Introduction: Spenser, Donne, and the trouble of periodization

Yulia Ryzhik

The names Edmund Spenser and John Donne are rarely seen together in a scholarly context, and even more rarely seen together as an isolated pairing. When the two are brought together, it is usually for contrast rather than for comparison, and even the comparisons tend to be static rather than dynamic or relational. Spenser and Donne find themselves on two sides of a rift in English Renaissance studies that separates the sixteenth century from the seventeenth and Elizabethan literature from Jacobean.[1] In the simplest terms, Spenser is typically associated with the Elizabethan Golden Age, Donne with the 'metaphysical' poets of the early seventeenth century.

Critical discourse overlooks, or else takes for granted, that Spenser's and Donne's poetic careers and chronologies of publication overlapped considerably. Hailed as the Virgil of England, and later as its Homer, Spenser was the reigning 'Prince of Poets', and was at the height of his career when Donne began writing in the early 1590s. Both poets, at one point, hoped to secure the patronage of the Earl of Essex, Donne by following him on expeditions to Cadiz and the Azores, Spenser by hailing his victorious return in *Prothalamion* (1596). The second instalment of Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* (also 1596) gives a blistering account in Book V of the European wars of religion in which Ireland, where he lived, was a major conflict zone, but it is Donne who travelled extensively on the Continent, including places where 'mis-devotion' reigned.[2] Spenser died in 1599 and was buried with much pomp at Westminster Abbey as if poetry itself had died with him. Yet Spenser's voice would be heard again from beyond the grave, in the seventeenth century, with the publication of the first full edition of *The Faerie Queene*, including the *Cantos of Mutabilitie*, by Matthew Lownes in 1609. By 1609 the greater part of Donne's poetry had already been written, but not his most ambitious poems, the two *Anniversaries*, *An Anatomy of the World* (1611), and *Of the Progresse of the Soul* (1612).

For all their many and major differences as poets, it is unusual for two canonical authors whose careers overlapped as closely as Spenser's and Donne's to have been so significantly separated in scholarly discourse. Yet literary-historical and pedagogical conventions have for a long time rendered the pairing as seemingly unnatural as apples and oranges.[3] The influence of Spenser on Milton – more openly acknowledged yet also more remote – has received much critical attention,[4] while the more immediate relation between Donne and Spenser has remained largely neglected. To date, books that treat both Spenser and Donne treat them more or less in isolation from each other, as discrete examples of a common theme.[5] *The Oxford Handbook*

of Edmund Spenser mentions Donne only three times, none of which refer to poetry. *The Oxford Handbook of John Donne* mentions Spenser fifteen times, of which ten are more than passing mentions, but only seven include a substantive comparison of the two poets' works.[6]

The traditional view of Spenser and Donne in terms of contrast rather than comparison has been cultivated from the earliest critical commentators forward, and is not unjustified.[7] Donne himself, in his radical and almost certainly deliberate departure from Spenser's poetics, may have been partly responsible. Thomas Carew, in his 'Elegy on the Death of Dr. Donne' (1633), praised Donne for his 'giant fancy', which proved 'too stout' for the 'soft melting phrases' of his predecessors, and for having purged the Muses' garden of classical deities, 'tales i' th' Metamorphoses' and other 'pedantic weeds' that had 'stuff[ed the] lines, and swell[ed] the windy page' of Elizabethan poetry. Milton, conversely – as Dryden tells us – declared his allegiance to Spenser, calling him his 'original',[8] and in 'At a Vacation Exercise' (1628) dismissed the shallow tricks of 'our late fantastics' – presumably imitators of Donne. Dryden himself took exception to Donne's 'affect[ing] the metaphysics' and 'perplex[ing] the minds of the fair sex with nice speculations of philosophy, when he should engage their hearts, and entertain them with the softnesses of love', as was done before him in the Elizabethan age and after him during the Restoration.[9] Spenser remained influential alongside Milton, and continued to be imitated, through the eighteenth century. The Romantic poets' favourable reception of Spenser's prophetic vision is well known, as is the appreciation of Spenser among the Victorians.[10] Donne had his admirers in the nineteenth century, but the sometimes rapturous responses of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Thomas De Quincey, and Robert Browning were exceptions rather than the rule.[11] When T.S. Eliot, with the indispensable aid of H.J.C. Grierson, resurrected Donne and the metaphysical poets from centuries-long critical obscurity, he did it at the expense of the epic poets, Spenser and Milton – although as Anne Fogarty and Jane Grogan show in Chapter 11, Eliot's alienated allusions to Spenser often prove more definitive of Eliot's self-conscious modernism than his emulative allusions to Donne.

The pattern has held in the contemporary academy, where, until recently, Donne studies and Spenser studies have tended to rise and fall in an inverse relation, and primary critical concerns and scholarly approaches associated with each poet have run on separate tracks. Proponents of New Criticism idolized Donne, while Spenser studies have inclined towards philology and later theory, especially in the heyday of deconstruction.[12] Donne studies have, of necessity, focused on manuscripts, archival research, and textual criticism, and the ongoing project of the Donne *Variorum* highlights the enormity and complexity of the task.[13] The *Oxford Handbook* devotes its entire first section to research tools and resources in Donne studies, approximately 11 per cent of the total page count excluding the frontmatter and index. Spenser studies, by contrast, have focused on publication history, which takes up 5.7 per cent of the page count in its respective *Oxford Handbook*.[14] Spenser might be discussed in the context of Neoplatonism, Donne in the context of new science, or 'new philosophy'.[15] Such examples are myriad. Although some scholars have published on both Spenser and Donne, there has been little crossover work that engages these poets concurrently and extensively; articles and book chapters that put the two in conversation are

few and far between, focusing mostly on the few sites of Donne's direct allusion to or parody of Spenser.[16]

The trouble here of course is one of periodization, the convenient divide at the turn of the sixteenth century, between the reigns of Elizabeth I and James I, who came to the throne upon the Queen's death in 1603. Spenser's death in 1599 places him firmly on one side. Donne's dates are not so neat, but his career is often described as twofold, divided between the early satires and amatory poems of 'Jack' Donne and the devotional poems and sermons of 'Doctor' Donne – a separation encouraged by Donne himself and immortalized in Izaak Walton's hagiographical account of Donne's life.[17] The same split has for a long time defined the careers of Shakespeare, divided roughly around the time of *Hamlet* (1601), and of Ben Jonson, with a line of division drawn between his poems and city comedies and his masques.

Not only literary-historical but also historical accounts of the period can be prone to this perception of rupture, and the 1590s can be viewed as a particularly turbulent time, an end of one era and the beginning of another. A confluence of disasters – famine, pestilence, wars of religion, internal rebellions – made the 1590s seem a veritable crisis, not only in England but all over Europe, and England's crisis was exacerbated by the uncertainty of succession.[18] Making matters worse, scientific and intellectual upheavals of the sixteenth century called into doubt long-held beliefs about the workings of the body, the world, the universe. Paracelsian chemistry displaced the long-standing theory of humours; Vesalian anatomy and medicine challenged the Galenic, showing the body to be a complex and highly specific machine; Copernican, heliocentric cosmology shook the foundations of the geocentric Ptolemaic system; astronomical findings of Kepler and Galileo, with the use of a telescope, showed that the superlunary world, previously held to be permanent, was subject to change.[19] The belief in a universal correspondence based on the analogy of macrocosm to microcosm – a foundational principle of natural philosophy in the West from late antiquity (and later a crucial concept in the critical movement focusing on the history of ideas) – was becoming increasingly untenable.[20] Both Spenser and Donne viewed the scientific revolution with studied suspicion, but Donne's famously hyperbolic pronouncement in the *First Anniversary* – over a decade after the turn of the century – that all was 'in pieces, all coherence gone' once again aligned him in critical discourse with 'new philosophy' against Spenser's old.[21] While it would be anachronistic to attribute the unrest of the 1590s to '*fin de siècle* malaise',[22] and while the dichotomous view of the broader period fostered by Michel Foucault and others has since been scaled back, it is clear – and it must have been clear to people living at the time – that a dramatic change was afoot.

The very terms by which we refer to the literary-historical period contain in themselves a rhetoric of disruption and division. The terms 'Renaissance' and 'early modern', which we use almost interchangeably to describe the broader period in English literature, are not the same.[23] 'Renaissance' implies a retrospective idealism dependent on the 'rebirth' of classical antiquity, relegating the time in between to the 'dark' or 'middle' ages. 'Early modern' implies a beginning of something new, a looking ahead (if not necessarily looking optimistically forward) to what we now call modernity.

Both terms, 'Renaissance' and 'early modern', are questionable (indeed often questioned) in that both discount what came immediately before. The term 'early modern', intended to correct the teleological, exceptionalist view of the 'Renaissance', only substituted one teleology for another, heightening the sense of rupture and sharpening the implicit distinction between the new and timely on the one hand and the obsolete and irrelevant on the other.[24] The separation is especially detrimental to medieval studies, but is damaging to early modern studies as well, whether we consider the period a bounded one on both sides, markedly different from both before and after, or an open-ended one, inaugurating an increasingly distant 'modernity'.[25] One effect of the narrative of rupture on either end of the English literary Renaissance is fragmentation within the field.[26] In this respect too, Spenser and Donne seem to stand on opposite sides of the divide, and this perception is symptomatic of the receding present in relation to the 'early modern' moment. It is Donne who is traditionally associated with modern innovation, but it is worth remembering that Spenser too was at one point the 'new poet'.[27] The misconception of Spenser as 'old' and Donne as 'new' is only furthered by Spenser's self-conscious medievalism that prompted Jonson to quip that Spenser 'in affecting the Ancients writ no language'.[28] Jonson played a part as well in calcifying Donne's role as a seventeenth-century 'metaphysical' opposed to the 'Cavalier' poets, the so called 'Sons of Ben'. The opposition between 'metaphysical' and 'Cavalier' drives Donne even further forward in the seventeenth century, over a decade beyond his lifetime, as 'Cavalier' came to signify one of the sides of the English Civil Wars.

To be sure, conventions of periodization are recognized as such and acknowledged to be functionally useful yet ultimately arbitrary.[29] The outer boundaries of the period continue to blur and shift as new scholarship tightens the links between the medieval and early modern and challenges long-standing markers of the period's end.[30] The internal divisions within the field are likewise becoming less stark, and certainly gestures have been made to complicate the well-worn dichotomies between sixteenth- and seventeenth-century literature and history.[31] Studies in early modern English literature have produced unusual and illuminating pairings between major authors: Shakespeare and Spenser, Shakespeare and Donne, Milton and Donne, and even Spenser and Jonson.[32] Likewise encouraging are recent re-evaluations of Spenser and Donne individually that question the standard view of each author[33] and fresh, unconventional pairings of their works in article-length studies.[34] Spenser studies and Donne studies are thriving fields of scholarly enquiry, but the legacy of periodization that imposed a sharp break between them remains palpable. For one, there is not yet a holistic book-length study of Spenser and Donne together, apart from other authors,[35] and insights still need to be gleaned from works that address one of the authors but mention the other only in passing.

The rift between Spenser and Donne is deep, and we are only just beginning to fill it. In recent years concerted efforts have been made to merge the interests of Donne and Spenser scholars more closely, as evidenced in the roundtable sessions, sponsored jointly by the International Spenser Society and the John Donne Society, at the MLA conventions of 2012 and 2014.[36] It is at the latter roundtable that this present volume had its beginning. Abstracts for these roundtables emphasize

'conversation' and 'dialogue' about the 'relation(s)' between the two poets, the work of poetic making and transformation, and a continuity, or at least a comparableness, of thought that enables reading Spenser and Donne both backwards and forwards.[37] In my own conversations with colleagues, I have heard an enthusiastic consensus that the Spenser–Donne pairing could prove to be a treasure trove for new research in early modern literature, but has been sorely understudied. Gradually, the conversation on Donne's Spenser and Spenser's Donne is emerging. This collection of essays, then, brings together scholars working on either side of the divide to put this nascent conversation into print.

The aim of this conversation is to move beyond the convenient but unfruitful contrast between Spenser and Donne that has dominated critical discourse. To be sure, the differences between the two poets are profound. Donne's verse was rough where Spenser's was mellifluous, stark and short where Spenser's was florid and expansive.[38] Spenser's poetic persona was retiring, Donne's was brash. Spenser thought allegorically, Donne metaphorically. Spenser presented his works to the world in print, Donne in manuscript.[39] Donne at times casts a resentful glance in Spenser's direction (as, for instance, in the 'Epithalamion Made at Lincoln's Inn'), but not an anxious one in the Bloomian sense.[40] Spenser is not a distant precursor whose memory Donne needs to repress, but a contemporary, a mere generation older, regularly publishing new work – sometimes provoking an immediate satirical response from Donne. If Donne felt any anxiety of influence towards Spenser, it is probably in the simpler, historical sense suggested by Walter Jackson Bate in *The Burden of the Past and the English Poet*.[41] Yet no poet's break from a competitor, predecessor, or past tradition can be reduced to a table of antonyms.

We take, therefore, a more relational view of Donne and Spenser, and, although Spenser was probably unaware of Donne's work, the relation is not necessarily unidirectional. The chapters engage critically with both poets not only at the sites of allusion, imitation, or parody but also in terms of common preoccupations and continuities of thought. Bearing in mind the subtitle 'Thinking Poets', the aim is not merely to compare what Spenser and Donne thought about certain subjects, such as contemporary events and politics, science, philosophy, love, marriage, or religious devotion. Rather, these chapters explore and meditate on *how* these poets thought: how they directed their rhetorical and figurative processes, how they crafted their verses, their authorial personae, and their literary careers, and how they navigated the rich landscape available to them of literary conventions, innovations, and influences both ancient and modern. A close analysis of Spenser and Donne together complicates and challenges the conventional wisdom of literary history.

To the extent that Spenser and Donne present scholars and critics with fundamentally different textual and intellectual problems, a comparative, relational study may seem at best indirect.[42] A significant part of this project, therefore, is establishing the appropriate terms to define the Spenser–Donne connection. Richard Danson Brown calls it 'overhearing'; my preferred term is 'engagement'; Ayesha Ramachandran suggests 'encounter'; David Marno uses 'foreshadowing'; I might also add 'interplay'. This volume showcases a multiplicity of approaches and points of entry into this area of research, but a robust theoretical model remains somewhat elusive. Here too, the

solution is 'thinking poets' – that is, thinking of Spenser and Donne as poets *qua* poets. To achieve a more holistic view of the relation, the scope of the evidence must be broadened, allowing not only the scattered moments of concrete linguistic borrowing or parody but also the more generalized sense of the pressure Spenser exerted on early modern poetry and Donne's more generalized response to that pressure.[43] The historical context can help situate the two poets within the larger social, political, and intellectual pressures of the time. To what extent should we consider the political and intellectual unrest of the late sixteenth century as a crisis of poetic imagination? Where do Spenser's and Donne's reactions to this crisis coincide, and where do they diverge? What insights might be gained from juxtaposing two poets so apparently unlike one another for comparison rather than contrast? How might this juxtaposition change our understanding of each poet individually? Reading Donne in the context of Spenser not only modifies our view of Donne as a poet but also illuminates important, if less conspicuous, aspects of Spenser's poetry. We see what Donne saw in it, what he rejected outright and what he considered worthy of imitation or of parody. We also see how Spenser's poetics may have aligned with, anticipated, or foreshadowed Donne's.

Certain loci in the two poets' respective oeuvres prove to be particularly generative: Spenser's *Mother Hubberds Tale*, the *Cantos of Mutabilitie*, *Fowre Hymnes*, and perhaps Book I of *The Faerie Queene*; Donne's *Metempsychosis*, the two *Anniversary* poems, three *Epithalamia* (especially 'Epithalamion Made at Lincoln's Inn'), and to a lesser extent the *Satires*. The sometimes unconventional pairings between Spenser's and Donne's works – for instance, Brown's juxtaposition of *Mother Hubberds Tale* and Donne's *Satire IV*, or David Marno's examination of devotional poetics in the *Fowre Hymnes* as a precursor of Donne's *Holy Sonnets* – yield surprising results and new connections. Another fruitful method is situating Spenser and Donne within a broader intellectual or literary tradition – for example, Ramist rhetoric (Niranjan Goswami) or philosophical poetry (Ayesha Ramachandran), treating them as part of the same continuum rather than separate points and finding that their places on the continuum are closer together than we think. Chapters that approach Donne and Spenser vis-à-vis genre and mode tend to perform a productive crossover, in which at least one of the poets is revealed as engaging a genre not typically associated with him: Spenser as a satirist (Brown), Donne as harbouring epic career ambitions (Patrick Cheney).[44] Finally, several chapters illuminate aspects of the Spenser–Donne relation by way of a triangulation with a third author, and in most cases that third author has turned out to be Ovid (Cheney, Anne Lake Prescott, Linda Gregerson). The Ovidian renaissance has been a critical growth area in early modern studies, but here for the first time Ovid proves instrumental to bridging a gap between two major English poets.[45]

The eleven chapters are arranged to construct an overarching narrative, moving from the more formal considerations of Spenser and Donne to the more thematic and philosophical readings, and returning, towards the end, to the issues of genre and the legacies of the two poets. The chapters by Richard Danson Brown, Christopher Dean Johnson, and Niranjan Goswami concern themselves with style, figuration, and rhetoric, respectively. In making a case for Spenser's 'rough' style and for the overheard

notes of Spenser in Donne, Brown progresses from a detailed metrical analysis to a more philosophical discussion of the ways in which Spenser and Donne negotiate the tension between sentence and poetic line, particularly in the context of dialogue and debate. Comparing Spenser's and Donne's figures of comparison, Christopher Johnson's chapter performs an astonishing chiasmus. Spenser's *Cantos of Mutabilitie* push against the limits of *comparatio* but resolve the conflict through an uncharacteristic dramatic syncrisis; conversely, Johnson makes a case for the importance of *similitudo* in Donne's *Anniversaries* to temper and balance the extremes of syncrisis for which the poems are notorious. Niranjan Goswami counters the long-standing Spenser–Donne binaries by examining the two poets' use of binaries as the underlying structure of their poetry, following the strategies of Ramist logic and rhetoric. The argument is particularly innovative with respect to Spenser, as his rhetorical methods have hitherto been overlooked in scholarship. Patrick Cheney's chapter caps off this section by taking a broader view of Spenser's and Donne's literary careers, but also anticipates the prevailing approaches in the rest of the book, finding an inclusive conceptual framework to comprehend both poets: the question of the sublime. Donne, Cheney argues, 'thinks about Spenser sublimely across the literary topics of genre, immortality, and career'. Whereas Spenser may be England's first 'sublime' poet, Donne produces a 'metaphysical sublime' – a coinage that conveys both a sense of continuity and a sense of departure.

Three chapters that follow, by Anne Lake Prescott, Linda Gregerson, and Ayesha Ramachandran, look beyond the English borders to establish the place of Spenser and Donne within the geographical region, the world, and the cosmos. Prescott deftly traces myriad potential lines and configurations as she looks at Spenser and Donne looking across the English Channel to the Continent, its history, its literature, its philosophy. In comparing the two poets' overall methods of appropriating Continental literature, however, she focuses on an 'ancient author, Ovid, and [on] one geographical feature, the hill'. Both Ovid and the hill – Arlo Hill, to be precise – feature prominently in Linda Gregerson's chapter. Using Ovid's Pythagoras as a point of departure, the chapter sees both Spenser and Donne questioning and subverting (although not quite levelling) nature's traditional hierarchies and boundaries to hint at an alternative 'vision of connection and interdependence that we now call ecological', or even 'post-humanist'.[46] If Gregerson's chapter concerns primarily earthly ecologies and worldly matters, Ramachandran's takes Spenser and Donne beyond the sphere of the moon to address cosmic matters – both in the sense of 'cosmos' as an orderly universe and in the sense of formal aesthetics. Situating Spenser's *Fowre Hymnes* and Donne's *Anniversaries* within the rich continental tradition of philosophical poetry, Ramachandran makes a strong case for both poets' poetic practice as an effort to repair the cosmological rupture brought about by new science, restoring its circularity through repetition.

The chapters by Elizabeth Harvey and Ramie Targoff can be considered companion pieces in that both address the issue of eroticism and sexual violence in the poetry of Spenser and Donne, albeit through vastly different lenses and points of comparison. Targoff looks to the classical tradition of the epithalamion, or marriage hymn, arguing that Spenser's mythological allusions, just before his glorious *Epithalamion*

reaches the moment of consummation, hint at 'the bride's involuntary role as sacrifice as the telos of the marriage ritual' – a barely concealed violence that Donne's parodic 'Epithalamion Made at Lincoln's Inn' brings rather graphically into focus. Harvey examines a different kind of 'graphic' violence: the breach of bodily and psychic integrity implicit in the common Petrarchan figure of writing on the beloved's heart. Although Spenser's and Donne's representations of that violence differ according to their preferred figurative devices, in both cases 'bounded subjectivity is sacrificed in the service of an eroticism that continually courts its own undoing'. With reference to psychology and the changing early modern notions of 'character' Harvey sees each poet fashioning a distinctive poetic 'signature'. Like Harvey, David Marno turns to a Petrarchan topos (informed by Augustine's influence) as a triangulating point between Donne and Spenser, elucidating a shared devotional poetics of distraction. Spenser, he argues, first appropriates this poetics in the *Fowre Hymnes*, moving from inattention towards a gradual correction of error. Donne's elaboration of this progression in the *Holy Sonnets* in turn plays a crucial role in the development of a meditative, author-oriented devotional lyricism of the seventeenth century.

Anne Fogarty and Jane Grogan conclude the book by returning to the question of the two poets' legacies and afterlives, focusing on the reception of Spenser and Donne among three major modernist writers: T.S. Eliot, William Butler Yeats, and James Joyce. In all three cases, the triangulation reveals unusual findings: for instance, Spenser is revealed to be a more generative source of allusion and poetic innovation for Eliot (compared to Donne's more 'functional' role), whereas Joyce, Fogarty and Grogan argue, deploys Spenser with the deepest of ironies and recasts Donne as essentially 'medieval'. Through these several complex triangulations, the chapter links the transitional period at the turn of the sixteenth century with another transitional period in English literary history, one that helped entrench the very scholarly paradigm that we are working to counter.

This book, I believe, breaks new ground, sustaining an extensive and multifaceted discussion of the Spenser–Donne relation, establishing new directions in the study of two canonical poets at a pivotal point in literary history and in the process compiling a much-needed critical bibliography. The implications of the Spenser–Donne relation are potentially far-reaching in understanding the literary culture of early modern England, particularly in the late Elizabethan and early Jacobean periods. These chapters will bring a remarkable convergence of lines of enquiry into focus and illuminate possible avenues for further exploration. We hope that this book will become an important starting point for scholars and students continuing to cultivate this fruitful field of research. When it comes to Donne's relation to Spenser, we are not done, for surely we must have more.

Notes

1 For instance, Spenser and Donne are treated in separate volumes of the Oxford literary histories: C.S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954), and Douglas Bush, *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century, 1600–1660*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962).
2 See Anne Lake Prescott, Chapter 5 below.

3 The same has been said of another unlikely pairing, Spenser and Shakespeare. Robert Lanier Reid, *Renaissance Psychologies: Spenser and Shakespeare* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017), 35.

4 See, for instance, Harold Bloom, *A Map of Misreading*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003); Maureen Quilligan, *Milton's Spenser: The Politics of Reading* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983); Linda Gregerson, *The Reformation of the Subject: Spenser, Milton, and the English Protestant Epic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Gordon Teskey, 'From Allegory to Dialectic: Imagining Error in Spenser and Milton', *PMLA*, 101.1 (Jan. 1986), 9–23.

5 Frank Kermode, *Shakespeare, Spenser, Donne: Renaissance Essays* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971); A.C. Partridge, *The Language of Renaissance Poetry: Spenser, Shakespeare, Donne, Milton* (London: Deutsch, 1971); Louis Martz, *From Renaissance to Baroque: Essays on Literature and Art* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1991); Murray Roston, *Tradition and Subversion in Renaissance Literature: Studies in Shakespeare, Spenser, Jonson, and Donne* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2007); Terry G. Sherwood, *The Self in Early Modern Literature: For the Common Good* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2007); Adam Potkay, 'Spenser, Donne, and the Theology of Joy', *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900*, 46.1 (2006 Winter), 43–66; Esther Gilman Richey, 'The Intimate Other: Lutheran Subjectivity in Spenser, Donne, and Herbert', *Modern Philology*, 108.3 (2011 February), 343–74; David Landreth, *The Face of Mammon: The Matter of Money in English Renaissance Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Daniel D. Moss, *The Ovidian Vogue: Literary Fashion and Imitative Practice in Late Elizabethan England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014); Judith H. Anderson, *Light and Death: Figuration in Spenser, Kepler, Donne, Milton* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2017).

6 Richard A. McCabe (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Edmund Spenser* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Jeanne Shami, Dennis Flynn, and M. Thomas Hester (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of John Donne* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

7 See, for instance, Edmund Gosse, *The Life and Letters of John Donne, Dean of St. Paul's*, 2 vols (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company; London: W. Heinemann, 1899), II.329–41, 351.

8 John Dryden, Preface to *Fables Ancient and Modern, Translated into Verse from Homer, Ovid, Boccaccio, and Chaucer, with Original Poems*, in *'Of Dramatic Poesy' and Other Critical Essays*, ed. George Watson, 2 vols (London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1962), 2.270–1.

9 Dryden, 'Discourses on Satire and on Epic Poetry' in *'Of Dramatic Poesy' and Other Critical Essays*, 2.76.

10 Michelle O'Callaghan, 'Spenser's Literary Influence', in McCabe (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Edmund Spenser*, 664–83. On Spenser's influence in the eighteenth century, see R.C. Frushell, *Edmund Spenser in the Early Eighteenth Century: Education, Imitation, and the Making of a Literary Model* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1999). On Spenser among the Romantics, see Greg Kucich, *Keats, Shelley, and Romantic Spenserianism* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991). For Victorian receptions of Spenser, see David Hill Radcliffe, *Spenser: A Reception History* (Columbia: Camden House, 1996), 114–48.

11 Albert C. Labriola, 'Style, Wit, Prosody in the Poetry of John Donne', in Shami et al. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of John Donne*, 704–17. On the reception of Donne in the nineteenth century, see Dayton Haskin, *John Donne in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), and 'Donne's Afterlife' in Achsah Guibbory (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to John Donne* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 233–46. Coleridge, De Quincey, and Browning admired even Donne's much maligned *Metempsychosis*, which also earned the unlikely appreciation of Alexander Pope. See A.J. Smith (ed.), *John Donne: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975), 2.154, 274; 347–50.

12 One outlier is Thomas Docherty's *John Donne, Undone* (New York: Methuen, 1986), a deconstructionist reading of Donne.

13 Shami et al. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of John Donne*, 12–95.

14 Wayne Erickson, 'Spenser's Patrons and Publishers', and Joseph Loewenstein, 'Spenser's Textual History', in McCabe (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Edmund Spenser*, 106–24, 637–63. See also Elisabeth Chaghafi, 'Spenser and Book History', in Paul J. Hecht and J.B. Lethbridge (eds), *Spenser in the Moment* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2015), 67–99; Andrew Zurcher, 'The Printing of the *Cantos of Mutabilitie* in 1609', in Jane Grogan (ed.), *Celebrating Mutabilitie: Essays on Edmund Spenser's* Mutabilitie Cantos (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), 40–60.

15 On Spenser, Platonism, and Neoplatonism see Robert Ellrodt, *Neoplatonism in the Poetry of Spenser* (Folcroft: Folcroft Press, 1969); Frances Yates, *Elizabethan Neoplatonism Reconsidered: Spenser and Francesco Giorgi* (London: Society for Renaissance Studies, 1977); Jon A. Quitslund, *Spenser's Supreme*

Fiction: Platonic Natural Philosophy and The Faerie Queene (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001); *Spenser and Platonism* [Special Issue], ed. and introd. Kenneth Borris, Jon Quitslund, and Carol Kaske, *Spenser Studies*, 24 (2009); Kenneth Borris, *Visionary Spenser and the Poetics of Early Modern Platonism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017). Studies on Donne and (Neo-)Platonism tend to focus on 'The Ecstasy'; see, for instance, Catherine Gimelli Martin, 'The Erotology of Donne's "Extasie" and the Secret History of Voluptuous Rationalism', *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900*, 44.1 (2004 Winter), 121–47. On Donne and science, Charles M. Coffin, *John Donne and the New Philosophy* (New York: Humanities Press, 1958); Marjorie Nicolson, *The Breaking of the Circle: Studies in the Effect of the 'New Science' upon Seventeenth-Century Poetry*, rev. ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960); William Empson, *Essays on Renaissance Literature, Vol. 1: Donne and the New Philosophy*, ed. John Haffenden (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Elizabeth D. Harvey and Timothy M. Harrison, 'Embodied Resonances: Early Modern Science and Tropologies of Connection in Donne's *Anniversaries*', *English Literary History* [*ELH*], 80.4 (2013 Winter), 981–1008. For recent work on Spenser and science, see Mary Thomas Crane, 'Spenser's Giant and the New Science', in Judith H. Anderson and Joan Pong Linton (eds), *Go Figure: Energies, Forms, and Institutions in the Early Modern World* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2011), 19–37; Sarah Powrie, 'Spenser's Mutabilitie and the Indeterminate Universe', *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900*, 53.1 (2013 Winter), 73–89.

16 Among the few articles that take a more holistic view of Donne's relation to Spenser are Kenneth Gross, 'Shapes of Time: On the Spenserian Stanza', *Spenser Studies*, 19 (2004), 27–35; and Elizabeth D. Harvey, 'Nomadic Souls: Pythagoras, Spenser, Donne', *Spenser Studies,* 22 (2007), 257–79. See also Anne Lake Prescott, 'Menippean Donne', in Shami et al. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of John Donne*, 158–79.

17 Izaak Walton, *The Lives of John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Richard Hooker, George Herbert and Robert Sanderson* (London: Oxford University Press, 1927).

18 See, for instance, Trevor Aston (ed.), *Crisis in Europe, 1560–1660: Essays from Past and Present*, introd. Christopher Hill (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965); Peter Clark (ed.), *The European Crisis of the 1590s: Essays in Comparative History* (London and Boston: G. Allen & Unwin, 1985).

19 Allen G. Debus, *Man and Nature* and *Chemistry, Alchemy and the New Philosophy, 1550–1700: Studies in the History of Science and Medicine* (London: Variorum, 1987); Frank Lestringant, *L'atelier du cosmographe: ou l'image du monde à la Renaissance* (Paris: A. Michel, 1991); James J. Bono, *The Word of God and the Languages of Man: Interpreting Nature in Early Modern Science and Medicine* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995).

20 George Boas, 'Macrocosm and Microcosm', in Philip P. Wiener (ed.), *Dictionary of the History of Ideas: Studies of Selected Pivotal Ideas* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973); Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of Human Sciences* (New York: Vintage Books, 1970). See also Leo Spitzer, *Classical and Christian Ideas of World Harmony; Prolegomena to an Interpretation of the Word 'Stimmung'*, ed. Anna Granville Hatcher, pref. René Wellek (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1963); S.K. Heninger, *Touches of Sweet Harmony: Pythagorean Cosmology and Renaissance Poetics* (San Marino: Huntington Library, 1974); and Leonard Barkan, *Nature's Work of Art: The Human Body as Image of the World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975).

21 The analogy of macrocosm to microcosm received its fullest enunciation belatedly, in Robert Fludd's *Utriusque Cosmi*. Allen G. Debus (ed.), *Robert Fludd and His Philosophicall Key: Being a Transcription of the Manuscript at Trinity College, Cambridge* (New York: Science History Publications, 1979).

22 Margreta de Grazia, 'Fin-de-Siècle Renaissance England', in Elaine Scarry (ed.), *Fins de Siècle: English Poetry in 1590, 1690, 1790, 1890, 1990* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 37–63, shows that historical periodization by century (which in the 1590s could signify any unit of 100, not just years) did not arise until the French Revolution.

23 See Gordon Teskey, 'Renaissance Theory and Criticism', in Michael Groden, Martin Kreiswirth, and Imre Szeman (eds), *Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005); Leah S. Marcus, 'Renaissance/Early Modern Studies', in Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn (eds), *Redrawing Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies* (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1992), 41–63; Heather Dubrow and Frances E. Dolan, 'The Term *Early Modern*', *PMLA*, 109.5 (1994 October), 1025–7.

24 Margreta de Grazia, 'The Modern Divide: From Either Side', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 37.3 (2007 Fall), 453–66; Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, 'In the Middle of the Early Modern', *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, 13.3 (2013 Summer), 128–32.

25 De Grazia, 'The Modern Divide', 456–7, 461, 463; Cohen, 'In the Middle', 128–9.

26 The professional division of the field into sub-specializations, dramatic and non-dramatic literature, can be considered another effect of this fragmentation.

27 Richard Danson Brown, *'The New Poet': Novelty and Tradition in Spenser's* Complaints (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1999).

28 Ben Jonson, *The Complete Poems*, ed. George Parfitt (London; New York: Penguin Books, 1975), 428. On Spenser's medievalism and archaism see, for example, Judith H. Anderson, *The Growth of a Personal Voice: 'Piers Plowman' and 'The Faerie Queene'* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), and *Reading the Allegorical Intertext* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2008); Andrew Zurcher, 'Spenser's Studied Archaism: the Case of "Mote"', *Spenser Studies*, 21 (2006), 231–40; Helen Cooper, *Pastoral: Medieval into Renaissance* (Ipswich: D.S. Brewer, 2012); Andrew King, 'Spenser, Chaucer, and Medieval Romance', in McCabe (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Edmund Spenser*, 553–72; William Kuskin, *Recursive Origins: Writing at the Transition to Modernity* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 2013); Kathryn Walls, 'Spenser and the "Medieval" Past: A Question of Definition', in Hecht and Lethbridge (eds), *Spenser in the Moment*, 35–66.

29 Helen Cooper, 'The Origins of the Early Modern', *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, 13.3 (2013 Summer), 133–7; *On Periodization: Selected Essays from the English Institute*, ed. Virginia Jackson (Cambridge, MA: The English Institute, 2010), http://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb.90047.0001.001, especially Caroline Levine, 'Infrastructuralism, or the Tempo of Institutions', and Marshall Brown, 'The Din of Dawn'.

30 James Simpson, *1350–1547: Reform and Cultural Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2004); Steven N. Zwicker, 'Is There Such a Thing as Restoration Literature?', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 69.3 (2006 September), 425–50.

31 See, for instance, Curtis Perry, *The Making of Jacobean Culture: James I and the Renegotiation of Elizabethan Literary Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Heather Dubrow, *Echoes of Desire: English Petrarchism and Its Counterdiscourses* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 221.

32 J.B. Lethbridge (ed.), *Shakespeare and Spenser: Attractive Opposites* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2008); Anita Gilman Sherman, *Skepticism and Memory in Shakespeare and Donne* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); Catherine Gimelli Martin, 'Milton's and Donne's Stargazing Lovers, Sex, and the New Astronomy', *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900*, 54.1 (2014 Winter), 143–71; James A. Riddell and Stanley Stewart, *Jonson's Spenser: Evidence and Historical Criticism* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1995).

33 Rachel E. Hile, *Spenserian Satire: A Tradition of Indirection* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017), reveals Spenser as a major influence on English satire; Hugh Grady, *John Donne and Baroque Allegory: The Aesthetics of Fragmentation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017) places Donne within an allegorical tradition, typically the province of Spenser.

34 Theresa M. DiPasquale, 'Anti-Court Satire, Religious Polemic, and the Many Faces of Antichrist: An Intertextual Reading of Donne's "Satyre 4" and Spenser's *Faerie Queene*', *Studies in Philology*, 112.2 (2015 Spring), 264–302.

35 My own monograph in progress, *Donne's Spenser: Between Allegory and Metaphor*, aims to correct this gap. Segments from this project have been published in article form: Yulia Ryzhik, 'Complaint and Satire in Spenser and Donne: Limits of Poetic Justice', *English Literary Renaissance*, 47.1 (2017 Spring), 110–35, and 'Spenser and Donne Go Fishing', *Spenser Studies*, 31–2 (2018), 417–37.

36 'Spenser, Donne, and the Work of Poetry' (45) at the 2012 MLA in Seattle (speakers: Judith H. Anderson, Theresa DiPasquale, Heather Dubrow, Anne Lake Prescott, and Melissa E. Sanchez; Sean H. McDowell presiding), and 'Spenser's Donne and Done' (330) at the 2014 MLA in Chicago (speakers: Joseph A. Campana, Jeff Dolven, Linda Gregerson, and Yulia Ryzhik; Gerard Passannante presiding).

37 *PMLA*, 126.5 (2011 November), 1258–9; *PMLA*, 128.5 (2013 November), 1169.

38 However, see Richard Danson Brown, Chapter 1 below, on Spenser's 'rough' style.

39 See Patrick Cheney, Chapter 4 below, on what these choices entail for Spenser's and Donne's literary careers.

40 Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997 [1973]).

41 W. Jackson Bate, *The Burden of the Past and the English Poet* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970).

42 On potential methodological problems when approaching Spenser and Donne, see J.B. Lethbridge, 'Spenser, Donne, I.A. Richards and the Limitations of Practical Criticism', *Ranam: Recherches Anglaises et Nord-Américaines*, 49 (2016), 29–42, 207–8.

43 J.B. Lethbridge, 'Introduction: Spenser, Marlowe, Shakespeare: Methodological Investigations', in Lethbridge (ed.), *Shakespeare and Spenser: Attractive Opposites*, 1–53, esp. 2–4, 49, 52–3.

44 See also Raymond-Jean Frontain, 'Donne, Spenser, and the Performative Mode of Renaissance Poetry', *Explorations in Renaissance Culture*, 32.1 (2006 Summer), 76–102.
45 Lynn Enterline, *The Rhetoric of the Body from Ovid to Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Syrithe Pugh, *Spenser and Ovid* (Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate, 2005); Daniel D. Moss, *The Ovidian Vogue: Literary Fashion and Imitative Practice in Late Elizabethan England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014). Moss's book contains chapters on both Spenser and Donne, but never draws the third line between Spenser and Donne to complete the triangle.
46 See also Joseph A. Campana and Scott Maisano (eds), *Renaissance Posthumanism* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2016), and Ayesha Ramachandran and Melissa E. Sanchez (eds), *Spenser and 'The Human'* [*Spenser Studies* 30] (New York: AMC Press, 2015).