

Title	Producing a Queen : The Political Ideology in The Sheheardes Calender
Author(s)	Mizote, Mari
Citation	待兼山論叢. 文学篇. 1990, 24, p. 17-32
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/47846
rights	
Note	

Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

Osaka University

Producing a Queen

—The Political Ideology in *The Shepheardes Calender*—

Mari MIZOTE

The mysterious gloss maker E. K. describes Spenser's debut as a poet:

... as young birdes, that be newly crept out of the nest, by little first to prove theyr tender wyngs, before they make a greater flyght. So flew Theocritus, as you may perceive he was all ready full fledged. So flew Virgile, as not yet well feeling his winges. So flew Mantuane, as being not full somd. So Petrarque. So Boccace; So Marot, Sanazarus and also divers other excellent both Italian and French Poetes. (*Epistle*)¹

Spenser intended to appear in literary history as a descendant of such famous poets. He wrote pastorals in the style of those ancient poets. His work was influenced by those preceding pastorals. Therefore, Spenser's efforts are a product of literary inheritance.

It is one of the characteristics of the genre that a pastoral should contain references to contemporary social problems. George Puttenham defined the purpose of the pastoral in *The Arte of English Poesie* as one that is:

... under the vaile of homely persons, and in rude speeches to insinuate and glaunce at greater matters and such as perchance had not bene safe to have been disclosed in any other sort.²

The author of *The Shepheardes Calender* also labored "to conceal" its purpose. "He (the author) chose rather to unfold great matter of argument covertly, then professing it" (*Epistle*). There is, then, an important opinion hidden in this work and it is not safe to disclose it. In fact, *The Shepheardes Calender* concealed political

criticism against the government. Its disclosure would entail great risk. It is necessary to pay attention to these two facts, facts that have already been discussed at length.

One interesting topic of current Spenser criticism is the function of this work in the social context. Critics often discuss just how this work is connected with the royal politic of the Queen. The aim of this paper is to demonstrate how the *Calender* concerned itself with the Queen's ideology.

I

Before discussing the problems of *The Shepheardes Calender*, it is important to examine Louis Adrian Montrose's new reading of the work. I would like to show how the specific literary texts, especially the Spenserian, and specific literary genre such as the pastoral, worked ideologically in Elizabethan society.

In his series of essays, Montrose establishes a new aspect of history. It is generally accepted that literary works are the creations of history. But Montrose's new conception of history proposes a mutual operation between history and literature. Montrose closely investigated the social conditions of the Elizabethan age and examines the specific texts from a social point of view. He concludes that certain literary texts took part in the production and the circulation of political ideology.

Elizabethan England was a typical hierarchical society ruled by the Queen. Her power was absolute. The Elizabethan social class system was strongly justified by a so called "Tudor ideology" to protect her authority. "Tudor ideology" was revealed, for instance, in the "Exhortation, concerning good order and obedience, to rulers and Magistrates":

ALMIGHTYE GOD hath created and appoynted all thinges, in heaven, earth and waters, in a mooste excellent and perfecte order. . . . Everye degre of people in theyr vocation, callyng, and office hath appointed

to them, theyr duety and ordre. Some are in hyghe degree, some in lowe, some kynges and prynces, some inferiors and subjectes, priestes, and layemenne, Maysters and Servauntes, Fathers and chyldren, husbandes and wives, reche and poore, and everyone have nede of other: so that in all thynges is to be lauded and prayed the goodly order of god, wythoute the whiche, no house, no citie, no commonwealth can continue and indure or laste. . . . God hath sent us his hygh gyft, oure moost dere soveraygne Lady Quene Elizabeth, with godly, wyse and honorable counsaile, with other superyors and inferiors in a beautiful order and goodly. . . . Let us consider the scripturs of the holy goste, whiche perswade and commaund us al obediently to be subjecte: fyrst and chieflie, to the quene's majestie, supreme head, over al, and next, to her honorable counsaile, and to al other noble men, magistrates and officers, whiche by God's goodnes be placed and ordered.³

This quotation is from homilies on obedience preached at church services. It is clear that such homilies greatly contributed to the dissemination and circulation of the ideology formed by the regime. This ideology, "placed and ordered" by God, guaranteed the supremacy of the Queen. The Queen and her government could prohibit all kinds of aspiring minds and ambitions for social class promotion because such attitudes were against the will of God. But not all Englishmen were content to accept such a rigid system.

The most significant threat to Elizabethan gynecocracy at home was a subject's hidden dissatisfaction with the sex of their sovereign. Montrose points out that there existed some kind of frustration among the male subjects of the Queen.

With one vital exception, all forms of public and domestic authority in Elizabethan England were vested in men: in fathers, husbands, masters, teachers, preachers, magistrates, lords. It was inevitable that the rule of a woman who was unmastered by any man would generate peculiar tensions within such a "patriarchal" society.⁴

In such a traditionally patriarchal English society, clearly, woman was second to man. This notion has its origin in Genesis. Woman

was “taken out” of man as his “helpmeet”. After the fall of man, the God said to Eve, “thy desire shall be subject to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee”⁵, so that woman was thought to be more of an assistant than a leader, director, or ruler. Elizabeth’s parliaments and counselors had persuaded her to marry and procreate an heir. It seems to be a right and proper requirement, because the Queen’s legitimate heir would assure England’s prosperity and peace. Moreover, Montrose explains the complicated intrigue behind this persuasion. “The political nation, which was wholly a nation of men, could sometimes find it frustrating or degrading to serve a prince who was, after all, merely a woman.”⁶ Elizabeth’s maintaining a divine supremacy over England caused much unrest among her subjects.

On the other hand, marriage, too, might cause another kind of anxiety. If she had had a consort, she would become his subject. As the ruler of the country, everyone was her subject, even her husband. People feared she might yield her sovereignty to her husband. It is certain Elizabeth was a frustration to the androcentric society she ruled. Conversely, she was under the yoke of the patriarchal power. In order to countervail any patriarchal force, she organized special strategies, namely, “some sort of transformation of her social and political character”, because “no woman could assume magistracy over a people”⁷ without taking such measures in the patriarchal society.

She responded to her male advisors on their suggestion of marriage as follows:

I have beene ever perswaded, that I was borne by God to consider, and above all things, doe those which appertaine unto his glory. And therefore it is, that I have made choyce of this kinde of life, which is most free, and agreeable for such humane affaires as may tend to his service onely.... And this is that I thought, then that I was a private person. But when the publique charge of governing the Kingdom came upon mee, it seeme unto mee an inconsiderate folly, to draw upon my selfe

the cares which might proceede of marriage. To conclude, I am already bounde unto an Husband, which is the Kingdom of England.... (And therewithall, stretcning out her hand, she shewed them the Ring with which shee was given in marriage, and inaugerated to her Kingdome with expresse and solemne termes.) And reproch mee so no more, (quoth shee) that I have no children: for every one of you, and as many as are English, are my Children.... But in this I must commend you, that you have not appoynted mee an Husband: for that were unworthy the Magestie of an absolute Princesse, and the discretion of you that are borne my Subjects.... Lastly, this may be sufficient, both for my memorie, and honour of my Name, if when I have expired my last breath, this may be inscribed upon my Tombe:

Here lyes interr'd ELIZABETH,
A Virgin pure untill her Death.⁸

Montrose explains that in this speech, Elizabeth justifies her single blessedness “in the cult of virginity”, shifts her “wifely duties” from home to the nation, displays her maternity “in her political rather than in her natural body.”⁹ What she presented as her attributes, that is, a virgin, wife and mother could promote her to a heavenly Virgin Mary. She transformed herself as a Virgin Mary and rid the nation of any misgivings it might have had about her. With her diplomatic assuagement, she made her reign readily acceptable by all.

The Elizabethan pastoral has this same softening effect on society. Montrose summarizes the point as follows: “... the symbolic mediation of social relationships was a central function of Elizabethan pastoral forms; ... social relationships are, intrinsically, relationships of power.”¹⁰ He goes on to say that:

(Pastorals) are symbolic instruments for coping with the goddess Fortune, with the endemic anxieties and frustration of life in an ambitious and competitive society. Pastorals that celebrate the ideal of content function to articulate—and thereby, perhaps, to assuage—discontent.¹¹

He regards the pastoral as a special filter through which the frustration and disappointment of reality could be made more easily accepted. The pastoral allayed society's fears and helped to disseminate the ideology of the regime.

The royal shepherdess is often depicted as a maiden queen, but she is also adored by shepherds. She takes care of them and their flocks like a mother. The characteristics of a shepherd queen is reflected in the Queen's political tactics. In this case, the pastoral form worked as an instrument of her policy.

While the highest pastoral persona of the Queen was a queen of shepherds, the lowest was that of a milkmaid. The Queen presented another speech to Parliament in which she responded to the demand on marriage by her subjects. She declared: "... if I were a milkmaid with a pail on my arm, whereby my private person might be little set by, I would not forsake that poor state to match with the greatest monarch."¹² Here she made metaphorical use of the pastoral as an instrument of policy. Her speech was irrational in itself. A real milkmaid living in poverty may choose to marry seeking for her happiness. The Queen was certainly no milkmaid. She was a queen regnant in possession of all available privileges. Acknowledging a milkmaid's lowly position in society and her sexual inferiority as a maiden, she did claim her weakness and tried to excite her nation to sympathize with her, and succeeded in winning the support of the nation. The Queen's strategy influenced her subjects' will as they submitted to hers.

The pastoral flourished, then, supported by Elizabethan poets and politicians, and by the Queen. Its success largely depended on the Queen and the skill with which "she and her courtier-poets turned that potential liability to advantage."¹³ The "potential liability" here meant that she was a female monarch of a patriarchal society. She did not pretend to hide her womanhood. On the contrary, she behaved as a lady and stressed her womanly nature. So the friendly relations between the royal shepherdess and her

subordinate shepherds, which are expressed over and over again in the pastoral, elaborately reflect the Queen's political strategy and policy. "What is most impressive about Elizabethan pastorals of power is how successful they really are at combining intimacy and benignity with authoritarianism."¹⁴ Pastoral facilitated the subjects' being subordinate to the will of their Queen.

In recent essays, Montrose shows interests in the moment in which a certain ideology is produced. All the creators of the Elizabethan texts are the Queen's subjects and the Queen is the subject of their discourse. The Queen as subject means the Queen as "the whole field of cultural meanings personified in her."¹⁵ The Queen is the subject of her subjects' discourse and her subjects shaped the Queen into a queen presented in their texts. In such a power relation between the sovereign and her subjects or the subject and the artists, which side could exercise authority over the other?

In the making of any kind of text, individuals who are making the text seem to have their own consciousness and to initiate a voluntary action. But they are motivated and constrained within "network of power beyond their comprehension or control."¹⁶ Elizabeth worked out her own strategies and shaped her image in various ways; as a virgin, wife and mother coexisting in a single person is a typical example. Those images are of her own self-fashioning. Yet she was shaped at the same time "by the existing repertoire of values, institutions, and practices specific to Elizabethan society and to Elizabeth's position within it."¹⁷

In Elizabeth's reign, there were many subjects who employed themselves in "sponsoring, designing and executing the representation of royal power."¹⁸ In the process of textualization, various Queen types have been produced and many people took part in the production of 'a queen' in many ways seeking for their own profit. They shape her identity to suit their own convenience. Stephen Greenblatt lays stress on the Queen's ability "to fashion her

identity and to manipulate the identities of her followers.”¹⁹ Montrose, however, insists the reciprocal action of such fashioning and manipulation between the Queen and her subjects. They were both “mutually defining and reciprocally constituted” in the texts. Montrose points out that kind of text is not only “the product of a received ideology” but “a production of ideology.”²⁰

Aprill in *The Sheperdes Calender* is used to exemplify that mechanism by Montrose. “The laye of fayre Elisa” is a typical example of the Elizabethan pastoral encomium of the Queen. Elisa is “textualized as the gendered and idealized personification of the state” shaped by the poet.²¹ Such an operation contributed to legitimate and enforce the political order of the Queen. In this sense, the poet refashioned the society to which he belonged as a subject. On the other hand, this lay is the encomium of the poet as well. Elisa is the daughter of Pan and Syrinx (*ll.* 50-1). According to the myth, this union resulted in Pan’s getting his reed pipe. Pan’s pipe symbolized the pastoral. Therefore, Elisa, the offspring of Pan and Syrinx, is the ideal pastoral created by Pan’s pipes. The praise and celebration of Elisa suggest that the lay itself should be praised and celebrated. In such a way, the poet presented his superb skill for making pastoral. The Queen was refashioned into the poet’s subject. The poet offered his encomium to the Queen and, at the same time, boldly presented his own encomium and appealed to the Queen for his promotion.

II

The pastoral world depicted in the literary text was the symbol of the Queen’s ideal reign in the Elizabethan age. The government politically utilized pastoral forms for establishing the Queen’s ideological image and manipulating the nation in her favor.

The unfortunate reality of Elizabethan England was that a poet’s success was completely dependent on the Queen. Poets vied with one another for her approval and did their courtship in their

poetry, especially in the pastoral. Poets gave enthusiastic praise to her and her reign in pastoral forms. A poet payed his court to the Queen by producing pastoral poetry that would contribute to the circulation of her ideology.

As mentioned in the foregoing section, Montrose interprets the function of *Aprill* in Elizabethan society from an ideological viewpoint. Montrose concludes that the poem is an encomium to the Queen and her reign, and contributes to the dissemination of the Queen's ideology. But at the same time, he sees that the poem functions as praise for the poet's talent and emphasizes his contribution to the artistic production of the Queen's ideology.

But the poet regards the pastoral as an insufficient means to offer praise to the Queen and also to the poet himself when the work is examined as a whole. The purpose of this section is to examine the poet's process of producing a royal ideology and to find the reason the poet felt praising the Queen in the form of a pastoral unsatisfactory.

When E. K. touched on the purpose of *The Sheperdes Calender*, he explained:

...onely this appeareth, that his unstayed yougth had long wandred in the common Labyrinth of Love, in which time to mitigate and allay the heate of his passion, or els to warne the young shepheards. s. his equalls and companions of his unfortunate folly, he compiled these xii. Aeglogues.
(*Epistle*)

Love, Colin's failure in love, is the apparent subject of this work.

Colin is enamoured of "a Country lasse Rosalind" who is "a Gentle woman of no meane house, nor endowed with anye vulgare and common gifts both of nature and manners" (*Aprill*, gloss). Moreover, Rosalind deserves no less than "Lauretta the divine Petrarches Goddess." The gloss hinted that Rosalind is the Queen's persona, because in Elizabethan literary history, the Queen was praised and adored as England Laura, and Elizabeth / Laura was

a sister of pastoral Elisa.²² The poet textualized the Queen as Rosalind or the Muse of Colin's poetry. Colin was "forsaken unfaithfully" (*June*, Arg.) by Rosalind. It means his Rosalind / Muse left him because she had a great contempt for his songs. He could not help stopping his creation of poetry because his Muse abandoned him.

October is a general comment on "the comtempt of Poetrie and pleasaunt wits." Cuddie, "the perfecte paterne of a Poete," finds himself "little good hath got, and much lesse gayne" (l. 10) in his career. Firstly he points out the honor he got from pleasing "the base and viler clowne" is a thing of no worth. He says: "Sike prayse is smoke, that sheddeth in the skye, / Sike words bene wynd, and wasten soone in vayne." (ll. 35-6) Poetry in general, much less the pastoral, cannot support a poet's aspiration to true fame. The pastoral holds the lowest rank in the poetical hierarchy. It rarely brings fame to the poets.

Piers then recommends that Cuddie sing about higher subjects such as "wars" and "giusts." Cuddie refers to the career of "the Romish *Tityrus*," namely, Virgil and admits that his success depends on his singing "of warres and deadly drede", the epic. Here the poet shows his ambition to write an epic in view of possible success.

The pastoral world was the symbol of the peaceful and stable reign of the Queen as it is praised in *Aprill*. Her pacifism was intentionally the object of admiration:

Olives bene for peace,
When wars doe surcease:

Such for a Princesse bene principall. (ll. 124-6)

This pacifism was satirized in *October*: "To doubted knights, whose woundlesse armour rusts, / And helmes unbruized wexen dayly browne." (ll. 41-2) These lines allude to the long peace of Elizabethan reign and absence of heroic poetry.²³ So the Elizabethan

peace deprived heroes and poets of the chance to show their ability. This is a subtle criticism of Elizabeth's diplomatic policy. Therefore, Cuddie expresses dissent to Piers saying: "...all the worthies ligger wrapt in leade,/ That matter made for Poets on to play" (ll. 63-4). He emphasizes it is not because of the poet's inability but because of the lack of worthy subject matter that the poetry brings ridicule upon itself. Piers expresses his pity for poetry.

O pierlesse Poesye, where is then thy place?
 If nor in Princes pallace thou doe sitt:
 (And yet is Princes pallace the most fitt)
 Ne brest of baser birth doth thee embrace.
 Then make thee winges of thine aspyring wit,
 And, whence thou camst, flye backe to heaven apace.

(ll. 79-84)

It is Colin who "fittes such famous flight to scanne," if he were not affected by love. What makes Colin suffer so much is "gynerastice, that is the love whiche enflameth men with lust toward woman kind." (*Jan.*, gloss) And this is instinctive desire to control women. Cuddie censured love for its threatening power: "For lordly love is such a Tyranne fell:/ That where he rulesk all power he doth expell." (ll. 98-9) The reason the Muse left Colin is "Ne wont with crabbed care the Muses dwell" (l. 101).

"The vaunted verse a vacant head demaundes," (l. 100)—Cuddie refers to the divine poet here: "Who ever casts to compasse weightye prise,/ And thinks to throwe out thondring words of threate" (ll. 103-5). The words of the divine poet are never contrived but flows "as fast as spring doth rise." The heavenly influence and love are alike in appearance but quite different in nature. Both are intense. But when heavenly influence catches fire and glows in the poet, he falls into ecstasy. In the case of love, he burns himself and finds no satisfaction like Colin in *December*.

The Muse/Queen is completely opposed to love, because it was her policy that nothing be greater than her power. The Queen's policy is expressed in one of her famous remarks: "I will have here but one Mistress, and no Master."²⁴ "Unwisely weaves, that takes two webbes in hand," (l. 102)—it is impossible to serve two masters at once. To serve love is one thing and to create poetry inspired by the Muse/Queen is another. It is impossible to manage both successfully. The Muse/Queen expects the poet/subject to serve her faithfully:

Between Princes and their Subjects there is a most straight tye of affections . . . , so neither ought subjects to cast their eyes upon any other Prince, than him whom God hath given them.²⁵

The reality of the poet's dependency on the Queen is rewritten in the imaginative reality of the poet's dependency on the Muse.

Pastoral Elisa in *Aprill* is another persona of the Queen. On the other hand, as Montrose has already pointed out and as E. K. suggested in the gloss, she represents pastoral poetry itself. In the classical myth, Syrinx was loath to fall into Pan's hands. She was transformed into a reed to protect her chastity from him. Pan caught the reed and made it into a panpipe in memory of her. Pan played the reed pipe and that was the origin of pastoral. Therefore, Elisa, the offspring of Syrinx and Pan, is the living embodiment of pastoral poetry itself.

As the opening woodcut shows, Colin is playing a musical instrument with his foot soaking in water. This clearly indicates that he created the lay with divine inspiration. Besides, there is an invocation to the Muses at the beginning of the lay. Elisa/pastoral poetry is the offspring of Colin and his Muse.

The poet textualized two queens with double meaning, namely, Rosalind/his Muse and Elisa/pastoral poetry. The poet meant that a queen/pastoral poetry is created by the poet and the Queen/

Muse. So Elisa / a queen is really the Queen's ideological entity in itself and the Queen could produce it in cooperation with the poet. Here the poet depicted the effects of the "reciprocal action of fashioning" between the Queen and her subject / poet. Thus the poet proved his importance in the social mechanism of producing ideology.

Cuddie, "the perfecte paterne of a Poete" in *October*, confesses that if he were as inspired as he was previous, he could "reare the Muse on stately stage" and "teache her tread aloft in buskin fine" (*ll.* 112-3). To wear buskin was a special manner of poets and players in tragedies. It is intended that Cuddie has a notion that the divine poet produces tragedies with the help of the divine inspiration. Colin invokes Melpomene, the Muse of Tragedy, in his elegy to Dido. Colin will sing a tragedy inspired by its Muse. The Muse returns to Colin. He then is able to serve the Muse again as a divine poet.

There has been a very famous comment that Dido is the name of the Queen of Carthage in the *Aeneid*. Her real name is Elisa. This comment supports McLane's hypothesis that Dido, in *November*, is identified with Elisa in *April*.²⁶ On this supposition, Dido / Elisa in *November* is also the embodiment of pastoral poetry itself and an offspring of Colin and the Muse. Colin obtains creative genius from the Muse and lets Dido / pastoral poetry fly back to heaven, its home; "Dido nis dead, but into heaven hent" (*l.* 169).

Dido's flight leads to Colin's rise to fame. Colin, in the *November* woodcut, is playing the trumpet and the other shepherd beside Colin is about to put the laurel crown on Colin's head. The trumpet and the laurel crown are symbols of Calliope, the Muse of epic poetry and the glory of poets. Colin's fame is symbolized by the trumpet and the laurel crown, namely, epic poetry, though he is writing the pastoral which occupies the lowest level in poetical rank. Colin rises from the pastoral to epic poetry, or from the lowest to the highest

ranking in poetry. Parting from Dido is Colin's parting from the pastoral. The elegy for Dido is an elegy for the pastoral as well.

The name of Dido / Elisa, referring to the Queen, was familiar to the poet's contemporaries, so that Dido in *November* is another persona of the Queen.²⁷ Dido / Queen goes to heaven. The fame of the Queen is praised to the sky. The poet succeeded in giving the highest praise to the Queen in the framework of the pastoral. But she has already been in the "Elisian fields" and associated herself with the nobles and the divine. She never comes back to the pastoral world. Therefore, the elegy for Dido is the elegy for the Queen who has left the pastoral world.

Spenser's *Calender* begins in January. It was generally believed that March was the start of the year. Though E. K. detailed the reasons, it is simply because he felt that the *Calender* must begin with the dreary winter season for a background. That season is inappropriate for singing pastorals. Colin makes an appeal as "now nis the time of merimake" (*Nov.*), and hangs his panpipe upon the tree (*Dec.*). Under the veil of pastoral, the poet insists on the virtual end of the pastoral experience at that time of political upheaval. In addition, the poet proclaims that there is no longer any worthy subject in the pastoral world and that he has enough ability to fly high and to find his subjects among the fallen heroes in Elisian fields.

The Shepheardes Calender is a pastoral which is certainly used to produce and disseminate the Queen's ideology. However, this work is also an elegy for the pastoral because the subject has been lifted from pastoral to epic poetry by the poet himself. The poet manifests his will to write an epic. Therefore, *The Shepheardes Calender* hails the arrival of the epic which will function as the true royal encomium.

Notes

- 1 All quotations of Spenser are from *The Yale Edition of the Shorter*

- Poems of Edmund Spenser* edited by William A. Oram et al. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989).
- 2 George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie*, ed. Glasys D. Willcock and Alicè Walker (Cambridge, Eng., 1936), p. 38, as quoted in Louis Adrian Montrose, "'Eliza, Queene of shepherdes', and the Patoral of Power," in *Renaissance Historicism*, ed. Arthur F. Kinney and Dan S. Collins. (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1987), p. 35.
 - 3 Reprinted in *Elizabethan Backgrounds*, ed. Arthur F. Kinney. (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1975), pp. 60-1.
 - 4 Montrose, "A *Midsummer Night's Dream* and the Shaping Fantasies of Elizabethan Culture: Gender, Power, Form," in *Rewriting the Renaissance*, ed. Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nance J. Vickers. (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1986), p. 68.
 - 5 Genesis, III. xvi.
 - 6 Montrose, "A *Midsummer Night's Dream*," p. 81.
 - 7 Constance Jordan, "Representing Political Androgyny: More on the Siena Portrait of Queen Elizabeth I," in *The Renaissance Englishwoman in Print*, ed. Anne M. Haselkorn and Betty S. Travitsky. (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1990), p. 157.
 - 8 William Camden, *The History and Annalls of Elizabeth, Queen of England*, trans. Richard Norton (London: 1630), Book 1, 28-9, as quoted in Montrose, "The Elizabethan Subject and the Spenserian Text," in *Literary Theory: Renaissance Texts*, ed. Patricia Parker and David Quint. (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), pp. 309-10.
 - 9 Montrose, "The Elizabethan Subject," p. 310.
 - 10 Montrose, "'Eliza, Queene of shepherdes,'" p. 34.
 - 11 (from 11 to 14) *Ibid.*, pp. 36, 37, 61, 61.
 - 15 Montrose, "The Elizabethan Subject," p. 303.
 - 16 (from 16 to 18) *Ibid.*, pp. 306, 310, 318.
 - 19 Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*. (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980), p. 169.
 - 20 Montrose, "The Elizabethan Subject," p. 322.
 - 21 *Ibid.*, p. 321.

- 22 Cf. Elkin Calhoun Wilson, *England's Eliza*. (New York: Octagon Books, 1939/1966), Chap. IV.
- 23 *October*, note.
- 24 Sir Robert Naunton, *Fragmenta Regalia, & in The Harleian Miscellany*. (London, 1809), p. 83, as quoted in Jordan, p. 163.
- 25 Wilson, p. 212.
- 26 Cf. Paul E. McLane, *Spenser's Shepheardes Calender*. (Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961/1968), Chap. IV.
- 27 McLane, p. 52.

(Doctorate Student)

〔和文要旨〕

『羊飼の暦』のイデオロギー性について

溝手 真理

昨今の『羊飼の暦』批評においてしばしば議論の対象になる問題は、作品が当時の社会においていかなる位置に存在し、どのように機能していたのかということにある。

本稿では、前半において、エリザベス朝の牧歌や特に「四月」のうたが果たした社会的機能についてモントローズの論文分析と平行させながら考察する。ここでは牧歌が女王のイデオロギーの形成と流布に貢献していた事実が示される。後半では、『羊飼の暦』のテキスト内においてイデオロギーの化身として現れる3人の女王の創出を通して、女王のイデオロギーの形成と社会への浸透というイデオロギー操作のメカニズムを描きだしてみたい。同時に、女王に社会的に依存する詩人と、詩人の創作する作品によってイデオロギー操作のメカニズムを確保する女王という両者の互恵的な関係を浮き彫りにしてみたい。