comparing handwriting, ink, condition of pen, and detailed differences from the other versions—and by being admittedly willing to conjecture when unmistakable evidence is lacking. My own look at this manuscript in Cambridge generally supported Sprott's findings, although I cannot agree on a few points, such as that the ink of pasted leaf (b) is "clearly different" from that of (a) (p. 9).

With regard to the second version of the poem, the Bridgewater manuscript, Sprott proposes that, though not in Milton's (nor likely in Lawes') hand, it "probably indicates the form and contents of Milton's first fair copy" (p. 23). Sprott also tabulates the major variants and omissions in this manuscript, and examines the relationship between it and the two song manuscripts, transcripts of which (without the music) are given in an appendix.

The third early version, the 1637 edition, has Milton's authority, Sprott claims, in that he "had prepared the copy text, and indeed probably wrote it" (p. 31). Partly because this version cannot be simply derived from either of the other two, Sprott supports the claim of Shawcross for the existence of a third manuscript, not now extant. This began, Sprott believes, as a fair copy of the already somewhat revised Trinity manuscript, was revised by Lawes for the actual performance (and in this state served as a basis for the Bridgewater manuscript), and was then revised again by Milton and used as a copy for the 1637 edition. In an appendix, Sprott ventures a re-creation of the first form of this manuscript.

There can be few complaints about the book. One may feel that the point of the sentence beginning "It is not clear . . ." (p. 23) is too far from clear, and one may have trouble finding one's way to the end of the first sentence on page 8, but generally Sprott's style in dealing with a rather complex subject is readable. The only misprint I have found is the printing of 392 instead of 390 (a reference to a line number) on page 33. The edition has obviously been prepared and executed with great care.

One may regret a delay of about seven years between the completion and the publication of Sprott's work. On page 33, brief notice is taken of the Trinity manuscript restoration in 1969 and of later transcripts and facsimiles. Especially noteworthy among these is the Scholar Press facsimile of the entire Trinity College manuscript, which is sold in Britain for only £1 in the paper-covered sewn-bound edition, less than one-tenth the cost of Sprott's obviously different book. The price of the latter does seem high; one is thankful that subsidies have kept it from being even higher.

There can be no doubt that this book constitutes a valuable addition to Milton studies, and sheds light both on the masque and on how Milton worked. Most editions and facsimiles of these early versions are now out of print, and Sprott's book not only makes the texts available, but presents them for the first time together, on facing pages, in a form eminently suitable for detailed comparison.

DANIEL W. DOERKSEN, *University of New Brunswick*

Donald F. Bouchard. *Milton a structural reading*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1974. Pp. 180. \$11.75.

In his introduction Professor Bouchard declares his book "is divided into three sections: the first section deals with a selected group of works before *Paradise Lost* [*Comus*, *Lycidas*

and some prose works, mainly *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* and *Eikonoklastes*]; the second is exclusively an analysis of *Paradise Lost*; and the third deals with *Samson Agonistes* and with *Paradise Regained*" (p. 9). These works are linked by an assumption defined in these words, "Interpretation is a labyrinth directed to the disclosure of the double" (p. 9). The problem for the reader is to understand the nature of the inquiry, because the introductory chapter is at once bewildering, with phrases like "envision the masterword of interpretation" (p. 1), and illuminating, with a number of incisive comments like "What appears as a way out for Satan is, in fact, a deeper movement into the heart of the labyrinth; the way out is the way in" (p. 3). By the end of the brief introduction the reader is still, unfortunately, unclear as to what the purpose of the study really is, though this (recurrent) obscurity is not forced upon it by the nature of the poetry under analysis. On the other hand, when Professor Bouchard concentrates on critical analysis, rather than on the application of linguistic theory to subjective critical interpretation, he is an enlightening and even exciting critic.

Professor Bouchard never seems to make an exact statement of his critical intent, but there are two assertions which are central: first, "Interpretation discloses the opposition of inside and outside; not a gradual passage from the outside to the inside, but a radical disjunction" (p. 1); and secondly, "mystification is revelation of the 'other' at the centre of the labyrinth, where revelation discloses the self as mystified in its disclosure of the 'other'" (p. 3). If the author means that criticism both acknowledges the context of the work in its own time and its relevance to the "present" of the critic, this is a commonplace; if he means (as I am inclined to believe he does) that criticism is ultimately a purposeless inquiry in that it can never reveal the arcanum of truth in a work of art, then Professor Bouchard is arguing against the viability of his own labours.

Clearly this is not a book for the beginner in Milton: it assumes a range of familiarity with Miltonic critics and with authors and critics of the seventeenth century which, in the main, only scholars possess. This is not to say that it is deliberately esoteric—in fact Professor Bouchard has valuable comments to make on all the major poetry—but sometimes the analysis is vitiated by a tendency to forget the work in question for the sake of a theory. When speaking of *Paradise Lost*, he breaks off to argue, "If behind words there is *no-thing*, then the material support of language is nothing else but other words, as what lies behind words is nothing else but other words, and to see nature as an accumulation of words by successive generations is to be caught in the endless jar of interpretation" (p. 92). Comments of this kind obscure rather than illuminate Milton's poetry: they belong to a different context of philosophical and linguistic argument where there is no danger of devaluing the very critical function in which the book is engaged. In contrast, when he analyses *Comus*, a fusion of theory and critical insight is achieved: "all the details associated with the cult of the older god, Dionysus, are either represented as philosophical errors (the 'drear woods', for that matter, are his realm) or as illusion. Orpheus, on the other hand, represents light and truth and, as importantly, he is the basis upon which true community can be founded" (p. 24). There are some technical blemishes; in explanation of the arguable assertion, "The artist creates something beautiful and opposes it to the bestial and distorted (beauty and the beast) in the hope that his creation and example will lead to reformation" (p. 32), he gives as a reference this note: "This matter has been dealt with in detail by Professor Peter Ohlin in an unpublished essay, 'King Kong and the Mechanical Bride.'" This is

surely pointless, for the reader has no access to these arguments, which are not, therefore, justified by this reference.

I would recommend this study as an illuminating insight into Milton's poetic development, but I would also caution the reader against some of the linguistic theorizing which is incorporated into the critical explication but remains separate and distinct from it.

W. REAVLEY GAIR, *University of New Brunswick*

Rogelio Reyes Cano. *La Arcadia de Sannazaro en España*. Anales de la Universidad Hispalense. Serie filosofía y letras. Nº 16. Seville: Universidad de Sevilla, 1973. Pp. 178. 300 pesetas.

Professor Reyes Cano opens the discussion of his topic with several pages on Sannazaro's relations with Spaniards in Naples, his friends, the famous Italo-Catalan poet Cariteo (Gareth) and a certain Giovanni Pardo, his membership in Accademia Pontaniana under the sponsorship of King Alfonso, and his two *farsas* celebrating the conquest of Granada. There is no record that either the Spanish world or its culture left any impression on the Neapolitan nor is there any evidence of the influence of any of his writings on Spaniards during his lifetime. That came later with the triumph of the Italian school.

In his brief mention of Sannazaro's poetry in Spain our author cites the Francisco de Aldana and Francisco Herrera Maldonado translations of his *De partu virginis*. For information on Garcilaso, the initiator of the vogue of Sannazaro in his country, we are advised to consult the bibliography in Gallego Morell's *Garcilaso de la Vega y sus comentaristas* (Granada, 1966). On him, incidentally, a relevant contribution has very recently been made in Chapter V of Inés Azar's Ph.D. dissertation (John Hopkins University, 1974), *Discurso retórico y mundo pastoral en la égloga de Garcilaso*. Professor Reyes has made the interesting discovery that two of the Italian poems of Sannazaro were put to music by Alonso de Mudarra in his *Tres libros de música en cifra para vihuelas*, one of which is the famous sonnet on jealousy, "O gelosia . . ." For it he reproduces the Spanish translation by Rey de Artieda. Why, one wonders, has he not gone on to note that in my *Estudios sobre el petrarquismo en España* (Madrid, 1960), I cite nine more translations and imitations as well as imitations of a dozen other poems?

This chapter is followed by fifteen pages on "*La Arcadia y los libros pastoriles españoles*," which largely discusses the present status of studies on the influence of Sannazaro on the Spanish pastoral novel. Some stress is laid on the originality in form and content of its three major representatives, Montemayor's *Diana*, Cervantes' *Galatea* and Lope's *Arcadia*. It is the best part of the discussion. As for other writers, they are disposed of in much too cursory a manner to be of any value. In the course of his comment on Cervantes, Reyes Cano extends his remarks to the *Quijote* story of Marcela and Grisóstomo, which reveals a pastoralism that, though it may have been stimulated by Sannazaro, is distinctly Cervantes' own. We may recall that Farinelli in his "Cervantes e il suo mondo idillico" (*Quaderni ibero-americani*, nos. 5-6, c. 1948, pp. 113-5) had observed that in Cervantes the Arcadian ideal runs parallel with its heroic side and that "il mondo arcadico del Sannazaro e del Garcilaso non urta col mondo fantastico degli Amadís delle matte imprese cavalleresche, ma le penetra con soavità e