and Frère Jean, on the other hand, "hardly ever use hypotactic sentence structure (except to parody it)" (p. 167) – their primary function being comic.

The final chapter of Dr. Coleman's study (Chapter IX) deals with poetic prose. Rabelais's use of language, how he borrows, expands, imitates and creates words, and his use of repetition, enumerations and rhythms are all examined. The final section of this chapter for no apparent reason turns to deal with a definition of Pantagruelism. A rather puzzling diagram on page 227 is intended to illustrate the total picture of Rabelais' world vision, only partially expressed in his famous definition of Pantagruelism given in the Prologue to the Quart Livre ("c'est certaine gayeté d'esprit conficte en mespris des choses fortuites").

Basically, Dr. Coleman's study of Rabelais suffers from an attempt to view his work from the almost exclusive perspective of literary form. To deny the importance of literary form for Rabelais would be foolish, but it does not provide the only clue to understanding him, as Dr. Coleman's study might lead one to believe. A sense of the seriousness of some of Rabelais's legal, philosophical, religious and moral preoccupations is lost. In the same way as to ignore literary form is to diminish the significance of the work of Rabelais, to neglect such serious and profound considerations is to distort his intentions also. A true understanding of Rabelais's work can be achieved only when one respects the essentially non-unified, unfocussed dialectic nature of this most profound and complex of books.

In spite of these reservations concerning Dr. Coleman's study, there is much here that is a distinct contribution to our appreciation of Rabelais's work. Dr. Coleman's incisive textual analyses are a refreshing antidote to the works of scholars who focus almost exclusively on content and sources. Her study of the Olympian author and of the almost conspiratorial author/reader relationship, in which both author and reader enter into the game of creating fiction makes Rabelais come alive in a delightful manner. One may have some reservations about Dr. Coleman's book for only partially explaining Rabelais, but then the book which explains him totally has yet to be written.

ALISTAIR R. MACKAY, University of British Columbia


In Borges’s story of “Pierre Menard, Author of the Quixote,” the title character sets out at the beginning of this century to write Don Quixote just as Cervantes wrote it, but without direct reference to Cervantes’ text. He succeeds: “Cervantes’ text and Menard’s are verbally identical”; but, says the narrator, Menard’s text is “infinitely richer.” It is richer because its anachronistic style and substance constitute such an utter departure from the spirit of its age – the early twentieth century – whereas in the seventeenth century the same sequence of words was perfectly conventional. The tale argues Borges’ belief that context is crucial.
The two books under review also illustrate this point. For P.W.K. Stone, Gloucester's reply to Edgar's "Ripeness is all" - "And that's true too" (5.2.11) - displays a "vacuousness" that "descends ... to fatuity" (p. 69). Steven Urkowitz describes the same four words as "a speech of extraordinary simplicity and depth" (p. 44). Stone asserts that the Fool's prophecy at the end of 3.2 has "little poetic merit and absolutely no dramatic relevance" (p. 111), while Urkowitz finds it a "typically Shakespearean adaptation of folk-poetry patterns and folk-drama themes" (p. 44). Both these speeches appear only in the Folio text of King Lear. The reader need not have the sagacity of Lear's fool to guess which critic believes that the Folio's unique readings constitute Shakespeare's revision of the play, and which judges them the product of another hand.

It is not my intention to make light of these enterprises, both of which make important contributions to our understanding of King Lear; rather, I want to emphasize at the outset how easily the desire to find a comprehensive theory can colour the facts which are adduced to lend objective support to the theory. This seems particularly true of textual criticism, where the mass and the complexity of details requiring explanation - like a volatile liquid in need of a container to give it shape and stability - can generate considerable pressure towards theoretical conformity. The main weakness of Urkowitz's book and of Stone's is an overly exclusive allegiance to the kind of context within which each critic operates, and a consequent reluctance to recognize other contexts that would render their own theories less certain but more valid. Indeed, their approaches are such complementary opposites that someone should bring the two men together in the hope that they can cancel each other's limitations and combine their strengths.

Steven Urkowitz's great strength is a sensitive theatrical imagination. He possesses the rare ability to visualize the effects that a speech or a gesture would evoke in its full dramatic context, and to respond to the play as an instrument for arranging and sustaining such effects, rather than as a series of isolated words. This ability can be very valuable when considering textual variants. For instance, all modern editors of King Lear have rejected as erroneous a change in speech headings between the Quarto and the Folio versions of 1.1.188, from "Glow" to "Cor." The one-line speech which follows this heading occurs directly after Gloucester has ushered France and Burgundy onstage, and the question of who utters it might seem of little consequence; "Here's France and Burgundy, my noble Lord." Editors accept the Quarto's ascription of the speech to Gloucester because it is he who introduces the two princes. Thus delivered, the speech becomes a conventional verbal acknowledgment of their entrance. But Urkowitz has noticed that the Folio's stage direction for the entrance also differs from the Quarto's, adding a trumpet flourish, and he perceptively relates the two changes to each other: "What then is the purpose of the speech, now given to Cornwall, if attention has already been brought [by the flourish] to the arrival of France and Burgundy?" (p. 39). As Urkowitz visualizes the scene, all attention except Lear's shifts to the newcomers; his eyes and thoughts are still focused on Kent, whom he has just banished, and even after the trumpet sounds it takes a tactful reminder from Cornwall to bring the perturbed king back to the immediate scene: "Here's France and Burgundy, my noble Lord." Delivered in this situation, the Folio's line marks a tense and revealing moment in the play, where the same line in the Quarto was merely ceremonial. Future editors of King Lear will have to take into
account Urkowitz’ arguments in favour of this and other variants, and should be moved to broaden the grounds on which they made editorial decisions.

Urkowitz’s book argues a dual thesis: that by fusing Quarto and Folio readings, modern composite texts often distort or destroy the dramatic qualities of both early versions; and that the Folio version constitutes Shakespeare’s own revision of the Quarto version – itself, Urkowitz believes, printed from Shakespeare’s foul papers. The first half of the thesis is much more successfully maintained than the second, and is in my view the heart of the book’s contribution. Urkowitz never loses his awareness of drama as a movement in time, playing over the thoughts and emotions of an audience. By comprehending and conveying the patterns of action and characterization inherent in each of the early texts, he demonstrates how finely attuned the Quarto and Folio are to theatrical concerns, and he shows how these harmonies are often obscured by editorial attempts to patch together an Ur-text or to incorporate every word that might possibly be Shakespearean. As in the example given above, he analyzes scores of variants at work in their theatrical contexts, and so gives compelling reasons for editors to convey a fuller sense of the integrity of each version. Perhaps the most valuable act of recovery is his discussion of the confusing conversation between Kent and a Gentleman at 3.1. The Quarto version by itself turns out to show Kent smoothly winning the Gentleman’s confidence by first revealing plans for a French invasion and then establishing his own credit, as he sends the Gentleman off to Dover to report on Lear’s mistreatment. The Folio by itself shows a more nervous Kent almost dropping the ball: the Gentleman interrupts his circuitous confidences and starts to leave, and Kent must shift to a plainer style to win a hearing; gone, in this version, are the hints of a French invasion or a meeting at Dover, and the scene’s emphasis is on the hard-won act of communication that takes place. Urkowitz is able to demonstrate that each version has its own defensible logic and its own distinctive dramatic merit, in contrast to the muddle of actions and motives that characterizes the composite text.

At times, however, Urkowitz’s sense of “good theatre” runs away with his good sense. This is especially true of his defense of the Folio text; since he believes that the Folio comprises Shakespeare’s second thoughts on the play, he seems often to feel it necessary to argue the superiority of Folio over Quarto readings. The pantheon of dramatic values that emerges from his judgments at such moments is a rather narrow one, less characteristic of Shakespeare than of some of his late Jacobean and Caroline successors: broad thematic juxta-positions, harsh contrasts, speed, tension, surprise, simplicity. Shakespeare’s playwriting does indeed possess these attributes, but along with other qualities that Urkowitz is too quick to sacrifice. Thus, the moving dialogue between Cornwall’s servants after the blinding of Gloucester must go: “There is certainly more ‘meaning’ provided by the Quarto’s lines, but in a crucial sense for the audience there is less ‘experience,’ not as much ‘magic,’ fewer sensations of ‘drama’” (p. 52). Act 4, scene 3, where the Gentleman paints a soft, reverent picture of Cordelia (“There she shook/ The holy water from her heavenly eyes”) in preparation for her reappearance in the next scene, is also dismissed: “It is of poetic interest, but in the plot it is at best forgettable and at worst misleading. When the scene is cut the play improves” (p. 54). Likewise, the resonant moral confrontation offered by the forty-line Quarto dialogue between Albany and Goneril at 4.2 should also be trimmed to the Folio’s twelve lines: “Albany loses his ‘sentiments’ in the Folio, but the exchange crackles more energetically” (p. 52).
These defences reveal a difference in taste, and in the conception of Shakespeare's art, between Ukrowitz and myself, as well as between him and most of the play's editors; and although one may wonder whether he would support the Folio so unswervingly if he were not proposing it as Shakespeare's revision, one cannot claim that these preferences entail any serious misrepresentation of the play's effects. This is not the case with other readings. In Chapter 4, for instance, when Ukrowitz is concerned to establish the device of the "interrupted exit" as central to King Lear, he posits one such interruption in 1.1. During the last couplet of France's speech accepting Cordelia, "France seems to advance Cordelia so that she may make her own farewell speech to Lear and the court." But, writes Ukrowitz, Lear then "disrupts the formally patterned plan of Cordelia's exit" (p. 62) with his own exit speech. Now, Cordelia has just been disgraced and disinherited for upholding actions over words ("Love, and be silent"), a "bond" over a formally patterned plan. The behaviour that Ukrowitz contemplates for her would be grossly out of character; and yet, his preoccupation with immediate theatrical effects causes him here and elsewhere to lose sight of broader concerns.

Ukrowitz's most problematical readings occur in Chapter 5, "The Role of Albany in the Quarto and Folio," where distortions arise from his desire to find a purposive, consistent recasting of Albany's character in the Folio variants. A reliance on special pleading weakens the validity of his arguments throughout the chapter. To wit:

Thus, in the opening movements of the play, we find speeches added to Albany's part in the Folio, lines added in the Folio to the parts of characters addressing Albany, and details in the Folio added to speeches referring to Albany. These additions create for the audience an image of a man who might be sympathetic to Lear in other circumstances, but who is caught up by and succumbs to the stresses of conflicting loyalties and conflicting values. (p. 86)

Looking back over the evidence, one finds that fewer than three lines of "speeches" have been added to Albany's part, and that two of them are choric in nature: "Deare Sir forbeare," delivered in unison with Cornwall, and "Pray Sir be patient." The lines added "to the parts of characters addressing Albany" consist of Lear's proclamation to Albany and Cornwall "to publish/ Our daughters severall Dowers," and of Goneril's eight lines on Lear's retainers at 1.4.322. The "details" added to "speeches referring to Albany" are a detail (the words "of kindnesse") in a speech at 1.4.60.

But probably the most serious deficiency in Ukrowitz's focus on the Folio's Albany is its irrelevance to so much of what is important in King Lear, especially in Act 5. After Edgar has mortally wounded Edmund, and the Gentleman with the bloody knife has come and gone, and the bodies of Regan and Goneril are brought in, do Albany's actions really become "the center of attention" (p. 120)? When someone is sent ("Run, run! O run!") to save Cordelia from hanging, does it occur to any spectator that Albany's "The Gods defend her!" (from which Ukrowitz deletes the traditional exclamation point) "throws a harsh light ... on his own repeated failures to defend Cordelia and Lear" (p. 122)? And when Lear raves incoherently with the dead Cordelia in his arms, are we really supposed to respond to Albany's words ("He knows not what he says, and vain is it/ That we present us to him") as "an explanation for his failure to address any further words to Lear" (p. 122)? If the play has done its work, surely our minds are elsewhere. It is to me inconceivable that any spectator without blinkers on would pay so much attention to this character in this scene of this play.
Would Shakespeare himself have paid it and, more generally, does Urkowitz’s argument for the Folio as Shakespeare’s revision carry weight? On the basis of the evidence given in the book, it is clear that the Folio revisions were made by somebody with a working knowledge of the theatre. But was that person Shakespeare? One of the book’s weaknesses is that a great deal of relevant textual evidence is not advanced in it; and the weight of this evidence lies heavily against Urkowitz’s theory. First of all, that theory depends on the presupposition that the Quarto is a copy of Shakespeare’s soul papers. The justification that Urkowitz gives for this view (pp. 130–140) is poor, depending on argument by analogy and ignoring many of the facts that have made every modern textual authority reject it. The unmistakable aural errors, the amount of hypermetrical “gag,” the severely defective stage directions (whoever wrote them seems to have had trouble identifying some of the characters unless they were named in the text), all point towards some kind of aural transcription rather than an authorial manuscript. Apart from this initial presupposition, the hard evidence against the Folio as Shakespeare’s revision is I think less strong, but again the theory is open to question on the basis of details not considered by Urkowitz. Since it is generally agreed that the copy text for the Folio was an altered copy of the Quarto, one must first ask why Shakespeare’s corrections did not prevail over so much of the Quarto’s misreading, mislineation (including the setting of verse as prose), mispunctuation and misprinting. If he made his changes for a promptbook which “embodied all of Shakespeare’s own revisions,” and with which the Quarto version “was carefully brought into agreement” (p. 129), why did so many of the Quarto’s errors survive into the Folio? Moreover, why would Shakespeare have bungled a number of corrections which he did attempt, leading to further mislineations or to substitutions which seem the product of uninformed guesswork? In the chapter (6) devoted to evidence of a purely bibliographical nature, Urkowitz argues at length for “the plausibility of Shakespeare as an artist who is capable of revising his own work” (p. 130), but he needs more to consider the specific textual details of this work if he wants to win acceptance for his theory. Case not proven.

Enter P.W.K. Stone, whose book is nothing if not specific. The Textual History of “King Lear” is a formidable study of the origin, nature, and relationships of the play’s texts. In form it resembles a great cathedral: a long nave of Quarto considerations in the opening chapters leads into a broad choir of shorter chapters on the Folio, while over a hundred pages of small-print appendices serve as flying buttresses for the main structure of argument. Though erected for true believers (“A book of this kind must necessarily address itself to the specialist”), the work lends itself to approaches by tourists: the existing scholarship on the text is summarized clearly and objectively, the author’s theory is set out with a minimum of esoteric terminology, and all the basic information needed to evaluate the theory is made available.

Stone’s argument runs as follows: the First Quarto – the Second being a reprint of no textual authority – derives from an unauthorized transcription made during a performance. The Quarto text was later corrected against the transcription and was extensively revised to furnish a new promptbook for the King’s Men, after their original promptbook was lost (perhaps in the Globe fire of 1613). This promptbook was commissioned from a competent theatrical writer – not Shakespeare, who was at the time no longer writing plays – and it served as primary copy when the Folio text was prepared in 1623.
Many objections might be raised against this theory, and many have been raised against those of its hypotheses which are not new; but on the whole Stone deals persuasively with the opposition. The idea that the Quarto derives from a theatrical report was in fact widely held until 1949, when G.I. Duthie proved that none of the known Elizabethan systems of shorthand was capable of providing a copy for the Quarto text. Stone demonstrates that it would be possible for a reporter to produce something like the Quarto copy in longhand during at most three visits to the theatre. (We know that texts of some other Elizabethan plays were actually obtained by the efforts of theatrical reporters, implausible as it may seem.) This hypothesis goes farther than anybody else’s in accounting for the kinds of errors and mislineations found in the Quarto, as Stone shows by examining scores of detailed examples. Some of the most convincing support for the reporter theory comes from Stone’s discussion of Quarto stage directions, which lack the theatrical sophistication that one would except in a playwright’s foul papers or in an actor’s memorial reconstruction. For instance:

It is well known that in Elizabethan theatrical parlance the stage was “out” or “without” and the tiring-hourse “in” or “within”, though a spectator would most naturally take the opposite view. In Q Goneril’s and Regan’s bodies are brought in (V.iii.238), in F they are brought out (231), as are the stocks at II.ii.144. (p. 111)

Stone’s assertion that the Folio text is derived from both Quarto and promptbook is similarly well documented and persuasive, but his repudiation of a host of Folio variants (un-Shakespearean, according to his theory) is as extreme and questionable as Steven Urkowitz’s defense of other such variants. In dealing with these variants, Stone sometimes betrays a lack of the theatrical imagination that animates Urkowitz’s study; and it is this lack which prevents him from recognizing their dramatic suitability. For example, at 2.2.158 a line that the Quarto attributes to Regan is given to Cornwall in the Folio: “Come my Lord, away.” Stone believes it unlikely that Cornwall would say this to Gloucester here, since Gloucester in fact remains onstage after the exit of Cornwall and Regan. But this occurrence in fact provides support for the Folio reading: by ignoring Cornwall’s admonition and staying with Kent, Gloucester proves that the sympathy he has just voiced for Kent is more than mere words. The gesture creates a stage image of an important shift in allegiance, and dramatizes the very defiance of Cornwall that will lose Gloucester his eyes in 3.7.

The Folio reading at 2.4.191. also demands serious attention when viewed in its theatrical context. Where the Quarto has Goneril enter and ask “Who struck my servant?” the Folio changes the speech slightly and gives it to Lear: “Who stockt my servant?” Stone admits that the Folio version is “very plausible” (p. 219) since Lear asks basically the same question shortly before and after, but rejects it as an “unnecessary alteration” because Lear has probably just struck Oswald. While it may be logically “unnecessary,” there are strong dramatic reasons for the alteration. In both versions the rest of the speech runs: “Regan, I have good hope/ Thou didst not know on’t.” Goneril has no cause to doubt Regan’s loyalty here, but Lear unfortunately has: immediately before Goneril’s entrance he has pronounced a terrible curse on her, looking to his other daughter for consolation (“No, Regan, thou shalt never have my curse”). Now Regan’s coldness makes him remember that Kent was in the stocks when he arrived, and the possibility of betrayal from his second daughter dawns on
him. The three variations on his question sound out like drumbeats growing louder and more plangent: "Who put my man i' th' stocks?" he asks, but is temporarily put off by the trumpet heralding Goneril's entrance. Then - in the Folio - he asks again, hardly daring to implicate Regan. Finally, after the sisters have given dramatic proof of their natures and their relationship by taking each other's hands, the same question conveys Lear's utter desperation: "How came my man i' th' stocks?" The Folio reading may thus be seen to provide the central notes in a finely orchestrated dramatic development.

The limitation in Stone's perspective - the narrowness of his context - seems to me to weaken his arguments but not to invalidate them. For instance, when he sums up an examination of variants by concluding that on "thirty several occasions the F text proves to be seriously problematical or obviously incorrect" (p. 58), my own back-tracking over the variants supports nineteen of his readings, quibbles with six, and differs completely with only five of them. It must be acknowledged, too, that among those nineteen readings are several brilliant and original emendations for which future editors of the play will be grateful: "discern" at 3.6.6, "questrels" at 3.7.17, "words" at 1.1.282, and "dull-eyed" at 1.2.13.

It will be evident that in writing this review I have benefited considerably from being able to apply the characteristic strengths of each book's procedures to the other. The two must be taken together. As such, they demonstrate how essential it is that the two contexts of "drama criticism" and "textual history" become one, and that this broader context be investigated with both thoroughness and imagination if we are to learn more of what the author of King Lear really wrote. Otherwise we risk emulating Pierre Menard, author of the Quixote, whose labours turned out to enrich "the halting and rudimentary art of reading" only insofar as they discovered "a new technique ... the deliberate anachronism and the erroneous attribution."

JOHN REIBETANZ, Victoria College, University of Toronto


Il y a un plaisir tout particulier qui consiste dans la redécouverte des chefs d'œuvre perdus. La Septmaine de Du Bartas entre dans cette catégorie d'œuvres injustement et trop longtemps consignées à l'oubli, et cela pour des raisons qui ont plus à faire avec les goûts changeants de ses lecteurs qu'avec la valeur intrinsèque du poème. À l'époque de la Renaissance la renommée de Du Bartas rivalisait avec celle de Ronsard, mais dans la cas de Du Bartas sa renommée était de courte durée. Au dix-septième siècle sa poésie, dans ses extravagances et ses enthousiasmes, n'était pas calculée pour plaire à un public épris des critères du classicisme; de plus, sa préférence pour des sujets religieux le rendrait sans intérêt pour certains tandis que l'aspect implacablement "didascalique et enseignant" de son œuvre découragerait ceux qui envisageaient autrement la fonction de la poésie - idées qui sont toutes élaborées dans la présente édition et par R. Braunrot, dans le premier chapitre de son