to Marvell's complex simplicities are no less densely crammed with information. Briefly, the author finds the same awareness of these dual pastoral traditions in Marvell's lyrics, both the Christian lyrics and the amorous pastorals, among the last of which he classifies the Mower poems. Here again, he reveals a refreshing tendency to ignore the esoteric excesses of some contemporary analyses of Marvell and banishes to some really frightening footnotes his disagreements with their positions, which he paraphrases or quotes pretty fairly. There are some excellent and lucid pages on "The Garden" as a synthesis of many diverse Renaissance attitudes (think of the highly localized, partisan and embattled explications one has read in favor of Neoplatonism, Hermeticism, etc. and one appreciates Cullen's sanity all the more); and his reading of the Mower poems in terms of pastoral comic tradition and love psychology provides a needed counterbalance to the barrage of Eden-analogues to which we have been treated in recent years.

A caveat: unfortunately, in these later chapters, a tendency in Cullen's style which has peeped up earlier (pp. 37-8) now comes alarmingly and fully to the fore: the doing of an argument to death through battering insistence and hammering repetition (see especially pp. 175-6 and 193-5). The intensity of the explication, frequently unrelieved by humor, wit or levity, reflects more and more the impersonal and relentless style currently cultivated by the literary journals; nothing is suggested, everything is asserted, propounded. A pity; in an otherwise Arcadian production, it is one of the few Mantuanesque blemishes, other minor ones being misprints on pages 13, 26, 60 and 112.

PETER V. MARINELLI, *University of Toronto*

Norman Rabkin, ed. *Reinterpretations of Elizabethan Drama: Selected Papers from the English Institute*. Columbia University Press, 1969. Pp. x, 205. \$6.

This volume of essays illustrates the unhappily increasing tendency of contemporary criticism of Elizabethan drama to examine not Elizabethan plays themselves but criticisms (including theatrical performances) of the plays. This criticism of criticism can at best reveal personal and social biases in previous interpretations of dramatic works, and alert us to the possible biases in our own interpretations; but too often it becomes either a mere recitation of others' critical views or a psychological or sociological study instead of a literary or dramatic one. Nevertheless, more and more of it appears: perhaps inevitably, as the backlog of literary criticism grows and begs to be comprehensively ordered (as in Schoenbaum's remarkable *Shakespeare's Lives*), and as the social sciences increasingly envelop the humanities.

Here we have both the good and the bad. Jonas Barish leads off with an informative, perceptive commentary on the critical perspectives of Archer, Artaud, and Brecht, and points out that every age interprets the literature of the past according to its own preoccupations. This begs the question: is Elizabethan drama therefore necessarily, as Barish believes, super-chameleon-like, or are we the chameleons, we citizens of the variable mid-twentieth century? Max Bluestone next overwhelms us with citation of some 80 studies of *Doctor Faustus*, in a heavy, 56-page demonstration of the play's ambiguity. The essay, though painstaking, and bibliographically useful, comes to life only when Bluestone approaches the drama itself

directly; and unfortunately he does so less frequently than his avowed intention of "locating" the play in stage spectacle would indicate. Robert Hapgood contributes sketchy notes, occasionally useful as performance data, on various Shakespeare productions. Daniel Seltzer, "Shakespeare's Texts and Modern Production," makes two important points: that all dramatic performances are necessarily limited, single interpretations of the works concerned, and that dramatic "paraphrases" such as the noted Peter Brook production of *King Lear* teach us largely not about the original plays but about the social and philosophical times of the productions. J. R. Brown is predictably persuasive on the merits of theatre-centred dramatic criticism.

Stephen Booth, unlike his fellow contributors, confronts a play directly: but, oblivious to his probable 1969 biases, offers an interpretation – of *Hamlet* as a coherent play of incoherence – which, though provocative and detailed, presupposes a very restrictive consciousness of genre, and of different value systems, on the part of the Elizabethan audience, and (in spite of plays like *The Old Wives Tale*) a linear, causal sequence in its expectations. He also ignores the presence of contradictory values in Elizabethan plays besides *Hamlet* (e.g., *Duchess of Malfi*, *Malcontent*, *A Mad World My Masters*).

The volume as a whole, especially Rabkin's introduction and Hapgood's article, is at times irritatingly trendy. In these days of frequent physical audience participation in theatrical productions, talk of the non-physically "included spectator" may seem new – but take away the jargon, and what do we have but what we have always had: the response of the audience, as a group and as individuals, to the dramatic work in question. As for Hapgood's subtitle, "The Polyvision Exhibition, Czechoslovakian Pavilion, Expo 67, Montreal": perhaps Hapgood has been having to spend too much time lately demonstrating to skeptical students the relevance of Elizabethan drama.

ANNE LANCASHIRE, *University of Toronto*

Robert Kimbrough. *Sir Philip Sidney*. New York: Twayne, 1971. Pp. 162. \$4.95.

This is the one hundred and fourteenth book in the Twayne English Authors Series, and the fact that this study has been preceded by works on such lesser Renaissance figures as Dekker, Daniel, and Drayton serves as a continuing indication that Sidney's writing has never received critical attention proportionate to its influence on English literature. (This is due in part, of course, to the commanding historical figure that Sidney the man has always presented.) It was not until 1961 that the first full-length study of the poetry appeared, not until 1962 that Ringer finally provided us with accurate texts of the poems. And, even though the last decade has gone a long way toward remedying this neglect, Kimbrough can still justly claim that his is the first work which attempts to provide a complete overview of Sidney: poetry, fiction, criticism, *and* life. Kimbrough insists that an understanding of the latter is important in dealing with Sidney's art, but fortunately this premise does not lead him back to the old clichés of the biographical critics. (In particular there are none of the speculations about an "underlying reality" that for so long diverted critical attention from the poetry of *Astrophel and Stella*.)

Instead one of the strongest features of this study lies in its discussion of "voice" in