A brief introductory chapter (pp. 1-11) places in their historical context the heterogeneous writings belonging to the period chosen; a second one (pp. 11-22) defines the means available for a stylistic characterization, which are essentially the numerous corrections made by Machiavelli himself on his manuscripts (each correction obviously reflects a conscious, symptomatic stylistic choice). Two chapters (pp. 23-49) investigate the vocabulary, both in terms of the repertoire of words normally available in the environment of the young Machiavelli, and with regard to the latter's attitude toward latinisms, technical terminology, foreign words, etc., which at the time could be employed to increase and vary the resources of ordinary Tuscan.

The rest of the volume (eleven short chapters condensing a great deal of material) is an analysis of syntactic structures, particularly of the various sentence types (hypothetical, concessive, causal, etc.). It is by means of this decomposition that one can observe in depth the genetic process which was to produce the terse and skillful syntactic architecture characterizing the great prose of the *Prince* and the *Discourses*.

Chiappelli's approach, based necessarily on a thorough classification of the data, is constantly guided by the need to interpret «gli istituti grammaticali in quanto operano dentro la coscienza del Machiavelli e caratterizzano concretamente la sua personalità». The method employed is, on the whole, traditional and modern syntactic theories remain foreign to it. The results, however, show what every good linguist should know, namely that a multiplicity of approaches is possible, and that different methods can yield equally good fruit.

The book is in every regard eminently readable, and certainly provides – together with the earlier monograph by the same author – an exemplary means for a full understanding of the linguistic identity of Machiavelli both at the time of his skillful *negotia* and, further, of his later productive *otia*.

GIANRENZO P. CLIVIO, *University of Toronto*

Jacques Grévin. *César*. Edition critique avec Introduction et Notes par Ellen S. Ginsberg. Textes Littéraires Français, 179. Geneva: Droz, 1971. Pp. 185.

César is the second modern play to treat of the assassination of Julius Caesar, and the first to do so in the vernacular (Grévin's teacher, Marc-Antoine Muret, had composed, ca. 1544, *Julius Caesar*, a Neo-Latin tragedy). It is also one of the earliest classical tragedies written in French. The play was performed February 16, 1561 (n.s.), and, along with Grévin's comedies, was published in Paris almost a year later. Reprinted twice in the next half-century, like all French dramatic literature before Corneille, it was then consigned to several centuries of oblivion.

Professor Ginsberg's intention has clearly been to provide us with "everything we always wanted to know about *César*." The relatively short text (1103 lines) is accompanied by a judiciously selected *apparatus criticus* drawn from, *inter alia*, Grévin's own annotated and emended copy of the first edition. Copious notes give relevant source materials, and there is both glossary and bibliography. Grévin's important "Brief discours pour l'intelligence de ce theatre," in both its complete and truncated forms, precedes the text, and is itself pre-

ceded by succinct introductory chapters on the author's life, language and versification, editions, variants, etc. Longer chapters are entitled "Sujet et sources" and "Analyse." The former analyzes Grévin's debt to various models: dramatic (Seneca, Muret), historical (Plutarch, Suetonius), and poetic (Du Bellay's *Antiquitez de Rome*), and shows parallels between *César* and the works of contemporary dramatists, Jodelle, the La Taille brothers, and Robert Garnier. The "Analyse" is devoted to a wide-ranging structural and stylistic evaluation of the play.

Prof. Ginsberg's desire to be complete occasionally leads to over-explicitness, but to cite even one example would be mere quibbling. On another level, the reader may not be so convinced that a given passage in Muret or Du Bellay is actually a "source" for *César* (e.g. p. 116, n. 41, and p. 128, n. 73); but even when a direct influence seems to be excluded, resemblances of thought and expression none the less reveal unconscious borrowing and perhaps a certain conventionality (the author was only twenty-one).

Our only serious reservations are aroused by the "Analyse." Prof. Ginsberg submits the play to a very close and perceptive Neo-Aristotelian reading, and concludes part way through that, as a coherently constructed imitation of an action, the play is a failure. She then reverses her stand and admits (pp. 57-58) that Grévin is not imitating a tragic action but a tragic event – which is what he had already told us in his "Brief discours" (p. 89). It is not fair to apply to *César* a definition of tragic structure which the author did not – perhaps could not – have. At the same time the issues and criticisms raised by Prof. Ginsberg – and they go far beyond what I have been able to indicate here – do illustrate why *César* and its contemporaries failed (and generally still fail) to appeal to ages later than their own. Like Jodelle (whose *Cléopâtre captive* begins only *after* Antony's suicide), Grévin collapses time and space so drastically as to make a progressively developing action impossible. Tension is eliminated as a dramatic device because the antagonists meet only once and very briefly. Both Caesar and the conspirators are presented in a favourable light, and if the play closes on a note of vengeance, it is perhaps more for historical than dramatic reasons. The Renaissance dramatist was more concerned with oratory and rhetoric, with talking, than with doing. It is a vice from which the French theatre has never completely recovered.

Prof. Ginsberg has made *César* available and accessible to the modern reader, but for all that we are not likely to become devotees of French Renaissance tragedy. We may, however, become devotees of Ellen Ginsberg. Her grasp of the materials and the sensible intelligence of her methods have enabled us to comprehend the Renaissance mind as it attempts to assimilate ancient history, Latin literature, the theory and practice of both rhetoric and tragedy, and also contemporary modes of poetic and dramatic expression, then to move beyond assimilation to original creation in a new and still unfamiliar genre.

JOHN McCLELLAND, *University of Toronto*

Coburn Freer. *Music for a King*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972. Pp. v, 245. \$11.

Positing that George Herbert's poetic was shaped by tension between humility and pride in his character, Professor Freer examines Herbert's style in light of the bathos and elegance