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“Gather up the reliques of thy race”: Paynim Remains in Faery-land

Placing Sansfoy’s death and the disappearance of his body alongside *The Faerie Queene*’s other defeated paynims—the Souldan and Pollente, Pyrochles and Cymochles—reveals that Spenser’s poem breaks from epic tradition in its treatment of the enemy dead. The corpse desecration and immoderate mourning habitually practiced by Spenser’s foreign characters makes visible early modern English anxieties about the limits placed on grief and the rites owed to the departed. In Book II, classical ideals of universal burial are gradually supplanted by treatment determined by racial and religious difference. Guyon’s evolving response to the question of burial discloses the racial stakes of paynim death in Books I and V. In its ambivalent handling of foreign mourners, however, the poem remains suspended between an emerging racialized logic of death and a human right to decent burial held in common.

*The Faerie Queene*’s first and most ostentatious paynim exits the poem as abruptly as he enters it.1 After cantering up to the Redcrosse Knight “all armde to point” and trading a few blows, Sansfoy quickly falls afoul of Redcrosse’s blade and “greet[s] his grave” a “grudging ghost.”2 His companion Duessa beats a speedy and characteristically tempting retreat (staying not to “waile his woefull funerall” [I.ii.20]), and Redcrosse runs hastily after the fair scarlet lady, swiping the fallen man’s shield as
he goes. The brisk pace of this scene discourages lingering, ushering the reader past the corpse and onward with Redcrosse to the next adventure. A returning reader, familiar with the poem’s labyrinthine dead-ends, could reasonably expect the defeated psychomachic paynim to fade, or retract into Redcrosse himself. A student of Spenser might recall certain influential commentaries on Faery-land: if its discontinuous landscape is “not actualized in advance” of the virtuous champion’s arrival, there is little guarantee that it will persist after he departs. The structure of The Faerie Queene is moreover famously and stubbornly heterogeneous; the rules of Book I will not necessarily hold within the allegory of Book II, and vice versa. This inconsistency extends to the poem’s treatment of the dead: sometimes corpses remain and sometimes they disappear; sometimes Spenser seems concerned with remains to the point of obsession and sometimes, he simply turns away. There is little reason to question the circumstances of Sansfoy’s death and certainly no reason to go looking for answers in the Books of Justice and Temperance, as this essay proposes to do. The apparent heterogeneity of Spenserian treatment of paynim remains resists interrogation, concealing the troubling design that emerges when these dead are gathered together.

The enemies of the Knight of Holinesse insist that he left Sansfoy to rot. When Sansloy meets Archimago in the shape of Redcrosse, he threatens to ritually sacrifice the seeming knight, claiming that his brother’s ghost is unable to “passen ouer Lethe Lake” unless provided with the necessary “mourning altars purged with enimies life” (I.iii.36). Sansloy’s threat suggests profane death, the kind of spiritual disquiet that rites of burial and sacrifice traditionally seek to avert. Duessa echoes this accusation when she sneaks into Sansjoy’s rooms on the eve of his duel with Redcrosse, informing the third brother that his opponent indeed brought Sansfoy to a “shamefull graue” (I.iv.47). This suggestion should give the reader pause. In classical epic tradition, failure to provide proper burial rites to the fallen is intolerable: it is Creon’s sin, the nadir of Achilles’s heroic career. Within The Faerie Queene, both Guyon and the Palmer advance universal funeral standards, the former appealing to pagan mores (“To good and bad . . . Religious reuerance doth burial teene” [II.i.59]), the latter to Christian morals (“To spoil the dead of weed / Is sacrilege” [II.viii.16]). Redcrosse may not have abused or stripped the corpse—the shield he took was by most standards rightfully won—but his actions were not particularly exemplary, either. Should the champion of holiness have done more for this foe? Yet the unease that these accusations provoke is swiftly dispelled. Sansloy is looking for an excuse for revenge, while Duessa is a habitual liar and agent provocateur,
keen to foment strife between rival suitors. The claims carry a hint of slander; it would be preposterous, after all, for allegations made by disreputable allegories of lawlessness and duplicity to be true.

Besides, corpse abuse is the province of the paynims themselves. Like Sansfoy, Book V’s Souldan resembles the proud Muslim tyrants of European fantasy: he rides out against Arthur in a hooked chariot, accoutered in rusty armor, blaspheming. The Souldan’s maltreatment of the dead is a framing condition of his downfall. As he prepares to meet the prince, we learn that “ere [his enemies] were halfe ded, / Their bodies to his beasts for prouender [he] did spred” (V.viii.28). Arthur’s hands are kept studiously clean of the “pagan hound[‘s]” execution; in lieu of drawing a weapon, he simply draws the veil from his mirrored shield, sending his opponent’s team into a fatal frenzy (V.viii.42, 37–38). The shield is explicitly directed at the horses—the beneficiaries of their master’s profane system—rather than at the Souldan himself (“comming full before his horses vew, / . . . it plain to them did shew” [V.viii.37; italics added]). Arthur is thus doubly insulated from the comeuppance he exacts, merely watching as his foe is “Torn all to rags, and rent with many a wound . . . scattred all about, and strow’d vpon the greene” (V.viii.42), in a grisly reflection of his offenses. Four savage partici- 

ples invite the reader to take pleasure in imagining this spectacle, a pleasure sanctioned by the transposition of culpability for the killing from virtuous Arthur onto his desecrative antagonist.

The Souldan’s horrifying practice toward the dead casts his widow Adicia’s forceful reaction to his own death as perverse. Having spotted the ad hoc monument Arthur constructs out of the Souldan’s armor, the grieving woman draws her knife “like an enraged cow” (the syntax is deliciously ambiguous here) and attempts to stab the whistleblowing damsel Samient before Artegall disarms her (V.viii.46–48). Adicia’s furious reaction to the sight of her late husband’s battered arms explicitly replaces traditional expressions of feminine mourning (“as women wont”) such as doleful fits, dismay, and frightened swooning (V.viii.45). The pagan queen turns away from the “en-
sample” of the monument toward darker exempla provided by Ino, Medea, and Agave (V.viii.47). Her grief is misguided and wild, diminished by her comparison to a mourning cow (a parodic revision of the traditional epic simile featuring a mother lion, tiger, or bear), by her violent attack on a younger woman, and by an association with a trifecta of mythic female kin killers that subtly suggests her complicity in the Bacchic death she presumes to mourn.

The proximity of these Spensierian figures—the immoderate mourner and the foreign desecrator—is no accident. In grafting two distinct traditions, the
poem compromises paynim grief by yoking mourning foreigners to acts of spoil and violation. The behavior of the Souldan toward the dead transforms his widow’s misery, however acutely felt, into hypocrisy. In The Faerie Queene, paynims seek to desecrate faery and Christian corpses yet grieve passionately for their own fallen. Paynims are presented as the source of the racially motivated distinctions the poem makes in its treatment of the dead, a displacement that disguises their actual origin in the English Protestant imagination. This ventriloquy, screened by the gothic excess of paynim abuses, effectively forecloses any legitimate protest over the treatment of paynim remains. The repugnant paynim denial of burial rights confirms these foreigners’ inhumanity and justifies, in turn, their exclusion from Christian standards of compassion.

Of the faery champions, Guyon alone demands broader charity for the dead before his sympathies are brought in line with the Palmer’s doctrine. His disciplining in moderation unfolds precisely as the former objects of his empathy become racially marked: the brothers Pyrochles and Cymochles emerge as paynim others in the very scene in which Guyon finally tempers his care for the dead. The faery knight’s expansive compassion must be replaced with a kind of selective disregard; his lessons in suppressing empathy take place in contrast to racially othered practices and at the expense of racially othered bodies. Saidiya Hartman and Joseph Roach have suggested that the true opposite of “honourable interment” may be the simple act of forgetting the dead and that the obliteration of memory can be as potent as the desecration of flesh. The temperance that The Faerie Queene advocates is not universal but differential, a method of determining not only how to grieve but for whom; the poem’s variable treatment of human remains demonstrates hierarchies of human value in the process of formation. The effect is not a general lesson about temperance in the face of death but a specific one: the bodies of paynims, particularly, are not worth grief or interment.

For the modern as for the early modern subject, the concept of common humanity emerges in part out of the certainty of common mortality, death as “an equall doome” (II.i.59). The guarantee of burial rights has been an essential tenet of the post–World War humanitarian laws championed by international advocacy bodies for nearly a century. Yet this definition of shared human value relies on assumptions of universality that can seem to scrub away individual identity, undermining the achievements of anti-racist and feminist work rooted in the recognition and affirmation of difference. Early modern scholars have demonstrated that both brutal racism and
complex cross-cultural exchange were realities of the premodern world, laboring to undo what Kim Hall once called the “critical effacement” of Renaissance race and racism. It would be a commensurate erasure, however, to consider the universal human the exclusive purview of modernity. This essay interrogates one early modern site where the essential value of human life and the consequences of human difference collide. In Spenser’s *Faerie Queene* death, burial, and mourning break down ideals of shared humanity. Universal expectations give way as processes of differentiation emerge out of death to determine the relative value of a life.

The Reformation threw customary attitudes toward mortality into turmoil across Europe, eliminating purgatory from the theological landscape and shoring up borders between the dead and the living, setting new and sometimes distressing limits on Protestant expressions of individual grief and communal rituals of commemoration. This cultural shift provoked newly anxious commentary on biblical passages like Luke 9:59–60, in which a follower of Christ asks leave to “goe and burie [his] father.” Jesus’s response to the man, “Let the dead burie their dead: but go thou, and preache the kingdome of God,” troubled Geneva translators, who attempted to intercept any possibility of Christ actually asking the man to abandon his dead father in order to preach. “That is, till he be dead and I have done my duty to him in burying him,” one 1560 marginal note hurriedly adds, resurrecting the father. Few editions seem comfortable with Jesus’s aphoristic response, electing to allegorize “the dead” as “those that are unprofitable to serve God” (1560) or those that “are strangers from the true life” (1599). Turning away from the spiritually dead is infinitely more palatable than neglecting to bury a literally deceased parent. In contrast to these Geneva editions, the heavily annotated 1582 Douay-Rheims is silent on this passage; the unease it provoked seems to have been largely limited to Protestant circles. Among Catholic readers, the idea of neglecting to tend the dead is apparently too unthinkable to warrant explicit intervention. For Protestant commentators, however, the passage may skirt uncomfortably close to Reformed teachings on the insignificance of mortal remains: prioritizing preaching over tending the dead is simply the rejection of popish rituals taken to a logical extreme.

As sixteenth-century English Protestant writers promoted moderation and temperance in the face of death, the burial practices of both Catholic Europe and of non-Christian, non-European cultures increasingly came under fire. “It is the manner of all pagans and infidels to be intemperate in their wailings of their dead,” Spenser’s Irenius opines in *A View*, describing the “despairful
outcries and immoderate wailings” that characterize Irish funerals. It would not be wrong, I think, to see this censure as emerging from the same anxieties demonstrated in the glossing of Luke, a chafing response to the demands of Protestant austerity. In one traveler’s account, the English clergyman William Biddulph describes the “skillful” cries of hired Bedouin mourners (who “call themselves Saracens”) at Ottoman funerals, while in another George Sandys is astonished that his Ottoman hosts even “mourn for them being dead, whom they murdered; honoring them with all dues of burial, and customary lamentations.” Not only do the laments of Bedouin women at Turkish and Moorish funerals resemble the wailings of the mourning Irishwomen of A View, but Spenser takes this custom as a sign that the wild Irish may be genetically descended from Egyptians, Spaniards, Moors, Africans, or Scythians. Protestant attitudes to death depended on continual differentiation from both spiritual and ethnic strangers, whom English commentators invariably characterize as caring overmuch for mortal remains.

Early modern historians of death have approached burial and mourning primarily in terms of theological difference; however, as scholars of race and religion have demonstrated, premodern theological categories were always mutually constituted. This fusion is nowhere more evident than in the figure of the “Moor,” “Turk,” “pagan,” or “Saracen,” a cluster of terms signifying variously subjects of the Ottoman Empire, certain Africans or Arabs, dark-skinned foreigners in general, or Muslims, again in general. Spenser’s paynims are compelling, in part, because they are always both/and: foreign infidel and domestic heretic; Muslim and Catholic; Spanish, Irish, and Ottoman; political allegory and literary allusion; religious and racial alien. The indeterminacy of these figures, additionally convoluted by their allegorical association with Catholic Ireland and Spain, is neither a defect of the poem nor an allegorical puzzle to be solved but reflective of the complex racial and religious politics of the day. In The Faerie Queene as in other early modern English writing, the standards of moderate funeral and temperate grief are both developed and displayed against a racialized backdrop of savage and exotic immoderacy. Nation, religion, lineage, blood, culture, physiognomy, and rank all converge at the grave.

In Book V, human remains exude the kind of permanence that Redcrosse’s duel with Sansfoy sidesteps: carcasses block doorways (V.x.37) and impaled heads grimace “many years . . . afterwards” (V.ii.19). Even the Souldan, who has been “scattred all about, and strow’d upon the greene” (V.viii.42), must be monumentalized. That the dead man leaves “no litle moniment” (a confusing litotic construction that already begins to reverse
the dispersal) presents an initial challenge for Arthur, but he soon settles for the ruler’s “brusd and broken” armor, which

... on a tree, before the Tyrants dore,
He cause[s] ... to be hung in all mens sight,
To be a moniment for euermore

(V.viii.44–45)18

Within the Book of Justice, corpses are educational opportunities: Arthur’s display is erected as an antiexemplary mirror for “mighty men,” to prompt reflection on the consequences of aspiring to tyranny. While the absence of the Souldan’s body might seem to complicate this endeavor, this circumstance actually favors the prince in several ways (V.viii.43). He is able to keep his distance from his enemy’s defilement, which is enacted first by the tyrant’s own horses, then by (presumably) wild predators and the elements. The impossibility of gathering the corpse for interment allows Arthur to evade the question of burial wholesale. Finally, the absent corpse leaves an interpretive void into which Arthur places his own monument. In the hands of a British knight, the donation of the fruits of violence to the public weal in the form of an instructive exhibit recasts the act of despoiling the dead—a quintessential paynim sin—not only as “moniment” but also as “spectacle” and “ensample” (V.viii.44). In monumentalizing the arms rather than the man, Arthur succeeds in fully displacing the act of de
cration onto the paynim foe.

Artegall is less successful. Like the Souldan, the “cursed cruel Sarazin” Pollente engages in the systematic spoil of his drowned enemies’ carcasses (V.ii.4), while his daughter Munera converts the revenues gained thereby into ownership of huge tracts of land. Pollente is an imitation of Ariosto’s Rodomonte, who constructs a large toll bridge to memorialize Issabella, the virtuous maid he accidentally beheaded in lieu of raping. Pollente inherits his predecessor’s parodic relation to honorable mourning but pays a far steeper price. After a lively aquatic combat, Artegall beheads his antagonist, leaving the matter of burial to the river Lee. Artegall retains the fallen man’s head, which he pitches on a pole before the castle as “sign of the conquerore” and “mirror to all mighty men” (V.ii.19). This procedure serves as model for Arthur’s similar actions a few cantos later, with a crucial difference: the inclusion of reappropriated human remains in the display creates eerie reflections between the knight and his enemies, opening the door to an unruly signifying potential that the Souldan’s physical dispersal precludes.
After staking Pollente’s severed head, Artegall and Talus enter the castle to seek Munera, who appears so pitiful that “Artegall him selfe her seeme-lesse plight did rew” (V.ii.25). Her supplication avails nothing with the ruthless automaton, however, who chops off her “suppliant hands” and groveling feet, nailing them up “that all might them behold” before throwing her maimed trunk, like her father’s, into the river to drown (V.ii.26). Talus’s in-exorable “Iustice” leaves Artegall free to pity Munera without any risk that pity might beget mercy. The division attempts to sanitize Artegall of the horror of Book V’s poetics of justice even as he oversees the conversion of the remains that elicited his pity—“suppliant” feet and hands—to didactic use.19

Artegall’s actions are more disturbing than those of Arthur, who executes his own foes (if at a distance) and makes his own monuments. The attempted separation of the knight of justice from justice’s means, far from displaying Artegall’s righteousness, reflects badly on this flawed champion of a virtue that Judith Anderson has called “inconclusive” in its very nature.20 Munera’s metallic extremities would practically invite monument making, were it not for their troubling suppliant position; as it stands, the exhibit seems to underscore the brutal consequences of surrender, rather than the just deserts of criminal exploitation. The Lee “wash[es] away [Munera’s] guilty blood” as its waters overwhelm the maimed woman (V.ii.27), recalling Pollente who likewise “stayned” the water with his “filthy bloud” (V.ii.19). This echo both reminds readers of the kinship between the two deceased and locates their shared “Sarazin” blood as a site of sin and contamination.21 The matter of Artegall’s first bloody exhibit is a paynim himself notorious for ill treatment of the dead, a practice that presumably authorizes subsequent mistreatment of Pollente’s corpse, but the knight unsettles his victory with the creation of fleshly monuments at least matching the savagery of his victims.

The characterization of paynims as desecrators of the dead extends beyond Book V. The same description that introduces Cymochles reclining among the unclad denizens of the Bower also establishes the knight’s habit of hanging the “conquered armes” of his enemies “for more defame / On gallow trees” and leaving their “carkases” for the vultures (II.v.26). We know what to expect, then, when the brothers happen on Guyon’s prone form following the Mammon episode. As Pyrochles and Cymochles approach the recumbent faery, the Palmer attempts to arrest their plunder of his weapons and armor with a pious appeal:

To spoile the dead of weed
Is sacrilege, and doth all sinnes exceed;
The Palmer has couched the first part of his plea in chivalric terms, asking the brothers to spare Guyon’s arms “For knighthoods loue,” accusing them of “fowle cowardize” and compromised honor if they dare to despoil the body (II.viii.16, 13). So far, so sensible. In this second part of the petition, he casts aside the secular code that the brothers appear to espouse in favor of a conspicuously Christian idiom, warning against “sacrilege” and “sinnes” and urging deference to the apparent corpse’s “relicks.” A reader might reasonably expect the Palmer to begin in his accustomed devout style before falling back on secular arguments with broader appeal; instead, he gradually abandons the secular in favor of a religious entrenchment that seems designed to alienate this menacing audience rather than to persuade. This is an odd rhetorical tack to take in a genuine campaign to soothe the ire of “Paynim brethren” and save Guyon’s life (II.viii.Arg). The careful shift of register tees up a contrast between a specifically Christian insistence on funerary rites and the heathenish horror of Cymochles’s acerbic suggestion that Guyon “be entombed in the rauen or the kight” (II.viii.16).

At this moment irascible Pyrochles and concupiscent Cymochles have only been paynims for seven stanzas. When the humoral youths first appear in II.v, the racial and religious markers that attend other paynims in the poem are absent. The reintroduction of the brothers as “Two Paynim knights, al armd as bright as skie” (II.viii.10) is closely modeled on Sansfoy’s entrance. Yet whereas Redcrosse’s opponent is outed as a “faithlesse Saraszin” (I.ii.12) both by a handful of telling descriptors—pride, wrothfulness, largeness of body, general puissance, a big shield reading “without faith” in French—and the narration itself, in the later episode it is the Palmer who makes the initial identification:

But leaue these relicks of his liuing might,  
To decke his herce, and trap his tomblacke steed  
(II.viii.16)\textsuperscript{22}
Foreby that idle strond, of him were told,
That he, which earst them combatted, was Guyon bold.
(I.viii.10)

Although it certainly remains possible that “Paynim” is a narrative intervention, this seems unlikely within the structure of the stanza: the first part, framed by the Palmer’s field of vision, provides a superficial description of the approaching figures (“Two Paynim knights”; “an aged Sire”; “a light-foote Page”), while the second half offers specific identifications of the brothers Archimago and Atin for the reader’s benefit. The Palmer can see that Pyrochles and Cymochles are paynims. What makes them visually distinct from the British and faery knights? Exotic foreign armor? Swarthiness? The Palmer’s glance classifies the brothers well before they begin to invoke Mahoune (II.viii.33) along with the fictional Muslim deity Termagaunt (II.viii.30), before they attract the usual cluster of telling adjectives (“the Pagan wroth” [II.viii.22], “the Sarazin” [II.viii.49], “the Paynim” [II.viii.50, 51], “the Pagan” [II.viii.52]) that pursue them to their deaths. Whether or not the evident conversion the brothers undergo for II.viii entails bodily change (i.e., from the suggestive “sandy lockes” that Pyrochles displays at II.v.14), it seems likely that whatever sign of difference enables the Palmer to quickly place the pair would be visually apparent to other onlookers as well.25

Attending to the racial overtones of this standoff alters our understanding of the exchange that follows. Arthur happens on the confrontation between the Palmer and the menacing, freshly paynim crew in the nick of time. The Palmer provides the prince with a brief summary of his grievance, but not before Arthur has already assured him that he “rew[s Guyon’s] pitteous plight” (II.viii.23). Unthinking commitment to the cause of an unconscious knight reflects Arthur’s virtuous pledge to fight “In the behalfe of wronged weake” (V.viii.30), but in this case the decision is likely also prompted by the “deadly hew” and “great magnanimity” of Guyon’s visage, available to the prince thanks to Cymochles’s haste in removing the faery knight’s helm (II.viii.23). Arthur engages in a similar gesture of unprompted visual approval when he first meets Artegall: the two knights nearly kill each other before putting up their beavers “each other to behold” (V.viii.12). A single admiring glance at “So faire a creature” distinguishes Arthur from a paynim and converts Artegall’s murderous intent into “intire affection” for the strange knight’s “heart and hew” (V.viii.12).26
Spenser’s poem thrives on mutable identity and pervasive misrecognition, frequently scrambling faery, British, and paynim paladins via ambiguities of syntax, morals, or other opacities produced in the course of armed conflict.27 The doffing of a helm often undoes these mix-ups with startling ease, producing scenes of spontaneous intimacy as identities are set straight. The identities produced in these moments never remain stable for long: the scenes poke gentle fun at the fantasy of sorting people out according to visible markers, a desire that the poem seems to delight in frustrating.28 These revelations can be provocatively vague, and it is never fully clear that recognition is facilitated by modern racial markers like skin color. Nevertheless, if the Palmer is able to identify Pyrochles and Cymochles as paynims in a single glance it is likely that the racial stakes of this conflict—paynim knights versus faery corpse—would be likewise apparent at a glance to the prince.

In both epic and romance, the victorious removal of a dead opponent’s beaver or helmet is frequently a site of tragic revelation, in which the champion discovers that the person he killed was a friend, brother, or lover.29 Before turning to consider the role of the deaths of Pyrochles and Cymochles in Guyon’s ethical education, it is worth briefly situating Spenser’s treatment of enemy death in the generic tradition that he both inherited and broke from in significant ways. Many readers of The Faerie Queene have taken Pyrochles, Cymochles, Pollente, the Souldan, and the Sans brothers as straightforward, if perhaps crudely drawn, homages to the antagonists of epic romance. Yet there is little precedent in epic for desecration of the dead functioning as a racial or cultural shibboleth; on the contrary, a basic respect for death rites often cuts across the boundary lines of warring groups. Mutual cease-fires to allow for entombment and funeral games are one of the major structural divisions of epic, whether in honor of Patroclus in the Iliad, Anchises in the Aeneid, or even the accidentally crushed infant Opheltes in Statius’s mocking Thebaid. When Hector challenges Ajax the Greater, he outlines the conditions of victory in explicit terms: if he loses, he cedes his gear to the Greek champion and entrusts his corpse to his friends; if he wins, he will strip Ajax’s armor and “hang it high . . . But not his body,” which he vows to return to the ships “so the long-haired Achaeans can give him full rites / and heap his barrow high.”30 In this mandate it is possible to see both the outlines of the ephemeral chivalric code that authorizes Arthur’s seizure of the Souldan’s armor but prohibits Cymochles and Pyrochles from despoiling Guyon, and an antecedent of the
principles underlying Article 4 of the 1929 Geneva Convention. While the threat of abandonment as carrion is invoked by both sides in the *Iliad* and skirmishes over the fallen point to attempted desecration, gods intervene on behalf of favored corpses on both sides. Achilles abuses Hector’s body but is famously compelled to return it to Priam; in the *Aeneid*, the invading Trojans and defending Latins declare a temporary truce to bury their dead. In Sophocles’s Theban cycle, Creon’s refusal to allow Antigone and her companions to complete burial rites brands him a tyrant; in Statius’s version of the conflict, the prohibition is sufficiently appalling for a neighboring state to intervene.

The epics of early modern Italy divided opposing armies along increasingly stark ethnic, religious, and national lines, but mutual concern for the unburied continued to traverse these emerging boundaries. Ariosto’s pagan foot soldiers Medoro and Cloridano hail from the fictional kingdom of Zumara; their gallant and disastrous sortie to retrieve the body of their fallen captain Dardinello for honorable burial earns Medoro the love of the poem’s elusive paragon Angelica and the respect of his Christian foe Zerbino. After Tasso’s Tancred kills the champion Argante, he demands the honorable interment of the man he has just referred to as a “fellow” (19.26): “Shall valorous Argante be / abandoned here, a prey to carrion crows?” (19.5–6). Tancred’s succinct praise of “valoroso Argante” echoes the poem’s elegy in the moment of Argante’s death, its lyric insistence that the “Superbi, formidabili e feroci” enemy warrior died as he had lived (19.26). Tancred’s honorable action here is testament to his Christian faith, but the association between respect for the dead and Christian virtue fails to fully cohere in Tasso’s poem: earlier, the enemy captain Solimano weeps as he views Franks “trampling down // [and] spoiling each still-unburied corpse” in the Muslim army, even while they conduct elaborate funeral rites for their own (10.26). While these poems are a far cry from modeling racial tolerance—*Gerusalemme liberata* ends, horrifically, with the mass killing of civilians in Jerusalem—they resist attributing habitual desecration or the defense of grave rites to any single ethnic or religious group. Achaeans, Trojans, Muslims, and Christians alike demonstrate concern for the dead and anxiously patrol violations of burial conventions in these poems.

In classical war narratives, a burial with “full rites” requires at least some gesture toward repatriation. In extensive catalogs, Homer lingers over the homelands of combatants, from the “Carians wild with barbarous tongues, / men who held Miletus, Phthires’ ridges thick with timber” (2.979–80) to “men of Phylace, Pyrasus banked in flowers . . . Antron along the shore
and Pteleos deep in meadows” (2.793–94). Not all Troy’s dead are as lucky as Zeus-born Sarpedon, who is returned to his native Lycia by Sleep and Death (16.667–84). The best the average Carian or Phylacean can hope for is makeshift wartime rites, a burial mound on a strange shore. The digressive Homeric catalogs are in fact crucial to dignifying the moment of death: where reclamation proves impossible, the Iliad often performs a kind of ritual poetic mourning or lyric repatriation, conjuring a dying man’s homeland in the instant his life is extinguished. The Italian epics are likewise attentive to lands of origin. Ariosto’s catalogs are studded with the names of far-flung locales both historical and imagined (e.g., Orlando furoso 14.10–28), while the men who fight before the walls of Tasso’s Jerusalem hail from “Alexandria’s abundant plain” (Liberation of Jerusalem 17.15) or “the isles round which Arabia’s salt wave curls” (17.23). Whereas the Iliad focuses on the names of men and their native landscapes, Tasso is also interested in how bodies connote communal origin: Godfrey leads the “Fair-skinned and blond” Netherlanders (1.43), the Irish “From dun / forests ... hair shaggy and uncurled” (1.44), and the “fierce and desperate race” of Swiss agrarians (1.63); the Caliph commands Arabs with “bodies short and thin, and long, black locks of hair, and swarthy skin” (17.21) alongside “i Negri” (17.23; “black-skinned churls,” a translation that preserves the tone of the nascent slur). These descriptions, interwoven with Tasso’s evocations of landscape, are a reminder of the role that somatic racial markers play in the business of identifying the war dead; the corpse must be, if not personally recognized, at the very least categorized before it can be returned to its countrymen for rites.

In making rituals of repatriation nearly impossible to complete, the first Protestant English epic breaks with its classical and Catholic forebears. The Faerie Queene is as claustrophobic as it is expansive; while reaching temporally and spatially outside of itself (“who ever heard of th’Indian Peru” [II.proem.2]), the poem is ultimately concerned with only two worlds, Faeryland and Britain, which are in fact one. After killing Sansfoy, Redcrosse asks Duessa to “tell, both who [she] be, and who that tooke [her] part” (I.i.21). A question that, in Virgil or Tasso, would be inevitably met with a lengthy account of the slain warrior’s lineage and country yields little: Duessa comes from the West, and the slain “faithlesse Sarazin” was, in fact, a Saracen. Pyrochles likewise hails from nowhere in particular; when Guyon asks the squire Atin “from whence” the knight derives (II.iv.41) he receives an account of his “immortal race” (II.iv.42), a genealogical answer rather than a geographical one.
These repeated dead ends suggest that Spenser’s paynims, like many of the poem’s figures, are geographically and temporally unmoored. This is characteristic of the poem—Coleridge lauds the “true imaginative absence of all particular space and time in The Faerie Queene”—but this creative avoidance of geography has particular consequences for scenes of paynim death. Unlike the faery and to some extent British knights, characters like Pyrochles and Cymochles are marked as “forreine” in Faery-land without being locals anywhere else. The soil on which they fight and die is not their own, but neither is any other. Longing for home and fear of dying abroad is visible in war writing of all kinds, from epic to romance to contemporary lyric poetry, and is frequently countered by an assurance that the soldier carries part of his native land within him: “some corner of a foreign field / That is forever England.” But even this imperialist consolation is not available to Spenser’s foreigners; no portion of Faery-land will Sansfoy forever be, since Sansfoy himself is native to nowhere. This rootlessness puts pressure on the foreign body, as physiology and genealogy are brought to stand in for geography and community, and raises problems for its remains. It lends an additional futility to Duessa’s and Sansloy’s protests; without the possibility of even symbolic repatriation, what exactly would the recovery and burial of Sansfoy’s body mean? “Putting the dead in their place” is a phrase favored by Reformation historians, but it is unclear what place, if any, is allotted to Spenser’s paynim dead.

The bodies of suicides are conventionally placed outside the Christian churchyard. Guyon pits himself against canon law when he demands decent burial for the recently deceased Amavia and Mordant in II.i. Standing over the bodies of the intemperate lovers, the faery knight “could vneath / From teares abstayne, for griefe his hart did grate” (II.i.56). Even though the one was embroiled in “fowle intemperaunce” (II.i.54) and the other committed suicide, Guyon insists on interring the passionate pair in “honor-able toombe,” arguing that “Religious reuerance doth burial teene” to “good and bad alike” (II.i.58–59). Neglecting burial, the knight reasons, would place Amavia’s and Mordant’s souls in dangerous straits come Judgment Day; in Sansloy’s terms, they might fail to “passen ouer Lethe Lake” (I.iii.36). The resemblance between Guyon’s eschatology and the paynim brother’s is telling. As Carol V. Kaske has observed, the knight’s equation of corpse exposure with the sin of self-slaughter—“so greet shame after death . . . As selfe to dyen bad, vnburied bad to beene”—is “outrageous in any terms but the classical.” And indeed, the rites that Guyon completes on the couple’s behalf are not Christian but broadly pagan in nature (cf. I.x.42).
That indiscriminate compassion only becomes possible on pagan terms belies any easy association between Christian praxis and universal care for the dead.

Like Arthur and Artegaill, Guyon defends the dignity of the deceased, but his championship of Amavia and Mordant’s cause rests on short-lived foundations. Over the course of Book II, Guyon learns to cast aside his heart’s grating grief and forget this momentary insistence on “Religious reuerance” as a universal injunction to bury the dead. In the first canto of Temperance, it is unsurprising that Guyon has not yet absorbed this lesson. The Palmer’s accessory role, however, is startling: the “Old syre” not only permits Guyon to “vouchsafe [Amavia] honorable toombe” but helps dig the grave and lay the pagan cypresses (II.i.57–60). While the Palmer will soon censure this kind of immoderate mourning in his companion, for a fleeting moment he too seems suspended between the stark demands of scriptural virtue and a more accommodating recognition of shared humanity.

During Guyon’s first confrontation with Pyrochles, the Palmer counters his charge’s sympathetic impulses with a resolve that compensates for any previous lapse. After Guyon has freed Occasion and Furor at the other knight’s request, Furor knocks Pyrochles down and begins “fowly batter[ing] his comely corse” (II.v.23). Guyon is horrified and, when Pyrochles cries out for aid, is “greatly moued at his playnt” (II.v.24), but the implacable Palmer admonishes him to “N[ot] let thy stout hart melt in pitty vayne” (II.v.24). Pyrochles has brought Furor on himself; if saved, he will simply repeat the same folly ad infinitum. Pyrochles is “His owne woes author” (II.v.1), since the “vncouth strife” (II.v.20) between him and Furor is simply the reiteration of his uncouth action at the beginning of the canto, when he struck Guyon unprovoked (II.v.3). Pity for the hotheaded knight, a figure of Guyon’s own “lesser partes” (II.v.16), would be mere self-interest. The Palmer’s prevention of Guyon from “yielding pitifull redresse” (II.v.24) is also an implicit rebuke of the knight’s recent courtesies, from his initial intervention in Furor’s assault on Phaon to his pity-fueled attempt to redress Amavia’s and Mordant’s shameful deaths.

In canto viii, Guyon’s moral education converges with Pyrochles’s and Cymochles’s new paynim identities as they spar with the Palmer over the faery’s prone form. Arthur’s intervention on the fair knight’s behalf soon puts the brothers on the defensive. Cymochles is “Resolu’d to put away . . . loathly blame, / Or dye with honour and desert of fame” (II.viii.44) in the combat, while Pyrochles insists that he “not ouercome doe[s] dye, / But in despight of life, for death doe[s] call” (II.viii.52). Each meets his end by provoking
the prince: Cymochles strikes a blow that renders Arthur “renfierst with wrath” (II.viii.45), while Pyrochles likewise makes the Briton sufficiently “wroth” to decapitate him (II.viii.52). Although the brothers never resemble doomed epic heroes like Argante more strongly than in this moment, there is no Tancred to praise their valor. Instead, details seem to estrange and diminish the pair: the Palmer’s references to sin and sacrilege, escalating uses of “Paynim” and “Saracen,” sudden invocations of fantastical Islamic gods, and even the charade of Guyon’s death serve to alienate the brothers, clarifying the stakes of the conflict.

In his reading of the Pyrochles and Cymochles episode, “Death in an Allegory,” Gordon Teskey claims that the extermination of these figures leads “not to a feeling of loss but rather to a feeling of clarity gained,” to a revelation of “the allegorical character’s meaning.” The “clarity gained” during this arc is that despoliation, excessive mourning, and pagan identity are co-morbid; the virtuous gentleman must learn to reject all three. “I would guess that Spenser himself, who was, after all, a Christian, was shocked by the death of Cymochles,” Teskey comments. But the poem’s vision of Christian temperance demands precisely the opposite of shock, a moderation of feeling in the wake of paynim death that approaches indifference. The Knight of Temperance awakens to a view of “those two Sarazins confounded late, / Whose carcases on ground were horribly prostrate” (II.viii.58); when he went to sleep, Pyrochles and Cymochles weren’t even Saracens yet. This is not the only thing that has changed. Arthur beheads Pyrochles and slices through Cymochles’s helmet, leaving their bodies “bleeding all the place” (II.viii.52). The corpses are left behind when the victorious trio departs: “After the Paynim brethren conquer’d were, / . . . they both yfere / Forth passed on their way in faire accord” (II.ix.2). As in the scene of Sansfoy’s death, the poem moves on without anyone, even Guyon, glancing back. This is not an intentionally punitive act, I think, but rather an omission striking for its very lack of intentionality, its absentmindedness. In other words, the “clarity gained” in the aftermath of Pyrochles’s and Cymochles’s demise is their insignificance, and the acceptance of this insignificance is the culmination of Guyon’s education in moderate grief. The knight has learned his lesson; he has simply forgotten the dead paynims. Like Sansfoy, the brothers will be food for the birds.

Or will they? Guyon, Arthur, and the Palmer are not the only characters present at the end of II.viii. Like Duessa in Book I, Archimago and Atin “fle[e] apace” following the defeat of the two champions (II.viii.56). In earlier encounters with Guyon, Atin has distinguished himself through his audacity
but also through loyalty to his fiery master Pyrochles: “His am I Atin, his in wrong and right” (II.iv.42), the servant claims, in an oblique echo of Guyon’s earlier resolution to bury “good and bad” alike. It is this unconditional loyalty that carries Atin to Cymochles, lolling among the ladies of the Bower, and rousts the indolent hero to ride to the aid of “Pyrochles deare” (II.v.38). Soon thereafter, Atin spots his master attempting to douse his invisibly flaming body via drowning. Pyrochles once again calls out for assistance, this time for “helpe to me last death to giue” (II.vi.45). Atin’s response is strikingly similar to Guyon’s reaction to Amavia and Mordant; just as the faery knight’s heart “grate[d]” from grief at the sight of the dead lovers (II.i.56), the squire is “grieued so sore, / That his deepe wounded hart in two did riue” (II.vi.45). Disregarding his own safety for the riving of his heart, Atin leaps into the river in defiance of Pyrochles’s orders.

The poem seems grudgingly to approve the squire’s heedless action, interpreting it not as the base impulse or infatuation of atê, but as “Loue” that “the dread of daunger doth despise” (II.vi.46). It is Atin who later attracts Archimago’s help, initiating the strangely gentle scene of the enchanter tending Pyrochles’s wounds with “balmes and herbes” (II.vi.51). The extravagant sympathy and care that Guyon’s antagonists insist on displaying for their own seems an insolent defiance of the Palmer’s temperate ideology. When Cymochles sees Arthur wound Pyrochles, he hurls himself at the prince “fraught with great griefe / And wrath” (II.viii.33); when the prince spears Cymochles in turn, his brother weeps furiously (II.viii.37). Their “excessive distress,” inscribed as pagan immoderacy, is a form of mutual memorialization in a poem that considers them worthy only of forgetting. Does Atin return to bury the brothers?

The squire and his companions are as synonymous with intemperance, faithlessness, and injustice as they are inextricable from Persia, Ireland, Turkey, or Spain. They are Guyon’s (or Arthur’s or Redcrosse’s) lesser humors, who just happen to be paynims. This stark psychomachia calls into question scholarly conventions that separate the moral from the historical, the didactic from the mimetic. Moral allegories, however imaginatively composed, are always constructed from the debris of cultural history; historical allegories always carry morals. This cross-pollination is nowhere more evident in The Faerie Queene than when considering the orientalized warriors cast as its humors and sins. Far from freeing the poem from the burden of historical representation, allegory tethers it to real lives and real fantasies.

Unlike the paynim deaths that follow, Sansfoy’s fatal skirmish with Redcrosse must be interpreted without the benefit of context. It is only by doubling
back to this episode that it becomes possible to see how patterns emerging from Books II and V alter what seems like one of the most straightforward encounters in *The Faerie Queene*. Sansfoy and his brothers are “proud Paynim[s]” (I.iii.35); according to William Kennedy’s *Spenser Encyclopedia* entry, “paynim” means “a Saracen emblematic of some wicked vice.”54 That an allegory of faithlessness in an early modern English poem would be played by a fierce Muslim caricature is so obvious that it practically ceases to signify, while the firm conflation of paynim identity and vice from the outset of the poem discourages any subsequent attempt to pull them apart.55 This recursive reasoning undergirds and precedes Spenser’s work. Saint Bernard, calling for the Second Crusade in 1146, declared that “Sane cum occidit malefactorem, non homicida, sed, ut ita dixerim, malicida” (A killer of Muslims [malefactors, literally] was only a destroyer of evil itself).56 This is psychomachia bleeding into life; it is the logic of race and of racism, wherein a person is no longer *homo* but simply the physical manifestation of a moral quality like *malum*. Racism, like allegory, inscribes moral value into flesh. The Book of Temperance deconstructs this relationship, giving its readers the tools to see that the conflation of the absence of virtue with religious and ethnic others is a process and a choice, not a given. It reminds us that even in a symbolic conflict as obvious as Sansfoy and Redcrosse’s combat, paynim identity signifies: Sansfoy’s race is not incidental but rather integral to his death and its aftermath.

Epic is no more divorced from the racial history of early modern England than the playhouses are. In a scholarly conversation that has been defined by drama, the affordances offered by poetic accounts of race have the potential to disrupt previously charted structures of embodied performance. With its slippery resistance to race-conscious interpretation, allegorical epic models some of the difficulties of talking about race in the modern moment. Poetry permits a deferral of embodiment; for example, the suggestive shift that Cymochles and Pyrochles undergo for canto viii would simply not be possible onstage. A dramatic rendering of their transformation would require a clothing change at the very least, a prayer, racial prosthetics, or even exchanged performers. The indeterminacy of the brothers’ paynim identification, possibly intersecting with embodiment but not bounded by it, is made possible by the poem’s form, which holds open the question of what racial identity means in this scene. There is much to learn about early modern race making from stage productions, but additional attention to poetry is crucial to understanding the period’s deferral of and resistance to racial disclosure.
Like Atin, Adicia doggedly persists in a display of grief that the poem proscribes; her wild mourning is immoderate, intemperate, and exotic. The viciousness of Adicia’s behavior is directly commensurate to the threat she presents to the moral allegory, a threat that must be contained both by Artegaal’s physical intervention and by the poem’s figurative language. Attacking Samient, Adicia is “enfelon’d or distraught,” her distress syntactically equated to criminality (V. viii. 48). Rituals of grief demand a body or, in its absence, personal effects to stand in for the absent loved one. With her husband’s corpse scattered and his armor reappropriated, Adicia is bereft of the traditional tools of mourning. Arthur’s confiscation of the Soulandan’s postmortem interpretation is the final indignity, leaving no space for her sorrow. The prince’s impunity depends, in part, on the assurance that he will control death’s lessons and monuments.

But a widow’s right to her grief carries its own powerful mandate. Adicia’s anguish haunts Arthur’s victory and so must be recast as madness, violence, ruthlessness, and ultimately inhumanity. As the canto draws to a close, the grieving woman shifts gradually from a “madding mother” into a “mad bytch” and finally into a tiger, in which guise she exits the poem (V. viii. 47, 49). Adicia metamorphoses into a Renaissance commonplace of pitilessness, a transformation that places her beyond the reach of sympathy and scrubs away the “dolours” that provoked her frantic fury in the first place (V. viii. 48). The final conversion cements Adicia’s association with Bacchus, stranger-god of the East, confirming her foreign character in the moment of her passage beyond the realm of the human. The scene ends with the prince’s victorious procession into the castle, but its most memorable image is that of the castle’s queen “breaking forth out at a posterne dore” to grieve alone in the “wyld wood” (V. viii. 48–49).

Adicia mourns a man who habitually dismembered his enemies and fed them to horses. The Faerie Queene undercuts paynim grief by tying it to paynim desecration, yet never fully succeeds in eliminating its affective force. It is unclear, as is so often the case in the poem, whether this is a failed lesson or whether failure is the lesson. Even as Spenser denounces his characters, he is also clearly fascinated by their mourning. These countercurrents are partially explained by the moral allegory: the paynims represent passions that English Protestants have themselves been forced to exorcise. In moral allegorical terms, wistfulness for the freedom to mourn fully is a form of self-interest, an expression of frustrated desire within a culture that increasingly demanded temperance even in the face of anguish. However, as Harry Berger has proposed, Spenser’s poem produces “conspicuous irrelevancies” beyond
the bounds of its ideological mandate. The allegory is never purely moral, and the historical Other is never fully outside of the equation. Even as it casts Pyrochles and Cymochles as callous scavengers, the poem cannot quite shake the sense articulated in *A View* and across English travel writing that the more urgent problem with these foreigners is their excessive care for one another. Spenser’s discomfiture with his poem’s immoderately wailing females seems plain, but the poem nevertheless grants a certain amount of space to their protests. Although vilified, grieving paynims are never really contained, remaining at large. It is much simpler to see Spenser as either the brutal landlord of Kilcolman or the sensitive, self-critical poet than it is to acknowledge that these personas are mutually dependent. To insist that he be wholly one or the other is to misunderstand a central aporia of modern racism, which always includes and makes devastating use of selective empathy alongside violent intolerance.

The matter of Sansfoy’s body appears once more, during Duessa’s visit to Night: “now the pray of fowles in field he lyes, / Nor wayld of friends, nor layd on groning beare” (*I.v.23*). In light of the deaths of Pollente, Munera, the Souldan, and Pyrochles/Cymochles, Sansfoy’s fate seems assured: this is not a poem that buries paynims. Duessa asks the goddess to “gather vp the reliques of [her] race” (*I.v.24*) and help bring wounded Sansjoy to the healer Aesculapius. Duessa, we learn, is related to the Sans brothers via Night, the “roote of *Duessaes* race” (*I.v.27*). As the closest female kin, it would have been Duessa and Night’s job to “wayl” (perhaps immoderately) at Sansfoy’s funeral, a task that Duessa abdicated following his death (*I.ii.20*). Her mission to the dark goddess is, at its root, a plea for assistance in funeral work.60 While Sansjoy is grievously injured, he remains whole—the reference to gathering seems to summon instead the dispersed corpse of Sansfoy, as well as the poem’s other scattered, mutilated, and beheaded paynims. The two women trace the footsteps of the hero Theseus, who “gather[ed] vp the relicks” of his “yrent,” “dismembered,” and “Scattered” son Hippolytus (*I.39, 38*). This myth will also be invoked during the Souldan’s death (*V.viii.43*); in this episode, the focus is not on the instant of dismemberment but on its aftermath. Theseus, early modern paragon of masculine order and civilization, makes an odd patron saint for these agents of female duplicity and sin. Here, he is the guilty, grieving parent gathering the sundered pieces of his child into some semblance of a whole; yet he is also the storied leader of Athens, who invades Creon’s Thebes to ensure the burial of Polyneices and the Argive dead. It is a tender and startling comparison in which, for a brief moment,
the individual right to bury kin and a more universal right that the poem has all but abandoned finally, fleetingly converge.
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NOTES

I would like to thank Dennis Britton, Kate Needham, Cathy Nicholson, Bill Oram, David Quint, Ayesha Ramachandran, and my two anonymous *Spenser Studies* readers for their comments and suggestions.

1. Among the array of possible terms for the poem’s foreign knights, I have preferred “paynim,” whimsical Spenserian orthography retained, over more common choices like “pagan,” “Saracen,” or “Muslim” in all but a few instances. This decision is an imperfect attempt to attend to Shokoofeh Rajabzadeh’s recent call to resist unthinkingly reproducing the racist etymology of “Saracen” in scholarship, while retaining the racial and religious ambiguity that is crucial to engaging fully with *The Faerie Queene*. See Rajabzadeh, “The Depoliticized Saracen and Muslim Erasure,” *Literature Compass* 16, nos. 9–10 (2019).


Heng has been an influential voice in the spirited medievalist premodern race conversation; for an overview, see Jonathan Hsy and Julie Orlemanski, “Race and Medieval Studies: A Partial Bibliography,” Postmedieval 8, no. 4 (2017): 500–531.

6. Hamilton provides a tortuous astronomical gloss for this epithet: “... summer’s scorching heat, which is marked by Sirius, the Dog Star, has now ended” (V.viii.42n). It is in fact a fairly common racial slur in early modern English romance and drama.


8. See Geneva Convention (1929), Article 4, fifth paragraph, which states that belligerents are responsible for ensuring that “the dead are honourably interred.” Article 17 of the 1949 Geneva Convention I adds that the interment must proceed “if possible according to the rites of the religion to which [the dead] belonged, that their graves are respected, grouped if possible according to the nationality of the deceased, properly maintained and marked so that they may always be found.” See “The Geneva Conventions and Their Commentaries,” International Committee of the Red Cross, https://www.icrc.org/en/war-and-law/treaties-customary-law/geneva-conventions. Critics point out that these conventions outlining the obligations of states to the dead are by and large limited to the context of armed conflict.


11. Koslofsky (Reformation of the Dead, 10) pushes the question of Protestant reform of death rites to its logical terminus: If the dead are fully beyond the help
of the living, why hold Protestant funerals at all? I am grateful to Catherine Nichol-son for pointing me to this scriptural passage.


16. Talya Meyers insists on reading Spenser’s paynims not only as surrogates for European Christian schism but also as “descendants of a long tradition of Muslim representations in epic literature” (“Saracens,” 38).


18. The image of the shield hung from a tree branch recalls not only Sansfoy’s shield hung as prize and provocation during the Redcrosse/Sansjoy duel (I.v.5) but also the Bower of Bliss, in which Verdant’s “warlike Armes . . . [a]re hong vpon a tree” (II.xii.80; a detail borrowed from the seductions of Rinaldo in Tasso’s Gerusalemme liberata and Ruggiero in Ariosto’s Orlando furioso). In each case, the hanging arms suggest the intimacy between sexual submission and physical dispersal in the knight’s abandonment of masculine pursuits and the victorious sorceress’s despoliation of his person.
19. The risks of royal pity becoming royal mercy presented a problem for many English onlookers during the 1580s, especially regarding the queen’s delay in executing her troublesome Scottish cousin. See Mary Villeponteaux, The Queen’s Mercy: Gender and Judgment in Representations of Elizabeth I (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).


21. I disagree here with Meyers, who asserts that in contrast to Pollente, Munera is “not described as a Saracen and displays no Saracen traits” (“Saracens,” 49). The description of her filthy blood seems to me unambiguous.

22. Both Koslofsky (Reformation of the Dead) and Neill (Issues of Death) observe that elaborate funerals flourished in spite of, or perhaps because of, Protestant insistence on the finality of death.

23. Commentators have observed that Pyrochles and Cymochles seem to be in the process of becoming paynims, in some sense, over the course of this canto. To some, the new terminology merely affirms that Guyon’s enemies are also God’s (W. B. C. Watkins, Shakespeare and Spenser [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1950], 189–90; see also Hamilton’s note to II.viii.10). To others, the abrupt doubling down on pagan identity is specifically elicited by crusading Arthur, who “hath to Paynim knights wrought great distresse, / And thousand Sar’zins fouly donne to dye” (II.viii.18) and breeds in fieldds by his very presence (Benedict Robinson, “The ‘Secret Faith’ of Spenser’s Saracens,” Spenser Studies 17 [2003]: 42). Arthur’s imminent arrival is still unlooked for, but the Palmer, as a consummate symbol of the Holy Land, may have a similar generative effect.


25. There is precedent in English romance for religious conversion entailing a change of somatic race. See The King of Tars, ed. John H. Chandler (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute, 2015); for the best critical account of this trope, see Dennis Britton, Becoming Christian: Race, Reformation, and Early Modern English Romance (New York: Fordham University Press, 2014).


27. Artegall’s entry into the castle of the Souldan and Adicia “clad in th’armour of a Pagan knight” (V.viii.26) has been particularly fertile for Spenserians interested in the imagined risks of “turning Turk” or other fantasies of racial conversion/degeneration in early modern England. This armor is taken from the dead body of
one of the unnamed knights pursuing Samient, who is despoiled by Artegall and Arthur and, presumably, left.

28. Spenser’s continual play with “inner” and “outer” practically invites comparison to influential contemporary allegories of racial identity such as Frantz Fanon’s and Homi Bhabha’s.

29. See, in no particular order, Sidney’s Amphialus/Parthenia duel, Malory’s “Tale of Balyn and Balan,” and Tasso’s Tancred/Clorinda combat. The recognition scene between Chrétien’s Yvain and Gawain provides a more welcome revelation.


31. Ibid., 22.38–45 for Priam wishing this fate on Achilles; see 16.667–84 for Sleep and Death removing the body of Sarpedon.

32. This episode draws not only on the famous night work scenes of *Iliad* 10 and *Aeneid* 9 but also on Statius’s Hopleus and Dymas, who die seeking the corpses of their leaders.


35. Repatriation is also an important component of biblical burial rites, of course; see, e.g., Heb. 11:22.

36. Alice Oswald emphasizes this essential structure in her contemporary poetic elegy for Homer’s war dead, *Memorial* (London: Faber, 2011).


38. The Letter to Raleigh collapses this distinction in bringing the poet’s project to “vayle in Type of Faery land / Elyzas blessed field, that Albion hight” into the open (Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, 722).
39. In Duessa’s visit to Night, the Sans brothers are furnished with an allegorical genealogy that does little to remedy this problem.
44. Hugh MacLachlan sees Pyrochles’s rejection of Arthur’s mercy as a sign of his stubborn resistance to a divine grace he is likewise free to accept (“The ‘carelesse heauens’: A Study of Revenge and Atonement in *The Faerie Queene*,” *Spenser Studies* 1 [1980]: 135–61); however, as Dennis Britton has convincingly argued, “Protestant understanding of Christian identity as a racial identity” constrains the paynim brothers and bars them from salvation (*Becoming Christian*, 32).
46. The Palmer warns Cymochles against disturbing Guyon’s dead carcass while disclosing privately to Arthur that the knight is a “sleeping ghost” (II.viii.26), presumably protecting the knight. Arthur briefly refers to Guyon as “dead seeming” in speaking to the brothers (II.viii.27) but soon falls in with the deception, calling him a “carkas” (II.viii.27) and “the dead” (II.viii.29).
48. Ibid., 69.
49. Prostration marks their death as religious submission, as in other British and faery victories. Arthur’s spear forces Pyrochles “groueling” to the ground (II.viii.32), just as Guyon made “stoup perforce vnto his knee, / And do vnwilling worship to the Saint” (II.v.11); the Knight of Holinesse likewise forces Sansjoy to “stoupe vpon his knee” (I.v.12). Their deaths may be required for Guyon’s revival: “By this Sir Guyon from his traunce awakt” (II.viii.53, italics added).
50. In Roach’s terms, they are “forgotten but not gone” (*Cities of the Dead*, 31).
51. Hamilton glosses “deare” in the line “Pyrrochles deare dismay” as an adverb modifying “dismay” (II.v.38). I read it as an endearment, as it is used elsewhere in the canto.

52. I disagree strongly with Teskey’s contention that Cymochles’s death fails to “occasion any sense of loss in his brother” (“Death in an Allegory,” 69).


55. Maleger, the poem’s walking corpse, is likewise ambiguously but unmistakably racialized: he leads an army “horrible of hew” (II.xi.13), shoots New World arrows “Such as the Indians in their quiers hide” (II.xi.21), and comports himself “as wonts the Tartar” (II.xi.26), following the View’s conflation of Irish, Indian, and Scythian.


57. The bitch is an allusion to Euripides’s Hecuba, who transforms as a consequence of the vengeance she has taken on her children’s murderers.

58. For a more extensive discussion of this structure, see Zatti, “Christian Uniformity, Pagan Multiplicity.”


60. I join Joseph Campana in taking Duessa’s discomfort with the circumstances of Sansfoy’s death and journey to Night at partial face value. See Campana, Pain of Reformation: Spenser, Vulnerability, and the Ethics of Masculinity (New York: Fordham University Press, 2012). Campana observes that “the burden of both suffering and sympathy devolves upon the bodies of idolaters whose moral status is at odds with their participation in an ethics rooted in pain and compassion” (34). Duessa is of course also entangled with the “woeful corse” of her dead fiancé (I.ii.24), a detail allegorized as the false church seeking Christ.