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

of the English metrical translations of the Psalms. Although he does not argue biographically that Herbert saw any particular translations of the Psalms, Freer suggests speculatively that there was good reason for the Psalms to have been central to worship for a seventeenth-century parson. A good part of the book reviews the history of psalm styles from Wyatt to Wither and explores the thesis that style and form are one with meaning. Wyatt's "sinking" style, for instance, corresponds to the bathos in his picture of the relation between man and God. The Psalms in general provide a model for poetic failure as a metaphor for religious failure. Most important to enriching our understanding of Herbert, Freer contends, is the hiatus between the elegant variety of the Sidneyan psalms and the forced monotony of the Sternhold and Hopkins Old Version. The drab Common Meter of the Old Version, the ballad stanza's fourteeners padded for rhyme's sake, as a treasury of bad verse, became for Herbert a means to dramatize a theme characteristic of the Psalms, the knowledge that through weakness one finds strength. The purposeful artlessness of the poet implies that God is the source of all art. In a detailed study of Herbert's style which comprises the second half of the book, Freer observes that whereas Herbert employs the musical variety of the Sidneys in poetry which bespeaks spiritual irresolution and torn sympathies, he steps down to the crude, facile, and clumsy style of the Old Version when he is reconciled with God. Differentiating between "orchestral" and "tentative" form, Freer demonstrates that metrical structures, stanza forms, and patterns of sound and syntax can become a part of Herbert's poetic meaning or, on the other hand, they can suggest a meaning which is different from the ideas expressed.

Although Professor Freer offers some subtle insights into individual poems, his technique of concentrating on meter and form tends to become laboured and repetitious. Much of the material could be handled more succinctly because it has been covered by other scholars. Louis Martz, Hallett Smith, Lily B. Campbell, to name just a few, are too conspicuously present in a book which claims to offer a fresh approach. Surely the thesis that form has meaning is a critical commonplace which is hardly peculiar to the Psalms. Neither is the Common Meter restricted to the Psalms. Far more disturbing than its content is the methodology of the book. Because he has not consulted the numerous Renaissance commentaries on the Psalms, Freer is forced to deduce rather than to describe a critical theory for this imitative verse. At times, for instance when he defines the primary motive for metrical translation as a desire to make money, the methodological weakness results in an appalling blunder. By emphasizing the influence of the songs of other men, Freer loses sight of the Renaissance notion that the Psalms were the Word of God to be sung to God and not to men. The number of studies of Herbert's style, which inevitably put the "manner" before the "matter," now seems out of proportion with the devotional nature of both his poetry and the Psalms. To quote from one Renaissance translator of the Psalms, Henry King, "this *Dixi* was not so much the language of *Davids* Tongue, as of his Heart; *Corde pronunciare erat*." Perhaps it is somewhat unjust to discuss what Professor Freer did not say. Obviously Herbert spoke to men with words as well as to God with his heart. What Herbert scholarship needs now is a study of something more than style. Until this is done the significance of the metrical versions of the Psalter will remain somewhat tenuous: Freer can only maintain that the fusion of the elegant and bathetic styles "may be" the way Herbert adjusts his pride to his vision of God.

H. ASALS, *York University*