle and the False Florimell. As Silberman notes, “The Joust is presented as a system designed to channel and control violent male desire” (Silberman 91). These desires are still of a sexualized variety, even though the prospect of social superiority is hinged on winning the most contested woman. The battles of the tournament are replete with sexualized imagery and demonstrations of machismo. The two sides of the tournament, the knights of friendship and the Knights of Maidenhead who represent false friendship, are “engaged in a contest of mutual phallic display” (Silberman 106). For example, Satyrane boldly enters the tournament with “An huge great speare” (IV.iv;17.2), later described as “beamlike” (IV.iv; 24.1); Blandamour runs “with all the strength and stifness that he can” (IV.iv.19.4). The phallic imagery throughout the contest reinforces the sexualized prize and motivations of its participants, particularly those outside of the virtuous ring of friends, such as Triamond and Campbell. That Spenser also employs animalistic metamorphoses here similar to those displayed by the real Florimell’s pursuers further clarifies the explicitly sexual intentions of the False Florimell’s warring suitors. For

37 The False Florimell or snowy Florimell, is created by the witch in Book III, canto viii, with “purest snow” and “virgin wex” (III.viii:6. 2,7) to satisfy the lustful desires of her son after the real Florimell rejects his advances. She is immediately taken by Braggadochio who subsequently loses her to Blandamour between Books III and IV. For further criticism concerning the False Florimell, see Roche (1964): p. 158, 162-7, 204-8; Silberman (1995): p. 69, 78, 100-5, 122; Hieatt (1975): p. 75, 84, 90-2, 103. The girdle originally belongs to Venus but is abandoned when she courts the God of War, further connecting the concepts of love and war. The girdle then passes to Florimell who loses it when chased by the hyena-like monster sent by the witch and is subsequently found by Satyrane. That Satyrane merely discovers the girdle, as opposed to winning it, is the cause for public contestation of its ownership which manifests itself as the tournament. For further criticism of the girdle, see Cavanagh (1994): p. 88-90, 94-96, 103-4, 154; Silberman (1995): p. 95, 101-6.
example, Satyrane and Bruncheual’s fight is described as “two fierce Buls, that striue the rule to get” (IV.iv:18.3), and others are compared to boars (IV.iv: 29.8-9), a lion (IV.iv: 32.5, 41.5) and wolves (IV.iv:35.6-8). Several other knights also have animalistic names: Bruncheual (IV.iv.17.9) is a combination of the french words “brun” and “chevalier” meaning “dark knight” or possibly “dark horse”; and Sanglier (IV.iv:40.3) is the French word for “wild boar;” Brianor (40.9) stems for the word “bruin,” another word for “bear.” That each of these animals also carries with it the implication of sexualized violence, further characterizes the tournament as a festival of masculine sexuality that uses physical violence to determine a social hierarchy between its participants. In this respect, Satyrane’s tournament is a spectacular failure in serving the purpose of solving homosocial tension, as the fruitless battles among its combatants provide no clear victor.

The ineffectiveness of the tournament to identify the superior form of masculinity is matched by the misjudged metrics of feminine virtue in the beauty contest. The opening lines of this section, “It hath bene through all ages euer seene,/That with the praise of armes and cheualrie,/The prize of beautie still hath ioyned beene” (IV.v:1.1-3), articulate the joint conceptualization of traditional masculinity, in the form of violent ability, and traditional femininity, in the form of physical beauty. Silberman asserts that, throughout The Faerie Queene, “female virtue is regularly subverted. It is often conflated with beauty, which is then shown to be illusory” (Silberman 9). This is perhaps most evident in the case of False Florimell, whose presence is itself an illusion, as she is created out of

38 The sexual violence of boars and bears is noted in Chapter One. For the horse as a symbol of virility, see Rowland (1973) p. 103.
snow and wax by the witch in Book III. Her attractive female form masks the complete absence of true feminine virtue in the same way that the armor won by Braggadocio, the man she eventually picks as the victor of the tournament, masks his complete lack of any masculine virtue.\(^{39}\) As Huston states, “Both are frauds who use false appearances to make their ways in the world and who eventually menace the principles upon which the social order is founded” (Huston 216). That the two characters least deserving of their respective titles win against the common wishes of those in attendance parodies the tournament’s abilities to definitively decide the social status of any of its participants, male or female. By extension, the results of the Tournament of Satyrane depict and critique the foundational metaphorical conceit of figuring the acquisition of love as a violent conquest.

**Defying the Ideology of Conquest**

The relics of war Britomart encounters in the halls of Busirane provide a comprehensive language in which to analyze and understand the gendered hierarchies presented by Book IV. As possessions of Busirane, they also have great significance to the conclusion of his story, as he himself also seeks to become a conqueror of Amoret. Britomart’s triumph over him, and the appearance of the hermaphrodite image which

follows in the original version of Book III, suggest the defeat of the ideology of
c masculine conquest; likewise, the cancellation of the hermaphrodite in 1596 also suggests
the continuation of this philosophy as the Faerieland of Book IV proves incompatible
with the notion of an egalitarian relationship between genders. The Amoret and
Scudamour relationship is irrevocably altered, transforming Scudamour from sympathetic
knight, to Amoret’s dubious conqueror. Utilizing the language and ideology first
presented in Busirane’s war artifacts, Scudamour pursues an agenda of conquest through
a false interpretation of the traditional quest-romance; in this misinterpretation,
Scudamour values social position and respect over actual virtue, resulting in the
impairment of the possibility of love. It is precisely this impulse which motivates the
participants at Satyrane’s tournament to seek the acquisition of the most beautiful, but not
the most virtuous, woman present. Because of this, women are interpreted as the currency
in an economy of flesh, the means by which to resolve homosocial tension and
competition through conquest and acquisition. The satirical conclusion of the tournament
and the uncomfortable resolution of the Amoret and Scudamour subplot suggest that
Spenser’s poem is critical of early modern gender structures and the manner in which
violent masculinity is directed.

The final cantos of Book IV reinforce Spenser’s critique of the metaphorical
interpretation of love as a kind of war game. After disappearing for nearly a book and a
half, The Faerie Queene returns to the character of Florimell in canto eleven, still a
captive of the god, Proteus. Unique to the final episode of Book IV is the absence of both
titular knight and a damsel’s rescue through the physical victory of violent masculinity. Instead of using the pervasive metaphor of linking violence and the acquisition of love the poem turns to the political role of marriage. Since her lover Marinell proves woefully inept in rescuing his lady, he relies on his mother, Cymodoce, to negotiate the release of her daughter-in-law to be. The intervention of Marinell’s mother at the conclusion of Book IV definitively halts the chain of violent masculinities that have pursued both the real and the false Florimell across the central books of *The Faerie Queene*. In the Legend of Justice which follows, Florimell and Marinell are happily married and become the single example of positive marriage throughout the epic. That they are able to achieve this as a result of not adhering to the generalized notion of violent masculinity determining social value is significant in the deconstruction and rejection of this ideology.
Conclusion: The Three Metaphors of Masculinity

The central books of *The Faerie Queene* are undoubtably concerned with negotiating and analyzing the proper socially constructed roles of women in society. The stories of Amoret, Florimell and Britomart explore distinct moments or crises of feminine virtue in the attempt to maintain their chastity which is deemed central to their social value. Every woman of *The Faerie Queene* is influenced by systems of patriarchal control that challenge their autonomy over their actions as well as their bodies. What has also become clear in the course of this study, however, is that, just as the central books depict women struggling against the codified assumptions of social law, so too do they portray men in a constant struggle between their sexuality and their social responsibility. Such is the case when Arthur misguidedly attempts to satisfy his sexual desires despite contradicting his responsibility as a virtuous ruler and faithful lover of Gloriana.

Scudamour, Timias and a host of other men each encounter this tension throughout the central books and are measured by their ability, or more likely inability, to prioritize their social role over their sexual desire. Considering the cumulative study of masculinity across Books III and IV, it is clear that Spenser utilizes at least three comprehensive and pervasive metaphors to articulate and criticize male sexualities: lust is beastly; sex is cannibalism; love is war. Each of these metaphors help to describe specific moments of interaction or stages of sexual gratification and necessitates its own social rules. The “lust is beastly” metaphor is concerned with the pursuit of love and explores the various proper and improper methods of attempting to achieve love. The “sex is cannibalism” metaphor
describes the moment of penetration and the either mutually destructive or mutually constructive results of such actions. Finally, the “love is war” metaphor provides the secondary, non-biological, social motivation for the pursuit of love as well as the social consequences of love following its consummation.

The first of these metaphors emerges directly out of the Roman mythology of Jove’s sexual deviancy and metamorphosis as translated through Early Modern and Christian concepts of biological hierarchy. This metaphor helps to portray the socially corrosive effect of lust and describes the transgressions of nearly every sexually deviant act across the central books. Literary metamorphosis, usually described as beastly, afflicts every single pursuer of Florimell, including Arthur, and is also used when speaking about combatants of Satyrane’s Tournament who fight for both reputation and for individual gratification. Literally animalistic creatures, such as the hyena which chases Florimell, and the Man-Beast which captures Amoret, are also present and symbolize lust as Spenser and others in the Early Modern Period understood it: as a violent, uncontrollable and ugly creature. Because of this, the beastly force of lust in The Faerie Queene is tempered through the constraints of the system of courtly love. These conventions allow a means of deferring the subject of sex with mutually understood processes of courting, such as gift-giving. Yet even in these constricted, and thereby consensual versions of courting as opposed to violent pursuit, the idea of lust as a beastly force is still present and must be constantly held in check. In the Spenserian version of masculinity, men are inherently
libidinous and necessitate a social decorum outside of a state of nature, such as those that the fisherman and the forester live in, in order to provide social stability.

The “lust is beastly” metaphor is thus also a prelude to the second organizational metaphor of the central books, “sex is cannibalism.” The previous metaphor describes instances of attempted rape; “sex is cannibalism” describes moments of literal and metaphoric rape. The two prime examples of this are the dual assaults of Amoret by Busirane and the Man-Beast. At the end of Book III, Amoret is subjected to a series of tortures by Busirane and arranged in sexualized tableaus which depict his complete physical and emotion violation of her through controlled violence. This violence includes the removal of her heart with phallic symbols, an act which is equatable to cannibalism. The Man-Beast episode further illustrates the connection of these concepts by making literal the processes which were metaphoric in the House of Busirane. Yet the destructive force of cannibalistic sex is not only an instance of violence against women but also a demonstration on the morally destructive effects of such actions on men. The Man-Beast is made physically horrendous as a result of and as a portrayal of his violent crimes. The implication in these scenes is that men are the secondary victims of their own inability for control; just as the Man-Beast makes literal Busirane’s crimes, he also represents the literal consequence of the metaphoric metamorphoses of Florimell’s misguided potential rapists were they to succeed in their actions. Figuring sex as cannibalism is, in the central books, presented as physically and morally degrading for both genders with one exception. The hermaphrodite scene which originally ended Book III presents an instance
of positive sexual cannibalism in that Amoret and Scudamour literally become one being with the unusual inversion in which the male figure resides within the female form, as opposed to cannibalistically consuming her. The image of the hermaphrodite presents the single instance in *The Faerie Queene* of a positive egalitarian union between lovers by subverting the trope of female consumption.

As has been discussed, the hermaphrodite figure is cancelled in the second printing of *The Faerie Queene*, most likely because the positive image of gender relations it presents are not sustainable in the gendered economy of hierarchy which Spenser wishes to relate in Book IV. In this book, Spenser invigorates the metaphor presented by the artifacts of Busirane’s second room, that “love is war.” This metaphorical conception of the process of love is significant in that it adds a secondary motivation to the various men of Book IV to pursue sexual gratification. In the Legend of Chastity, the primary motivation is biological; men pursue sex in order to satisfy a non-social need while women must resist these forces in order to maintain their social positions. As its titular virtue suggests, in the Legend of Friendship, the male knights must also factor into consideration a social framework for their sexual pursuits. Because of this, the obtainment of women, as love-objects/war-prizes, is used as a means of building homosocial status and reputation; men are measured solely by their relative ability to demonstrate their physical prowess. This social understanding is critiqued in several manners throughout Book IV; first, by showing how such metaphorical frameworks defeat the possibility of heterosocial friendship, as seen in the loveless relationship between Amoret and
Scudamour; second, by separating judgements of male strength from female beauty as seen by the satirical victory of Braggadocio and False Florimell at Satyrane’s Tournament. The “love is war” metaphor thus provides a second motivation for the male characters of *The Faerie Queene*, but perhaps more importantly, it also demonstrates a manner of understanding love following consummation.

In each of these stages, the pursuit, penetration and ownership of a female body, the manner in which the male characters understand their own sexuality, is heavily criticized by the poem. The organizational metaphors discussed here are considered by the characters of the poem, both male and female, as universal qualities of masculinity. This is the nature of pervasive metaphorical structures: the concepts expressed by them become central to the very manner in which a certain topic is analyzed. In the case of Spenser and the Early Modern Period, male sexuality cannot be considered in any other terms but animalistic ones and the same is true of the other metaphorical concepts discussed here. Through the use of the tapestries and war artifacts placed at the very center of the central books, Spenser articulates a language of discussing male sexuality which engages both Roman mythology and war history. In doing so, the central books are able to explore violence, specifically violence against women or in the name of women, in order to critique accepted Early Modern conceptions of masculinity.
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