iconographical knowledge and an acute observation of incidental symmetries which seem convincing. The second of these two makes great play with one of Fowler's recent favorites: Mannerist sophistication and confusion of numerical patterns in a way, given the period, which may well accord with the facts. But the over-arching generalizations themselves concerning formal numerical organization depend on weak chains of demonstration.

There is a characteristic Fowlerian approach to these matters which entails astral and temporal significances and the counting of classes of entities within a poem, as well as the central numerological practice of counting the poem's divisions — lines and stanzas. On the other hand, for instance, there is a principally German school of verse numeracy which puristically insists on non-symbolic numerical symmetries, counting lines forward and backward in a poem. There are other schools, including ones for Classical scholars. Probably they cannot all be right. Certainly numerical structure in some Medieval and Renaissance poems has come as close to being demonstrated as anything is, ever, in literary studies, yet there remains an awkwardness. The majority of numerical analyses of individual poems are in my opinion without much substance as yet, and the total subject has not yet been systematized. We are not much closer to an imaginatively convincing picture of the role of numerical symbolism in older poetry than we were twenty years ago, although considerable energy has been expended on analysis. (I have examined this problem at somewhat greater length in a paper in a collection on numerological subjects and the like, edited by Caroline Eckhardt and shortly to be published by Bucknell University Press.)

A. KENT HIEATT, *The University of Western Ontario*

A.C. Hamilton. *Sir Philip Sidney: A Study of his Life and Works*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977. Pp. viii, 216. \$13.95.

This slim volume announces itself as a "Life and Works," but it is rather what the preface declares, a general survey of Sidney as writer. The subtitle is justified by a persistent and explicit attempt to relate the life to the work. The historian may thereby be warned about the extent to which the book is meant for him, but the literary student should also be put on his guard. While I am gratified to know that "there is no man apart from the legend, no face under the mask" (p. 8), I am disquieted by the statement that the writings "are always centrally concerned with the business of a man (and that man is Sidney)" (pp. 11-12). Professor Hamilton assures us that the relationship between Sidney's life and writings "is not direct: the writings do not reveal his actual life — whatever that may have been like" (p. 12), but he also says, quite astonishingly, I think, that to understand *Astrophel and Stella* 33 ("I might, unhappy word, O me, I might, / And then would not, or could not see my bliss"), "one must know that marriage had once been proposed between Sidney, when he was almost 22, and the 13-year-old Penelope Devereux" (p. 94). Why should the poem be tied down to these specific facts (would it not equally suit a story like that of *Eugene Onegin*?), and how is it incomprehensible without them?

Professor Hamilton's intention to find the genesis of Sidney's work in his life extends beyond the *Astrophel and Stella*. Sidney is said to have written the *Defense of Poesie* in about 1580 to 1582 because "evidently he had concluded that his future lay in writing rather than in politics" (p. 108); concerning the *Old Arcadia*, Professor Hamilton speculates that "Sidney chose to write such a story" because "he was exorcising his private nightmare" (p. 41) of parental disapproval. Within the *Old Arcadia* Philisides is to be so completely identified with the author that the character's account of how he came to fall in love, called "a most true event" (though prefacing the highly stylized dream vision of Diana and Venus later transferred to Amphialus), must be taken as biographical fact: "Since Philisides is Sidney, what he singles out as 'a most true event' could only be taken by his sister and her circle as a personal confession" (p. 36). Professor Hamilton's reading of the *Old Arcadia* and the *Defence* survives these (I believe) insupportable statements because he seems only to half-believe them himself, discussing the works independently of biographical insights and supplying the necessary caveats about convention and transmutation into art.

But the reading of *Astrophel and Stella* and the *Certain Sonnets* is further weakened by a determination to see them as forming a narrative, whether real or feigned does not matter here. Going beyond Neil Rudenstine's claims for the coherence of *Certain Sonnets*, Professor Hamilton converts this copybook assemblage into what is "in effect, the story of Philisides' love" (p. 75), and adds to an undeniable "end" and a putative beginning (see echoes of *CS* 32 in 1) a highly suspect "midpoint" as *CS* 17. An analogous, and to judge by the criticism, an apparently inevitable, three-part narrative structure is then assigned to *Astrophel and Stella*. Professor Hamilton's particular version seems logical enough; yet the conspicuous inability of critics to agree on where the divisions occur offers a counterweight to his argument. Justifying the assertion that *Astrophel and Stella* does tell a story (the quarrel is of course with C.S. Lewis), Professor Hamilton also reads the sonnets within each group as primarily governed by a narrative impulse, though what he means by "narrative" frequently reduces itself to scheme rather than story. The schemes he notes are probably there — as are other, sometimes more interesting ones — but to view the poems in this context is either to miss what is strongest in a given sonnet or to distort the natural emphasis of a poem for the sake of an ultimately unenlightening pattern (see the treatment, e.g., of *AS* 7-12). The lure of the easy pattern may also be responsible for Professor Hamilton's missing the more profoundly disconcerting issue of limits, definitions and value that *Astrophel* broaches in sonnet 35 (see p. 96).

But this review too has been distorting what one might call the natural emphasis of reader response, even of this reader's response, to Professor Hamilton's study. The book has many virtues, so that overall one wants not to quarrel but to praise. There seems to be a movement afoot to reassess Sidney's place in English Renaissance literature, and Professor Hamilton's substantial discussion of the entire *oeuvre* will contribute to Sidney's being granted the centrality he deserves. The Sidney he offers for consideration is, I think, the proper one as well: a man whose "writings remain profoundly secular despite his strongly religious nature" (p. 6), and whose "greatness as a writer rests finally on the 1590 *Arcadia*" (p. 172).

Professor Hamilton's discussion of both *Arcadias* is one of the strengths of his book. The decision to treat them separately within the chronology of Sidney's life, discussing the *Old Arcadia* very suggestively along with *Lady of May*, and the *New*

Arcadia after the poetry and the *Defence*, enables him to make interesting observations about both versions without deprecating either of them. He sees in both *Arcadias* an attempt to integrate pastoral and heroic, action and contemplation, as can be seen in the following description of the shape of the *Old Arcadia*, where Pyrocles and Musidorus are said to be "forced by love to turn the powers of the mind 'inward for thorough self-examination.' In disguise, they reveal their princely natures, their shame turns to glory, and by the end they may put off disguise to become themselves, now fulfilled by love" (p. 36). "Their shame turns to glory" refers to the princes' behavior in prison awaiting trial and to their desire to die for each other after Euarchus' judgment, both of which are interpreted as examples of "heroic virtue." Professor Hamilton conjectures that the *New Arcadia* was conceived because of some insight Sidney gained from writing the original Books IV and V; I would myself further narrow the genesis to the trial scene, but this may be because my *Arcadia* is a more "political" book than Professor Hamilton's. He argues that the *Arcadia* will show man himself "in the ethic and politic consideration," but even when political overtones are so peculiarly present as they are in the description of the hunt quoted at length (pp. 147-8, *NA* 60-61), Professor Hamilton allows comment to be exclusively in terms of delight: the passage is testimony that the *Arcadia* is full of the "daintiest wit" and of "sweet conceit."

NANCY LINDHEIM, *University of Toronto*

Amy M. Charles. *A Life of George Herbert*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1977. Pp. 242. \$15. *The Williams Manuscript of George Herbert's Poems*. A Facsimile Reproduction with an Introduction by Amy M. Charles. Delmar, N.Y.: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1977. Pp. xxxvi, fols. 119. \$30. Mario A. Di Cesare and Rigo Mignani, eds. *A Concordance to the Complete Writings of George Herbert*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1977. Pp. xiv, 1319. \$30. John R. Roberts. *George Herbert: An Annotated Bibliography of Modern Criticism, 1905-1974*. Columbia: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1978. Pp. xv, 280. \$23.

As John Roberts announces in the Preface to his bibliography, George Herbert is now recognized as "one of the chief poets of the seventeenth century," and during the past twenty-five years his art "has engaged some of the best minds of the scholarly world." The 1978 George Herbert Celebration in Dearborn, Michigan, attracted over seventy paper submissions, each assessed by four readers, and most considered to be of high quality. The current degree of interest in Herbert is a welcome phenomenon, but it is not easy to do justice to this writer's accomplishments. Good Herbert scholars will be grateful for all the real help they can get, and it is highly appropriate that books of the kind dealt with here should appear.

The *Life* by Amy Charles is a desirable attempt to take us beyond Walton, and begins (p. 6) with a clear acknowledgment of that first biographer's shortcomings. We may be assured that Amy Charles has aimed at objectivity and accuracy in a way that Walton did not. Her care in verifying dates and places is everywhere evident, and in the course of her investigations she has turned up some interesting details,