

schen Vorlage und Nachdichtung die besondere Beziehung der inhaltlichen Genauigkeit besteht, die durch die Heiligkeit des Textes garantiert war. Die Leistung Sidneys war somit fast ausschließlich auf die strophische Strukturierung beschränkt. Bei der Analyse der Strophenfüllung geht der Verfasser von Überlegungen Wimsatts aus, die er systematisch auszubauen versucht. Er entwickelt dabei eine Typologie der Beziehungen zwischen Klang und Sinn in den durch Reim miteinander verbundenen Zeilen. Dabei wird deutlich, daß Sidney dem Sinnparallelismus gegenüber dem gedanklichen Kontrast in den durch Reim gekoppelten Versen den Vorzug gab. Von dieser Beobachtung ausgehend vermag der Verfasser den Nachweis zu führen, daß bei Sidney die amplifizierende, gedanklich nur langsam fortschreitende und stets durch Rückverweise harmonisierende Strophenfüllung typisch ist.

Es gehört zu den Vorzügen dieser Arbeit, daß sie nicht nur eine Fülle von Einsichten in die Struktur der Lyrik Sidneys bringt, sondern durch ihr sorgfältiges und methodisches Vorgehen ein Instrumentarium bereitstellt, das weitere Untersuchungen zur Strophenstruktur ermöglicht. Erfreulich ist, daß der Verfasser bei allen Bemühungen um terminologische Präzision und Differenzierung seine Ergebnisse in einer klaren Sprache vorträgt. Zu bedauern ist die strikte Trennung der Untersuchung zur Strophenfügung und zur Strophenfüllung, die zwar zur methodischen Klarheit beiträgt, aber sich auch insofern nachteilig auswirkt, als die Interdependenz zwischen interner Strophenfüllung und externer Strophenfügung nicht aufgezeigt werden kann. Trotz dieses Mangels stellt die Arbeit eine erfreuliche Leistung dar, durch die das Verständnis eines bis jetzt kaum erschlossenen Gebietes eine erhebliche Förderung erfährt.

KÖLN

WOLFGANG WEISS

J. K. Walton, *The Quarto Copy for the First Folio of Shakespeare*. Dublin: Dublin University Press, 1971, 306 S., £ 5.00.

A special task of twentieth-century Shakespearian textual scholarship has been to throw light on the textual origins and on the processes of pre-printing transmission of the works of Shakespeare. By sophisticated methods of analysis of the extant printed texts, many problems of their origin and derivation have been solved. Yet some remain which have so far defeated scholarly ingenuity. These are connected largely with a group of six plays, *Richard III*, *King Lear*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *2 Henry IV*, *Hamlet* and *Othello*. For each of these plays, two authoritative, but different texts ('collateral substantive texts' in Alice Walker's phrase) exist in the textual witnesses of a quarto and the folio version respectively. In his new book, J. K. Walton proposes

a solution to the problems of their derivation and transmission. The nature of his evidence and the methods of procedure in his argument concern the reviewer.

Professor Walton's point of departure is one of firm limitation in method. Rejecting from the outset all claims of bibliography to being the key discipline in textual scholarship (without, however, specifying whether he would consider a distinction in this respect between analytical, or pure, and textual, or applied, bibliography), he denies, in particular, the uses of bibliographical reasoning and procedure for the establishing of the genetic relationship of texts. Only a strictly non-bibliographical evaluation of substantive readings is considered admissible in all discussions of textual transmission. Substantive variants are sub-divided into 'definite errors' and 'indifferent variants' to provide the basis for determining textual provenance. It is only the "definite error which we can be sure is an error without reference to any preconceived theory of the text" which can be used as evidence in exploring textual derivation. The 'indifferent variant' cannot be so used: for as it has "a meaning similar to the reading it replaces", it is subject to reappearing by multiple chance coincidence in several non-touching textual witnesses; this makes it unfit to demonstrate direct stemmatic links between them. Since first put forward in *The Copy for the Folio Text of Richard III* (Auckland, 1955), the division of 'indifferent variants' and 'definite errors' has been somewhat refined, but the case it is being applied to in all of Part II of the present book has not essentially altered. Professor Walton still holds that Folio *Richard III* was derived exclusively from Q3. He is, though through no fault of his own, unable to present new evidence from substantive readings which could incontrovertibly be classed as 'definite errors' to prove his case. The refinement by augmentation of his argument therefore lies in the long lists of variants, classified as 'indifferent', which are compiled from all the Shakespeare plays which passed through ancestral series of quarto editions. These are set up to provide numerous analogies to the Q6F concurrences in *Richard III* which are thus dismissed as fortuitous. The appeal is to our belief in coincidence, but we would be more readily persuaded if at the same time some long-standing problems arising from Professor Walton's interpretation of the textual evidence had been effectively solved. Yet even in the instance of such a disturbing Q6F concurrence as that at IV, iv, 536 ('newes' Q6F against 'tidings' Q3), no note is taken of the suggestion that in the Folio line "Is colder Newes, but yet they must be told", 'newes' constitutes a Q5 corruption transmitted via Q6 to F, while 'but' is the result of a consequent metrical sophistication in the Folio. To remain true to established criteria, Professor Walton apparently has no choice but to leave this variant among those which for their similarity of meaning are labelled 'indifferent' and therefore can tell nothing about textual derivation. The question thus arises whether the definitions themselves of the established categories of substantive variants are sufficient. In a

versified text, it seems, the exclusive reliance on meaning in establishing variants as either 'definite' or 'indifferent' is unduly limiting. Dramatic speech in blank verse must surely be considered also in its metrical setting. In the case in question, the variant, then, we would argue, is no longer one of 'newes' vs. 'tidings', but of 'newes, but' vs. 'tidings'. While in a prose context the readings 'newes' and 'tidings' are admittedly very similar in meaning (and thus, according to Professor Walton, 'indifferent'), the readings 'newes, but' and 'tidings' are alternative ways of fulfilling the verse pattern – one presumably correct, the other an error. They should be considered without reference to the close semantic relation between the two nouns (i.e. without any preconceived idea about the meaning of the text). Instead, the essentially formal nature of the verbal redundancy, that is the doubling of conjunctions ('but yet'), within the blank verse (which itself is unaffected by the verbal changes – i.e. remains invariant) should help to establish the definiteness of the error in the Folio line. Quite apart from any bibliographical arguments that might be (and have been elsewhere) brought to bear on the problem, it is in the nature of the distinction offered that a 'definite error', by its quality, constitutes proof of the pattern of textual relationship it fits into. The Q6 derivation of F would, even in the terms of Professor Walton's classification of variants, become demonstrable were the reading 'newes, but' accepted as a recognisable 'definite error'. The criteria, however, by which we would suggest it could be established as such do not enter his line of argument. It may be, then, that for the textual analysis of writings in verse his classes of variants are not sufficiently well distinguished and defined.

Yet, doubts aside, the test of evaluation by 'definite errors' is the method of procedure by which Part III of the monograph sets out to solve the question of quarto vs. manuscript copy for *2 Henry IV*, *Hamlet* and *Othello*. The other three plays are made to act as 'control texts'. For each of the six plays, the 'definite common errors' are listed and arranged in three classes. Class I "is made up of instances where there is evidence specifically indicating the printing of the F text from a corrected quarto," class II "consists of graphic errors" which are deemed to have originated in authorial or scribal manuscripts, and class III "consists of errors ... which do not bear any specific indication of the particular stage or stages in the transmission at which they were made."

As far as the class I errors are concerned, this classification does nothing more than confirm what has been known all along, namely that Folio *2 Henry IV*, *Hamlet* and *Othello* show no easily recognisable traces of having been printed from annotated quarto copy. Yet from the interpretation of the fact that the quarto and folio versions of these three plays contain common errors of the class II and class III varieties only it is suggested that positive proof can be derived that their Folio texts were printed directly from manuscript. The assumption is

that the common errors were common errors of the manuscript archetype/original which were independently transmitted. This, of course, is precisely what we would like to be certain of, for if original errors were transmitted unchanged in two texts radiating from a common archetype, then original correct readings were also so transmitted, and all invariant readings of the collateral substantive textual witnesses would be mutually re-inforcing, while all their variants would be more closely definable as to their nature and origin. In the absence of documentary manuscript material, however, the difficulty is that, with respect to their invariants, the texts of the extant quarto and folio witnesses cannot but be expected to be exactly the same, whether thus derived independently by radiation, or else by linear descent from the quarto. Even in the special situation created by quarto annotation, where radiating texts were actually conflated, or 'contaminated', the loss both of the fresh manuscript used for the annotation, and of the exemplar of the quarto annotated, prevents us from knowing which, if any, of the QF common invariant readings were re-confirmed by the manuscript, and thus (while we have no choice but to assume that they descended linearly from the quarto used as copy) were in actual fact transmitted into the Folio text by radiating textual authority. One way or another, it is self-evident that common invariants, whether errors or correct readings, in collateral substantive texts – be their derivation that of linear descent plus contamination, or of independent radiation – must have originated in a common lost stage of pre-printing transmission.

At this juncture, the potential value becomes clear of isolating, for further analysis, the 'definite errors' from the whole body of substantive textual invariants. For only with errors is it meaningful to ask at which stage of the textual transmission they arose. But in order to prove positively which was their point of origin, specific criteria will have to be found which distinguish between errors in the common archetype/original, and errors which came about by the process of transferring a manuscript printer's copy into the earliest extant substantive printed text. Radiating descent of the quarto and folio versions of a given text could be inferred only from the former, while the latter would suggest linear derivation of the invariant element of the Folio text, by way of a quarto annotated and used as copy, even in those cases where there is no further demonstrable connection, through error and/or common error as caused by the reprinting process, between the versions of the text in quarto and folio respectively. In the absence, then, in *2 Henry IV*, *Hamlet*, and *Othello*, of such class I errors, and in view of the fact that class III comprises errors whose origin cannot be determined, all the weight of the case for independent manuscript derivation of these three plays in the Folio must fall on the evidence from the class II errors. These, it is true, are seen to be much more numerous in the collateral texts of *2 Henry IV*, *Hamlet* and *Othello* than in those of *Richard III*, *King Lear* and *Troilus and Cres-*

sida. If we can accept that they all could not have arisen anywhere but in a common lost manuscript source, the probability of independent manuscript derivation of the Folio versions of these plays must, from the evidence, be regarded as high.

A scrutiny of all instances classified as class II errors in the six plays indeed admits of viewing them all as graphic errors. The belief, however, that, as such, they all originated and were first present at a manuscript stage of transmission (surely an essential qualification under the circumstances), is seriously weakened by two of the four class II 'graphic errors' in *Richard III*. Concerned here with minimizing the incidence of class II errors (as *Richard III* is one of the plays whose Folio text was demonstrably printed from an annotated quarto copy), Professor Walton faithfully admits that one of them originated in Q3, the other in Q2. But if this is so, then the class II errors, as a body of evidence, cannot carry the weight put on them. Rather, these two examples establish that there is no necessary connection between the real (or even just apparent) classification of an error as a 'graphic error', and the assumption that all such errors originated at a manuscript stage of transmission, let alone that they were all present in the ancestral manuscript common to two radiating textual descendants. They may have originated or been present there, but they may also have arisen, say, at the point of transfer of a manuscript into print for the first quarto. For even then they would make their appearance as common QF errors, if the Folio text was (after all) based on the quarto. They may, of course, still have been the result of 'graphic misreading'; but this only goes to show of how little use the evaluation and classification of an error as a 'graphic error' is for the purposes of establishing the genealogy of a text.

When so much has been said, we must allow that a study setting out to discuss the quarto copy for the First Folio of Shakespeare cannot perhaps be expected to be centrally concerned with the question of manuscript copy for any plays therein contained. But it is also clear that, for the whole group of collateral substantive texts, the problems of quarto and/or manuscript copy are so inextricably tied up with one another that it is essential to base on positive demonstration a decision to exclude three of the six plays from further discussion under the heading of quarto copy. Professor Walton has, however, excluded them on evidence which falls short of proving conclusive. Yet in the pursuit of his main subject, he has added new data worthy to be taken seriously in further considerations of the question of derivation of the Folio texts of *2 Henry IV*, *Hamlet* and *Othello*. In an interesting and sensible exploration of the special problem of collation and annotation of all the quartos used as copy for the Folio, a fruitful distinction is drawn between plays where, in collating, reference may have been made only to stage directions and other theatrical aspects such as acting-version cuts and possibly speech-prefix revisions, and plays where the collation affected the texts themselves. Careful attention to the text was ap-

parently only paid in those plays where the Folio reproduces a collateral substantive text. Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, for four plays – i. e. the three which were undoubtedly derived from annotated quarto copy, plus *Richard II* – distinct, and similar, patterns of a varying efficiency in the collation within each text are revealed. These patterns are established by estimating the proportion of definite errors corrected from act to act by the collator. Thus, the book's basic method of evaluation of substantive readings, in their most tangible form of errors, is put to its final use.

The question of what manuscripts were used for the collation, and what manuscripts lay behind the authoritative quarto texts, is cursorily only summed up at the end. From the point of view of the book's argument, it may not have needed further elaboration. But in view of our objection that it is the question of manuscript copy for the folio versions of three of the collateral substantive texts which is most seriously left unresolved, the conclusion is open-ended. The analysis of errors and their correction, to reveal the nature and the varying degree of efficiency of the collation which was carried out in preparation of quarto editions as printer's copy for the Folio, is appealing. Were its results set against the statement – which, however, is not further substantiated – that the assumption of quarto copy for Folio 2 *Henry IV*, *Hamlet* and *Othello* would, on the basis of error patterns observed, presuppose collation of a much higher thoroughness and uniformity than elsewhere, then perhaps yet another line of attack might be opened up on the problem of manuscript copy for these plays. A study of the manuscript copy for the First Folio on lines similar to those of the present one on quarto copy would have to be written. The book we have been presented with has indeed somewhat reduced the uncertainties still persisting about quarto copy for the 1623 collection. Thus, from a refinement of traditional ways of textual analysis, partial results have been derived. But, for the very reason of its conscious limitation in method, J. K. Walton's monograph has not been able to solve fully the complex problem of quarto copy for the First Folio of Shakespeare.

MÜNCHEN

HANS WALTER GABLER

Michael Manheim, *The Weak King Dilemma in the Shakespearean History Play*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1973, x + 198 S., \$ 8.00.

Ever since the publication of E. M. W. Tillyard's monumental study in 1944¹, the Elizabethan history play, till then a rather neglected field of research in which hardly more than questions of sources,

¹ *Shakespeare's History Plays* (Harmondsworth, 1962 [1944]).