行政院國家科學委員會專題研究計畫 成果報告

改教前後之古典修辭學與聖經詮釋:「農夫皮爾斯之信條」、「愉悅的閒暇」及「仙后」第一章中救恩論之文學呈現, II-II
研究成果報告(精簡版)

計 畫 主 持 人 ：林質心

計畫參與人員 ：碩士班研究生-兼任助理人員：郭詩裴

報 告 附 件 ：出席國際會議研究心得報告及發表論文

處 理 方 式 ：本計畫涉及專利或其他智慧財產權，2 年後可公開查詢

中　華　民　國　98 年 11 月 01 日

行政院國家科學委員會補助專題研究計畫 X 成果報告
☐期中進度報告

計畫名稱

改教前後之古典修辭學與聖經詮釋:「農夫皮爾斯之信條」、「愉悅的閒暇」及「仙后」第一章中救恩論之文學呈現(II-II)

計畫類別：X 個別型計畫　　☐ 整合型計畫
計畫編號：NSC 97-2410-H-004-157
執行期間：　97　年 8 月　1　日至　98　年　7 月 31 日

計畫主持人：林質心
計畫參與人員(兼任助理)：郭詩裴

成果報告類型(依經費核定清單規定繳交)：X 精簡報告　☐完整報告

本成果報告包括以下應繳交之附件：
☐赴國外出差或研習心得報告一份
☐赴大陸地區出差或研習心得報告一份
X 出席國際學術會議心得報告及發表之論文各一份
☐國際合作研究計畫國外研究報告書一份

處理方式：除產學合作研究計畫、提升產業技術及人才培育研究計畫、
　　　　列管計畫及下列情形者外，得立即公開查詢
　　　　X 涉及專利或其他智慧財產權，☐一年　　X 二年後可公開查詢

執行單位：國立政治大學
中　華　民　國　九十八　　年　　10　　月　31　　日

（一）前言、研究目的

      In this two-year project, I continue my project for the academic year 2005-2006 on the adaptation of classical rhetoric in the middle passús of *Piers Plowman*.   In the first year of this two-year project, I studied several texts of the Plowman tradition and examined how the issues raised by Wycliffite preachers are presented in these texts.   In a paper I presented at the 44th International Conference of Medieval Studies at Kalamazoo this May, I examine the concerns for the use of rhetoric in sermon manuals by Augustine, Alan of Lille, Humbert of Romans , Guibert of Nogent, Robert Basevorn, and Wcylif.   There I study related issues like the intention of the preacher, the training in scholastic speculation, the use of figures of speech like exeumplum/tale, and allegorical interpretation of the Bible and examine whether the preacher figures in the *Pierce the Ploughman's Crede*, *The Plowman's Tale*, and *Jacke Jpland and the Reply of Friar Daw Topias, with jack Upland's Rejoinder* really desert the training in scholastic logic and prefer plain style and literal interpretation as they claim.   In the paper, I argue that these preacher figures limit the use of scholastic training in sermon but do not really reject the study of rhetoric completely.   There I argue that similar to classical rhetoricians, they pay special attention to the relationship between the intention of the preacher and the validity of the interpretation but they emphasize particularly whether the preachers actually practice their own lessons.   There I argue that they prefer rhetorical figures sanctioned by the Bible and even use some rhetorical figures like images, exeumpla, tales/narrative, and similitude as the basis for an understanding and dissemination of the Christian doctrine of salvation.   There I show that the preacher figures in these texts do not follow steps for an interpretation of an action in classical rhetorical treatises: they do not place a biblical passage in the beginning of a debate as a definition, as any rhetorician trained in judicial rhetoric would, and they do not use that definition as the basis of the argument.   Instead, the preacher figures, the plowman, Jack Upland, and the pelican, in these texts are often more assertive, presenting their accusations as fact, and use biblical images rather than abstract topics to organize their debate.   There, though, I also point out that these preacher figures may not realize that they are a lot more indebted to the university training in rhetoric than they want to admit in terms of allegorical interpretation and adapt rhetoric to their use more than they realize when choosing and organizing their topics.

      The research result of the first year naturally leads me into thinking whether this preference for using certain rhetorical figures and images to scholastic analysis and rhetorical topics (*topos*) as an organizing tool and the focus on the intention and behavior of the preachers persist in the texts I propose to study in the second year, *The Pastime of Pleasure* and Book I of *The Faerie Queene*.   At first glance, in these two texts, unlike the three texts of the plowman tradition, there is no single preacher figure the narrator can depend on and therefore no ideal model established for the adaptation of classical rhetoric for the understanding of dissemination of Christian doctrine of salvation.   The main characters in these educational journeys, therefore, are often as confused as the Will in *Piers Plowman*.   In these two texts, Hawes and Spenser also choose a much more ornate style, with stories full of exotic images and rhetorical figures.   The problem is whether Hawes and Spenser choose the "aureate diction" (Lerer 169) because they want to show how confusing rhetorical figures and allegorical interpretation can be or whether they are actually more willing to revive classical rhetoric for the understanding and dissemination of the doctrine of salvation.   The same ambiguity exists about questions like whether the two authors believe that the validity of a lesson about the doctrine of salvation is based on the intention and character of the speaker.   The preacher figures in *The Pastime of Pleasure* are the personified seven liberal arts and their intentions and characters are not the focus of the discussion.   The preacher figures in the House of Holiness, like Charissa and

Contemplation, are clearly well-intentioned and virtuous figures, but they don't talk much and it is difficult to examine their intention and characters against their lesson. Do Hawes and Spenser, then, have totally different concerns for rhetoric, for the language skills used to understand and disseminate the doctrine of salvation? If so, what are their concerns?

（二）文獻探討

Critics are not unaware of Hawes' and Spenser's concerns for the training of rhetoric. Copeland starts his paper by saying that "the association of [Lydgate's and Hawes's] work with late medieval poetics should not obscure their place in the scientific or academic history of rhetoric" (57). He believes that Hawes, like Cicero, "describes the origins of rhetoric as a governing order bringing law to a barbarous society" (79), comparing Hawes' rhetoric to the rhetoric of the "Second Sophistic," which is characterized by "grand and florid display, in its Roman form" and "its efforts to encomiastic tributes to the emperors" (82). Lerer believes that in comparison to Lydgate whose "aureate terms were designed primarily to communicate a sense of inspiration," Hawes was more "possessed by the problems of preservation" (169). He argues that "Hawes integrates the technical mnemonic language into his larger metaphorical structures" and uses each images as "a *signyfycacyon* (1255) of both narrative and its moral import," defining "literature as a storehouse of moral exempla" (171). He shows that Hawes follows Cicero and "considers the purpose of poetry as 'moralyzing the symylytude.'" (173). King focuses his study on particular rhetorical figures, the exemplum and images, of heroic virtue, and shows how the choice made by Graunde Amour in the beginning accords with Hercules's in the tradition established by mythographers (59-60). He also shows, however, that the woodcuts in *The Pastime of Plesaure*, embedded in the traditions of pageants and emblems, eventually serve to "teach [the reader] the irrelevance of earthly pleasure" and "punish the reader for expecting to enjoy the poem" (67). He seems to suggest, then, that "sophisticated rhetorical devices" are themselves figures of the "repetition, vagueness, superficiality, and utter tediousness" of the earthly pleasures (67).

Spenserian scholars, similarly, can't help notice Spenser's "verbal sensuousness" and its role as a "rhetorical instrument, a means of appealing to the reader's feelings and awarenesses" (Alpers 118). Here critics notice stronger relation between the use of rhetoric. the allegorical pattern, and its effect on the readers. Alpers believes, for example, that "In all the climatic episodes of *The Faerie Queene*, Spenser brings us into extraordinarily close, almost physical contact with his verse" (126). He also argues that "allegorical significance is plain enough in its general outlines, because symbolic encounters, emblematic figures, and the like were simply raw narrative material to Spenser" while "confusion sets in the moment we try to elaborate the significance of the allegory by treating details of language as if they were fictional details" (127). Murrin sees the prologue of Book II as an argument for the existence of the fairyland and proposes that "Spenser ends the Prologue in very mundane fashion" and concludes that "Elizabeth can see her own realms *mirrored* in faery" (77). He shows, again, then, that rhetoric, as an art of persuasion and argument, is adopted in Spenser's poetry as an allegorical device, helping the reader "assess the value of a man's life or come to know it properly" and "perceive it teleologically "(94). He argues that for Spenser, as for Augustine, Christians, through the representation of worldly shadows, will learn to make "the whole set of connections between here and there," a connection that is both "labyrinthine and yet fundamental" (95). Berger picks up on Alper's "emphasis on the narrator as rhetorician" (11) and finds his "identification of both [the narrator and narrative] with Spenser" problematic (11). He studies researches about "the politics of oral communication" (41) and suggests that "if the locus of unreliability shifts from narrator to narrative, we can be a little more relaxed in our efforts to

make sense of what often seems to many readers to be misleading or inadequate commentary" (44).

Although these critics all see the two authors' effort to persuade the readers or the narrators' roles as rhetoricians—whether they believe they are successful or not—these critics do not really study the reader-author relationship as defined in rhetorical treatises that these two authors would have studied. They study Hawes' and Spenser's ornate style—their preference for a rhetorical language full of exotic images, exempla, similitude, and tale/narrative—and define them either as effective tools of persuasion or figures for the unreliability of human language, but they do not see that how the rhetoricians in the fifteenth and century centuries would look at the use of these rhetorical figures. Although both Hawes and Spenser, especially in Book I, obviously think about how the doctrine of salvation can be accurately and persuasively presented, these critics do not try to understand why Christians have always been indecisive about whether rhetorical figures are useful or misleading tools for the understanding and dissemination of the doctrine of salvation. Neither do they, of course, study how Hawes and Spenser respond to the general concerns of the period about the validity of rhetorical figures and the roles of the authors/narrators as rhetoricians.

(三) 研究方法

I therefore, start this project by delving into the transformation of classical and medieval rhetoric in the Renaissance. It is commonsensical among scholars of Renaissance scholars that the humanist movement in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is closely related to the revival of the classical literary training. After all, the major effort of the Renaissance humanists was to revive classical language and literature. What's more, rhetoric, one subject of the trivium, became "the queen of the liberal arts," and "dialectic, which had reigned supreme during the late Middle Ages," flagged (Rebhorn 1). With the rise of rhetoric, though, comes the debates about its effectiveness and validity as a persuasive tool. As Rebhorn argues, "if Renaissance writers see oratory as essential for social and political order, they," unlike the classical rhetoricians, "also worry that it will do precisely the opposite and create disorder, violence, and war" (4).

One argument is an extension of the tendency among rhetoricians of the late Middle Ages to focus more on rhetorical figures and style, one sub-subject under the study of rhetoric. Peter Ramus, the central figure who "ordained logic should offer training in invention and arrangement," traditionally the more important sub-subjects of rhetoric, and believed "that rhetoric should offer training in style and delivery" (Howell 148). The famous Christian educator, Melanchthon, also groups the study of invention and arrangement under logic (McNalley 36-38). For some scholars, Ramus spoke for those who "accepted the medieval tradition that rhetoric was concerned only with smoothness and ornament of speech and all that went toward captivating the ears, and straightway picked up all the serious purpose and thoughtful content of classical rhetoric . . . to hand them over to logic" (Baldwin 56). It may also seem that "Melanchthon is siding with 'the establishment' of scholastic logicians and theologians against the Renaissance 'revolutionaries' of rhetorical humanism" (McNalley 38). However, as McNalley argues, "the concessions are made in the course of Melanchthon's attempt to present a theory of specifically *rhetorical* invention" (38). The regrouping of rhetorical invention, therefore, can actually reflect the rising status of classical rhetoric, though now called dialectic. In the preface of *Loci communes* of 1521, for example, Melanchthon explains that "each discipline has its central points of thought, or *loci*, which guide student into the understanding of the content and intent of its exposition of truth" (Kolb, 576). By replacing or modifying the classical *topos* with theological commonplaces, Melanchthon

actually gives rhetoric a new status.

Neither were the rhetorical figures and style treated as a matter of trivial literary ornamentation.   For example, Petrarch "accepted Cicero as a model and set himself the task of recovering the complete works of the master," because he was attracted by "the marvelous harmony of Cicero's period before he was old enough to understand the sense" (Scott 7).   While Quintilian's *De Oratore* and the *Institutio Oratorio* became "the guide in the concrete organization of school curricula," Cicero became "the model for style in composition" (Scott 8).   The study of Cicero's style was such a major concern among the fifteenth-century poets that toward the end of fifteenth century, "the rational Ciceronians of the type of Barzizza came to be considered enemies of the cause" (Scott 10) because they did not see "the literal imitation of Cicero's vocabulary and construction" the way to promote Cicero's style (Scott 10).   There are of course Renaissance writers, who are concerned with literary ornamentation, with rhetorical figures.   Bacon, for example, is concerned with "rhetoric as an art of ornamenting, adorning, or garnishing of speech" (Wallace 51).   He thinks that "Schoolmen often fell victims of the distemper, and when they did it was falling in love with words as images only, as objects only" (Wallace 52). However, a quick look through rhetorical treatises shows that many rhetoricians and poets believe that the study rhetorical figures and style are more than a study of literary ornamentation.   It's true that Fraunce, Sherry, and Puttenham all focus more on rhetorical figures and style in their books on poetics or rhetoric.   It may seem from these treatises that rhetoric is now finally a study solely of literary ornamentation, but earlier in Erasmus' *De Utraque Verborum ac Rerum Copia*, literary ornamentation has already gained a new significance.   Here Erasmus starts his treatise by coupling a copia of thoughts and a copia of words and showing his sympathy for those who "strive for this divine excellence diligently, indeed, but unsuccessfully, and fall into a kind of futile and amorphous loquacity, as with a multitude of inane thoughts and words thrown together without discrimination" (11).   He laments that these people "obscure the subject and burden the ears of their wretched hearers" (11).   Erasmus is of course not unaware that "there may befall us what we see happen to certain perverse affectors of laconism," but he is sure that we "may be able to amplify by copia in such a way that there is nonetheless no redundancy" (15).

In this paper then, I propose to look at the literary ornamentation in Hawes's *Pastime of Pleasure* and Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*, Book I, and see how the concerns for literary ornamentation is embodied in Graunde Amour's and Redcrosse's journeys, in their journeys toward an understanding of the doctrine of salvation.   Through a study of discussions about the effectiveness and validity of literary ornamentation in treatises of rhetoric and poetics, I want to examine how Hawes and Spenser adopt rhetorical figures as tools of persuasion, whether they find them as valid as rhetorical invention or scholastic argument, whether they go beyond contemporary rhetorical and poetical theories and provide other answers to the possible ambiguities caused by and deceptions made tempting by these figures.

(四)結果與討論

Read against the rising status of rhetorical invention as well as that of rhetorical figures, the aureation in *The Pastime of Pleasure* and the verbal sensuousness in *The Faerie Queene* may gain new significance.   They may not be simply viewed as rhetorical devices used to persuade the readers.   They may also be a new kind of rhetorical inventions used to map the spiritual journeys for the readers.

Hawes defines invention as "the most noble werke / Of v. inwarde wyttes with hole affeccyon" (702-03), not the traditional rhetorical *topos*, commonly accepted beliefs used as the premise of an argument.   For him, invention evokes emotion and is used "With mysty colour / of cloudes derke" (706); that is, invention for Hawes means the use of rhetorical

figures allegorically.   He also associates invention with imagination, which helps "draw a mater full facundyous" (709), with fantasy (722), and with summary for the sake of memory (736-49).   His invention, then seems to be Erasmus copia.   What's more, Hawes also believes that the study of rhetorical figures, which he calls elocution, also "The mater exorneth right well facundyously / In fewe wordes swete and sentencyous" (910-11) and clothes truth "vnder mysty figures / By many coloures" (932-33).   Hawes, in short, sees the study of invention as actually the study of poetry, and his description of the study rhetorical figures is very similar to that of invention.

Spenser does not offers such a clear description of the study of rhetorical invention and figures, but as Hawes's Graunde Amour, Spenser's Redcrosse has to fight with the apocalyptic dragon before his promised union with Una.   It may be a coincident in the age of romance that both heroes are asked kill the dragon before winning the lady, but it is probably not an coincidence that the dragon is identical with a biblical figure in the Apocalypse and that neither heroes find the full satisfaction they expect before accomplishing their tasks.

Despite the similarity in the two heroes' journeys and challenges, these two heroes start with very different trainings.   Instead of a literary training in the seven liberal arts administered to Graunde Amour, Redcorsse has to go through a much more emblematic world.   Redcrosse also is a lot more confused: he does not have dependable guides to help him understand the world he observes.   He is shown a vision of the New Jerusalem by Contemplation, but unlike, Graunde Amour, he still needs "Vnto his Farie Queene back to returne," with "*Vna* left to mourne" (I, i, 41).   He needs to go on learning about his task in this world at the end of the story.

There are a few possible explanations for the differences between the two stories.   A convenient one is that Spenser is a Protestant, and Protestants tend to place more importance on this world.   However, this Protestant tendency does not help explain why Redcrosse lives in a much more emblematic world and is so often much more confused.   The Protestants do not like images and normally prefer plain style.   There are two other possible explanations.   First, Spenser may simply want to reflect the confusion caused by the argument between the Roman Catholic Church and the Reformers.   By using images more than traditional preacher figures who are skilled in the art of rhetoric, Spenser seems to suggest that signs have become more and more confusing and literary training, without divine grace, can not really help Christians to interpret the events and understand the doctrine of salvation.   Here the characters of the image-makers and the interpreters do seem to be as important a factor as they are in the texts of the plowman tradition.   Second, it may also be possible that Spenser believes that images are better media, if read with the help of divine grace, for an understanding of the complex but fecudious doctrine of salvation.   These two possible explanations may coexist and work together for our understanding of Spenser's solutions to the debates about the use of rhetoric for the understanding and dissemination of the doctrine of salvation, but my research and study right now have not brought me to a definite answer.

(五) 參考資料

(a) Primary materials

Ad Herennium.   The Loeb Classical Library 403.   Ed. G. P. Goold.   Trans. Harry Caplan.   Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1954.

Alan of Lille.   *Plaint of Nature*.   Trans. James J. Sheridan.   Medieval Sources in Translation 26.   Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1980.

Augustine.   *On Christian Doctrine*.   Trans.   D. W. Robertson, Jr.   Library of Liberal Arts.   New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1958.

Bacon, Francis. "The Proficence and Advancement of Learning." *Francis Bacon: A Selection of his Works*. Ed. Sidney Warhaft. New York: Macmillan, 1982.197-271.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *Cicero on Oratory and Orators*. Landmarks in Rhetoric and Public Address. Illinois: Southern Illinois UP, 1986.

---. *Inventione*. Trans. H. M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library 386. Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1976.

Cox, Leonard. *The Arte of Crafte of Rhethoryke*. Chicago: U. of Chicago P, 1899. Reprint. New York: AMS P.

Erasmus, Desiderius. On Copia of Words and Ideas. Medieval Philosophical Texts in Translation 12.. Milwaukee: Marquette UP, 1999.

Ficino, Marsilio. *Commentaries on Plato*. Vol. 1: Phaedrus and Ion. Ed. and Trans. Michael J. B. Allen. The I Tatti Renaissance 34. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard UP, 2008.

First and Second Prayerbooks of Edward VI with an Introduction by the Bishop of Gloucester. Ed. Ernest Rhys. Everyman's Library 448. London: J. M. Dent, 1910.

Fraunce, Abraham. *The Arcadian Rhetoric [1588]*. A Collection of Facsimile Reprints 176. Menston, England: Scolar P, 1969.

---. *The Lavviers Logike Exemplifying the Pracepts of Logike by the Practise of the Common Lawe, by Abraham Fraunce*. Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership: At London: Imprinted by William How, for Thomas Gubbin, and T. Newman, 1588.

Sherry, Richard. *A Treatise of the Figures of Grammer and Rhetorike Profitable for Al that be Studious of Eloquence, and in Especiall for suche as in Grammer Scholes Doe Reade Moste Eloquente Poetes and Oratours*. Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership: Londini: [Printed by Robert Caly?] in adibus Ricardi Totteli. Cum priuilegio ad imprimendum solum, [the iiii. Daye of Maye, the yeare of oure Lorde. MDLV. [1555].

The Geneva Bible. Facsimile edition. Intro. Lloyd E. Berry. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1969.

Harington, John, trans. *Orlando Furioso*. Ludovico Ariosto. Ed. Robert McNulty. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1972.

---. *The Sixth Book of Virgil's Aeneid*. Ed. Simon Cauchi. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1991.

Hawes, Stephen. *The Pastime of Pleasure*. Intro. William Edward Mead. Early English Text Society 173. London: Oxford UP, 1928.

---. *The Minor Poems*. Ed. Florence W. Gluck and Alice B. Morgan. London: Oxford UP, 1974.

Kallendorf, Craig, ed. *Humanist Educational Treatises*. The I Tatti Renaissance Library 5. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2002.

Luther, Martin. *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings*. Ed. John Dillenberger. New York: Anchor Books, 1962.

Petrarch, Francis. *Four Dialogues for Scholars*. Cleveland, Ohio, P of Western reserve U, 1967.

Pico, Gianfrancesco della Mirandola. *On The Imagination*. Trans. Harry Caplan. Cornell Studies in English. Vol 16. New Haven: Yale UP, 1930.

Pico, Giovanni della Mirandola. *Commentary on a Canzone of Benivieni*. Trans. Sears Jayne. American University Studies. Vol. 19. Romance Languages and Literature. Series II. New York: Peter Lang, 1984.

---. *Heptaplus*. Trans. Douglas Carmichael. *Pico della Mirandola: On the Dignity of*

Man. Intro. Paul J. W. Miller. Indianapolis: Hackett P, 1965.

Porphyry. *The Cave of the Nymphs*. Trans. and Ed. Robert Lamberton. Barrytown, New York: Station Hill P, 1983.

Puttenham, George. The Arte of English Poesie [1589]. A Collection of Facsimile Reprints 110. Menston, England: Scolar P, 1968.

Rainolds, John. *John Rainolds's Oxford Lextures on Aristotle's Rhetoric*. Ed. and Trans. Lawrence D. Green. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1986.

Ramus, Peter. *Arguments in Rhetoric against Quintilian*. Trans. Carole Newlands. Dekalb, Illinois, Northern Illinois UP, 1986.

---. *Attack on Cicero*. Trans. Carole Newlands. Ed. James J. Murphy. Davis, CA: Hermagoras P, 1992.

Scott, Izora. *Controversies Over The Imitation of Cicero in the Renaissance*. Michigan: Hermagoras P, 1991.

Sidney, Philip. *A Defence of Poetry*. Ed. Jan Van Dorsten. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1966.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene*. Ed. A. C. Hamilton. Longman Annotated English Poets. London: Longman, 1977.

Tyndale, William. *Doctrinal Treatises*. Ed. Henry Walker. Parker Society. Vol. 42. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1848.

Vives, J. L. "Plan of Studies for Girls." *Vives and the renaissance Education of Women*. New York: Longmans, 1912. 137-94.

---. *Tudor School-Boy Life: The Dialogues of Juan Luis Vives*. Trans. foster Watson. Kessinger Publishing's Legacy Reprints. London: J. M. Dent, MCMVIII.

(b) Secondary Materials: rhetoric, Langland's literary offspring, Hawes, and Spenser

Alpers, P. J. "The Rhetorical Mode of Spenser's Narrative." *Spenser: The Faerie Queene*. Ed. Peter Bayley. Casebook Series. London: MacMillan, 1977. 118-27.

Baldwin, Charles Sears. *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance*. Ed. Donald Lemen Clark. New York: Columbia UP, 1992.

Berger, harry, Jr. "Narrative as Rhetoric in The Faerie Queene." *English Literary Renaissance* 21 (1991): 3-48.

Cheney, Donald. "Plowman and Knight: The Hero's Dual Identity." *Spenser: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Harry Berger. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1968.

Clark, Donald Lemen. *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance: a Study of Rhetorical Terms in English Renaissance Literary Criticism*. New York: Columbia UP, 1922.

Graham, Kenneth J. E. *The Performance of Conviction*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994.

Hamilton, A. C. "The Visions of Piers Plowman and The Faerie Queene." *Form and Convention in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser*. Ed. William Nelson. New York: Columbia UP, 1961.

Houston, John Porter. *The Rhetoric of Poetry in the Renaissance and Seventeenth Century*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1983.

Howell, Samuel Wilbur. *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700*. New York: Russel & Russel, 1961.

Kennedy, George A. *Classical Rhetoric & Its Christian & Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. 2nd ed. London: U of North Carolina P, 1999.

---. *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1983.

Kinneavy, James L. *Greek Rhetorical Origins of Christian Faith: An Inquiry*. New York: Oxford UP, 1987.

Kinney, Arthur F. *Humanist Poetics*. Amherst: Massachusetts UP, 1986.

Kolb, Robert. "Teaching the Text The Commonplace Method In Sixteenth Century Lutheran Biblical Commentary." *Bibliotheque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 49

(1987): 571-85.

Lampe, G. W. H., ed. "Chapter X: Erasmus In Relation to the Medieval Biblical Tradition." *The Cambridge History of the Bible. Vol. 2 of 3*. London: Cambridge UP, 1969. 492-535.

Long, Percy W. "Spenser and the Plowman's Tale." *Modern Language Notes* 28 (1913): 262.

Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1979.

McNally, J. R. "Melanchthon's Earliest Rhetoric." *Rhetoric: A Tradition in Transition*. Ed. Walter R. fisher. Michigan: Michigan State UP, 1974.

Murphey, James, ed. *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1974.

---, ed. *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*. Los Angeles: California P, 1983.

Murrin, Michael. "The Rhetoric of Fairyland." *The Rhetoric of Renaissance Poetry: From Wyatt to Milton*. Ed. Thomas O. Sloan and Raymond B. Waddington. Berkeley: U of California, 1974.

Parenti, G.. "Teaching the Text The Commonplace Method In Sixteenth Century Lutheran Biblical Commentary." *Bibliotheque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 49 (1987): 571-85.

Rebhorn, Wayne A. *Renaissance Debates on Rhetoric*. Ithaca: cornell UP, 2000.

Rhodes, Neil. *The Power of Eloquence and English Renaissance Literature*. NY: St. Martin P, 1992.

Ruthven, K. K. "The Poet as Etymologist." *The Critical Quarterly* 11 (1969): 9-37.

Sharon-Zisser, Shirley. *The Risks of Simile in Renaissance Rhetoric*. New York: Peter Lang, 2000.

Shuger, Debora K. *Sacred Rhetoric: the Christian Grand Style in the English Renaissance*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1988.

Smith, Peter. *Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice*. Gloucester: Columbia UP, 1959.

Snare, Gerald. "Satire, Logic, and Rhetoric in Harvey's Earthquake Letter to Spenser." *Tulane Studies in English* 18 (1970): 17-33.

Stowe, A. Monroe. *English Grammar Schools in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. New York: Columbia UP, 1908. 104-24.

Stark, Ryan J. "Thomas Wilson's Apocalyptic Rhetoric." *Studies in Philology* 106 (2009): 341-53.

Wallace, karl R. "Bacon, Rhetoric, and Ornament of Words." Rhetoric: A Tradition in Transition. Ed. Walter fisher. Michigan: Michigan UP, 1974.

Weiner, Andrew D. *Sir Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Protestantism*. Minnesota: Minnesota UP, 1978.

Woollcombe, K. J. "The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development of Typology." Essays on Typology. *Studies in Biblical Theology*. No. 22. London: SCM P, 1957.

 (c) Secondary Materials: Hawes and Spenser

 Copeland, Rita. "Lydgate, Hawes, and the Science of Rhetoric in the Late Middle Ages." *Modern Language Quarterly* 53 (1992): 57-82.

Eden, Kathy. *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition: Chapters in the Ancient Legacy and Its Humanist Reception*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1997.

Evans, G. R. *The Language and Logic of the Bible: The Road to Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.

Ferry, Anne. *The Art of Naming*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988.

Hulse, Clark, Andrew D. Weiner, and Richard Strier. "Spenser: Myth, Politics, Poetry." *Studies in Philology* 85(1985): 378-89.

Hume, Anthea. *Edmund Spenser: Protestant Poet*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984

Kaske, Carol V. *Spenser and Biblical Poetics*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1999.

King, John N. "Allegorical Pattern in Stephen Hawes's The Pastime of Pleasure." *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 11 (1978): 57-67.

---. *Spenser's Poetry and the Reformation Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1990.

Lemmi, C. W. "Notes and Observations: the Influence of Boccaccio on Hawes's *Pastime of Pleasure*." *Review of English Studies* 5 (1929): 195-98.

Lerer, Seth. "The Rhetoric of Fame: Stephen Hawes's Aureate Diction." *Spenser Studies* 5 (1984): 169-84.

Mallette, Richard. *Spenser and the Discourses of Reformation England*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1997.

Murphy, James J. "Caxton's Two Choices: 'Modern' and 'Medieval' Rhetoric in Traversagni's Nova Rhetorica and the Anonymus Court of Sapience." *Medievalia et Humanistica* 3 (1972): 241-55.

Pearcy, Roy J. "Restructured Late-Medieval Schemata in Stephen Hawes's *The Conforte of Louers* (1510/11)." *Fifteenth-century Studies* 19 (1992): 177-90.

Rundle, David. "A New Golden Age? More, Skelton and the Accession Verses of 1509." *Renaissance Studies* 9 (1995): 58-76.

Shaheen, Naseeb. *Biblical References in* The Faerie Queene. United States: Memphis, 1976.

Wall, John, N. *Transformations of the Word: Spenser, Herbert, Vaughan*. Athens: U of Georgia, 1988.

Wells, Whitney. "Stephen Hawes and The Court of Sapience." *Review of English Studies* 6 (1930): 284-94.

Whitaker, Virgil K. *The Religious Basis of Spenser's Thought*. New York: Gordian P, 1966.

卡拉瑪茲的中古研究會議報告

卡拉瑪茲的中古研究會議我已耳聞多年,此次有幸成為臺灣古典、中古、暨文藝復興研究協會的代表團成員之一,覺得受益良多。由於有國科會計畫資助機票及大會對本學會的代表團提供之食宿,更使我在此行時無任何經濟上之後顧之憂。十分感謝。

這次代表團的論文發表排在會議議程第一天第一場,除了與本會素有來往的美韓學者參與指教外,也有幾位其他學者參與。其中一位學者專研 Arundel 影響下天主教會對威克理夫運動之回應,與我所研究主題十分相關,故與我在會後有一些討論,使我思考在研究以 Piers 為主角之文本時,除以天主教及威克理夫派之神學教育理念為基礎外,亦該多看一些天主教會對改革派之回應以為參考。也透過這位學者使我得知國外已有 Lollard Society 設立。在參與此學會所主持之場次時,亦得從其他學者所研究的威克理夫著作中驗證自己對改革派之重意圖、輕修辭之看法。

為了更多涉獵各學門相關知識,此次我以自己研究的題目「詮譯及修辭學」為中心,選擇了數個哲學、神學、文學、及藝術圖像類的場次參加。中古詮釋柏拉圖、聖經的方式本來就有許多為文學家採用, Hugh of St. Victor 的聖經註釋影響尤大。在此次會議中就有一個場次研究 Hugh of St. Victor,由 Society for the Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages 主辦。其中 James DeFrancis 提出「道成肉身」為詮釋法則,加深我對讀者品格與詮釋結果兩者關係的思考。Marcus Elder 針對 Augustine, Hugh of St. Victor, 和 St. Thomas 三人詮釋理論細微處的研究加深了我對「字面意義」及「寓意」、「靈意」的思考,他指出 Hugh of St. Victor 率先提出有些聖經章節只能以寓意解之,使得 St. Thomas 得以把 Augustine 視之為「靈意」的解釋稱之為「字面的意義」,大大提高了「字面意義」的重要性。另外 International Medieval Sermon Studies Society 所主持之場次也從方言講道的文本研究中,讓我更清楚中古講者如何考量讀者特質來選用修辭技巧。有關寓意與讀者、作者之關係的討論也持續在以文學之本為討論中心的場次中進行。

在 Spenser Society 所主持的場次中, Mary Ellen Lamb 為三場主題為 Senses, Transformation, 和 Ethics 的場次總結時提到文學總是帶領我們去挖掘意義,但寓意最後仍要帶領我們去瞭解物質世界,使我連想到 Piers 這個角色隨著時代的前進,似乎越來越多使用寓意的語言,但也似乎越來越充滿入世的批判精神。

在許多其他場次也可聽到這種對讀者如何搜尋意義的探討。在一場有關編年史及另一場有關騎士故事的場次中,都有發表人不約而同地討論作者或文本中的「權威」如何影導讀者詮釋。兩場由 International *Piers Plowman* Society 主辦的場次中,發表人更是從古早手抄本或早期印本下手,研究當時讀者或編輯對 *Piers Plowman* 的反應,其中 Paul J. Patterson 論文中提到 *The Plowman's Tale* 在 1556 之版本中的注釋並分析此類注釋中所透露出那一時代讀者對此文本的評價,與我的研究十分相關,會後我也在第一時間收到他新寫好的論文。

除此之外, Roberta L. Krueger 的主題演講尤為精彩,她以 "Fictions of Conduct in Medieval France" 為題,層層分析這種原來深具教育意義之文類如何轉型,變成諷刺文類,顛覆了原來的教育意義,卻又隱含更複雜的教育意含,這種文類進化的過程和我研究 Langlnnd 的 *Piers Plowman* 如何被改寫也頗有相似之處。我也參與了一場由 *Pearl*-Poet Society 主辦,一場由 Index of Christian Art 資料庫公司所主辦的場次,分由文學,圖像來探討中古的時間/永恆觀,兩場雖然研究主體不同,但比對研究結果後,深覺不同領域可為互補,應該要常有交流機會。

除參與個樣論文發表場次外,這次亦有機會和國外學者交流。從坐上機場到會場的接駁車起就和 Alan T. Gaylord 聊起他在錄製中古詩的努力,在大會自助餐廳中也巧遇 Edward Donald Kennedy,聊了聊朗誦 Morte Dathur 的困難,使我想到如要朗讀刻意仿古調的 Spenser 時也有同樣的困難。週五晚間參與中古德文詩的音樂會,週六晚上和

Caroline D. Eckhardt 及其友人一起吃飯,有機會在非正式場合中聊聊文學在大學教育中之角色,也分享不同型態學校面臨到不同的問題。最有趣的是某天我獨自用餐時,忽聽鄰坐學者非常興奮地在和兩位非文學出身的與會者介紹 *Piers Plowman* 的情節,忍不住插嘴接話,經介紹後才知是著名學者 Mary Clemente Davlin,後來我也去參與她所主講的場次,與她有一些簡短的討論,讓我能較從天主教會的立場看 *Piers Plowman* 中懺悔儀式的有效性。甚至最後在候機室等飛機時都能與兩位英國來的學者聊到中古研究的學者平時想與其他學者交流的困難,也聽聽她們兩位研究中古音樂的學者平時在研究教學上所碰到的困難。

此外,大會的書展規模十分龐大,除了一些知名的中古書籍出版社外,也有二手書店及最新的影音資料庫介紹,讓我收集到不少尋覓已久的文本及影音資料。西密西根州立大學的網路研究資源也十分豐富,所有與會者都可憑證入其圖書館查閱。我特別在會議結束後多留一晚,收集了上次至多倫多大學未收集完全的資料,包含文本及近百張與我研究主題相關之圖像資料,對我國科會計畫大有幫助,不像上次做一年計畫時,資料若在第一年出國時沒收齊,就沒有補救機會了。

整體說來,這次參加全世界規模最大的中古研究學術會議可說是滿載而歸。不論在正式的論文發表會中或在私下的閒聊中,無一不有刺激思考,擴展眼界的機會。對我目前的研究及將來可能的發展都有幫助。在清幽的西密西根州立大學校園裏,張眼望去全是中古研究的學者。雖說在期中請假一週,前後都要補課,十分辛苦,但也十分值得。唯一的遺憾便是想參與的場次實在太多。未來想要參與的學者務必在去之前詳閱議程,先挑好想去的場次,找到場次地點,會議開幕前先熟悉校園環境,免得在偌大的校園中猶疑不定或找不到開會地點。更要在去之前保持好體力,方能盡享盛宴。

圖表 1: 西密西根州立大學清幽的校園

圖表 2: 西密西根州立大學春天美景

圖表 3: 樸素但實惠的宿舍

圖表 4: 二人套房中間共用的衛浴設備

卡拉瑪茲的中古研究會議會議論文

The Dangerous Art of the Layman Instruction:

Biblical Interpretation and Rhetoric in the Plowman Tradition

In this paper, I will talk about the transformation of a literary image, the plowman in three texts, in *Peres Ploughman's Crede*, in *The Plowman's Tale*, and in *Jacke Upland, the Reply of Friar Daw Topias, and Jack Upland's Rejoinder*.

In the English literary history, Piers the Plowman is not just a character. This image was already a literary *topos* for an ideal Christian teacher in *Piers Plowman*. There the character is a simple, uneducated commoner who argues with and shows his more educated Christian fellows the ideal social construction and the way to truth. However, there he does not really teach the confused narrator who/what is Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest. There he leaves the scene and the narrator has to wander through Friars, Thought, Wit, Clergy, Dame Studie, Scripture, and Imaginatif to learn who/what Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest are. The plowman in later texts, in contrast, becomes more voluble, preaching directly to the narrator in doubt or arguing with friars in these texts of the plowman tradition. In *Pierce the Ploughman's Crede*, an ignorant narrator wanders around to find someone to teach him the Creed, and after friars of four orders all disappointed him by telling him how they are better than friars of other orders and try to convince him to not to bother himself with learning the creed, he finally meets a plowman who tells him what's wrong with the four orders and teach him the creed. In *The Plowman's Tale*, a plowman, who a pilgrim, tells a story about a debate between a pelican and a griffin. In this debate, the pelican speaks on behalf of the Wycliffites and accuses the church authorities of greed, pride, and flattery, is attacked by the griffin, and is finally triumphant. In *Jacke Upland and the Reply of Friar Daw Topias, with*

Jack Upland's Rejoinder, Jacke Upland, an uneducated commoner accuses the friar of greed and pride and answer the friar's reply again in the end.

These texts were written at a time when Wycliffites and other concerned church authorities were expressing their concerns for the legitimacy of university literary training, the trivium, especially rhetoric, in preaching and concerns for the glossing of the Bible for profits. These texts were also written at a time before the Reformers really started to advocate for the right of lay preachers and gave primacy to literal reading of the Bible. These texts, then, naturally reflect the changing attitudes toward the legitimacy of various interpretive methods for the Bible and the proper literary training of a preacher.

Critics studying Langland's literary offspring naturally discuss their dialogue/argument with the Wycliffites and their unintentional influence among the Reformers. Most critics see these texts as texts that continue an anti-fraternal tradition and usher in the Reformation, whether they were written by Wycliffites or not. Most critics, however, focus on the theological debates of the time, both debates about an ideal Christian life for laypeople and for clergy or debates about the doctrine of salvation. Some other critics focus more on various literary motifs or topical issues to decide whether these texts are just anti-fraternal or actually Lollard texts.

There are only a few critics who study the adaptation of classical and medieval rhetoric and biblical interpretation in these texts of the plowman tradition, in a piecemeal fashion. These critics do not, however, treat these texts as an ongoing process of adapting phrases and motifs appearing in the Bible as well as in literary texts like *Piers Plowman*, to formulate a new way to read and teach the Bible, with the danger and usefulness of rhetoric in mind, with the contemporary models of an ideal literary training for preachers in mind.

This paper, then, explores how the authors of the plowman tradition questioned the validity of the medieval Christian education for preachers. Through a study of how the

trivium, especially rhetoric, was supposed to help religious teachers interpret the Bible and preach the truth, this paper seeks to find out which interpretive methods for the Bible were considered more valid on what occasion.   This paper also seeks to explore how different sets of topics in classical and medieval rhetorical treatises were adopted or modified by these authors to disseminate the doctrine of salvation, and whether certain rhetorical figures were more sanctioned than others and why.   To understand how this image, the plowman, can be used to counter the standard for Christian teachers that is previously established by the same image, we need first understand how the trivium was supposed to help Christians interpret the Bible and preach the truth.   We need first see how the rhetorical treatises of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian were adapted by Christian rhetoricicians like Augustine and Cassiodorus, what was consider an ideal Christian education by a medieval Christian educators like Bonaventure and Hugh of St. Victor, and what authors of sermon manuals like Alan of Lille, Guibert of Nogent, and Robert Basevorn believed to be the function of university literary training, especially rhetoric, in helping students interpret the Bible and equip them with a list of topics and rhetorical figures appropriate for religious instruction.

The authors of medieval manuals for sermons answers the Christian concerns about rhetoric very specifically.   First, they often have to defend the use of rhetoric in sermon. The authors of the plowman tradition, though, are not so affirmative about the validity of either rhetoric or logic in helping preachers to understand or spread the truth.   In terms of university education in general, the author of *The Crede* even concludes that "And thanne nedeth [a preacher] nougt neuer for to studyen; / He migte no maistre [ben] kald (for Crist that defended)" (LL 837-40).   In terms of the study of rhetoric, these authors are also very concerns with the use of figures of speech.   *The Crede*, for example, starts with the friars' accusation that the Carmelites are japers and jugglers who tell miracle stories, especially about Mary to attract donation.   The author of *Jack Upland* starts his warning against

"Antichrist and his disciples," who "by colours of holines, / walking and deceiving Christs church / by many false figures " (3-8).   These authors in particular oppose the use of tales in sermons, like miracle stories and other exemplar, which are considered a rhetorical figure. Is it true, then, that these authors accord with Wycliffites and bring in a new trend of using plain language without many rhetorical figures among reformers?   There is no definitive answer, but it is at least clear that they are all writing tales.   The plowman in *The Plowman's Tale* explicitly says in the beginning that "I pray you that no man me reproche / Whyle that I am my tale telling" (51-52). .   Another problem is whether the discretion in using rhetorical figures means a rejection of rhetoric in general.   The answer is of course no.   Medieval rhetoric, with its inclination to emphasize figures of speech, still consider invention, the technique to come up with proper topics, as an important part of rhetoric.   Actually, the adoption of the debate form in *The Plowman's Tale* and *Jack Upland* indicates that the authors have the university rhetorical training in mind, although they definitely have adapted it to their use.   In this light, the word tale may not simply means stories.   It may not simply be a rhetorical figure, a narrative, in the study of rhetoric.   It may mean the presentation of the fact in a legal case, a topic in judicial rhetoric.

What topics, in addition to the fact, do the authors of these texts prefer? Medieval Christian rhetoricians have always emphasized some topics and ignored others. First, they tended to follow Quintilian and talk about the orators' or the audience's intention not as topics used in a debate but as the definition of a good orator/poet. Second, medieval Christian rhetoricians tended to skim through the topics concerning facts and focused more on those concerning definitions and interpretations of facts, expediency, and virtues and vices.

The authors of the plowman tradition are very predictably concerned with the preachers' intention and character and seemingly refuse to use the speaker's intention or character

simply as a topos that helps win the readers' good intention.   They do not start with a presentation of their good will.   However, toward the middle of *The Crede*, when the narrator "wente be the waie wepynge for sorowe," he sees "a sely man" (421), the preacher figure, the plowman appears as someone whose "hod was full of holes & his heer oute, / With his knopped schon clouted full thykke" (423-24).   Here sorrow and poverty are two very often used topics that draw the readers' good will in the Christian tradition.

In addition to the topics concerning the speakers' intention and character, there seem to be much more descriptions of the facts than interpretations of the facts.   These facts, however, are not really straight facts with specific time and place.   They are the preacher figures' interpretation of the situation.   They seem to be facts because the preacher figures simply present them as facts: it seems that they are not aware of other possible interpretations of the facts.

The plowman in *The Crede* starts his rebuke on the friars by telling the narrator to "beware of tho foles" (455), saying that "thei ben wild were-wolues that wiln the folk robben" (459).   There is no definition of folly, no discussion of the time, place, and occasion of the robbery, and above all, no explanation about why the friars are called fools and robbers. The preacher figure, the pelican, in *The Plowman's Tale*, depends even more on biblical images.   When "The Pelican began to preche / Both of mercy and of mekenese" (93-94), instead of a definition of meekness, the pelican, first explains how "The Evangely bereth witness / A lamb, he lykneth Christ over-all, / In tokening that he meekest was, / Sith pryde was out of heven fall" (97-100).   He argues that "so shulde every Christned be" (101), so should the priests "Beth lowlich and of low degree" (103), on the basis that priests should be like Christ, who is allegorically described as a lamb.

This use of biblical images and metaphors seem to mean that these authors base their argument on allegorical interpretation of the Bible.   The problem is that these authors have

defined good preachers as someone who works "With-outen gabbynge of glose as the godspelles telleth" (*The Crede*, 275).   They have argued that the church authorities have deceived simple people by their "false glose" (*Upland's Reply*, n 2) and "gildyn glose" (*Upland's Rejoinder*, n 7).   It seems authors who oppose so strongly to the glossing of the Bible will not gloss the Bible themselves, but how else can we understand "gloss" if it does not mean interpret the Bible allegorically?   One kind of gloss is certainly seen as dangerous by the author of *The Crede*: he says that "now the glose is so greit in gladding tales / That turneth vp two-folde vnteyned opon trewthe, that they bene cursed of Crist y can hem well proue" (515-17).   The gloss objected to here is the gloss about the story of how "Frauncis founded his folke fulliche on trewthe" (511), not the gloss of the Bible.   It is true, though, that biblical passages are used to conclude a passage with the allegorical interpretation implied in all three texts.   The biblical passages are seldom explained here as in sermons like *Northern Homily Cycle*, which usually start with biblical passages.

With a study of the language used in the three texts in contrast to the kind of language thought proper for preachers with a formal university education, we find that these authors do not really reject the study of rhetoric completely.   They do have doubts about scholastic training in logic, but they modify and make use of the list of the classical and medieval rhetorical topics concerning the speaker's intention and character.   They also prefer rhetorical figures sanctioned by the Bible.   They even use some rhetorical figures as the basis of their argument.   However, they do not follow steps for an interpretation of an action in classical rhetorical treatises and are reluctant to admit that they do interpret the Bible allegorically.   Instead of placing a biblical passage in the beginning for a definition and using that definition as the basis of argument, the preacher figures, the plowman, Jack Upland, and the pelican, in these texts become more assertive, presenting their accusations as fact, and use biblical images rather than abstract topics to organize their debate.   Thus, they become

the preachers that laypeople can understand and are attracted to, but they may not realize that they are a lot more indebted to the university training in rhetoric than they want to admit in terms of allegorical interpretation and adapt rhetoric to their use more than they realize in terms of choosing and organizing their topics