<http://www.diva-portal.org>

Postprint

This is the accepted version of a paper published in *English literary renaissance*. This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Bergvall, Å. (1997)

Between Eusebius and Augustine: Una and the Cult of Elizabeth.

English literary renaissance, 27(1): 3-30

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6757.1997.tb01098.x>

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:kau:diva-17380>

Between Eusebius and Augustine: Una and the Cult of Elizabeth

In 1522 Juan Luis Vives, the Spanish humanist that later tutored Princess Mary, could after long labors dedicate a new Latin edition of the *City of God* to Henry VIII.¹ The message of the book was timely, Vives intimated in his dedication, since Augustine had been involved in a task similar to that of the king, the "Defender of the Faith":

You and Saint Augustines point and purpose in writing, seeme almost to intend and attaine the same end. For as you wrote for that better Rome against Babilon, so Saint Augustine against Babilon defended that ancient, Christian and holier Rome.²

The writing "against Babilon" on behalf of the papacy ("that better Rome") was of course the king's celebrated refutation of Luther, the *Assertio* of 1521.³ In typical medieval fashion Vives has identified the city of God with the papacy, yet his association of Babylon with Lutheran heresies is obviously a new twist. But by one of the many ironies of history, within a decade the political theories of the "Babylonian" Luther were shaping Henry VIII's official policy. And by another twist, that policy was based on Luther's reinterpretation of the political theory of the *City of God*.

The Augustinian political presence remained persistent throughout the Tudor period, and is particularly evident in Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*. As I have shown elsewhere, the allegorical centers of the Legend of Holiness, the House of Pride and the House of Holiness, are informed by the two conflicting cities of the *City of God*.⁴ Yet Spenser deals not only with the eschatological dimensions of the Augustinian cities, but also discusses their political and civic dimensions through the cities of Cleopolis and the new Jerusalem.⁵ By separating the argument into two contrasting pairs, Spenser not only portrays the cosmic battle between the cities of God and the devil (his main interest in Book 1), but he also shows the interaction between the civic state and these two other cities. Seeing the heavenly city from the Mount of Contemplation, Redcrosse in canto 10 distinguishes it from Cleopolis, the civic state:

Till now, said then the knight, I weened well,
 That great *Cleopolis*, where I haue been,
 In which that fairest *Faerie Queene* doth dwell
 The fairest Citie was, that might be seene;
 And that bright towre all built of christall cleene,
Panthea, seemd the brightest thing, that was:
 But now by prooffe all otherwise I weene;
 For this great Citie that does far surpas,
 And this bright Angels towre quite dims that towre of glas.

Most trew, then said the holy aged man;
 Yet is *Cleopolis* for earthly frame,
 The fairest peece, that eye beholden can:
 And well beseemes all knights of noble name,
 That couet in th'immortal booke of fame
 To be eternized, that same to haunt,
 And doen their seruice to that soueraigne Dame,
 That glorie does to them for guerdon graunt:
 For she is heauenly borne, and heauen may iustly vaunt.

(*FQ* 1.10.58-59)⁶

With the help of a characteristic pun, Spenser distinguishes between the new Jerusalem and Cleopolis. Following Augustine, who had contrasted the "earthly peace" of the human city with the "eternal peace" of the heavenly city, he calls the new Jerusalem a city of "eternall peace" (*FQ* 1.10.55), while Cleopolis is "for earthly frame, / The fairest peece, that eye beholden can" (*FQ* 1.10.59). Yet another Church Father, Eusebius of Ceasarea, who had provided another, highly influential pattern for Tudor political thinking, is also evident in these very stanzas. What are we to make of the fact that Gloriana, the ruler of Spenser's earthly city, is "heavenly borne" (*FQ* 1.10.59), a Eusebian intrusion into the very stanzas that expound the Augustinian dichotomy between the earthly and heavenly societies? To answer

that question we must take a closer look at the history of these competing ideologies and their Tudor pedigrees before returning to Spenser.

I

During its first three centuries, Christianity had been of marginal political importance. Indeed, because of long periods of intense persecution the early Christians had often perceived Roman society as an unmitigated evil. Using the vocabulary of Revelation, early Fathers like Tertullian not seldom delineated church and state in stark apocalyptic terms as the New Jerusalem and Babylon.⁷ All of this had changed, however, with the deathbed conversion of Constantine (337). Earlier apprehensions about political interference in the affairs of the church were suddenly replaced by a much more optimistic view of the secular powers. The empire was no longer an enemy of the church, but an ally in the fight against pagan surroundings.

Eusebius of Caesarea, whose thought was deeply indebted to Origen and through him to Middle Platonism,⁸ became the spokesman for a new imperial theology that mobilized "Hellenistic ideas of kingship to create an image of the Christian ruler as the reflection and counterpart in the visible world of God's invisible *logos*."⁹ After recording the history of Roman persecution against the early church in his *Ecclesiastical History*, Eusebius could end the work on a note of praise "to the pious emperor with his sons, so dear to God."¹⁰ He proclaimed the new ideology in two orations presented before the emperor in 335 and 336, and later appended to his *Life of Constantine*.¹¹ Timothy Barnes explains the purpose of one of the orations: "The greater part of the *Panegyric* consists of variations and elaborations on a single theme: the similarity of Constantine to Christ. The empire of Constantine is a replica of the kingdom of heaven, the manifestation on earth of that ideal monarchy which exists in the celestial realm. Constantine governs with his eyes ever gazing upward, patterning himself on the divine model of monarchical rule."¹² According to Eusebius, Christ's mission and the Roman Empire had a single divine origin: "Together, at the same critical moment, as if from a single divine will, two beneficial shoots were produced for mankind: the empire of the

Romans and the teachings of true worship.”¹³ The emperor (“God’s friend”) plays a crucial role in bringing mankind to the heavenly kingdom:

And in this God’s friend henceforth shall participate, having been furnished by God with natural virtues and having received in his soul the emanations from that place. His ability to reason has come from the Universal Logos, his wisdom from communion with Wisdom, goodness from contact with the Good, and justness from his association with Justice. (*In Praise* 89)

Indeed, the emperor is almost divine in his mission. As Barnes writes, “like the Savior of the world, Constantine prepares men for the kingdom of God.”¹⁴ Or as Eusebius himself puts it: “As the Universal Savior renders the entire heaven and earth and highest kingdom fit for His Father, so his friend, leading his subjects on earth to the Only-Begotten and Savior Logos, makes them suitable for His kingdom” (*In Praise* 85). In Eusebius’ ordered and vertical universe, the Christian emperor is head not only of the state but of the state religion, leading the human kingdom towards the heavenly kingdom, different from each other only in degree.

Ambrose, bishop of Milan (then the imperial capital in the west) and Augustine’s spiritual mentor, had incorporated Eusebian imperialism into his neoplatonic theology, and his North-African convert was duly influenced. Augustine’s adherence to a “Christian Empire” reached its zenith about the turn of the fifth century, but it proved a short-lived infatuation.¹⁵ When Rome was sacked by Germanic tribes in 410, his civic optimism was shattered. The shock waves from this blow to Roman civic pride spread throughout the Empire and led him to construct a new and hugely influential political synthesis, expressed in the *City of God*.

Taking a new path, Augustine steered a middle way between early Christian distrust and more recent adulation of the state. We find the classic exposition in Book 19 of the *City of God*, where Augustine most clearly spells out the relationship between the heavenly and the earthly cities. Sometimes the city of man (or “Babylon”) represents the evil empire of the devil and his followers, including all those humans that are not citizens of the city of God. This indeed is the normal meaning in the *City of God*.¹⁶ Yet at other times, as in Book 19, it stands for the civic state, hovering between the “earthly” and the “heavenly” cities. As R.A. Markus explains, “‘Babylon’ is both the city of the impious, and the secular sphere in which

good pious Christians may discharge important functions.”¹⁷ The secular state is part of a divine plan, yet its purpose is not to lead man to eternal felicity but “to deal with the disorganisation and conflict resulting from the Fall.”¹⁸ If it is not autonomous in relation to the city of God, it nevertheless has its own sphere of operation and its own more limited telos: “The earthly city which does not live by faith seeks only an earthly peace, and limits the goal of its peace, of its harmony of authority and obedience among its citizens, to the voluntary and collective attainment of objectives necessary to mortal existence. The heavenly City ... must use this earthly peace” (*CG* 19.17).¹⁹ Unlike Eusebius, Augustine does not see the rulers of the earthly city as a means of reaching God.²⁰ Yet their office is still part of a God-given order of a lesser magnitude, and the members of the city of God must obey their laws as long as they do not militate against a higher loyalty: the city of God “has no hesitation about keeping in step with the civil law which governs matters pertaining to our existence here below. For, as mortal life is the same for all, there ought to be a common cause between the two cities in what concerns our purely human living” (*CG* 19.17). In other words, the Christian has a dual citizenship and is expected to be an active member of both the earthly and the heavenly cities.

Yet if Augustine distanced himself from his earlier conflation of the two kingdoms into a “Christian empire,” as a Catholic bishop he soon became involved with combating the opposite challenge in the form of Donatism. The Donatists advocated a distinctly North-African church that was independent from both the Roman empire and the hierarchy of the established church (which they felt had compromised itself during earlier persecutions), and therefore fell back on the old isolationist dichotomy between Jerusalem (themselves) and Babylon (the rest of society, including the Catholic church).²¹ Augustine fought hard against this view, and in his many anti-Donatist works increasingly he was forced to defend the active cooperation of church and state, even to the point of condoning governmental compulsion in the implementation of the edicts of the church. The Donatist challenge was in effect neutralized through state intervention. The ecclesiastical use of secular force is a less savory aspect of the Augustinian heritage that has earned the bishop the epithet “Father of the Inquisition,” and it clearly strains his own distinctions between the two kingdoms (without,

however, conflating it into Eusebian imperialism).²² What can be said is that Augustine never envisioned a radically secular state; he saw the cooperation between the two kingdoms as part of the "control of the wicked within the bonds of a certain earthly peace."²³

II

The millennium separating Augustine and Luther saw developments unforeseen by the bishop of Hippo. Yet, as Walter Ullmann has explained, it was the age of Augustine that set the tone: "It was in the late Roman period from the fourth to the fifth century that the foundations were laid for the basic conceptions and ideas relating to government."²⁴ Christian imperialism acquired a rival when Pope Leo I (440-61) in the generation after Augustine propagated a papal-hierocratic political system based on the pope's supposed "plenitude of power"—i.e., the claiming of both spiritual and temporal power through the reduction of the political realm to the theological. Both papal and imperial theory, in Ullmann's terms, adhered to "descending," theocratic systems, influenced by neoplatonic ideas. In between these extremes we can position the Augustinian vision as described in the *City of God*. Yet while the Augustinian terminology was retained, its meaning was diluted. As medieval society became permeated by Christianity, the distinction between the two cities became blurred. Finally, in the twelfth century the historiographer Otto of Friesing felt that he had "been writing the history not of two cities but, almost, of one, which I call 'Christendom.'"²⁵ But with only one "city" to rule, pope and emperor kept quarreling about their respective jurisdiction.²⁶

While some medieval writers, such as William of Ockham and Marsilius of Padua, had returned to Augustine for support of the position that church and state had to be separated again, it was Martin Luther who inaugurated a new Augustinian era. Luther knew of Ockham's political writings, but he was more at home with the *City of God* itself. Luther's political creed is expressed most clearly in a hugely influential pamphlet written in 1523: *Secular Authority: To What Extent It Should Be Obeyed*. In it Luther establishes that "God has ordained the two governments; the spiritual, which by the Holy Spirit under Christ makes

Christians and pious people, and the secular, which restrains the unchristian and wicked so that they must needs keep the peace outwardly, even against their will.”²⁷ Having both secular and religious obligation, the Christian is a member of both kingdoms. Luther saw his distinction between the two kingdoms as a necessary correction of the medieval distinction between secular and spiritual that had separated the Christian community into two halves: the ordinary laity and, on a higher level, the “professional” estates of priest, friar, and nun. The former monk instead abolished convent and priory and taught the priesthood of every believer. All Christians had the same relationship to God, and the demarcation between secular and spiritual was not external but internal. Luther, however, no more than Augustine, envisioned a society that is radically secular in the modern sense (even if his theory clearly is a step in that direction). The secular ruler, stresses Luther in a dictum that was to be echoed by Elizabethan propagandists,²⁸ is responsible for the enforcement of both tablets of the Mosaic law—not just the second dealing with social mores, but also the first dealing with the relationship to God. Augustine’s anti-Donatist writings were therefore used by virtually all mainline Protestants against the Anabaptists and other members of the radical reformation that wanted to separate themselves from society.²⁹

If Luther followed earlier thinkers, he soon inspired others to follow suit. His humanist co-worker at Wittenberg University, Philip Melanchthon, immediately transferred the theory to the educational sphere, where the relationship between the “twofold government” became a topic of academic debate and was incorporated into the curriculum of the Protestant schools and universities.³⁰ And among second-generation reformers, John Calvin echoed Luther’s distinctions, stressing that “man is under a twofold government” and that “Christ’s spiritual Kingdom and the civil jurisdiction are things completely distinct” (*Institutes* 4.20.1; see also 2.2.13, 3.19.15, and 4.11.1).³¹ While these reformers may differ in detail, they nevertheless share a similar Augustinian emphasis: the civil government, in the words of Melanchthon, has its legitimate sphere, the “external matters which even the saints use,” while its main job is the “coercion of the bodies of those who are without the Spirit of God.”³² This congruence of ideas had repercussions not just within the religious sphere but for society at large: “The social and political doctrines associated with the Reformation,” writes Quentin Skinner, one

of our most respected historians of Renaissance political theory, "came to be officially recognised by the secular rulers of Germany, England and Scandinavia."³³ We, however, shall limit ourselves to the English connection.

III

But how could the political theory of Luther, whom Henry VIII had recently decried as a heretic, become official English policy? The answer is, of course, "the King's matter," Henry's divorce and the subsequent split with Rome.³⁴ The king desperately needed authoritative backing for his moves, and what could be better than the distinctions between secular and sacred jurisdiction culled from the most prestigious of the Church Fathers, Saint Augustine? It was Luther's version of the Augustinian theory that provided the real blueprint for the Tudor propagandists,³⁵ and it was the works of two Englishmen, William Tyndale and Robert Barnes, that provided the first and most important bridge between Wittenberg and London. "Both Tyndale and Barnes studied at Wittenberg University," Carl R. Trueman explains, "and ... used Luther's writings as the textual basis for significant portions of their own literary output."³⁶ In *The obedience of a Christen man* (1528) Tyndale first enunciated the Augustinian/Lutheran distinction between "the kyngdome of god and of Christe" and "the temporall regimemente."³⁷ Barnes then added *A supplicatyon ... unto Henry VIII* (1531), in which he makes the Augustinian connection very clear.³⁸

In an exposition of the Sermon on the Mount Tyndale comprehensively sets forth the theory: "Ye must understand that there be two states or degrees in this world: the kingdom of heaven, which is the regiment of the gospel; and the kingdom of this world, which is the temporal regiment."³⁹ Tyndale spells out the believer's twofold responsibilities and in the process prescribes the extent and limits of the jurisdiction of the king on the one hand and of the preachers and bishops on the other:

Moreover when I say, there be two regiments, the spiritual and the temporal; even so I say that every person, baptized to keep the law of God and to believe in Christ, is under both the regiments, and is both a spiritual person and also a temporal, and under

the officers of both the regiments; so that the king is as deep under the spiritual officer, to hear out of God's word what he ought to believe, and how to live, and how to rule, as is the poorest beggar in the realm. And even so the spiritual officer, if he sin against his neighbour, or teach false doctrine, is under the king's or temporal correction, how high soever he be.⁴⁰

The pope has of course lost all authority and has been replaced by the reformed clergy as representatives of the heavenly kingdom—not as intermediaries between God and the Christian, but as stewards and dispensers of the Word. But as Luther already had made clear, it was part of the temporal ruler's job to ensure that the church and its ministers *de facto* followed the Word. (The problem of what actually constituted the teaching of the Scriptures did not trouble the reformers overmuch, since they saw their own brand of Christianity as a return to the primitive church, the unsullied fountainhead of pure doctrine.) The ruler, on the other hand, was not free to live and rule as he or she pleased, but was supposed to be guided by the moral and doctrinal teaching of the Scriptures. Theoretically the church had the right—indeed the obligation—to correct an errant ruler; but there is no doubt that Tyndale came down much heavier on the side of the obligations of a Christian towards the ruler, as *The obedience of a Christen man* made abundantly clear. And of course this is why Henry found the book so useful.⁴¹

Here indeed is where we find the greatest dissimilarities with Luther's views. Where Luther distinguished clearly between the two regiments and thereby provided a certain space for secular society, in Tudor polemics this distinction is blurred by the king or queen being not only the ruler of the political commonwealth, but also the head of the Church of England. This blurring was strengthened by the propagandistic use of Constantine culled from Eusebius,⁴² whose imperialist ideology was to compete with the Augustinian vision. It was natural for Charles V as the latest of a long line of Holy Roman Emperors to appropriate the cult of Constantine in his battles against the papacy, and as Frances Yates and others have shown, the same strategy was employed by the emerging national states of Europe, England not the least.⁴³ Henry VIII saw himself as a new Constantine, but under Elizabeth I the

imperialist propaganda rose to an ever higher pitch. Eusebius was widely read,⁴⁴ and his support was enlisted by the Elizabethan propaganda machinery.⁴⁵

Nowhere is the propaganda as blatant as in the *Acts and Monuments*, where John Foxe blazons the queen as the incarnation of the first Christian emperor (and in the process makes himself the new Eusebius).⁴⁶ Christianity had come to England through the efforts of Constantine, explains Foxe, but Elizabeth is not to be outdone: "let Constantinus be never so great, yet wherein is your noble grace to him inferiour?"⁴⁷ To underline the connection Foxe encloses a portrait of the queen within the capital C of "Constantine." As several scholars have argued, Spenser's *Faerie Queene* was another influential disseminator of the imperial propaganda.⁴⁸ Yet as we shall see, Spenser's attitude towards the cult of the queen was ambivalent at best,⁴⁹ and he was as much influenced by the political vision of Augustine as by Eusebian imperialism.

The Elizabethan establishment itself vacillated between Eusebius and Augustine. Despite the imperialist rhetoric, Tudor spokesmen from William Tyndale to Richard Hooker made the theory of the two regiments a cornerstone of Anglican policy. Yet their confessional adversaries kept accusing them of conflating and confusing the regiments. The attack, peaking in the reign of Elizabeth, came from both the left and the right. Catholic recusants and Puritan nonconformists shared a common distrust of royal meddling with the kingdom of God—Catholics because they wanted to reinstate the sovereignty of the pope in ecclesiastical affairs, and Puritans because they believed the magistrate hampered further reform along Presbyterian lines. What is quite amazing is the extent to which the altercations were conducted within the parameters of Lutheran theory. Even Cardinal William Allen, the foremost Catholic apologist, talks about the different "regiments" seemingly oblivious to the fact that the concept was Tyndale's direct appropriation of Luther's *regimente*.⁵⁰ The whole religious spectrum from Catholic to Puritan seems to have accepted the basic outline of Luther's version of the Augustinian theory. The link to the Church Father is indeed the most likely reason for its general acceptance, as each side is anxious to enlist the support of such an important ally.

What Cardinal Allen especially objected to was the "othe of the Queenes souraintie in spiritual regiment, a thing improbable, vnreasonable, vnnatural, impossible."⁵¹ We can understand his concern since committed Catholics, being unable to take the royal oath, were effectually barred from any civic career and risked being executed for treason if they were caught proselytizing.⁵² The Presbyterian nonconformists with Thomas Cartwright in the vanguard voiced similar grievances against the Elizabethan settlement. The war of words between Cartwright and Archbishop Whitgift in the 1570s was to a great extent fought over the spheres of state and church. "The godlye Magistrate is the head of the common wealth, but not of the church," argued Cartwright, because "the regiment of the Church is spirituall, and respecteth the conscience, and therefore hath not to doe with ciuill offices, which respect properly the common wealth, and the outwarde, godly, honest, and quiet behautour [sic]."⁵³ Richard Hooker came to Whitgift's rescue with his magisterial defense of the Elizabethan church, *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. His main targets were Cartwright and the Puritans, but he also takes time to counter the attacks from Allen and other Catholics. In Book 8, Hooker defines the two sides of what he considered the same coin: "When we oppose the *Church* therefore and the *Commonwealth* in a *Christian Societie*, we mean by the *Commonwealth* that societie with relation unto all the publique affayres thereof, only the matter of true religion excepted. By the *Church*, the same societie with only reference unto the matter of true religion without any other affaires besides (*Laws* 8.1.5)."⁵⁴ He meets the Puritan objection "that the *Fathers* do oftentimes mention the *Commonwealth* and the *Church* of God by way of opposition" with the counter-argument: "Can the same thing be opposite unto it selfe?" (*Laws* 8.1.5). This made sense to him since "*Saincts* and *Citizens* [are] one and the same people" (*Laws* 8.1.6).⁵⁵ Although he recognizes the distinction between the church and the commonwealth, thereby maintaining the scaffolding of Augustine's mature political theory, Hooker nevertheless approaches a more Eusebian position in his adherence to a "Christian Societie."

The queen's position as the head of the church remained a touchy question throughout her reign, as is especially evident in Thomas Bilson's *The trve difference betweene Christian svbiectiion and vnchristian rebellion*, the officially sanctioned answer to Allen's charges

against the Elizabethan settlement. Following Tyndale closely, Bilson distinguishes between the offices of prince and preacher:

The spirituall regiment which Christ hath ouer the faithfull in his Church is infinitely before the temporal regiment of Princes ouer their subiects. ... As in spiritual perfection and consolation the Preacher excelleth the Prince by many degrees, God hauing appointed Preachers not Princes to bee the sowers of his seede, messenge[r]s of his grace, stewardest of his mysteries: so for externall power and authoritie to compell & punish, which is the point that we stande on, God hath preferred the Prince before the Priest, so long as the Prince commaundeth that which God alloweth. (*Trve difference* 219)

Bilson is clear about where to draw the line: "We giue Princes no power to deuice or inuent new religions, to alter or change Sacraments, to decide or debate doubtess of faith, to disturbe or infringe the canons of the church" (*Trve difference* 240). These prerogatives belonged to the spiritual regiment, in which sphere the queen stood on equal terms with her subjects.

There is some evidence that Elizabeth herself felt strongly about this issue, despite an apparent endorsement of the imperialist program. The *39 Articles of 1562*, approved by the queen, is quite explicit in spelling out her limits. Where King Edward, following Henry VIII's example, in the *42 Articles of 1552* had boldly proclaimed that "The King of Englande is Supreme head in earth, next vnder Christe, of the Church of Englande, and Irelande,"⁵⁶ the corresponding Elizabethan article is much more guarded: "The Queenes Maiestie hath the chiefe power in this Realme of Englande, and other her dominions, vnto whom the chiefe gouernment of all estates of this Realme, whether they be Ecclesiasticall or not, in all causes, doth appertayne, and is not, nor ought to be subiect to any forraine iurisdiction." To this has been added an explanation, completely lacking in the Edwardian *Articles*:

Where we attribute to the Queenes Maiestie, the chiefe gouernment, by whiche titles we vnderstande the myndes of some slaundersous folkes to be offended, we geue not to our Princes, the ministring eyther of Gods worde, or of Sacramentes, the whiche thyng, the Iniunctions also lately set foorth by Elizabeth our Queene, doth moste playnely testifie: But that only prerogatiue, whiche we see to haue ben geuen alwayes

to all godly Princes in holy scriptures, by God himselfe, that is, that they shoulde rule all estates & degrees, committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical, or no, and restraine with the ciuill sword, the stubborne and euyll doers.⁵⁷

Although Head of the Church, Elizabeth was not allowed to trespass into the domain of the clergy. As John Guy, citing *A Declaration of the Queen's Proceedings*, points out: "Elizabeth denied herself power 'to define, decide or determine any article or point of the Christian faith and religion.' ... As a matter of principle as much as to sidestep the Presbyterian lobby in pulpit and parliament, she upheld the separation of church and state in practice, ruling both but through different channels of administration."⁵⁸ The Queen's main task, in the wording of the *Articles*, was the restraining "with the ciuill sword, the stubborne and euyll doers." Or as Augustine himself had expressed it: "control of the wicked within the bonds of a certain earthly peace."⁵⁹

It is important to stress these restrictions, spelled out in the key doctrinal document of the Elizabethan settlement. The fear of papalist intervention made the establishment fall back on the time-honored *language* of imperialism, yet it also acknowledged that radical Eusebianism did not square with central tenets of the reformation. What Ullmann has to say about the declining relevance of papalist ideology is equally true for the imperialist extreme: "It was no longer faith in the function of the pope [or of the emperor] standing mid-way between God and man, but faith in the Bible, that is, faith in the individual's own ability to interpret the Bible. When that stage was reached, the days of the papal-hierocratic [or imperial-hierocratic] government became shorter and shorter."⁶⁰ It was rather the political vision of the mature Augustine, with its clear limits surrounding the secular sphere, that conformed to the Protestant emphasis on the limited human cooperation in matters of faith: it was the redemptive work of Christ, unaided by human effort (imperial, papal, or otherwise), that brought about salvation. These caveats are important when we now turn to *The Faerie Queene*. Although the work contains its fair share of Eusebian imperialism, this influence is strongly tempered by an Augustinian political outlook.

IV

To return to our original question, what is the position of the Legend of Holiness? How does Spenser's Augustinian distinctions square with the Eusebian cult of the queen, a stance that on the face of it fuses sacred and secular. Not only is Gloriana "heavenly borne," but she grants "glory" (*FQ* 1.10.59) to her retainers, for Augustine a very dubious practice within the earthly city. Is Spenser making the Fairy Queen (and thereby Queen Elizabeth) a ruler with divine prerogatives? Is she dispensing heavenly glory?⁶¹ The immediate context of Book 1, canto 10, speaks against such clear-cut pronouncements. When Contemplation continues his instruction of Redcrosse, he drastically modifies the glory just promised. The fealty to Gloriana, however necessary, is bought at a terrible price: "Thenceforth the suit of earthly conquests shonne, / And wash thy hands from guilt of bloody field: / For blood can nought but sin, & wars but sorrowes yield" (*FQ* 1.10.60). No, the glory Redcrosse will one day receive in the new Jerusalem will not depend on his service to Cleopolis: "Vnworthy wretch (quoth he) of so great grace, / how dare I thinke such glory to attaine?" (*FQ* 1.10.62). To enter the city of God, as stanza 57 had already made clear, he must instead be "purg'd from sinfull guilt, / With pretious blood" of "that vnspotted lam, / That for the sinnes of all the world was kilt." Yet neither is Redcrosse to follow the Anabaptists or the Donatists by withdrawing from society. As citizen of two kingdoms he has dual and compatible responsibilities.

The glory of Gloriana is further tempered by the implicit comparison between Cleopolis and the House of Pride, where "glorie vaine" (*FQ* 1.4.15) is flaunted for all the wrong reasons. As Spenser follows Augustine in distinguishing between the heavenly and the earthly church, so he separates Lucifera's infernal city from Gloriana's earthly city. Yet he at the same time invites us to compare the two by stressing their similarities, both cities being ruled by virgin queens in the midst of courtiers hungry for fame.⁶² The Augustinian warning is clear: even if Cleopolis has its legitimate place in the divine dispensation by administering an earthly peace, it can also slide into near identity with Babylon in trying to build towers toward heaven. The description of Lucifera in *FQ* 1.4.8-10, therefore, is in part Spenser's

answer to Catholic accusations of civic idolatry. Yes, he seems to be saying, if the queen actually takes her cult as more than exaggerated rhetoric she, like Phæbus in *FQ* 1.4.9, is only presuming. Yet Spenser at the same time aims a political punch directly at the Catholics by making Duessa, the papal whore, an honored guest at the House of Pride. With Protestant glee he turns the medieval identification of the papacy with the city of God upside down by depicting how it has instead fallen in with the evil city in its bid for earthly power and glory. What is only an oblique warning to Elizabeth against exaggerated erastianism is an open indictment of papalism.

Despite the religious imagery, the poet's motive in blazoning Gloriana, like the official cult itself, is largely political. To bolster English morale through hyperbole was a strategy of survival in the decade of the Armada. Only in such a political context does the Elizabethan rhetoric make sense. To take the flattery of Spenser's Proems at face value as a *religious* statement would surely be misguided.⁶³ At the very least we have to admit that the poet, like so many Elizabethan propagandists, is caught vacillating between Eusebius and Augustine.

V

If we neglect the political tensions between the Eusebian and the Augustinian vision within Tudor society, we are apt to arrive at an all too simple picture of the role of Elizabeth I. This has been true of some one-sided research into the cult of the queen, and especially of Spenser's participation in it. Frances Yates' important and influential studies have led some to forget the context of Spenser's encomium of Elizabeth. Thomas Cain in particular has made some exaggerated claims about the poet's mission:

That Elizabeth bridges the potentially opposed realms of heaven and earth is an idealistic conception essential to Spenser's encomium as presented in 1590. By defining a real monarch, it avoids the traditional Augustinian dualism between the Cities of God and This World that would set heaven and England at odds and that would place a low valuation on human achievement in the service of the state.⁶⁴

In addition to the all too common simplistic view of the "opposed realms" of "the traditional Augustinian dualism," Cain claims that Queen Elizabeth is "part of the fixed order of eternity" and "a celestial Idea that sheds meaning upon the milieu of experience and history"; indeed, she is "the principle impelling man to realize his proper rational nature."⁶⁵ These lyrical rhapsodies, presented without a hint of a qualification, make the most deferential panegyric pale in comparison. Yet should Elizabethan propagandist rhetoric be the norm for modern criticism?

The issue boils down to Cain's wholesale identification of Elizabeth I with Una, which in turn leads to an equally rigid equation that "makes the queen identical with the True Church."⁶⁶ I am of course not holding the equally untenable position that the two have nothing in common, yet a more rigorous reading of the Legend of Holiness is called for, one that looks at contexts and makes necessary distinctions. Such a reading would reveal a more basic panorama into which England is fitted as part of a larger whole. If Una represents the Anglican church (with Elizabeth I as its head), that is only because she on a more fundamental level stands for the universal church, born in Eden and striving to be united in the regained paradise with her true head, Christ.⁶⁷

When Una relates her own story to Prince Arthur in canto 7, Spenser presents her as the daughter of Adam and Eve:

The forlorne Maiden, whom your eyes haue seene
 The laughing stocke of fortunes mockeries,
 Am th'only daughter of a King and Queene,
 Whose parents deare, whilest equall destinies
 Did runne about, and their felicities
 The fauorable heauen did not enuy,
 Did spread their rule through all the territories,
 Which *Phison* and *Euphrates* floweth by,
 And *Gehons* golden waues doe wash continually.

Till that their cruell cursed enemy,

An huge great Dragon horrible in sight,
 Bred in the loathly lakes of *Tartary*,
 With murderous rauine, and deuouring might
 Their kingdome spoild, and countrey wasted quight:
 Themselues, for feare into his iawes to fall,
 He forst to castle strong to take their flight,
 Where fast embard in mightie brasen wall,
 He has them now foure yeres besiegd to make them thrall.

(*FQ* 1.7.43-44)

A dragon has driven Una's parents away from Eden, and "fast embard in mightie brasen wall, / He has them now foure yeres besiegd to make them thrall." This presentation has only an indirect connection with the contemporary situation; instead we are given a fairly traditional Christian view of the redemption drama.

Augustine had delineated a historical progression in four steps: before the law (*ante legem*), under the law (*sub lege*), under grace (*sub gratia*), and in peace (*in pace*).⁶⁸ This scheme informs these stanzas and indeed a large section of Book 1.⁶⁹ The Elizabethan reader had easy access to this scheme even without going back to Augustine. It had become common property long before the sixteenth century,⁷⁰ and the reformers adopted it for their own ends. One of the more popular presentations was in the widely read *Carion's Chronicles*. Despite its title this was largely the work of Luther's right hand, Philip Melancthon, who kept adding to it until his death in 1560. The whole structure of the *Chronicles*, like so many similar works, was based on Augustine's fourfold scheme:

The worlde shall stande syxe thousand yeres and after shall it falle.
 Two thousande yeares wythout the Lawe.
 Two thousande yeares in the lawe.
 Two thousande yeares the tyme of Christ.
 And yf these yeares be not accomplyshed, oure synnes shall be the cause, whyche are greate and many.⁷¹

The age of the world was supposed to reach six thousand years (unless foreshortened by sin): four thousand from Adam to Christ,⁷² and two thousand from Christ to the End. As it had for Augustine, this made the fourfold scheme correspond to the heptamaeron, the seven days of creation: the first three ages of 2000 years each equal the six first days of creation, while the fourth, in peace, merges with God's rest on the seventh day.⁷³

Una's story in canto 7 falls into place in this perspective. The "foure yeres" in stanza 44 allude to the period from the Fall to Christ,⁷⁴ while the "brasen wall," is a reference to the Old Testament (OT) law that was both a protection and a prison until the period of grace under Christ. A historical perspective beginning with Adam stretches before us, culminating in a dragon-fight that reenacts Christ's victory at Calvary over "the great Dragon, or captayn of all the vnfaithful sort, that olde croked serpent which deceyued Adam," to quote John Bale.⁷⁵ This philosophy of history, glimpsed in the biblical narrative and expounded by Augustine, was part of a medieval heritage that had been taken over by the Reformation. Calvary, according to this tradition, was the hub, the "All-circling point"⁷⁶ from which the spokes of redemption history spread. In a mythical typology that connected the first and the last book of the Bible with its central gospels, Eden was seen to prefigure both Calvary and the New Jerusalem. So Bale could connect the river flowing out of the heavenly city in Revelation 22 with "the swete flood of Eden," and the trees lining the river with the "tree of lyfe ... in the myddes of Paradyse at the beginnyng,"⁷⁷ while John Donne could connect Eden and Calvary: "We thinke that *Paradise* and *Calvarie*, / *Christs Crosse*, and *Adams tree*, stood in one place."⁷⁸ Throughout canto 11 with its dragon-fight, healing trees, and reviving water, Spenser taps into this myth by conflating Genesis, Calvary, and the Apocalypse.⁷⁹ And the earlier cantos, leading up to the dragon-fight, can similarly be read on different historical planes: Una as the church is depicted both in an OT, a New Testament (NT), and in a contemporary/apocalyptic embodiment.⁸⁰

The subdivision of the OT into a period without law and a period under the law provides the structure for the cantos that depict Una's wanderings "as in exile, / In wilderness and wastfull deserts strayd, / To seeke her knight" (*FQ* 1.3.3). Augustine had expressed the progression of the Church in chapter 118 of *The Enchiridion*: "[God's people] existed at first

before the law; then under the law, which was given by Moses; then under grace, which was first made manifest in the coming of the Mediator. Not, indeed, that this grace was absent previously, but, in harmony with the arrangements of the time, it was veiled and hidden.”⁸¹ In addition to glossing Una as the Church and as a symbol of grace, this passage also provides an exegesis as good as any of her much-discussed veil. In canto 3 Spenser investigates the period under the law, while in canto 6 the emphasis is on a society living before or outside the mosaic law. Una’s wanderings in the deserts of these cantos is an appropriate and traditional symbol for the history of the church. From Abraham’s journey to the promised land until the Babylonian exile (“exile” in *FQ* 1.3.3 is a carefully chosen word), deserts form a vital part of the biblical narrative. The most important was of course the exodus from Egypt under Moses, a desert wandering that was habitually seen as a symbol for the whole OT era.⁸²

The *sub lege* character of canto 3 is most graphically portrayed in Abessa, carrying her Hagarite pot in the shade of mount Sinai:⁸³

Vnder the steepe foot of a mountaine hore; ...
A damzell spyde slow footing her before,
That on her shoulders sad a pot of water bore.

(*FQ* 1.3.10)

Paul had explicated the story of Sarah and Hagar in Genesis 21 as an allegory of law and grace: “For these mothers are the two Testaments, the one which is Agar of mounte Sina, which gendreth vnto bondage, (For Agar or Sina is a mountaine in Arabia, & it answereth to Ierusalem which now is [i.e., to the Jews]) ... But Ierusalem, which is above, is fre” (Galatians 4: 24-26). Paul identifies Hagar with the OT law given at Sinai and thereby with the Jewish religion, while Sarah (with her son Isaac) symbolizes the promises given to Abraham, and thus the faith of the Christian church. The same holds true for Una and Abessa. Throughout this canto Spenser, in Luther’s words, “shows the difference between Hagar and Sarah, that is, between the synagogue and the church, or between the Law and the Gospel.”⁸⁴ The one difference from Paul is that Spenser (with Luther) also includes the legalistic Romanists in his depiction of the synagogue.⁸⁵ This double-vision is in line with the general tendency to see the periods before and after Christ in tandem, and is encouraged by

the reformers' insistence that grace and law were universal concepts that could not be equated with the old or new testaments.⁸⁶ Abessa therefore represents the legalistic impulse throughout history, while Una stands for the covenant of grace both in biblical and Tudor times.

Canto 6 repeats canto 3. Una roams the "deserts" in search of Redcrosse, when she is suddenly threatened by danger. After the allegorical core (1.3.10-25 and 1.6.7-34) Archimago appears, and furious battles with Sansloy bring both cantos to a close. These parallels underline the complementary nature of the allegory. As the veiled Una in canto 3 is contrasted with a synagogue living *sub lege*, so here she is confronted with the satyrs, living outside the law altogether. The satyrs have traditionally been interpreted as representing pagans living according to natural religion, and the emphasis has most often been upon their innocence, even "human perfectability untainted by original sin."⁸⁷ The first part of this interpretation I believe to be correct, but as to the second part I have serious reservations. Satyrs after all were proverbially lecherous,⁸⁸ a characteristic that is emphasized in canto 6. Whenever Spenser refers to satyrs elsewhere, they are destructive or even deadly, but never innocent.⁸⁹ The satyrs that worship Una may have an instinctive feeling for religion, but all too easily they degenerate into idolatry. As the people of Asia Minor in Acts 14: 11-13 worshipped Paul and Barnabas as Zeus and Hermes, so the satyrs mistake Una for a pagan deity: "[They] worshipt her in vaine, / And made her th'Image of Idolatryes; / But when their bootlesse zeale she did restraine / From her own worship, they her Asse would worship fayn" (*FQ* 1.6.19).

Of their leader Sylvanus no better can be said. Seeing Una, he "burnt in his intent" (*FQ* 1.6.15); and although taking her for Venus and Diana, this does not prevent him from being reminded of previous pederasty. Harry Berger provides a pertinent gloss: "The tree of death on which Sylvanus supports his aged limbs comes to life as a mirror of inverted and destructive love (the god for the boy, the boy for the beast), a love which destroys its own object through ignorance or uncontrol"⁹⁰ Far from being a description of prelapsarian innocence, a picture emerges that can best be glossed by some strong verses from Paul's Epistle to the Romans (1: 21-25):⁹¹

Because that when they knewe God, they glorified him not as God, nether were thankful, but became vaine in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was full of darkenes. When they professed them selues to be wise, they became fooles. For they turned the glorie of the incorruptible God to the similitude of the image of a corruptible man, & of birdes, and foure footed beastes, & of creeping things.

Wherefore also God gaue them vp to their hearts lustes, vnto vncleannes, to defile their owne bodies betweene them selues.

Sylvanus and his satyrs show ingratitude by not glorifying God;⁹² instead they worship and serve the creature, forsaking their Creator, and are therefore given up "to their hearts lustes." As Paul in Romans contrasts the Christians with the law-less Gentiles (as well as with the law-abiding Jews), so here Spenser contrasts the faith of the true church with classical pagan society, and the picture is not a pretty one.

But what of the Greek achievements in philosophy and the arts? Is not Spenser supposed to stand in the forefront of Renaissance humanism? Yes, but in Book 1 he is talking about *faith*. As he is wary of mixing freely the political and the spiritual realm, so he distinguishes the realms of reason and revelation. Yet Sylvanus is not the whole picture: we must also take Satyrane into account. Satyrane's allegorical function has been subject to a plethora of interpretations, ranging from a faculty of the soul or a part of Redcrosse's psyche to external identifications such as primitive Christianity or Henry VIII.⁹³ But if the satyrs represent pagan civilization, a more natural interpretation would be to see Satyrane as the acme of such a society, in the form of those Greek philosophers that had arrived at a position that was as close to revealed truth as was humanly possible: the belief in a supreme deity and a system of ethics not unlike the one given the church. Had not Socrates been likened to a satyr by Alcibiades in the *Symposium* (215-222b)? The Greek names of Satyrane's ancestors—Thyamis ("passion"), Labryde ("turbulent," "greedy"), and Therion ("wild beast")—reveal both the geographical setting and the ethical morass from which he rises. His fame, like Greek philosophy, has spread over the world (*FQ* 1.6.29); and coming into contact with divine Truth, he (in the same way that Plato, according to an persistent tradition, had sat at the feet of Moses) learns Una's "discipline of faith and veritie" (*FQ* 1.6.31). In return

Satyrane brings Una out of the *silva*, the place "in which beastliness and passion dominate,"⁹⁴ but ultimately he cannot take Redcrosse's place: "But she all vowd vnto the *Redcrosse* knight, / His wandering perill closely did lament, / Ne in this new acquaintaunce could delight" (*FQ* 1.6.32). Battling Sansloy, who was the one to lead Una "away into a forrest wild" (*FQ* 1.6.3), Satyrane's power is strained and we are left in suspense as to the final outcome.⁹⁵ That may be as it should, since the Saracen's name ("without law") glosses Satyrane's own origin.⁹⁶ One thing is clear: against the dragon he would have done no better than the knights in *FQ* 1.7.45 that became its "pitteous pray"; only Redcrosse can be victorious against such an enemy. In the natural sphere Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle have their value, but they cannot be relied upon in matters of salvation.

For Augustine the fourfold scheme was seen not only as historical periods, but also as stages in the religious development of the individual, from a state of ignorance via the knowledge of the law to the freedom of grace and the final beatitude in peace. He puts it most succinctly in chapter 118 of *The Enchiridion*:

When, sunk in the darkest depth of ignorance, man lives according to the flesh, undisturbed by any struggle of reason, this is the first state. Afterwards, when through the law has come the knowledge of sin, and the Spirit of God has not yet interposed His aid, man, striving to live according to the law, is thwarted in his efforts and falls into conscious sin, and so, being overcome of sin, becomes its slave This is man's second state. But if God has regard to him, and inspires him with faith in God's help, and the Spirit of God begins to work in him, then the mightier power of love strives against the power of the flesh; and although there is still in the man's own nature a power that fights against him (for his disease is not completely cured), yet he lives the life of the just by faith, and lives in righteousness so far as he does not yield to evil lust, but conquers it by the love of holiness. This is the third state of a man of good hope; and he who by steadfast piety advances in this course, shall attain at last to peace, that peace which, after this life is over, shall be perfected in the repose of the spirit, and finally in the resurrection of the body.

The reformers, with Luther in the forefront, likewise described the spiritual progression in the same categories, with an emphasis upon the move from the condemnation of the law to salvation by grace.⁹⁷

We find the same dual historical and individual progression in the Legend of Holiness. We have looked at the historical stages in cantos 3 and 6, but Spenser also makes Redcrosse advance from a state of ignorance (seen in particular during his first meeting with Archimago), through condemnation under the law (most acutely felt when he encounters Despair), to the healing grace encountered in the House of Holiness and the peace glimpsed from the Mount of Contemplation. When Redcrosse has come within sight of that final goal, Spenser sums up the progression of the whole book by comparing four different mountains:

That done, he [Contemplation] leads him to the highest Mount;

Such one, as that same mighty man of God,

That blood-red billowes like a walled front

On either side disparted with his rod,

Till that his army dry-foot through them yod,

Dwelt fortie dayes vpon; where writ in stone

With bloody letters by the hand of God,

The bitter doome of death and balefull mone

He did receiue, whiles flashing fire about him shone.

Or like that sacred hill, whose head full hie,

Adornd with fruitfull Oliues all arownd,

Is, as it were for endlesse memory

Of that deare Lord, who oft thereon was fownd,

For euer with a flowring girlond crownd:

Or like that pleasaunt Mount, that is for ay

Through famous Poets verse each where renownd,

Or which the thrise three learned Ladies play

Their heavenly notes, and make full many a louely lay.

(*FQ* 1.10.53-54)

If Mount Parnassus represents *ante legem*, then Mount Sinai stands for *sub lege* and the Mount of Olives for *sub gratia*. And of course, from the Mount of Contemplation (which these three other mountains are compared to) Redcrosse is shown the city of "eternall peace" (*FQ* 1.10.55).⁹⁸

Which brings us back to where we started: Spenser's presentation of Augustine's two cities in stanzas 55 to 63. What needs to be emphasized again in our own summary is that this progression, both in its historical and its individual guise, leads up to the *heavenly* city, not to Cleopolis. Elizabeth I, as head of the Church of England, has a part to play in that city, yet her own progression towards peace lies primarily on the personal level. Gloriana is not Una.

¹ Vives' edition, which included his own copious commentary, became part of Erasmus' edition of Augustine's *Opera omnia*, published by Froben in 1528-29.

² Augustine, *The citie of God: with the learned comments of Io. Lodovicvs Vives*, trans. John Healey, 2nd ed. (London, 1620). STC 917. Vives' dedicatory letter and Henry VIII's reply are printed immediately after the title page on unnumbered pages. I am citing the second rather than the first edition of 1610 since it has been "compared with the Latine Originall, and in very many places corrected and amended" (title page).

³ *Assertio septem sacramentorum aduersus M. Lutherum* [Assertion of the Seven Sacraments against Martin Luther] (London, 1521). STC 13078. It has been questioned whether Henry actually wrote the work himself, but the papacy rewarded him for it by making him *fidei defensor* in 1524.

⁴ See my "The Theology of the Sign: St. Augustine and Spenser's Legend of Holiness," *SEL* 33/1 (Winter 1993): 21-42.

⁵ As was shown already by Isabel E. Rathborne, *The Meaning of Spenser's Fairyland* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1937), p. 24.

⁶ All quotations from *The Faerie Queene* (*FQ*) are taken from Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, ed. Thomas P. Roche Jr., and C. Patrick O'Donnell, Jr. (New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press, 1981), with references to book, canto, and stanza given in the text.

⁷ See Johannes van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon: A Study into Augustine's "City of God" and the Sources of His Doctrine of the Two Cities* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), pp. 295-301.

⁸ Timothy D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard Univ. Press, 1981), p. 99-100. My brief account of Eusebius is based largely on this seminal work.

⁹ R.A. Markus, *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St Augustine* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1970), p. 77. On Eusebius' appropriation of Hellenistic political theory, see also Glenn F. Chesnut, "Eusebius, Augustine, Orosius, and the Later Patristic and Medieval Christian Historians," *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, ed. Harold W. Attridge and Gohei Hata (Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1992), pp. 701-02.

¹⁰ Eusebius, *The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine*, trans. G.A. Williamson (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965), p. 414.

¹¹ Constantine himself had set the tone in the *Speech to the Assembly of the Saints*, presented to a Christian audience sometime between 321 and 324 (see Barnes, pp. 73-76).

¹² Barnes, p. 254.

¹³ Eusebius, *In Praise of Constantine*, trans. H.A. Drake (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1976), p. 120. This translation comprises Eusebius' two orations: *Panegyric to Constantine* and *Treatise on the Church of the Holy Sepulcher*, which are often added as an appendix to the *Life of Constantine*. References to the orations will be given in the text by page.

¹⁴ Barnes, p. 254.

¹⁵ See Markus, p. 78, and John M. Rist, *Augustine: Ancient Thought Baptized* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1994), pp. 203-10. Disagreeing with Markus, van Oort (pp. 154-63) believes that even the young Augustine never adhered to an Eusebian vision of the Roman Empire as a Christian state.

¹⁶ Some careless readers, including scholars who should know better, make this the *only* meaning to be had from the book, thereby reducing Augustine's complex thought to a simple otherworldliness.

¹⁷ Markus, p. 59.

¹⁸ Markus, p. 84.

¹⁹ Augustine, *City of God*, trans. Gerald G. Walsh et al., ed. Vernon J. Bourke (Garden City: Doubleday-Image, 1958). References to the work, abbreviated *CG*, are given in the text by book and chapter.

²⁰ Augustine discusses the role of the Roman emperor in Book 5 of the *City of God*. See Richard J. Dougherty, "Christian and Citizen: The Tension in St. Augustine's *De civitate Dei*," *Collectanea Augustiniana*, ed. Joseph C. Schnaubelt and Frederick Van Fleteren (New York: Peter Lang, 1990), pp. 205-24, esp. pp. 211-13 on the role of the Christian emperor.

²¹ Tyconius, a gifted Donatist theologian, propagated the dichotomy of Jerusalem and Babylon in a *Commentary on Revelation* (now lost). Tyconius' two cities provided Augustine with the framework for his own *City of God*. Yet while the Donatist view is truly "one-dimensional," Augustine's vision is multi-faceted and complex in its distinctions. It is unsettling, however, to see how often modern scholars collapse Augustine's political vision into Tychonian dichotomies.

²² For good discussions of these strains, see chapter 6 of Markus, and Rist, pp. 239-45.

²³ *De Genesi ad litteram* 9. 9.14, as cited in Markus, p. 96.

²⁴ Walter Ullmann, *Medieval Political Thought* (1965; rpt. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979), p. 19. This paragraph is in part based on Ullman's account, in particular pp. 19-44.

²⁵ As quoted in Markus, p. 164.

²⁶ "There was no basic difference between the concept of the monarchic function of the pope and that of the emperor" (Ullmann, p. 22).

²⁷ *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings*, ed. John Dillenberger (Garden City: Doubleday-Anchor, 1961), p. 370. See also Luther's "Sermon on the Duty of Sending Children to School," trans. F.V.N. Painter, in *Early Protestant Educators* (1931; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1971), pp. 127-28.

²⁸ See, for example, John Jewel, *The Apologie of the Church of Englande* (London, 1562), fol. 57^{r+v}: "God hath committed vnto euery faithfull Prince the charge of both the tables, to the entent he shoulde vnderstande that not only Ciuile matters, but also religious & Ecclesiastical causes appertained to his office." STC 14590.

²⁹ As the Protestants themselves were accused of Donatism by the Catholics. In general it is remarkable to see to what a large extent the Augustinian bugbears were appropriated by everyone along the confessional spectrum: the Protestants habitually accused the Catholics of Pelagianism while the Catholics saw the Protestant as Manichees (as well as Donatists). It is as if they all relived the turmoil of the third and fourth centuries A.D.

³⁰ See "Themes for the Sixth Holiday" (1522), in *Melanchthon: Selected Writings*, trans. Charles Leander Hill (1962; rpt. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1978), pp. 89-90. In the same collection, see also the "Summary of Doctrine," written on the behest of Landgrave Philip of Hesse in 1524, in which Melanchthon further explains the differences between the "Christian" saving righteousness and the "human" or "political" righteousness, "by which the wicked should be coerced" (p. 97).

³¹ John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960). In addition to Skinner's account (see next note), a good exposition of Calvin's distinctions is provided by Sheldon S. Wolin, *Politics and Vision* (London, Allen & Unwin, 1961), pp. 179-85.

³² Melanchthon, p. 91.

³³ Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1978) 2: 65. A large section of the second volume is given to a description of Luther's theory, and to its dissemination. The most important study dedicated to Luther is otherwise W.D.J. Cargill Thompson, *The Political Thought of Martin Luther*, ed. Philip Broadhead (Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1984), which incorporates his earlier article "The 'Two Kingdoms' and the 'Two Regiments': Some Problems of Luther's *Zwei-Reiche-Lehre*," *Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S. 20.1 (April 1969): 164-85. See also John M. Headley, *Luther's View of Church History* (New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press, 1963), and John Tonkin, *The Church and the Secular Order in Reformation Thought* (New York and London: Columbia Univ. Press, 1971). On England, see James Edward McGoldrick, *Luther's English Connection: The Reformation Thought Of Robert Barnes and William Tyndale* (Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1979), and Carl R. Trueman, *Luther's Legacy: Salvation and English Reformers, 1525-1556* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1994).

³⁴ An up-to-date historical synthesis of Henry's pivotal role for the reformation is provided in Richard Rex, *Henry VIII and the English Reformation* (Houndmills and London: Macmillan, 1993).

³⁵ Not that the Augustinian influence was new. According to Thomas Renna, "Virtually all English authors after 1300 who wrote about the nature of the Church claimed to be followers of the Bishop of Hippo. They were especially attracted to Augustine's *De ciuitate dei*" ("Augustine's 'City of God' in John Wyclif and Thomas More," *Collectanea Augustiniana*, p. 261).

³⁶ *Luther's Legacy: Salvation and English Reformers, 1525-1556* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), p. 54. None of Luther's political tracts were translated into English during the sixteenth century, but Melanchthon played a more active role in "the King's matter" and some of his works appeared in English dress—e.g., *A ciuile nosgay wherin is containyd not onely the offyce and dewty of all magistrates and Judges but also of all subiectes*, trans. John Goodale (London, 1550?). STC 17788.

³⁷ William Tyndale, *The obedience of a Christen man and how Christen rulers ought to governe* (Antwerp, 1528), fol. 51^v. STC 24446. On Tyndale and Augustine, see Trueman, pp. 31-32, and J.K. Yost, "Tyndale's Use of the Fathers: a Note on His Connections to Northern Humanism," *Moreana* 6 (1969): 5-13; on Tyndale and Luther, see W.D.J. Cargill Thompson, "The Two Regiments: the Continental Setting of William Tyndale's Political Thought," in

Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c. 1500-c. 1750, ed. D. Baker (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1979): 17-33; for Tyndale's life, see David Daniell, *William Tyndale: A Biography* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1994).

³⁸ Trueman writes: "The influence of patristic writers upon the work of Robert Barnes can scarcely be overestimated. His earliest work consists of a collection of quotations from early Christian writers in support of a series of Reformation propositions His later work, *A Supplication*, is essentially an expansion of this collection" (p. 33). In an appendix to *A Supplication* Barnes gathers the citations from the Church Fathers used in the work. Of its 21 pages, Augustinian citations take up 9, while the remaining 11 pages are divided between ten other writers.

³⁹ William Tyndale, *An Exposition upon the V, VI, VII chapters of Matthew* (1533), in *Expositions and Notes* (Cambridge, 1849), p. 60. As Tyndale followed Luther in his *Introduction to Romans*, so here he hews very close to Luther's own *Commentary on Matthew 5-7*, published in the fall of 1532.

⁴⁰ Tyndale, *Expositions*, p. 67.

⁴¹ Soon the Tudor propaganda machinery had produced their own officially sanctioned defenses of the break with Rome, such as Edward Fox's *De vera differentia regiae potestatis et ecclesiasticae* (London, 1534), published for a larger audience under Edward VI as *The true dyfferens between the regall power and the Ecclesiasticall power*, trans. Henry Lord Stafforde (London, 1548). STC 11220. And by another twist of fate, Stephen Gardiner, who as Queen Mary's Chancellor was to become the nemesis of the Protestants, had earlier followed Tyndale's lead with his *De vera obedientia oratio* (London, 1535). This work was to harry him under Mary since an anonymous translator (most likely John Bale), who also added a lengthy and tendentious preface and a conclusion, published the work in English under the title *De vera obediencia an oration* (Roane [London?], 1553). STC 11585.

⁴² To clarify, by "Eusebius" I mean the imperialist use of Constantine inspired by the writings of the Father, in particular the *Life of Constantine* with the appended orations. Eusebius was regarded as *the* authority on the first Christian emperor even if his name was not always mentioned as a source. This imperial "Eusebianism" sometimes merged with the thought of Thomas Erastus (1524-1583), and the Eusebian and Erastian strands cannot always be disentangled. For my purposes I shall have to disregard these further distinctions, well aware that "Eusebian" will sometimes function metonymically for larger forces.

⁴³ See Frances A. Yates, *Astrea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975). On Elizabeth I, see also Roy Strong's two iconographical studies, *Portraits of Queen Elizabeth* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1963) and *The Cult of Elizabeth* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977), as well as Helen Hackett's recent *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (London: Macmillan, 1994).

⁴⁴ A gauge of Eusebius' provenance in Tudor England is provided by E.S. Leedham Green, *Books in Cambridge Inventories*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1986). Leedham Green has transcribed and compiled the 200 inventories (largely consisting of book-lists) made for deceased persons within the jurisdiction of Cambridge university between 1535 and 1760. For my part I have studied the 176 inventories made in the sixteenth century in order to see which authors were the most widely owned (and presumably read). Of these 176 inventories, 25% contained at least one copy of Eusebius. This places him fourth among the Church Fathers, almost shoulder to shoulder with Jerome (at 28%) and trailing only Augustine and Chrysostom (both just over 40%). Of Eusebius' works, the *Ecclesiastical History* was by far the most widely owned (33 out of the 44 inventories that included Eusebius). For a fuller presentation of the 50 most commonly owned authors in the

Cambridge inventories, see the appendix to my article "Melanchthon and Tudor England," *Cultural Exchange between European Nations during the Renaissance*, ed. Gunnar Sorelius and Michael Srigley (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1994): 85-95. The *Ecclesiastical History* was "Englished" by M. Hanmer as *The auntient ecclesiaticall histories* (London, 1577). STC 10572. There followed new editions in 1585, 1607, 1615, and 1636, the last of which also included a new translation of the *Life of Constantine*.

⁴⁵ By Thomas Bilson, for example, when he argues for the queen's right to be the head of the Church of England in *The trve difference betweene Christian svbiectiion and vnchristian rebellion: wherein the princes lawful power to commaund for trueth, and indepriuable right to beare the sword are defended against the Popes censures and the Iesuits sophismes vttered in their Apologie and Defence of English Catholikes* (Oxford, 1585), pp. 134-37. STC 3071. Bilson refers in these pages to Eusebius' *Life of Constantine* as well as to the *Ecclesiastical History*. Further references to Bilson will be given in the text by page.

⁴⁶ Yates, p. 42.

⁴⁷ As cited in Yates, p. 42.

⁴⁸ See Yates, pp. 69-74; Kermode, pp. 273-88; Thomas H. Cain, *Praise in "The Faerie Queene"* (Lincoln and London: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1978); Robin Headlam Wells, *Spenser's "Faerie Queene" and the Cult of Elizabeth* (London and Canberra: Croom Helm, 1983); John N. King, *Tudor Royal Iconography* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1989), as well as his *Spenser's Poetry and the Reformation Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1990).

⁴⁹ In a fine study that nicely complements this paper Richard F. Hardin traces the Erasmian political influence in Tudor and Jacobean England, arguing convincingly that "Spenser neither believes in James VI of Scotland's divine rights of kings nor defends absolute rule or the imperial concept of monarchy" (*Civil Idolatry: Desacralizing and Monarchy in Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton* [Newark: Univ. of Delaware Press, 1992], p. 20).

⁵⁰ See for example William Allen, *An apologie and trve declaration* (Henault, 1581), fol. 40^v-41^r. STC 369. Although the *OED* traces the first English occurrence of "regiment" in our sense to John Gower's *Confessio Amantis* of 1390, it also notes that it was "very common c. 1550-1680," no doubt as a result of the dissemination of Lutheran political theory.

⁵¹ Allen, fol. 10^v.

⁵² Even if the Elizabethan government tried to distinguish between the two regiments by executing recusants for *treason* against the state rather than for *heresy* against the church (which had been the policy under Queen Mary), the end result was of course the same. It should be kept in mind, however, that many more were burned for heresy during Mary's brief reign than were executed for treason during Elizabeth's 45 years in office.

⁵³ Thomas Cartwright's *Reply* (1573), as cited in John Whitgift, *The Defense of the Aunswere to the Admonition, against the Replie of T.C.* (London, 1574), pp. 695 and 754. STC 25430.

⁵⁴ *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, in vol. 3 of *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker*, ed. P.G. Stanwood (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1981). References to the *Laws* are given in the text by book, chapter, and section.

⁵⁵ Whitgift had countered with a similar argument: "In diuers places, [Cartwright] maketh such a distinction betwixt the church of Christ, & a Christian common wealth that hath a Christian magistrate, as he would do betwixt the church & a Heathenische common wealth, that hath a persecuting and an vnbeleuing magistrate" (p. 695).

⁵⁶ *The 42 Articles of 1552* (London, 1553), article 35, "Of Ciuile magistrates." STC 10034.2.

⁵⁷ *The 39 Articles of 1562* (London, 1564?), article 36, "Of Ciuil Magistrates." STC 10038.5.

⁵⁸ John Guy, "The Henrician Age," in *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500-1800*, ed. J.G.A. Pocock (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993), p. 42.

⁵⁹ *De Genesi ad litteram* 9. 9.14, as cited in Markus, p. 96.

⁶⁰ Ullmann, pp. 128-29.

⁶¹ Earlier critics have answered that questions differently. While Rathborne, for example, thought that "this glory, symbolized by the Fairy Queen herself, is ... an earthly glory" (p. 33), Jan Karel Kouwenhoven has more recently argued that "Spenser's statement that the Faery Queen represents glory and Arthur magnificence in particular means that his poem is about the temporal manifestations of God" (*Apparent Narrative as Thematic Metaphor* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983], p. 20). Kouwenhoven's disagreement with Rathborne is not quite as radical, however, if we stress the "temporal" in his citation. We may indeed find ourselves within Augustine's civic city.

⁶² See King, *Spenser's Poetry*, pp. 114-20.

⁶³ See Helen Hackett's thoughtful study *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mother* (Houndsmills and London: Macmillan, 1995), esp. pp. 78-83, and 139-44.

⁶⁴ Cain, p. 53.

⁶⁵ Cain, pp. 67, 72, and 73.

⁶⁶ Cain, p. 60. Cain admits that "recurrent figures in *The Faerie Queene* do not maintain the allegorical senses at all points," and that Una therefore does not "consistently figure forth the queen" (p. 71). Yet for Cain this only strengthens the encomium: whenever something blameworthy is said about Una, the queen is not intended, while everything positive has Elizabeth as the target. This view can hardly be a constructive basis for making useful distinctions since it knows the answers before asking the questions.

⁶⁷ As Melanchthon had stated: "*Una est Ecclesia Dei perpetua inde usque ab Adam*" (cited in Peter Fraenkel, *Testimonia Patrum* [Geneva: Droz, 1961], p. 62).

⁶⁸ See e.g. *Eighty-Three Different Questions* 61.7; *Propositions from the Epistle to the Romans* 13-18; *On the Trinity* 4.4.7; *The Enchiridion* 118.

⁶⁹ See Joseph Wittreich, "Apocalypse," in the *Spenser Encyclopedia*, ed. A.C. Hamilton et al. (Toronto and Buffalo: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1990), pp. 46-48.

⁷⁰ Thomas Aquinas, among others, had passed along the scheme in his *Summa theologiae* 2.1 (questions 91, 98, 106-07).

⁷¹ *The thre bokes of Cronicles*, trans. Gwalter Lynne (London, 1550), sig. *.vi^v. STC 4627.

⁷² The 1560 Geneva Bible, for example, contains "A Perfite Svppvtation of the Yeres and Times from Adam vnto Christ, proued by the Scriptures," which finds that "from Adam vnto Christ are 3974 yeres, six moneths and ten dayes," while John Foxe settles for the round figure of 4000 years. For a study of the apocalyptic context of the computations, see Katherine R. Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain 1530-1645* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1979), esp. pp. 20-1, 93-4 (Foxe), and 182 (Raleigh). Also see C.A. Patrides, *Premises and Motifs in Renaissance Thought and Literature* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1982), pp. 52-63.

⁷³ Also John Bale transmitted the conflated four- and sevenfold schemes in his *Comedy concernynge thre lawes* (1548?). See Wittreich (*Spenser Encyclopedia*, p. 47), who applies both these schemes to *The Faerie Queene* with its six completed books and a seventh that

yearns towards "that Sabaoths sight" (*FQ* 7.8.2). While Wittreich corroborates my conclusions by seeing periods "of nature, bondage, and grace" depicted throughout the poem, his examples in Book 1 are different from mine. Maren-Sofie Røstvig sees the same sevenfold pattern in *The Shepheardes Calender*: "The Shepheardes Calender: A Structural Analysis," *Renaissance and Modern Studies* 13 (1960): 49-75.

⁷⁴ Which Percival long ago suggested, but no one else (to my knowledge) has caught on to (Percival is quoted in *The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition*, ed. E. Greenlaw et al., 11 vols. [Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1932-57], 1: 256).

⁷⁵ John Bale, *The Image of bothe churches* (London, 1548?), sig. e vii^r. STC 1297.

⁷⁶ Richard Crashaw, "In the Glorious Epiphanie of our Lord God, a Hymn," as quoted in C.A. Patrides, *The Grand Design of God* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972), p. 82. Patrides provides a fuller explication of these themes.

⁷⁷ Bale, *Image*, sigs. Oo viii^r and Pp i^v.

⁷⁸ "Hymne to God my God, in my sicknesse," in *The Metaphysical Poets*, ed. Helen Gardner (1957; rpt. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977), p. 90.

⁷⁹ It is clearly seen in stanza 46, to give only one example, where the "apples rosie red" and the "pure vermillion" juxtaposes images from the Passion and the Fall.

⁸⁰ Una, watching Redcrosse's fight "from farre" (*FQ* 1.11.32), not only plays her part as the Lady of the St George legend or as the woman clothed with the sun in the apocalyptic dragon-battle, but also reenacts the role of the faithful women that remained at Calvary (after the men had fled) and then were the first to come to the open grave: "And many women were there [at the crucifixion], beholding him *a farre of*, which had followed Iesus from Galilee, ministring vnto him" (Matthew 23: 55—all biblical quotations are taken from the 1560 Geneva Bible; my emphasis).

⁸¹ Augustine, "The Four Stages of the Christian's Life, and the Four Corresponding Stages of the Church's History," in *The Enchiridion on Faith, Hope and Love*, trans. J.F. Shaw, ed. Henry Paolucci (Chicago: Henry Regnery-gateway, 1961), p.137. *The Enchiridion* also influenced Spenser's conception of the House of Holiness.

⁸² Already in the NT this view of the OT was established; see especially Hebrews 11.

⁸³ See Kathryn Walls, "Abessa and the Lion: *The Faerie Queene*, I.3.1-12," *Spenser Studies* 5 (1984): 3-30. Unfortunately, despite Walls' conclusive affiliation of Abessa with Hagar (for the pot on her shoulder, see Genesis 21: 14), the old but unconvincing identification with the Samaritan woman still lingers on (the even more unlikely allusion to Rebecca at Haran has at least been dropped): see Darryl J. Gless, in *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, p. 3, and *Interpretation and Theology in Spenser* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1994), pp. 85-87.

⁸⁴ Luther's lectures on Galatians, in *Luther's Works*, ed. J. Pelican (St. Louis: Concordia, 1963) 26: 442.

⁸⁵ Also Calvin lumps together "Papists, Ishmaelites and Hagarites" (*Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians*, trans. William Pringle [Edinburgh, 1854], p. 145).

⁸⁶ "The old Testament," says Calvin, "is taken two manner of wayes: sometimes to signifie the Legall couenant, sometimes to signifie the couenant of grace as it was established with Abraham & his posteritie" (*Aphorismes of Christian Religion*, trans. H. Holland [London, 1596], p. 41). STC 4374.

⁸⁷ Sean Kane, *Spenser's Moral Allegory* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1989), p. 184. For similar views see M. Pauline Parker, *The Allegory of "The Faerie Queene"* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1960), pp. 70-71; Graham Hough, *A Preface to "The Faerie Queene"* (London:

Duckworth, 1962), pp. 150-51; Harry Berger, Jr., "Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, Book I: Prelude to Interpretation," *Southern Review*, 2 (1966): 34; C.S. Lewis, *Spenser's Images of Life*, ed. Alistair Fowler (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1967), pp. 83-85; Maurice Evans, *Spenser's Anatomy of Heroism* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1970), pp. 101-02; John Erskine Hankins, *Source and meaning in Spenser's Allegory* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), p. 123; James Nohrberg, *The Analogy of "The Faerie Queene"* (1976; rpt. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1980), pp. 218-22; Douglas Brooks-Davies, *Spenser's Faerie Queene: A Critical Commentary on Books I and II* (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1977), pp. 61-62. A greater awareness of the satyrs' moral limitations is shown by some scholars: Virgil K. Whitaker, "The Theological Structure of *The Faerie Queene*," in *That Soueraine Light*, ed. W.R. Mueller and D.C. Allen (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1952): 52; William Nelson, *The Poetry of Edmund Spenser* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1963), pp. 156-57; Anthea Hume, *Edmund Spenser: Protestant Poet* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1984), pp. 87-89. Yet the consensus, as expressed in the *Spenser Encyclopedia*, is still to see the satyrs of *FQ* 1.6 as "naive, benign creatures" (p. 628).

⁸⁸ See Henry Gibbons Lotspeich, *Classical Mythology in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1932), p. 59 (Fauns) and pp. 105-06 (Satyrs).

⁸⁹ See *FQ* 3.10.48 and 3.11.35; *Daphnaida* ll. 155-61; *The Teares of the Muses* ll. 267-70; *Virgils Gnat* ll. 177-79; *Bellayes visions* 12.

⁹⁰ Berger, p. 36.

⁹¹ I join Gless (*Interpretation*, p. 108) in seeing the analogy to Romans 1.

⁹² Sylvanus' "yvie twyne" (*FQ* 1.6.14) is a traditional emblem of ingratitude (Richard Douglas Jordan, "Una Among the Satyrs: *The Faerie Queene* 1.6," *MLQ*, 38 [1977]: 128). Jordan's general interpretation of the satyrs as OT Jews, however, I find unpersuasive.

⁹³ See *Variorum*, 1: 244-48; Nelson, p. 157; Berger, p. 38; Evans, p. 102; Hankins, p. 124; Nohrberg, p. 222; Brooks-Davies, pp. 67-68; A. Bartlett Giamatti, *Exile and Change in Renaissance Literature* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1984), p. 93; *Spenser Encyclopedia*, p. 628.

⁹⁴ Nelson, p. 159.

⁹⁵ His success as knight "is limited" in other parts of the poem too (*Spenser Encyclopedia*, p. 628); see cantos 7 and 11 of Book 4, and cantos 4 and 5 of Book 4.

⁹⁶ Cf. Gless, *Interpretation*, p. 109.

⁹⁷ The law/grace dichotomy of course goes back to St Paul but Augustine extended its application in a number of works. Of these, *On the Spirit and the Letter* (*De spiritu et littera*) was of crucial importance for Luther's theological development and for the development of the Reformation at large.

⁹⁸ Spenser's rearrangement of the Augustinian scheme is admittedly odd, but repeats the reverse order of the first two eras in cantos 3 and 6. Carol V. Kaske, "Spenser's Pluralistic Universe: The View from the Mount of Contemplation," *Contemporary Thought on Edmund Spenser*, ed. Richard C. Frushell et al. (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1975), has also interpreted the three mountains (Parnassus, Sinai, and Olivet) as representing "the traditional three dispensations: Nature, Law, and Grace" (p. 147), but for her the mountains do not represent a progression along Augustine's fourfold scheme but "different dispensations or ways to heaven" (p. 132). Thus trying to show Spenser's "pluralism," Kaske makes the farfetched claim that Redcrosse "is suddenly told by the Hermit to become a pagan again for a while" (p. 148), as if service in the earthly kingdom is not commensurate with Christianity.