

THE WORLD'S CLASSICS

SIR PHILIP
SIDNEY

THE OLD ARCADIA



THE WORLD'S CLASSICS



SIR PHILIP SIDNEY

*The Countess of Pembroke's
Arcadia
(The Old Arcadia)*



Edited with an Introduction by
KATHERINE DUNCAN-JONES

Oxford New York
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1985

Oxford University Press, Walton Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

London New York Toronto

Delhi Bombay Calcutta Madras Karachi

Kuala Lumpur Singapore Hong Kong Tokyo

Nairobi Dar es Salaam Cape Town

Melbourne Auckland

and associated companies in

Beirut Berlin Ibadan Mexico City Nicosia

Oxford is a trade mark of Oxford University Press

Introduction, Notes, Bibliography, and Chronology © Katherine Duncan-Jones 1985

Glossary and Index of First Lines © Oxford University Press 1973

First published as a World's Classics paperback 1985

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of Oxford University Press

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Sidney, Sir Philip

The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (the old Arcadia).—(The World's classics)

I. Title II. Duncan-Jones, Katherine

823'.3 [F] PR2342.A6

ISBN 0-19-281690-X

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Sidney, Philip, Sir, 1554-1586.

The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (the old Arcadia)

(The World's classics)

Bibliography: p.

Includes index.

I. Duncan-Jones, Katherine. II. Title.

PR2342.A5 1985 823'.3 84-91150

ISBN 0-19-281690-X

Printed in Great Britain by

Hazell Watson & Viney Limited,

Aylesbury, Bucks

INTRODUCTION

'OLD' is a somewhat misleading epithet for Sidney's five-book romance, for he was very young when he wrote it. If he began it soon after returning home from his diplomatic mission to Vienna in June 1577, as Edmund Molyneux tells us,¹ he was then not yet twenty-two. Three years later, in October 1580, he promised his brother Robert a copy of his 'toyfull book' by the following February²—apparently the only reference to the *Arcadia* in his letters. This would make him only twenty-five when he finished it. The Phillipps MS of the *Old Arcadia* refers to it as 'made in the year 1580', and it probably was indeed completed then. We do not distinguish Keats's two versions of *Hyperion* as 'Old' and 'New', for we recognize that both are the work of a very young poet, and both are unfinished. *Mutatis mutandis*, we should approach the two *Arcadias* in a similar way. Sidney wrote both versions while he was in his twenties, and both are unfinished, the second one radically so.

The term 'old', as applied to the *Arcadia*, derives from Fulke Greville's letter to Sidney's father-in-law and executor, Sir Francis Walsingham, written only a few weeks after Sidney's death:

Sir: This day one Ponsonby, a bookbinder in Paul's Churchyard, came to me, and told me that there was one in hand to print Sir Philip Sidney's old *Arcadia*, asking me if it were done with your honour's consent . . . Sir, I am loath to renew his memory unto you, but yet in this I might presume, for I have sent my lady your daughter at her request, a correction of that old one done 4 or 5 years since which he left in trust with me, whereof there is no more copies, and fitter to be printed than that first which is so common.³

'Old' here means only 'former' or 'previous'—synonymous with 'first' at the end of the sentence. From Greville's limited perspective in November 1586, we can understand his momentous decision to ensure that it was Sidney's revised but incomplete romance that reached print in 1590. We may, however, in many ways regret its consequence, which was that the 'old' version in its complete form

¹ Holinshed, *Chronicles* (1587), iii. 1554.

² Sidney, *Works*, ed. Feuillerat, iii. 132.

³ PRO, SP 12/195/33. Modernized version of quotation in Robertson, p. xl.

was lost until its rediscovery by Bertram Dobell in 1907.⁴ As far as Greville in 1586 was concerned, the 'old' version was already published, for there was an abundance of manuscript copies in the hands of the Sidney circle and their friends—it was 'so common'. The nine surviving manuscripts of the *Old Arcadia* probably represent dozens which were in circulation in the 1580s. It was natural that Greville should believe the 'corrected' version, with which he had been entrusted, to be superior. This version, the 'New' *Arcadia*, had the profound disadvantage of being only half written, breaking off in mid-sentence with a huge amount of unfinished business pending in its multiple plots. But its more ambitious, intricate and increasingly intellectual qualities no doubt appealed to Greville, quite apart from the value it had as the version personally entrusted to him.

From 1593 onwards the 'New' *Arcadia* was given a false completeness by being printed with Books 3–5 of the 'old' version, though it was admitted that this could provide only 'the conclusion, not the perfection of *Arcadia*'. Sidney's revised version contains many major characters and episodes which had not figured at all in the earlier work, and the pastoral intrigues of the 'old' version's Books 3–5 add inapposite complexities to the intricate and semi-tragic situations of the 'New'. In revising—or as Greville would have it, 'correcting'—his *Arcadia*, Sidney had moved perhaps irreversibly far from the limited pastoral arena, dealing in Book 3 with areas of thought and experience at which the earlier work had scarcely hinted. *Arcadia*, praised in the old version for its peacefulness, is here at war—a civil war with many notable casualties, such as the virtuous Argalus and Parthenia. Of the four young principals, three are in prison; the two princesses have been tortured; Musidorus, outside Cecropia's castle, is badly wounded, while inside, in the last chapter Sidney wrote, Pyrocles looks poised to recover his valour but not his dignity, since he is still disguised as a woman and taking rather unfair advantage from his disguise. By the revised Book 3 the amusing follies of mistaken or over-eager love have given place to a much darker picture of evil and moral blindness, in which the heroic energies of the two young princes are largely paralyzed. More seriously still, they have ceased to be a strong centre of narrative interest compared with the fascinatingly complex figure of Amphialus, who did not exist in the earlier version. The disjunction between the two versions, at the point where they

⁴ *The Athenaeum*, 7 September 1907.

were cobbled together, is enormous: it is as if the head and shoulders of a man were grafted on to the hind quarters of a horse.

Yet it was this literary centaur which was read for over three hundred years. We should remember this when we contemplate the *Arcadia's* progress from enormous popularity (throughout the seventeenth century) to neglect and even contempt from the later eighteenth century onwards. The critical history of the *Arcadia* is, until the middle of the twentieth century, the history of a long disjointed pair of fragments which Sidney himself can never have envisaged amalgamating, still less publishing. His *Old Arcadia*, as he makes clear in his dedicatory letter to his sister—'his chief safety shall be the not walking abroad'—was not intended for publication; his *New Arcadia* was unfinished, possibly unfinishable; least of all, one suspects, would he have liked to be judged by the 'composite *Arcadia*' which was fashioned from the two. No doubt from excellent motives, Greville did his beloved friend's long term fame considerable damage by preventing the publication of the 'old' *Arcadia*. C. S. Lewis made a characteristically firm case for the composite text as the one which must concern the literary historian: 'It alone is the book which lived; Shakespeare's book, Charles I's book, Milton's book, Lamb's book, our own book long before we heard of textual criticism.'⁵

But what kind of life did it really have? The honest literary historian must chronicle a steady decline in the *Arcadia's* popularity during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, a major cause of which must have been the composite text's length and discontinuity. Horace Walpole in 1768 called it 'a tedious, lamentable, pedantic, pastoral romance, which the patience of a young virgin in love cannot now wade through'.⁶ Hazlitt in 1820 called it 'one of the greatest monuments of the abuse of intellectual power upon record', and concluded an imaginative tirade against it by saying:

It no longer adorns the toilette or lies upon the pillow of Maids of Honour and Peeresses in their own right (the Pamelas and Philocleas of a later age), but remains upon the shelves of the libraries of the curious in long works and great names, a monument to shew that the author was one of the ablest men and worst writers of the age of Elizabeth.⁷

⁵ C. S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century* (1954), 333.

⁶ Horace Walpole, *A Catalogue of Royal and Noble Authors of England* (1758), i. 164.

⁷ William Hazlitt, *Lectures on the Age of Elizabeth*, in *Works*, ed. P. P. Howe, vi. 318–25.

Virginia Woolf echoed Hazlitt, calling the *Arcadia* 'one of those half-forgotten and deserted places' which we pause over before returning 'to its place on the bottom shelf';⁸ and T. S. Eliot echoed him more concisely and damningly in calling it 'a monument of dulness'.⁹ Historically and bibliographically, C. S. Lewis was right in saying that the composite *Arcadia* is the version that 'lived', for it went through fifteen editions during the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, until no gentleman's residence in England can have lacked a copy.¹⁰ But as the quotations will have shown, it did not 'live' in any very positive sense, having by this century acquired a very bad name for tedium and prolixity.

A return to Sidney's original version, which has been possible only since the appearance of Feuillerat's edition in 1926, enables us to discover and enjoy a work which is bursting with young life—whose delight is that, though in a sense 'old', it is fresh, innovatory, overflowing with colour and sensation, the vigorous product of 'a young head'. The *TLS* reviewer of Feuillerat's edition called it 'a young man's work', 'almost as light-hearted an affair as "Pickwick"'. Far from being 'old' in the sense that Virginia Woolf suggested—'one of those half-forgotten and deserted places where the grasses grow over fallen statues and the rain drips and the marble steps are green with moss'—the earlier *Arcadia* offers a bright, energetic, often jokey world, as brilliant in detail as a Hilliard miniature and as assured in structure as a Ben Jonson comedy.

Structure is one of the *Old Arcadia*'s most notable features. Writing within weeks of Sidney's death, Edmund Molyneux praised its 'orderlie disposition'.¹¹ It is composed of five 'Books or Acts', whose organization is far from random. Overall, these terms probably reflect Sidney's admiration for two previous works of English literature. 'Books' recalls the five books of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, the only English poem given unqualified praise by Sidney in his *Defence of Poetry*: 'Chaucer, undoubtedly, did excellently in his *Troilus and Criseyde*; of whom, truly, I know not whether to marvel more, either that he in that misty time could see so clearly, or that we in this clear age go so stumblingly after him.'¹²

⁸ Virginia Woolf, 'The Countess of Pembroke's *Arcadia*', in *The Common Reader* II (1932).

⁹ T. S. Eliot, 'Apology for the Countess of Pembroke' (1932).

¹⁰ For a full bibliography of these editions, see Bent Juel-Jensen, 'Some Uncollected Authors xxxiv: Sir Philip Sidney', *Book-Collector* xi (1962).

¹¹ Holinshed, *Chronicles* (1587), iii. 1554.

¹² Sidney, *Misc. Prose*, 112.

In its context, I believe this is a tribute to Chaucer's sense of form, for it comes immediately after a passage complaining of the shapeless, disordered character of recent English poetry. Contemporary poets, says Sidney, put their matter hectically into verse, 'never marshalling it into any assured rank, that almost the readers cannot tell where to find themselves'. Though Sidney's romance is comic and Chaucer's poem tragic, there are enough parallels to suggest that Sidney, like Spenser, took Chaucer as his English master. The most obvious one is the pivotal Book 3, which in both works culminates in a consummation of the love pursued with great difficulty in the previous two, and severely jeopardized in the two books following.

The other term, 'Acts', clearly refers to drama, and to Terentian five-act structure.¹³ Here the English model is more dubious. Among English dramas, the only one Sidney confessed to admiring was *Gorboduc*, the five-act Senecan tragedy by Sackville and Norton dealing with abdication and civil strife in Ancient Britain. It was acted before the Queen in 1561.¹⁴ Sidney praised it as 'full of stately speeches and well-sounding phrases, climbing to the height of Seneca his style'. The elaborate musical dumb shows dividing the acts are perhaps structurally equivalent to the Eclogues in the *Old Arcadia*, though of course very different in matter; thematically the pastorals may owe more to the intermezzi in Italian *commedia erudita*.¹⁵

Troilus, and to a lesser extent *Gorboduc*, may have provided the structural loom on which Sidney wove his narrative, but for his yarn he largely bypassed England in favour of Greece, Italy, France and Spain. Appropriately for a romance set in Ancient Greece, he turned to the late Greek romances for much of his setting and plot material. He drew fairly heavily on Heliodorus's *An Aethiopian History*, whose 'sugared invention of that picture of love' he classified as poetic in the *Defence*.¹⁶ He seems also to have made some use of Achilles Tatius's *Clitophon and Leucippe*, and Apuleius's Latin *Golden Ass*, which had been translated by Adlington in 1566.

Italian literature was his richest quarry. The enormously popular *Arcadia* of Jacopo Sannazaro (Naples, 1504, and many editions

¹³ Cf. T. W. Baldwin, *Shakespeare's Five-Act Structure* (Urbana, 1947); Robert W. Parker, 'Terentian Structure and Sidney's Original *Arcadia*', *ELR* ii (1972), 60-78.

¹⁴ Printed as *The Tragidie of Ferrex and Porrex* (1570/1).

¹⁵ Cf. Robertson, xxi.

¹⁶ *Misc. Prose*, 81. The *Aethiopica* was translated as *An Aethiopian History* by Thomas Underdowne, c.1577.

thereafter),¹⁷ which alternates twelve short prose descriptions with twelve verse eclogues, provided Sidney with his title, his setting, models for many of his verse forms, and even some specific lines—see for instance the note on pp. 65–6. Sannazaro gave more to Sidney's Eclogues than to his Books, and the sometimes wearisome eloquence of the melancholy gentleman shepherds is a contribution for which the modern reader may not always be grateful. A more varied Italian source was Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*, which offered models for descriptive details and narrative techniques, especially the interrupted narrative.¹⁸ A good example is the abrupt breaking off of Musidorus's encounter with a dozen violent peasants (p. 177), not resumed for over a hundred pages. The long romance *Amadis de Gaule*, originally Spanish but read by Sidney in the much more sophisticated French version, gave him many crucial plot details, such as the idea of falling in love with a lady's portrait and the Amazon disguise of one of the male lovers.¹⁹ Sidney commended the reading of *Amadis*, 'which God knoweth wanteth much of a perfect poesy', as a stimulus to 'courtesy, liberality, and especially courage';²⁰ but it must be confessed that the elements he drew from it for his own romance were not, by and large, such wholesome ones. Another source which he drew on in considerable detail was the prose romance *Diana* by the Spanish writer Jorge de Montemayor, and its continuation by Gil Polo.²¹ This pastoral romance with poems and songs offered Sidney many descriptive passages and points of detail, though it wholly lacks the vigour and forward thrust of his own narrative. *Diana* answers better than the *Old Arcadia* to Virginia Woolf's account of 'half-forgotten and deserted places', being somewhat static and limited in register. Its connection with the Sidney circle continued into the next decade, however, Bartholomew Yong's translation of it being dedicated to Lady Rich, Sidney's 'Stella'.

Classical sources, in a work of this period, may to some extent be taken as read. Sidney, however, was exceptionally well versed in

¹⁷ There is a translation of Sannazaro's *Arcadia* by Ralph Nash (Detroit, 1966).

¹⁸ Sir John Harington praised Sidney for this Ariostan technique in the 'Preface' to his translation of *Orlando Furioso*.

¹⁹ See John J. O'Connor, *Amadis de Gaule and its Influence on Elizabethan Literature* (New Brunswick, 1970).

²⁰ Sidney, *Misc. Prose*, 92.

²¹ These links are well discussed by Judith M. Kennedy in her edition of Yong's translation of *Diana* (Oxford, 1968).

classical authors, having, to adapt Ben Jonson's comment on Shakespeare, much Latin and quite a lot of Greek. He was at Shrewsbury School under the Calvinist headmaster Thomas Ashton. At Oxford he was part of a distinguished generation of undergraduates which included William Camden and Richard Hakluyt, and perhaps learned more from them than from his tutors. During his three years of Continental travel he moved in extremely varied humanist circles, acquiring as friend and mentor the Protestant statesman Hubert Languet, among many other learned friends and acquaintances. Letters of advice to his younger brother Robert and to his friend Edward Denny (both in 1580, the year he was completing the *Old Arcadia*) tell us a good deal about his energetic and wide-ranging approach to study. The classical authors whose presence can most frequently be detected in the *Old Arcadia* are Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, Virgil, Cicero and Ovid.

In the end, however, what is most remarkable about the *Old Arcadia* is not its distillation of sources, but its originality. Though sources and influences can be identified, as I have just very superficially done, Sidney's achievement as a whole cannot be paralleled. Certainly the few English works of fiction close to it in time come nowhere near it in brilliance. We might consider, for instance, Gascoigne's *Adventures of Master F.J.* (1573 and 1575), John Grange's *The Golden Aphroditis* (1577) and Lyly's *Euphues* (1578). All of these, even Gascoigne's amusing story of adultery in a country house, are works for which allowances and excuses must be made if they are offered to a modern reader: that is, they must be viewed as primitive works of prose fiction which the contemporary reader will need to approach in a somewhat antiquarian spirit. The *Old Arcadia*, I believe (though perhaps not its Eclogues), can be as vivid and immediate a source of pleasure to modern readers as Shakespeare's comedies still are to modern audiences.

'Audience' is a helpful term for readers of the *Old Arcadia*, for Sidney's narrative voice is quasi-dramatic. Though some sheets of the *Old Arcadia* were sent by Sidney to his sister 'as fast as they were done', the majority, he reminds her, were written in her presence, and may well have been read aloud by him then and there. Many of the remarks addressed to the coterie of 'fair ladies' suggest this, and we can almost picture the young Sidney sitting as entertainer among a cluster of lively young ladies. The narrator's relationship with his audience is comfortable and intimate: 'do not think, fair ladies, his thoughts had

such leisure as to run over so long a ditty' (p. 211). Still more intimate is his rapport with his central characters, especially Philoclea. One or two interjections suggest that he is to be seen as being half in love with her, rather as Chaucer's narrator is with Criseyde:

But alas, sweet Philoclea, how hath my pen forgotten thee, since to thy memory principally all this long matter is intended. Pardon the slackness to come to those woes which thou didst cause in others and feel in thyself. (p. 95)

At moments Arcadia is presented as a place far away and long ago, like Spenser's Faerie Land, a world where archetypes of all that is good and bad in contemporary England are to be found in primitive form; but more often, as here, the story is vividly immediate. The sun climbs over 'our horizon' (p. 280), and at least in the first three books, the narrator seems to be part of the story he tells. He has especially direct access to the thoughts and desires of his two princes, refining brilliantly on the Chaucerian technique of apparent sympathy. When Pyrocles disguises himself as an Amazon, the narrator seems to embark with gusto on the transformation, which entails a change of pronoun which even modern readers may find a little disquieting:

Thus did Pyrocles become Cleophila—which name for a time hereafter I will use, for I myself feel such compassion of his passion that I find even part of his fear lest his name should be uttered before fit time were for it; which you, fair ladies that vouchsafe to read this, I doubt not will account excusable. (p. 25)

This is the pantomime strategy of stimulating audience involvement through shared secrets, and its immediate effect is to create complicity with the two young princes and their amorous exploits. Yet it is undeniably deflating to Pyrocles, who is in any case only seventeen and apparently beardless, that he is referred to as 'she' until the fifth book. As the narrative proceeds there are proliferating suggestions that the princes, though lovable, are not quite so admirable as they at first appear. They may have been altruistic young giant-killers before they came to Arcadia, but their pretensions to heroism within the pastoral arena are often exceedingly suspect. When they kill a lion and a bear at the end of Book 1 the convenient provision of one beast per prince makes the encounter comic rather than threatening, little more than an amusing opportunity for them to show off to the girls. In Book 2 Pyrocles-Cleophila gives a splendid display of rhetoric after putting down the Arcadian uprising, but one which takes no account of the reality of the situation: the princes themselves are fostering 'the duke's

absented manner of living', which is a prime cause of civil discontent. They are also neglecting the claims made on them by the princess Erona, who will be burned at the stake if they do not come and rescue her within a year. Though they persuade themselves that they have plenty of time in hand before they need worry about her, the long unhappy complaint of Plangus in the Second Eclogues ensures that the reader, at least, does not forget about Erona's sufferings.

As lovers, the princes are by no means so chivalrous or considerate as their language may suggest. Only the timely arrival of 'a dozen clownish villains' prevents Musidorus from raping Pamela (p. 177), enabling him later to bask in her extremely idealized image of him while well knowing it to be false (pp. 269-70). His elopement with Pamela is possible only after he has carried out a succession of highly elaborate and rather cruel tricks on the peasant family Dametas, Miso and Mopsa. The courtship stratagems of Pyrocles are still more dubious, for they require him to injure the girl he loves, who is made ill with confusion, love-melancholy and neglect, and cause lifelong misery to her mother, the passionate and imaginative Gynecia. The scene in which he encourages Gynecia to believe that he returns her passion does not show him in a very favourable light:

With that (under a feigned rage tearing her clothes) [Gynecia] discovered some parts of her fair body, which, if Cleophila's heart had not been so fully possessed as there was no place left for any new guest, no doubt it would have yielded to that gallant assault. (p. 180)

C. S. Lewis expressed horror at passages such as these revealed by the discovery of the *Old Arcadia*, preferring to see the princes as ideal types of chivalry: 'We cannot suspend our disbelief in a Musidorus who commits indecent assaults; it is as if, in some re-discovered first draft of *Emma*, we were asked to accept a Mr Woodhouse who fought a duel with Frank Churchill.'²² Yet without these 'lapses', as Lewis calls them, the sombre fourth and fifth books lose much of their power. Sidney's complex presentation of the two princes, in which he plots the ever-widening discrepancies between their idealized pretensions and their actual self-interest, yet keeps them always the heroes, is one of the special strengths of the 'old' version. The more dignified and idealized treatment of them in the revised version is one of the changes that make the story uncompletable on the old lines. Such a passage as the debate between Pyrocles and Philoclea on

²² C. S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century* (1954), 332.

suicide in Book 4 is as fine on a semi-tragic level as anything in the later version, and its power is reinforced by the double narrative perspective which has given us so much sympathetic insight into Pyrocles's consciousness, while occasionally nudging us into a more detached consideration of his profound moral confusion. The progress of Pyrocles towards despair can be seen in the *Old Arcadia*, but not in the *New*, as being as inevitable as that of Spenser's Redcrosse. Young, blinded and foolish, Pyrocles has much to be ashamed of, and only the *Old* version makes this clear, preparing us for the sombre and frightening drama of the trial in Book 5.

Fulke Greville wrote of Sidney as being wise and grave beyond his years, 'his very play tending to enrich his mind'.²³ Though Greville prevented the publication of Sidney's youthful 'Old' *Arcadia*, it can now be seen to reflect this quality well. The *TLS* reviewer of Feuillerat's volume in 1926 found the *Old Arcadia* to be 'the work of an old young man, who, if he lose himself for a day in the fantastic invention, cannot fail to remember for an hour or two at least that he knows more than most men of his age and standing of the vicissitudes of life and the infirmities of majesty'. Like *The Importance of Being Earnest*, the original *Arcadia* is 'A Trivial Comedy for Serious People'.

²³ Fulke Greville, *Life of the Renowned Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. Nowell Smith (1907), 6.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

HELP and stimulus of various kinds have been given me by Mr R. E. Alton, Mr M. Brennan, Mr E. Christiansen, Professor John Gouws, Mr V. Houliston, Mr D. C. Kay, Mr J. F. Maule, Professor G. Warkentin, Mr A. N. Wilson and Mr H. R. Woudhuysen. My greatest debt is, of course, to Sidney's previous editors, Professor W. A. Ringler and Miss Jean Robertson, on whose mighty labours my small ones depend: *sic vos non vobis*.

NOTE ON THE TEXT

THE text of the *Old Arcadia* offered here is that of the Oxford edition by Jean Robertson (1973), with a few minor corrections and emendations. This edition, based on a careful collation of the ten surviving manuscript texts of the *Old Arcadia*, is modernized, differing in that respect from W. A. Ringler's edition of Sidney's *Poems* (1962). Miss Robertson's Glossary has been included, which will be found inclusive and exact, and the explanatory notes also draw heavily on the commentaries of Ringler and Robertson.

A discussion of quantitative and accentual verse, which occurs at the end of Book 1 in two of the *Old Arcadia* MSS, is included, from Robertson's text, as Appendix A. Appendix B, a *canzone* sung by Philisides for his absent Mira, probably written in 1577-80, was first printed in the 1593 edition of the *Arcadia*; the text here is that in *Selected Poems of Sir Philip Sidney* (Oxford, 1973).

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

EDITIONS: The *Old Arcadia* was first edited by Albert Feuillerat in 1926. This text, based on the very poor 'Clifford Manuscript', formed the fourth and last volume of his edition of Sidney's *Works* (reprinted, 1962). W. A. Ringler included the poems from the *Old Arcadia* in his edition of *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney* (Oxford, 1962), and about half of these were included, in modernized spelling, in K. Duncan-Jones's *Selected Poems of Sir Philip Sidney* (Oxford, 1973). Jean Robertson's edition of *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia)* (Oxford, 1973) is based on a collation of all the manuscripts, taking the St John's College, Cambridge, MS as copy-text. The present text is based on this excellent edition.

BIOGRAPHY: Fulke Greville's *Life of Sir Philip Sidney* (1652, new Oxford edition by John Gouws forthcoming) is an important document, but not a biography in the modern sense. Another interesting early 'biography' is *Nobilis*, an edifying life of Sidney written in Latin by Thomas Moffett c. 1592 (edited and translated by V. B. Heltzel and H. H. Hudson, California, 1940). The standard modern biography is still that of M. W. Wallace (Cambridge, 1915). Roger Howell's *Sir Philip Sidney: The Shepherd Knight* (1968) is sound, but based on a less thorough sifting of primary sources than Wallace's book. Important sources that have come to light subsequently are included in James M. Osborn's *Young Philip Sidney: 1572-1577* (Yale, 1972), which weaves together in narrative form a collection of sixty-five letters to Sidney from Continental humanists (now at Yale), together with much of Sidney's correspondence with Hubert Languet. This offers a detailed guide to Sidney's European contacts in the years immediately preceding the composition of the *Old Arcadia*. Far more inclusive, however, is John Buxton's *Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance* (corrected edition, 1964), which is a beautifully written study of Sidney, his circle, his patronage and the aftermath of his death. It is essential reading for anyone who wishes to understand Sidney's world. Two lively attempts to explode the 'Sidney myth' are Richard A. Lanham's 'Sidney: The Ornament of his Age' (*Southern Review*, Adelaide, 1967), and Alan Hager's 'The

Exemplary Mirage: Fabrication of Sir Philip Sidney's Biographical Image and the Sidney Reader' (*Journal of English Literary History* xlviii, 1981). The volume of essays under the editorship of J. van Dorsten and D. Baker-Smith to be published in 1986 to mark the quatercentenary of Sidney's death promises to make some further contributions to an understanding of Sidney's life and legend.

CRITICISM: Critical studies of the *Old Arcadia* which treat it separately from the revised version are not very numerous. It was enthusiastically reviewed in the *TLS* (28 October 1926; see Introduction). A short essay by Mario Praz, 'Sidney's Original *Arcadia*', gave preference to Sidney's style in the *Old* version, but slighted both (*London Mercury* xv, 1927). R. W. Zandvoort made a useful *Comparison between the two versions* (Amsterdam, 1929; reissued, New York 1969). K. O. Myrick's *Sir Philip Sidney as a Literary Craftsman* (Harvard, 1935) favoured the revised version, as being closer to epic. The second edition of his book (1965) includes a useful bibliography of Sidney studies by W. L. Godshalk. In his magisterial *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century* (1954) C. S. Lewis expressed a strong preference for the revised version (see Introduction). Richard A. Lanham in 'The *Old Arcadia*' (bound up with W. R. Davies, 'A Map of *Arcadia*', Yale Studies in English clviii, 1965) analysed the work's rhetoric skilfully, while treating it as almost wholly comic; conversely Franco Marengo, in *Arcadia Puritana* (Bari, 1968), saw it as a serious Calvinist allegory. An even narrower treatment of the *Old Arcadia* from a religious standpoint was Andrew D. Weiner's *Sir Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Protestantism* (Minnesota, 1978). The American journal *English Literary Renaissance* devoted a whole issue to Sidney in Winter 1972. This included articles dealing with the *Old Arcadia* by A. C. Hamilton, Robert W. Parker and Nancy Lindheim; it also has a useful bibliography of Sidney studies by W. L. Godshalk, updated by Godshalk in collaboration with A. J. Colainne in *ELR* (1978). A lucid and pleasing attempt to integrate both *Arcadias* into the context of Sidney's life and personality is Dorothy Connell's *Sir Philip Sidney: The Maker's Mind* (Oxford, 1977). Richard C. McCoy's *Rebellion in Arcadia* (1979) offers a detailed analysis of political ideas in Book 3 of the *Old Arcadia*.

Sidney's poetry has been the subject of many books and articles, but the majority have taken *Astrophel and Stella* as their main focus. Theodore Spencer's 'The Poetry of Sir Philip Sidney' (*Journal of*