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The Narrator’s Political Strategy: Self-Presentation in The Faerie Queene

Kayoko Adachi

Introduction

The narrator’s frequent addressing of Queen Elizabeth throughout The Faerie Queene (FQ) may suggest his intense attention to the queen as his audience. The poem was dedicated to her, and in the 1596 Dedication the narrator calls himself the queen’s humble servant wishing to serve her by his poetry: “TO ... ELIZABETH ... QVEENE OF ENGLAND ... &c. HER MOST HVMBLE SERVAVNT EDMVND SPENSER DOTh IN ALL HVMILITIE DEDICATE ... THESE HIS LABOVRS....”

Contrasting with the private tone in the speaker of Sonnet 80 of Amoretti (1595), who asks for “leaue” to retire in “pleasant mew” (9) to sing in praise of his beloved lady after his laborious service, “so long a race ... / Through Faery land, which those six books compile” (1-2), the narrator of FQ seems to assume a more public identity. The speaker’s reservation in the sonnet, that the praise of his own lady should be modest, “fit for the handmayd of the Faery Queene” (14), all the more intensifies the official tone in the narrator of FQ.

The phrase “your humble servant” has been used customarily in subscribing a letter to a superior, or in addressing a patron in the dedication of a book. Since the Dedication functions as the narrator’s deference to the queen, the phrase appears quite ordinary here. However, considering the usage of the phrase by contemporaries such as Ralegh in his pleading poem to the queen during his imprisonment, “I your humblest vassal” (“Sir Walter Ralegh’s petition to the Queen, 1618,” Hammond 61), the phrase seems to demand the queen’s more serious attention. Unlike Shepheardes Calender (1579) pub-
lished under a pseudonym, *FQ* is an autonym. The signature as the queen's humble servant Edmund Spenser suggests the narrator's strategic choice to win royal attention.

There may be a clear distinction between courtiers and servants in the Elizabethan court. Courtiers may refer to the privileged retinue, who enjoyed the queen's personal recognition and acceptance, while servants were the rest of the royal household staff (May 12, 20). Nevertheless, when Ralegh, and even Essex, designated themselves as the queen's servants,² surely they used the term "servant" not in May's sense, but in a more inclusive sense, that is, someone who renders homage to the queen. I would also like to use the term in this sense.

According to Whigham, in the Elizabethan era when advanced education necessary for public service became less exclusive, social mobility was caused by those ambitious to get positions in the queen's court, which was "simultaneously an arena of conflict and a mart of opportunity as well as a radiant center of order" (x). The received sense "of personal identity, seen as founded on God-given attributes such as birth" was gradually replaced by a new view that "the individual creates himself by his own actions" (Ibid.). Public life at court was governed by "identity derived from behavior," so that, instead of the received ontology of social being, it had increasingly become "a matter of doing, and so of showing," that is, of self-presentation (32-3). Hence, from the political point of view, articulating one's official identity as the queen's favorite servant may be strategically most profitable to win royal favour. In this thesis, I would like to examine the particular strategy the narrator of *FQ* adopts to attain the queen's favour by poetic service and the reason why he makes that choice. In this way, the narrator's political strategy may be revealed.

I The Figure of the Queen's Favorite Servant

Williams summarizes the figure of the queen's favorite servant: "The Queen valued intelligence in a man no less than she appreciated
the courtly graces of music and poetry or the energetic performances in the tiltyard” (21). With a view to fashioning noble youth to satisfy the royal taste, Sir Humphrey Gilbert proposed in 1564 a scheme for founding “Queen Elizabeth’s Academy,” with a curriculum ranging from classical subjects to political, courtly, and martial practice. The queen’s taste seems almost in accord with the ideal courtiership favoured in European courts in the late sixteenth century: “a rounded Renaissance man, as versatile in his parts as the prince he served” (Ibid. 22). Courtesy books were quite influential in molding such a model (Whigham xi), and Williams enumerates the versatility recommended in one such book by Castiglione: one should be a companion in one’s prince’s Privy Chamber, a reliable councilor in political affairs, a skilled soldier, a man of wit and fashion as well, fairly good at art, poetry, sports, music, dance, riding, dressing, and that all simultaneously (24).

Such a brilliant figure might be able to catch the queen’s fancy. However, the epithet “humble” must precede all, for even the brightest is but a subject who has to pay obeisance to the queen. Elizabeth’s monarchical style was “distant” and barred familiar mingling with her subjects (May 13). She rules over her world like the sun. She was often described as such,3) and her sovereignty demanded absolute obedience. OED explains the word “humbleness” roughly in two senses: humility as the opposite of self-exaltation or pride and modesty according to one’s relatively inferior degree. The subjects must kneel low under the foot of the sun queen, in exaltation of her, and in complete recognition of their inferiority to her. In a word, humbleness is required the most, for it implies the subjects’ adoration and loyalty for the queen.

At the same time, the kneeling humble one is also addressing the high queen to manifest worship and faith for her, that is, to appeal for her attention and favour. The religious implication of humility may be helpful to understand that this presentation is a safe and subtle strategy to claim royal favour. Humbleness is the virtue that even a monarch should have, for it is the attribute of Christ:
“For even the Son of Man did not come to be served but to serve ...” (Mark 10.45). Christ frequently preaches humbleness, especially to those who govern. The queen, the head servant of God and her people, should be the paragon, and be attentive and favorable to her subjects’ humbleness.

Still, there may be another important aspect. According to Williams, being rather fastidious about rules of etiquette on formal occasions, Elizabeth was pleased in her unbuttoned mood to see her subjects “a little in love with her ...” (21-2). The queen’s inclination to this slightly amorous relationship is also pointed out by other critics. Curiously, this liking of the queen coincides with the crucial requirement for a good courtier to serve his beloved lady with absolute obedience (Castiglione 245). Thus, presenting oneself as a faithful lover is recommended, while it is welcomed by the queen.

The figure of the Elizabethan ideal servant may be summarized as “a versatile, but humble servant in love with her.” The narrator of FQ seems quite responsive to this, and fashions Prince Arthur as such, who is loved most by Gloriana, an allegory for Elizabeth, as the narrator clearly reveals in the Proem of Book III. Sir Guyon seems very proud of his status as Gloriana’s favorite knight (II.i.40-2). Saved from death by Arthur, Guyon commends Arthur’s “wondrous worth and warlike feat” (II.ix.6.3). This may suggest that Guyon regards these merits as crucial for royal favour. Truly, Arthur is “the best and noblest knight aliue” (II.iii.18.3), and his all-round excellence is shown rather exhaustively. However, his reply, “My whole desire hath beene, and yet is now, / To serue that Queene with all my powre and might” (II.ix.7.3-4), seems to qualify Guyon’s words. Arthur seems to put the highest priority on humble service over other requirements to be the queen’s knight. Simultaneously, Arthur is the humble lover in the manner of courtly love. The story of his own falling in love with the Faerie Queene indicates unequivocal courtly love (I.ix.8-16). Though he hears in his dream that her love is promised to him, he never takes it for granted, but humbly hopes to serve her, wishing that she “with her bounty and glad coun-
tenance / Doth blesse her seruants, and them high aduaunce” (II.ix. 5.5-6). It seems that Arthur is presented as the consummation of a servant summarized above.

Sir Walter Ralegh may also understand the queen’s requirement. He is safely counted as one of the brightest versatile courtiers in her court, and he presents his writing self as a humble servant-lover like Arthur in his poems for the queen. In the most well-known “The 21st (and last) Book of the Ocean to Cynthia” (Hammond 37-49), the disgraced speaker is complaining that the queen “... did untie the gentle chains of love” (330) and has gone away from him “Who long in silence served and obeyed / With secret heart and hidden loyalty; / Which never change to sad adversity” (398-400). In his study on Elizabethan sonnet sequences, Marotti argues that the courtiers’ love poetry reflects their ambitious striving for the royal favour, relating figuratively “the realities of suit, service, and recompense ... as well as the frustrations and disappointments experienced in socially competitive environments,” and that especially in Elizabethan England, having an unmarried female monarch, the courtiers calculatedly translated their political striving into amorous verses (398-9). So does Ralegh, and adopts the figure of a humble servant-lover to express his covert plea to resume the queen’s favour.

With self-reference as the narrator of FQ, the speaker of Amoretti states the central issue of FQ to be to “enlarge her [i.e. Elizabeth’s] liuing prayses dead” (Sonnet 33). Similar statements, like “O soueraigne Queene, whose prayse I would endite” (III.i.3.4), are repeated throughout FQ. These may indicate the narrator’s hope to serve the queen as a poet who portrays her in verse as the court painters do with their brushes. He even advertises the superiority of poets “that passeth Painter farre / In picturing the parts of beautie daint” (III. Proem 2.6-7).

Then the narrator seems very anxious to try to present himself as an ideal poet servant. First, he seems to display his poetic versatility, alluding to his proficiency in various kinds of poetry such as a pastoral by “Oaten reeds,” a romance of “Knights and Ladies gentle
deeds” (I. Proem 1.4-5), a chronicle of the queen’s ancestry (II.x.1.7), and an epic or a more martial song of war (I.xi.7). At the same time, expressions of humbleness and plea for the queen’s appreciation are salient in his laudatory address: “The argument of mine afflicted stile: / The which to heare, vouchsafe, O dearest dred a-while” (I. Proem 4.8-9). He calls himself but an “apprentice of the skill” with too “humble a quill” (III. Proem 3.1,3). In the Proem of Book V, he again praises the queen and begs her pardon: “Pardon the boldnesse of thy basest thrall, / That dare discourse of so diuine a read, / As thy great iustice praysed ouer all,” and at once entreats her attention: “loe here thy Artegall” (11.1.6-9). Thus, throughout the poem, the narrator addresses the queen in a compound, almost patterned way, presenting himself as a versatile but humble poet servant, who, in awe and adoration, bids for the queen’s favorable appreciation.

This self-presentation of the narrator, however, seems to lack the aspect of a devoted lover that the queen likes. He seems to wish that the queen may be in her relaxed mood, in preference to love, be ready to hear his poetry, so he supplicates that Cupid may “From her high spirit chase imperious feare, / And vse of awfull Maiestie remoue: / In sted thereof with drops of melting loue, /... Sprinckle her heart, and haughtie courage soften, / That she may hearke to loue, and reade this lesson often” (IV. Proem 5.3-9). Nevertheless, he seems to observe the formal decorum, and unlike Ralegh’s speaker, he does not express his love for the queen in any amorous sense. It appears a momentous defect in presenting himself as the queen’s favorite servant figure. How does he amend this? Or does he have his own way of differentiating and making himself conspicuous from others?

2 A Tutor of True Love

That the narrator bids the queen to listen to his “lesson” in the citation just above suggests that the narrator may try to give a teaching on love to the queen, as Rambuss also points out (105). Here Castiglione’s writings may be helpful again. The speaker says, “as
musicke, sportes, pastimes, and other pleasant fashions, are... the floure of Courtlinesse, even so is the training and helping forwarde of the Prince to goodnesse[i.e. virtue], ... the fruite of it” (261). In a word, the speaker suggests that a good courtier, making use of his versatility and wisdom, should first of all be a cordial moral guide of the prince, instead of a fashionable, but flattering sycophant. This point seems rather obscure in Williams’ summary extracted above.

Authorized and recommended as it is, a servant teaching a lesson may imply presumptuousness. In order to avoid the queen’s possible displeasure, the narrator exalts her as the paragon of true love, in whose breast “treasures of true loue enlocked beene” (IV. Proem 4.4). He tries to illustrate the idea that true love is not unilateral, but is mutual, just as the queen is assumed to practice: “that loueth best, / And best is lou’d of all aliue...” (Ibid.6-7). Also, he does not direct his words to the queen herself, but to her train, especially to her attendant ladies, the supposed audience as well as the queen herself.

When the narrator addresses his lesson to the ladies, “Ye gentle Ladies, in whose soueraine powre / Loue [i.e. Cupid] hath the glory of his kingdome left” (VI.viii.1.1-2), he is clearly mentioning the traditional lore of courtly love, which certainly has presided over European literature for a long time. C. S. Lewis points out its four marks: “Humility, Courtesy, Adultery and the Religion of Love” (12). As “fin amour” (true love), the central idea, is considered to be “a humbling and refining passion” which leads the lover to virtues (Muscatine 13), the lady is a guiding star for him. Moreover, as Valency says, the conceit “which equated love with feudal service ... was the shaping principle of the whole design” of courtly love, in which the lover was his beloved lady’s vassal, whereas she was his sovereign lord (146). Consequently, humility and courtesy are requisite for a lover.

To avoid the problems which occur subsequent to adultery, temperance, or self-control is required. According to Andreas Capellanus, pure love, strictly distinguished from “mixed love,” is peculiar-
ly featured by the abnegation of “the final act of Venus” (122). At the conceptual level, sensuality is totally attenuated, and the image of “fin amour” is the eternally frozen figures of a beloved lady, chaste-ly robed, and a knight kneeling before her in the formal gesture of homage; he forever suppliant for mercy, while she forever holding and withholding (Valency 145-6). Since the lady “is allowed a free choice in her acceptance or rejection of a lover” (Lewis 34), mercy is certainly her supreme prerogative, the sovereign power in the narrator’s words to the ladies quoted above. Paradoxically, the lady is supposed to withhold it, and that, in turn, may allow her to hold the lover’s service unilaterally withoutrequiting him with her mercy.

In FQ, adulterous love for a married lady is convicted as false, lustful love in the episode of the philandering knight Paridell and the wanton lady Hellenore (III.x.). As a result, it seems that the code of continence is removed, and happy fulfillment by mutual love and marriage is celebrated and expected as seen in the many loving pairs, for example, the Redcrosse knight and Una, Artegall and Britomart, and above all, Gloriana and Arthur. The ladies, or the maidens in FQ need not withhold their prerogative as the frozen lady does in Valency’s image. There is no injunction to deter them from giving mercy to their true lovers, so they are urged to exercise their right freely, but in the proper way.

Thus, the narrator seems to argue that ladies should reward the humble service of their loyal lovers with mercy, and requite them with love. By this, he exhorts them to practice bilateral love, following the queen’s exemplar. This may be the core of the lesson: “Be well aware, how ye the same [i.e. mercy] doe vse,” and “be ye soft and tender eeke in mynde” in treating “th’hearts of men... / In yron chaines” enthralled to them (VI.viii.1.3-4,6, 2.1-3). The lesson is given in a typological way, presenting some examples of false usage of mercy, and then contrasting them with the right ones. Since right usage of mercy is associated with right practice of courtesy, it seems that the examples are rather concentrated in Book VI, the legend of courtesy.
The first example of false usage is Serena, Sir Calepine's beloved lady. The knight rests himself in comfortable shade "To solace with his Lady in delight ... / ... And eke the Lady was ... courteous withal, ..." (VI.iii.20.4-8-9). The word "solace" is traditionally used in courtly love when the lover gets his lady's mercy, while "courteous" suggests Serena's right requital of mercy towards him. However, her wandering in the fields picking up "duers flowers distinct with rare delight / ... as liking led / Her wauering lust after her wandring sight" (Ibid.23.5-7) suggests her wantonness like Flora, the goddess of whores, which invited the attack by the Blatant Beast. Moreover, despite Calepine's true love and devoted service to her, "euermore she blamed Calepine ... / As th'onely author of her wofull tine: / For being of his loue to her so light" (Ibid.viii.33.1-4). Such wantonness and disbelief in her knight are sharply contrastive with, for example, Una's true love featured by chastity and firm faith in the Redcrosse knight. Serena's seemingly courteous usage of mercy becomes quite suspicious, for it is not originated in her genuine love and sincere gratitude for Calepine's humble service.

The second one is Pastorella, who is captured by the brigands. Burnt by lustful flame, the captain woos her "To graunt him fauour, or afford him loue" (Ibid.xi.5.4) with all the weapons of a courtly lover, such as looks, words, gifts and vows. Keeping faith for Calidore, she rejects the captain at first. However, as he grows quite molesting, she becomes so fearful of his forcible action that "She thought it best, for shadow to pretend / Some shew of fauour, by him gracing small" (Ibid.6.5-6) in order to secure safer condition. Then, "With better tearmes she did him entertaine, / Which gaue him hope, and did him halfe perswade, / That he in time her joyaunce should obtaine" (Ibid.7.2-4). Giving "hope" to the lover is the first step of the lady's ratification of love, while the second is the granting of a kiss, the third, the enjoyment of embrace, and the fourth and the prohibited step is consummation (Andreas Capellanus 42). Truthfulness is required when she gives these tokens of mercy, but she is allowed to withdraw without blame until the third stage is passed.
Nevertheless, Pastorella seems to misuse her mercy, for she grants the captain the first stage of mercy out of her necessity of self-defense or worldly tactics to pacify him. Her mercy is that forged courtesy of Blandina, censured by the narrator as “false and fayned” (VI.vi.42.1). False mercy invites her further agony, for the captain, who is in no sense a traditional humble servant-lover, grows more pressing, and she succumbs to mental disease and withers in debility.

The third is Mirabella, who was “belou’d of many a gentle Knight, / And sude and sought with all the seruice dew” (VI.viii.20.5-6). Extremely proud of her beauty, she despised them and would not give them mercy, so the lovers were driven to despair and death. She does not care about their lifeconsuming smart, but boasts her “soueraine might, / That with the onely twinkle of her eye, / She could or saue, or spill, whom she would hight” (Ibid.vii.31.6-8).

Owing to this tyrannical pride and lack of mercy, she is sentenced to heavy punishment at the court of Cupid, the god of courtly love. This may indicate that the narrator thinks Mirabella’s cruel withholding of her mercy to be the worst abuse of ladies’ supreme right, and the most heinous discourtesy.

3 The Narrator’s Advantage

Sharply contrastive is the fourth example, Colin’s maiden. The shepherd poet loves this anonymous shepherdess, “That made him pipe so merrily,” at once making him humble: “low to lout” (VI.x.15.9, 16.7). Kelsey and Peterson survey that the allegorical equivalence of piping with writing has been used by poets since the Roman ages, when the word “pipe” signified “both reed pipe and reed pen, [in] a coincidence which fuses the acts of singing and writing” (235).

Here, Colin’s act of piping may be identified with his composing a lay of love for his maiden. Merrily, but humbly, the lover sings his love for the maiden, for she is present before him. A song in the tradition of courtly love is fashioned out of the poet’s love for his lady (Valency 109), and the song, in turn, serves him to express his
love and supplication for her mercy.

The narrator says, "He pypt apace, whilst they him daunst about" (VI.x.16.6). "They" may mean the major and lesser Graces, constituting concentric circles around the central maiden who is called the fourth Grace. The maiden's dancing to the lover's piping suggests that she is in sympathy with his humble love and responding to him from her free will. The Graces, who are the goddesses of courtesy as Colin expounds before long, bless the pair with their sympathetic dance. As C. S. Lewis says, this scene is the allegorical core which confirms the idea of courtesy (351), and the narrator's doctrine of courtesy is depicted in the figure of the three major Graces, giving, receiving, and requiting benefits freely and thankfully. Their blessing suggests that the lover's true love and the maiden's requiting mercy accord with the doctrine. The narrator seems to indicate that this pair is a model of courtesy, and this maiden's dispensation of mercy is exemplary.

However, the narrator never indulges himself in praise of Colin's maiden. Here, the narrator puts the significant stanza:

Sunne of the world, great glory of the sky,
That all the earth doest lighten with thy rayes,
Great Gloriana, greatest Maiesty,
Pardon thy shepheard, mongst so many layes,
As he hath sung of thee in all his dayes,
To make one minime of thy poore handmayd,
And vnderneath thy feete to place her prayse,
That when thy glory shall be farre displayd
To future age of her this mention may be made. (VI.x.28)

In his addressing Gloriana, or Elizabeth, with the supreme epithets, the narrator clarifies his deferent recognition of her almost deified status as the sun queen. Then he beseeches the queen's pardon for putting the small lay in praise of Colin's maiden at her foot. Here resuming his role as a lowly shepherd, he may emphasize his humbleness, while he tries to remind her of the first lines of FQ (I. Proem
1), in which he, a shepherd-poet, instead of his rural songs, sets forth to the laborious service of the queen's praise: "so many layes, / As he hath sung of thee in all his dayes," in which "thy glory shall be farre displayd / To future age." In the apparent apology, the narrator covertly displays his arduous service in his strategically patterned way in the compound of encomium, humbleness, and appeal for royal appreciation.

Moreover, the humbling term "thy poore handmaid" for Colin's maiden not only places her on the same level with the queen's ladies, the supposed audience of the narrator's lesson, but also exalts the queen high above the exemplary model as well as the attendant ladies. The sun epithet, in contrast with Ariadne's Crown (VI.x.13.1) for Colin's maiden, implies the queen's superiority, and reassures her status as the paragon of true love and ladies' courtesy. Therefore, this stanza has a significant function as a dulcifying complement for the queen. Thus, mollifying the queen, the narrator is able to present himself safely and simultaneously as the queen's humble servant and as the preacher of true love and ladies' courtesy. By this composite self-presentation, the narrator may have an advantage over those who present themselves as humble servants-lovers, the queen's favorite subject figure.

Presenting himself as a faithful lover of the queen, Ralegh's speaker is unable to overstep the tacit code of courtly love. In the tradition of courtly love, the women are always called "the beloved ladies," while the men, "the lovers." Love and service are male duty, whereas being loved and served is female privilege. Lady Emilia's exhortation to a courtier to "frame his own [wishes]" according to his beloved lady's (Castiglione 245), is based on one of the rules of courtly love: "Being obedient in all things to the commands of ladies, thou shalt ever strive to ally thyself to the service of Love" (Andreas Capellanus 81). As surveyed earlier, their relationship simulates that of the feudal lord and vassal, and ladies are allowed the supreme authority to accept or reject them, so that they may hold lovers' free service and absolute obedience. The courtiers are urged to do ser-
vice to the ladies, whereas the ladies need not requite them, if not inclined to.

The dynamics, when coinciding with the queen's welcome to her subjects' complimentary amorousness and the courtiers' responsive translation of their ambitious expectation into amatory language, contributes to the queen's dominance. The queen may preside over her court not only by her monarchical power, but also by the traditional female privilege, assuming the unilaterally beloved lady of her subjects. She seems to induce her subjects to ingratiate amorousness on the one hand, but she may withhold her requital of mercy or reward to them on the other hand. In this way, she may hold their loyalty by the name of faithful love, while the subjects must persevere in their unrewarded situation as distressed lovers' concomitant with female sovereignty. This relationship is all the more intensified by the virgin queen's almost consecrated superhuman position as a goddess or a saint. Such a figure may demand absolutely continent worship, while one should have firm faith in her grace, and should not blame her coldness.

Thus one who chooses the role of a humble servant-lover to win royal favour must submit oneself to this frustrated condition. At best he may complain gently and beg her mercy plaintively as Ralegh's speaker does, but never is he allowed to censure her ill-treatment. On the other hand, uniquely harmonizing happy fulfillment of mutual love with the traditional code of courtly love, the narrator prefers the combined self-presentation as a humble servant and a tutor of love and ladies' mercy. Directing his lesson outwardly to the lesser audience, the narrator keeps himself safe from the queen's possible disgrace, while it is addressed covertly to the queen herself. By this, the narrator has the political advantage over the humble servant-lover, and through his lesson of ladies' courteous requital of mercy to their faithful lovers' service, insinuates that the queen should not withhold her favour, but attentively reward her humble servants.
Conclusion

Throughout the poem, the narrator repeatedly renders homage to the queen by displaying himself as a versatile, but humble poet who, in awe and adoration, serves the queen by immortalizing her glory by his verses. At the same time, his self-presentation as a tutor of love and courtesy is an indirect but insinuating plea for the queen’s recompense to his service. Refraining from adopting the servant-lover figure, this particular way of suppliance at first seems disadvantageous to catch royal favour, however, from a political standpoint, it seems to me a more practical strategy than that of the contemporary amatory servants who are supposed to persevere meekly with unrewarded labour.

Milton calls Spenser “our sage and serious Poet, ... a better teacher then Scotus or Aquinas” (Cummings 163-4), and such didactic aspect of FQ has been treated with polar attitudes, from deference to distance. Truly, as the author explains in his letter to Ralegh, the poem may serve “to fashion a gentleman or noble person in vertuous and gentle discipline” (Hamilton 737) through the adventures of Prince Arthur and the titular knights. Nevertheless, in spite of the author’s attention to gentlemen readership, the narrator’s eyes are insistently fixed upon the queen. Taking this into account, we may find the narrator’s mastery of political dexterity in the moralistic countenance of FQ.

Notes
2) As for Essex’ designation of himself as the queen’s “most humble servant,” see his apologizing letter to her, quoted in Williams 232.
3) For example, Harington wrote, “When she smiled, ... it was pure sunshine that everyone did choose to bask in if they could” (Williams 33). In the poetry, she appears as “another Sun in glory” in Sir John Davies’ “Two Poems of Dedication” (Gerald Bullett, ed., Silver
Poets of the Sixteenth Century (London: Dent, 1947), p.343), and in FQ, she is called with the sun epithet (VI.x.28.1). Also, the famous "Rainbow portrait" bears a motto, "NON SINE SOLE IRIS," indicating that the sun queen brings a rainbow [i.e. peace].

4) See, for example, Mark 10.42-4.


7) Some critics depend on E.K.'s commentary on Shepheards Calendar in their interpretation of the meaning of the three Graces, giving, receiving, and requiting benefits courteously.
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