

3. EDITIONS AND TEXTUAL STUDIES

reviewed by EMMA DEPLEDGE

The year 2020–2021 witnessed the publication of important titles that invite us to reflect on the history of editing and textual studies, their specific relationship to earlier approaches such as New Bibliography, the responsibilities we bear when presenting new or revisionist narratives, and ways in which the field can do more to embrace diversity. A landmark resource was released in the form of the two-volume New Variorum Edition of *King Lear*, with Richard Knowles's breath-taking textual notes recording all variants in seventy-seven editions from the period 1619 to 2000. *The Arden Shakespeare Third Series Complete Works* was released, as was the much anticipated second edition of Andrew Murphy's *Shakespeare in Print*, complete with an updated chronological appendix that now takes us to the year 2017. The first scholarly edition of the commonplace book *Bel-vedere or the Garden of the Muses* was also published, and exciting new monographs by Faith Acker, Zachary Lesser and Molly G. Yam were joined by edited collections entitled *Shakespeare / Text* and the *Arden Research Handbook of Shakespeare and Textual Studies*.

EDITIONS

Richard Knowles's colossal edition of *King Lear*, which consists of two volumes of around 1,000 pages each, diligently upholds the New Variorum series's reputation as the foremost reference source detailing centuries of emendation history and textual scholarship. Knowles does not simply update Horace Howard Furness's 1880 edition; with the help of student assistants – John C. Hill, Becky Bohan, Vivian Foss and Elizabeth Reinwald – he has redone the work of collating seventy-seven editions, including Furness's. The first volume contains the text of the 1608 First Quarto, the first printed edition of the play, and includes 110 additional lines taken from the First Folio. Knowles states that it must include both Q-only and F-only

lines 'because all of those lines have been subject to commentary and theatrical use' (xv). Q1 was selected, he writes, because it 'reflects the general belief today that it not only is the earliest edition but also offers the earliest version of the play, one close to Shakespeare's original drafts, and that the Folio represents a later version incorporating changes made for various theatrical and artistic purposes' (xv). Textual issues are analysed in detail in the second volume, where Knowles sets out what is known about the printing history of Q1, Q2 and F before surveying the multifarious opinions about both the texts' relationship to one another and what, if anything, they might tell us about 'Shakespeare's intentions' (1042). Ultimately, he finds in favour of a hypothesis that 'allows for the possibility that some of the revisions in F might be authorial but recognizes also that numerous other hands could have intervened, and in all probability did' (1205).

Each page of text records collations from Q2 of 1619 through to Stanley Wells's 2000 Oxford edition, in addition to hundreds of years' worth of critical and editorial commentary on individual words. It is, of course, not a text for reading – one seldom gets more than six lines of the play-text to a page – but it is one from which a great deal can be learned about the play's editorial and critical history. It might be surprising, for example, to discover that A. C. Bradley speculated at length about the reasons why Lear may have addressed Burgundy before France in the play's first act; Bradley suggested that 'the apparent choice in public here is a mere fiction because Cordelia's marriage has been prearranged', as opposed to simply seeing the exchange with Burgundy as a delay deliberately designed for dramatic effect, with 'Burgundy's backpedaling', as Knowles sensibly suggests, winning sympathy for France and Cordelia (100-1). Sagacious and accurate throughout, Knowles's editing is of the highest quality.

A much appreciated material feature that greatly adds to the volume's utility and convenience is the inclusion of the sigla for editions in both volumes' end-paper paste-ins, where they are arranged both chronologically and alphabetically. The sigla, of vital importance to anyone wishing to follow the condensed formulae used to record textual collations, are also included in Knowles's 'Plan of the work', but it is much easier to refer back to the opening of the volume, or else to consult the paste-downs of the second volume, whilst reading from the first volume, than it is to find the correct page in the plan. The edition's appendix, contained in Volume II, is also worthy of strong praise. The play's stage history, produced by Paula Glatzer, includes seventeenth-century performances, a survey of significant performances of the play from 1681 to 2000, and an overview of changes to the text as recorded in adaptations and prompt books from 1681 to 2000. A further three pages are dedicated to 'Films, adaptations, and offshoots', from silent films to novels, and there is also a section on the play's use of music, complete with 'possible contemporary musical settings for some of its lines, and of later music inspired by the play' (1864). The incredible survey of interpretive criticism, written by Kevin Donovan, who is listed as Associate Editor of the edition, is also joined by detailed discussion of the play's sources.

Knowles's *Lear* is the last New Variorum Shakespeare edition to be published by the Modern Language Association. It was completed long before its release date suggests, with publication initially delayed due to financial issues. It is therefore a relief to note that the series now has a new home; according to the series's website, in 2019, 'Laura Mandell, Director of the Center of Digital Humanities Research (CoDHR) at Texas A&M University, generously offered to publish the NVS and contracted with Anne Burdick to build a site for the series in order to bring it to the WWW and thereby to a broad audience.' New editions of this vitally important series, aptly described as an 'edition as archive' in Murphy's *Shakespeare in Print* (358), will thus continue to be produced, and editions

previously published in print will be available online.

Another volume that marks a milestone in Shakespeare editing, though with a very different kind of readership in mind than Knowles's *Lear*, is *The Arden Shakespeare Complete Works*, edited by Richard Proudfoot, Ann Thompson, David Scott Kastan and H. R. Woudhuysen. This represents the first collected edition of a full set of Arden texts, given that the last Arden *Complete Works* featured a mixture of Arden 2 and Arden 3 texts. The individual playbooks of the Arden Third Series have been extensively reviewed by my predecessors, and the series as a whole was analysed in Jennifer Young's excellent review essay in the previous issue of *Shakespeare Survey* (74 (2021)), but it is nonetheless worth reflecting on what changes most when a series of individual poetry and play editions becomes a complete works edition. For example, the order in which one receives individual editions depends on their release date; here, instead, the sonnets and poems are followed by the plays, arranged not in the order in which their editing was completed, nor in their most likely original chronological order of printing or performance, or even according to genre, but rather in alphabetical order. In stark contrast with the pages of individual Arden 3 editions, where annotations and collation notes at times take up more space than the text of the plays, the pages of texts here presented are void of marginal glosses, footnotes or detailed notes on collation (with the exception of *King Lear*, *Titus* and *Thomas More*, discussed below). The work aims to create 'clarity and consistency' through the application of what the general editors define as 'conservative' editing: by silently 'modernizing the spelling and punctuation ... regularizing (and not abbreviating) the names of characters, and rationalizing entrances and exits' (vii). The effect is that the individual texts resemble each other typographically and the reading process is seldom interrupted. The *Complete Works*' bibliography and glossary also link the texts by offering coverage of the plays and poems together at the end.

The series's most novel content features – the inclusion of *Double Falsehood*, *Sir Thomas More*, *King Edward III* and the three-text *Hamlet*, i.e., the First and Second Quarto texts of 1603 and 1604–1605, and the 1623 First Folio text – are accounted for in the 'General Editors' Preface'. The introductions preceding *Falsehood*, *More* and *Edward III* also argue (albeit here in much briefer form than in the individual editions) the case for their plays' inclusion in the *Works*. Of *Hamlet*, the general editors insist that 'the text of Shakespeare's most complex play cannot adequately be presented singularly' (vi); briefly summarize the key theories surrounding the relationships between Q1, Q2 and F; and suggest that 'most editors ... offer a "conflated" text', before concluding that 'in the absence of a consensus about the precise relationship between the texts it seems preferable to treat each as if it were an independent entity' (vi). Applied to *Hamlet* alone, and made at the start of the volume, might cause some readers to assume (mistakenly) that there *is* a consensus about 'the precise relationship between the texts' of Shakespeare's other plays and poems.

That said, the introductions to individual plays do offer brief accounts of, for example, 'anomalies and dislocations in the text', and ways in which scholars have explained them (*Measure for Measure*, 919). The introductions and texts of *Lear*, *Titus* and *Thomas More* go further by alerting readers to conventions the editors have used to signal significant variants between different early printed versions of the texts, and, in the case of *Thomas More*, between 'the manuscript sections and the principal hand in each one' (1160). The *King Lear* text, based on the Folio, indicates words and passages present only in the 1608 Quarto by using a superscript Q, and uses a superscript F to mark those unique to the Folio (751). The 1594 First Quarto is used as the base text for *Titus* and this is annotated using the superscript 'Q2' at the beginning and end of passages to alert readers to 'a few corrections from the 1600 Second Quarto'. The 'addition of 3.2 from the 1623 First Folio' is likewise designated by a superscript F; and passages that 'Q1 should probably have deleted' are placed within braces '{ }' (1271). The various hands

involved in the manuscript of *Thomas More* are indicated by more detailed typographical conventions, with a font change (to sans serif) used to indicate occasions when a second hand intervenes, superscript initials used to identify hands in the text, marginal lines used to alert readers to longer deleted passages, underlining used to show shorter deleted passages, and subscript letters / initials used when the identity of the hand responsible for a deletion is known (1160).

Another noteworthy material feature is the presentation of six sonnets per page in two columns – which arguably emphasizes links between different groupings – rather than dividing them into the pattern described in the introduction. Sonnets 1–16 are, like in most editions, said to be 'mainly addressed to a man younger and of higher social standing than the poet; sonnets 127–52 to an unfaithful mistress, whose other lovers include the young man', and the final two sonnets 'on the traditional themes of Cupid and Diana' are said to 'stand apart from this pattern' (17). The *mise-en-page* in the *Complete Works* does set 153 and 154 apart in the sense that these two final sonnets appear alone in the right-hand column (with 150–2 in the left-hand column), but it also sees 126 ('O thou my lovely boy') appear alongside the first five 'dark lady sonnets'. This arguably invites echoes between the 'sovereign mistress' (a clear personification of nature) of 126 and the mistress mentioned in 127 (line 9) which sits below it, as well as in 130, which sits adjacent to 127 and below right of 126. The Arden text is based on the 1609 First Quarto, where part of 127 also appears below 126 but, in the Quarto, 127 is divided at line 8, thus pushing the word 'mistress' onto the verso (H3^v). Stripped of the textual gloss and collation found in Katherine Duncan-Jones's stand-alone Arden edition, the mysterious parentheses that famously occupy the place of 126's final couplet also invite ambiguity and confusion for those turning to the *Complete Works* to read the sonnets for the first time. It is thus a perfectly competent *Complete Works* edition that presents very clean texts in which the reading process will seldom be interrupted, but I suspect all will not

always appear as clear or ‘accessible to modern readers’ as the editors intended (vii).

TEXTUAL STUDIES

Readers of the sonnets are considered afresh, away from the kinds of biographical readings which flourished in the wake of Edmond Malone’s 1780 biographical commentary on them, in Faith Acker’s *First Readers of Shakespeare’s Sonnets, 1590–1790*. Her study consists of nine short chapters that address the sonnets’ production and circulation in print and manuscript over a 200-year period. Acker brings together a range of early discordant responses to the sonnets that have thus far escaped scholarly attention, and argues for the need to study what she sees as the ‘priorities and interpretations’ of early readers by recovering ‘four lost critical’ approaches to the sonnets: ‘early readers’ interests in Shakespeare’s classical adaptations, political applicability, religious themes, and rhetorical skill during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries’ (i). The monograph draws on the methodologies of book history, editorial theory and manuscript studies to investigate the ‘sonnets’ public and private readers’ (47). Her account seeks to highlight ‘the versatility and flexibility that the sonnets’ earliest readers imagined in and around these poems’ (1), something which she claims has been obscured by the persistence of biographical readings.

The study joins a handful of recent monographs that provide reconsiderations of Shakespeare’s poetry. Acker’s painstaking reading of sonnet collections 1590–1790, annotated printed books, *Sammelbände* and manuscript sources result in numerous original findings, and it is refreshing to see manuscript and print history handled within the same study. For example, chapter 3 makes reference to twenty-one seventeenth-century manuscripts containing Shakespeare sonnets, and Acker observes that Sonnet 2 was the most ‘widely transmitted Shakespeare sonnet’ in the seventeenth century, with some compilers reading the poem ‘in sexual contexts, considering the pleasures of

intimacy even as they valued the rhetorical emphasis on the sexual product, with all its benefits to lineage and authority’, while others ‘seem also to have found the sonnet relevant within the contexts of their own political ambitions’ (71).

Chapter 1 provides a clear and coherent overview of the publication history of the sonnets. It is here argued that the ‘(1599) *Passionate Pilgrim*’s brevity, single-sided printing, careful genre associations, and affiliation with Shakespeare’s classical texts were meant to entice a wide range of possible buyers’, from those ‘who appreciated the courtly ideals of Renaissance sonnet sequences’, and those who were keen to purchase more Shakespeare poetry after appreciating earlier publications, to those who appreciated ‘Shakespeare’s long-standing association with classical texts’ (11). Elsewhere, she reads annotations found in print editions to note patterns by which early readers ‘corrected the volumes they owned, sometimes updating their own editions to match variations and corrections suggested in other editions, and sometimes relying on their own experiences and intuition’ (6). She further notes that transcribers of Shakespeare’s poems produced manuscript miscellanies in which the sonnets were frequently ‘enjoyed without the benefit of a larger sonnet sequence’, or else ‘set Shakespeare’s sonnets between works by other poets, repeatedly mingling his works with poetry by members of their local communities and often pairing poems thematically rather than authorially’ (7). The sparsity of extant evidence does, however, at times lead to a touch of overstatement concerning readers/transcribers. For example, she writes that ‘Jaggard’s clients, newly elevated to the elite status of Shakespearean sonnet readers, valued the collection’s content and themes, and did not seem to notice stylistic discrepancies between the four formal sonnets by Shakespeare and several other poems – some by other poets – that completed the volume’, but this claim is supported by reference to only ‘a few extant manuscript transcriptions’ (12).

Acker’s strongest chapters are those which lie at the centre of her monograph. Chapter 4 offers an

important reappraisal of John Benson, a stationer who was for a long time written off as a pirate, or else accused of meddling with the sonnets to discourage certain types of biographical readings. Acker provides a convincing reading of Benson as both a commercial stationer and an ‘engaged and thoughtful reader’ who, ‘faced with a diverse array of short poems by a popular author’ (97), put much thought into an arrangement that would offer internal coherence by illuminating common themes and accommodating changes in addressee and tone, whilst simultaneously deploying material features that helped to align the collection (visually) with earlier sonnet sequences. Indeed, she presents a case for crediting Benson with providing ‘the most thorough textual apparatus for Shakespeare’s poems within the first century and a half of their composition’ (78). Chapter 6 demonstrates that, contrary to popular critical belief, it was not simply Shakespeare’s plays that were altered during the second half of the seventeenth century: ‘verses from Thorpe’s 1609 sequence and Benson’s 1640 collection – both featuring poems of procreation, temporal decay, and tumultuous passion – progressively became a Royalist song, a cross-dresser’s dialogue, devotional poetry in praise of a virtuous King, two seductive confections, and a laudatory preface’ (124). Acker thus provides an important corrective for those of us who, by focusing on print alone, wrongly assumed that Shakespeare’s poems were overlooked in the post-1650 period.

What is perhaps needed in this study is a clearer overview of how the nine chapters contribute to Acker’s overarching thesis. Acker is right to consider stationers and editors as early readers of the sonnets, and I appreciated her insistence that the interventions of these stationers ‘reveal the breadth of circumstances in which they imagined the sonnets might be read, as well as the agency they exerted upon other readers’ experiences’ (3). It would, however, have been helpful to have a clearer idea of how she defines (and distinguishes between) types of readers and transcribers, alongside a statement on the wider conclusions we can draw about the influence and ‘agency’ different manuscript and print sources had on different

readers, and on the afterlife of Shakespeare’s sonnets more generally. There is nonetheless much to be discovered in the individual chapters of this learned study, and the overviews of the sonnets’ print history in particular will prove a valuable resource for students and scholars alike.

Another source for uncovering ways in which Shakespeare’s plays and poems were approached by early readers are commonplace books – collections of excerpts, copied from contemporary texts, that were deemed worthy of extraction for later moral or rhetorical use. One such print collection is *Bel-vedère or The Garden of the Muses*, which we now know to contain at least 240 quotations from Shakespeare’s plays and poems, thanks to the publication of the first scholarly edition of the text. *Bel-vedère* was popular during its own time, with two editions published within a decade of each other (1600 and 1610). Although made available in facsimile reprint in 1875, its utility for scholars of early modern literature was for a long time undermined by the fact that its verse quotations were presented without attribution.

Bel-vedère has now been carefully edited for the first time by Lukas Erne and Devani Singh, who have analysed and identified more of the authors and texts behind its approximately 4,500 verse quotations than ever before. Erne and Singh’s edition offers clean, easy-to-read text with annotations alerting the reader (where possible) to full records and verbatim quotes from the source texts for comparison. The editors inform us that the sententiae, assorted under headings such as ‘Of God’, ‘Of Hate’, ‘Of Friendship, &c’, and ‘Of Fate’, are taken from the works of anonymous authors as well as canonical writers such as Shakespeare, Edmund Spenser (c.232 quotations), Christopher Marlowe (c.51), and others.

The main strength of the edition lies in their extensive work to identify the sources of *Bel-vedère*. Erne and Singh build on the work of a previous owner, Thomas Park (1758/9–1834), whose annotated copy of *Bel-vedère* resides in the Newberry Library, and of Charles Crawford, who published an edition of *England’s Parnassus* in 1913 and set out (but ultimately did not manage) to

produce an edition of *Bel-vedère* for Oxford's Clarendon Press. According to the current editors, Park 'assigned a total of 193 passages, 186 of them correctly' (xxxvii), and Crawford managed to identify substantially more, as recorded in a 1911 article, in 'interleaved [manuscript] sheets inserted into a copy of Crossley's 1875 facsimile of *Bel-vedère*, now at the British Library' (xliii), and in his personal copy of his edition of *England's Parnassus*, which is now held at the Folger Shakespeare Library.

Further aided by digital resources not available to their predecessors, such as EEBO TCP, but hindered by the fact that so many of the source texts were modified and not cited verbatim, Erne and Singh identified the source texts for all but 926 of *Bel-vedère's* 4,482 passages before going to press. Their Introduction promises a follow-up website in which they will provide 'a searchable database of quotations that enables users to view material in the edition and to refine their queries by author, text, genre, year of publication and keyword' (lii). The database, which is not yet available (though the website shows an additional 177 newly identified passages, reducing the number of unidentified sources to 749, only 0.16 per cent of the passages in the text), will offer scholars a unique opportunity to mine this commonplace book in ways that are most relevant to their own research projects.

Erne and Singh's detailed Introduction includes analysis of *Bel-vedère's* position in the history of early modern commonplacing, detailed discussion of the structure and contents of *Bel-vedère*, a textual introduction that covers the context for the text's original publication, as well as its bibliographical afterlife. Four impressive appendices also provide users with an 'Index of authors or texts quoted or adapted in *Bel-vedère*', 'The paratexts of the first edition of *Bel-vedère* (1600)', the 'Origins of the source identification of the passages in *Bel-vedère*', and an overview of the overlap between passages quoted in both *Bel-vedère* and *England's Parnassus* (1600), another commonplace book published in the same year, which is further discussed in the Introduction (xxvii–xxviii). This new edition of *Bel-vedère* therefore looks set to become a key

reference tool for early modern scholars interested in reception histories, authorship studies and the changing status of English literature in the early modern period.

Murphy's *Shakespeare in Print*, already celebrated as a vital resource and reference tool for scholars of Shakespeare and textual studies, has been updated. His extensive revisions include a new Introduction, an entirely new chapter, two radically amended chapters, and a chapter that has been significantly expanded. Chapter 11, previously entitled 'The later twentieth century', is now entitled 'Shakespeare in the modern era', taking Murphy's analysis up to the present day by including important discussion of complete works editions such as *The New Oxford Shakespeare*, the *RSC Shakespeare* and *Norton 3*. The Chronological Appendix has also been updated and extended (by a decade and a half), with minor errors corrected, and the volume's story of Shakespeare in print has been revised to reflect a wealth of new scholarship. One of the most significant ways in which the volume as a whole has been updated is through Murphy's interaction with challenges made to New Bibliography, 'the impact of the New Bibliography on mainstream Shakespeare publishing' (291), and the persistence of its methods.

The entirely new chapter, entitled 'Shakespeare beyond print', addresses the history of digital Shakespeare, from the pioneering contributions to Shakespeare texts in 'Machine Readable Form' (and to computational linguistics more generally) by Sister Dolores Marie Burton, SND (Sisters of Notre Dame) and Sally Yeats Sedelow in the 1960s, to 21st-century Shakespeare apps produced by the likes of Luminary, Heuristic Media and Touch Press. This is no mean feat, given that records concerning digital texts tend, rather ironically (given their temporal proximity to us), to be more difficult to locate than those pertaining to Shakespeare in print. Murphy nonetheless succeeds in detailing landmark moments such as the advent of the CD-ROM in the late 1980s, Michael Hart's 'Project Gutenberg' and its free-to-access Shakespeare, and the mapping of variants in digital editions of series such as the New Variorum.

Included in this chronological overview of digital Shakespeare are biographical accounts of key figures in this phase of Shakespeare's afterlife, many of which – like that of Hart's family – are truly fascinating.

Murphy remains as alert to issues of access and economics in the new chapter as he was when discussing print editions of Shakespeare. He distinguishes between private research initiatives (such as those of Burton and Sedelow) and those released for public consumption, and outlines how much it cost to acquire the earliest commercial digital Shakespeare publications. For example, the Oxford University Press *William Shakespeare, Electronic Edition*, the Electronic Text Corporation's *WordCruncher Bookshelf Shakespeare*, and the Oxford Text Archive's *Shakespeare's First Folio and Early Quartos* – released in the 1980s – all required a substantial financial investment, with prices in the region of \$150 to \$299, plus the price of the software needed to read the texts, and not to mention the time investment needed to master 'the intricacies of complex text analysis programs' (327–8). As Murphy rightly notes, although made available to a wider public, these second-wave digital Shakespeare editions were in essence still specialist resources, primarily designed with researchers in mind.

He identifies a key turning point in the late 1980s and early 1990s, with the advent of the CD-ROM and the release of the first internet browser in which text and graphics were integrated: Mosaic. This was, he writes, the moment when 'a fundamental shift in digital Shakespeare' design and distribution took place (329), leading to the creation of digital Shakespeare editions which contained texts that were primarily designed to be read, and which became increasingly affordable and (later) even free-to-access. Key examples include *Shakespeare on Disc!* (containing all the plays, poems and sonnets), which was made available for users of PCs and Macintosh computers. Another important title was *Library of the Future*, which sold Shakespeare's works alongside other Classical and canonical writers, and which was

sufficiently successful to go through 'four different editions, being expanded from version to version until it finally ran to more than 5,000 texts' (330). The release in 1994 of the Gutenberg Shakespeare (334), along with other websites drawing on Grady Ward's 'Moby Shakespeare' made Shakespeare texts free to download for the wider public, but most of these early resources were not concerned with textual cruxes. Indeed, as Murphy notes, early Shakespeare sites, important though they were in increasing accessibility to versions of the plays and poems, have 'sometimes given readers the mistaken impression that all texts are more or less equal, with the differences between them being of little more than passing local significance' (337).

Murphy makes important distinctions between texts that were *rendered*, versus those which were *born*, digital. For example, the Internet Shakespeare Editions (ISE) broke new ground as they were not only produced 'specifically in a form native to the Internet', but also, in some cases – cf. the example of David Bevington's ISE *As You Like It* – equipped with the option to show textual variants that are colour-coded according to the edition in which they first appeared (349). Astute points of contrast and comparison are made between the story of Shakespeare in print presented in earlier chapters and the story of Shakespeare beyond print, particularly in terms of the different rates at which the production technology behind the two media developed. Murphy also places digital texts in the context of the wider developments in Shakespeare editing discussed earlier in his volume. He highlights, for example, how the scholarly conventions of the New Variorum Shakespeare, with its extensive recording of textual variants, lent itself to digital delivery (first on CD-ROM and now via the series's online platform), where such variants could be presented free from 'the constraints of the limited space available on the printed page', prompting him to conclude that 'the digital text offers a level of multiplicity that the printed text can never manage fully to accommodate' (359).

Murphy's comparisons and his consistency of approach when discussing print and electronic Shakespeare editions are to be applauded. It is

a shame, however, that the two media at times seem pitted as rivals. He summarizes that ‘the final trajectory of this chapter may appear ultimately to confirm the narrative of the triumph of the printed book in the face of upstart technologies and theories: the digital text has not fully displaced the printed text’, before nuancing this with the statement that ‘such a reading would fail to take into account certain important facts’, such as technological improvements in terms of ‘portability, usability – and, indeed, very simply, in terms of battery life’ (362). But the two media need not be placed in competition. As this chapter and the revised volume as a whole demonstrate, Shakespeare texts have enjoyed a rich, multifaceted and often contradictory journey in both printed and digital form.

Murphy is somewhat generous when noting the limitations of facsimile editions, like those provided by the expensive resource Early English Books Online, particularly in light of his discussion of shortcomings associated with free-to-access apps. He cites Bruce R. Smith’s observation that his exciting discovery of a printer’s hair in a Huntington Library material copy of Scaliger’s *Poetics* (1561) would have appeared as a mere scratch on a digitized image as an example of what can be lost with the remediation of printed texts, but there are far more potential issues with resources such as EEBO, as Ian Gadd and others have pointed out, including the fact that one does not always know what they are looking at when consulting EEBO facsimiles. This is an issue that is handled deftly in Claire M. L. Bourne’s excellent chapter, ‘Shakespeare and “textual studies”’: evidence, scale, periodization and access’, in Erne’s edited collection, *The Research Handbook of Shakespeare and Textual Studies* (discussed below). As Bourne insists, EEBO:

does not provide information about the copy (like a shelfmark) beyond the name of the collection where the copy is held (or was at the time it was photographed for the UMI microfilm). Sometimes the repository is not named. Bibliographers and book historians working in the digital age will tell you that EEBO is a good entry point but that it is ‘best practice’ to consult the object in person if you wish to make any claims about its material

features. Without a shelfmark, this can be a challenge. For instance, the EEBO record for the First Folio . . . (STC 22273) indicates that the image set of this edition is a ‘[r]eproduction of an original in the Folger Shakespeare Library’. The Folger . . . has eighty-two copies of this edition in its collection, making it impossible to identify which copy we are looking at. This matters because no two copies of the First Folio are identical, not just because of the contingencies of moveable type printing or the fact that *Troilus and Cressida* was added belatedly and thus appears in some copies and not others but also because each copy of the book has its own unique 400-year old history that might affect what it is we are looking at. (39)

Murphy’s warning that ‘many free-to-access [Shakespeare] apps offer very little information at all about the providence of the standard texts they provide’ should thus be extended to resources such as EEBO (359).

Shakespeare in Print remains a breath-taking work of bibliographical scholarship. It has, and will always have, a central place on any Shakespearian’s bookshelf (hopefully with a scan of its Chronological Appendix on their desktop too), but *Shakespeare in Print* is much more than a reference work. Murphy’s accounts of what he terms ‘a set of intertwined textual histories’ are a joy to read (9). Citing the work of Zachary Lesser, Adam Hooks, András Kiséry, Tara Lyons and others, he writes of the move towards contextualist approaches to bibliography, and himself provides details of the wider careers and apparent tastes of Shakespeare’s early publishers and printers in a lively and engaging manner. As mentioned above, the return to historical debates in the field and the new chapter on Shakespeare beyond print make this second edition an important record documenting key developments in the field over the last two decades. For his monumental contribution, his attention to detail and his willingness to tackle this formidable project not once but twice, Murphy deserves the gratitude of all scholars of Shakespeare and textual studies. His modest tone and respectful engagement with the work of others also provides a model for us all to emulate, particularly in a field that was once – and sometimes still is –

known to be aggressive, pedantic and exclusionary.

Bourne's aforementioned chapter is taken from an impressive Arden resource aimed at those starting out in the field. *The Research Handbook of Shakespeare and Textual Studies*, edited by Erne, consists of seventeen essays, produced by established experts in the field. The chapters are divided into four parts which offer overviews of 'Research Methods and Problems', 'Current Research and Issues', 'New Directions' and 'Material for Further Research', respectively. This structure offers readers a comprehensive grounding in Shakespeare and textual studies, with topics covered including 'The Shakespeare manuscripts', 'The early printed texts of Shakespeare', paratexts, the early modern book trade, the Shakespeare canon and apocrypha.

There are also essays on editing which cover analysis of the approaches and contributions of editors from the eighteenth century to the present day (Murphy), a stimulating overview of the debates and choices (conflation, eclectic, single-text, etc.) that have shaped modern editors' preparation of Shakespeare texts (Margaret Jane Kidnie), and the apparatus of modern editions of Shakespeare, how they vary according to intended readers/consumers, their value, and the extent to which their creation is motivated by scholarship versus commerce, i.e. presses wishing to maximize sales (Suzanne Gossett). Additional resources, which will no doubt be welcomed by general readers, students, and scholars looking to increase or refresh their knowledge, include a chronology detailing landmark moments in the history of Shakespeare and textual criticism – from the publication of *Venus and Adonis* in 1593, through the field-reshaping work of Henrietta Bartlett, A. W. Pollard and W. W. Greg (plus that of 21st-century scholars), to the completion of the Arden Third Series and the release of the New Oxford Shakespeare. There is also an A–Z of key terms and concepts – from Accidentals to Watermarks – for quick reference, and a wonderful annotated bibliography (produced by Jean-Christophe Mayer) in which the most relevant scholarship in the field has

been arranged in categories such as 'Authorship and the Shakespeare canon', 'Shakespeare's early texts' and 'Beyond Shakespeare: bibliography, book history and the book trade'. The volume thus contains more or less everything someone approaching the field might need or wish to know, and those reading it from cover to cover will certainly be able to hold their own when talking or writing about the field.

The collection will prove a valuable aid for many years to come; indeed, it offers both a stocktaking of the history of the field and its most important developments, and ideas for future projects and ways in which one can gain further training, conduct research of one's own (be it with books in the wild, or through electronic resources), attend annual conferences and apply for funding opportunities. I appreciate the fact that essays are commissioned many years in advance and that few of us expected to still be reeling from the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, but it is nonetheless a shame that the section entitled 'New directions', which contains only two essays, was not expanded to include more work by emerging scholars, and reflections on the ways in which the pandemic has impacted the way many of us work. The relevant and excellent chapters on 'Shakespeare and authorship attribution methodologies' (by Hugh Craig) and 'Shakespeare and digital editions' (by Sonia Massai) are, however, supplemented by chapters in another Arden collection released almost simultaneously: Bourne's collection, *Shakespeare / Text*.

Bourne's volume encourages authors to 'rethink patterns of influence, both historical and scholarly' by focusing on single binaries that have 'long defined how "the Shakespearean text" has been treated in scholarship, editing, performance and criticism' (2). The twenty chapters are organized into four sections entitled 'Inclusive / Exclusive', 'Before / After', 'Authorized / Unauthorised' and 'Present / Absent'. Many chapters feature established scholars returning to their fields of expertise from the fresh perspective of their assigned binary, but there is also new work on show from emerging scholars. Highlights include Aleida Auld's piece on 'Canon / Apocrypha', which identifies the release

of varying configurations of the poems in the early eighteenth century as the watershed moment in the formation of the Shakespeare canon; Hannah August's 'Text / Paratext', though it might have been more accurately named 'Title Page / Playbook'; and Miles P. Grier's 'Black / White', where he offers a thought-provoking combination of textual analysis, performance studies and material considerations in his discussion of Aaron and Tamora's inter-racial relationship in *Titus*. Grier argues that 'the page' is the only means by which Tamora can 'conceive (of) a child with Aaron' as there simply is not time in the play (326), adding that Aaron and Tamora's union is seen to lead not to the birth of a human child, but instead to the delivery of texts carrying 'a moorish parent's black "stamp" and "seal"' (320). He also builds on the work of Philip Kolin to demonstrate how such notions are literalized in performance, with the '*blackamoore childe*' wrapped and carried in the nurses' arms being 'not merely *like* the books [Lucius carries onstage] but [instead] made *of* (and made *into*) reading material' (331). 'Bundled rages', the primary ingredient used to make early modern paper, were, he explains, 'often used to represent infants in early modern performance' (331).

In one of the collection's other stand-out essays, B. K. Adams discusses the legacy of New Bibliography from the angle of race. Adams's chapter focuses on 'Fair / Foul', terms Greg and others used to talk about textual legitimacy, with foul used to describe draft – as opposed to polished ('fair') – copies behind editions. Her chapter traces the ways in which binaries such as 'fair/foul' and 'Shakespeare/Text' have been used and reworked across time, to demonstrate 'how they are used within book historical and bibliographical contexts to reproduce ideologies of race and gender (often imbricated) in early modern England', with Shakespeare presented as fair and his perceived status as white and pure upheld by the efforts of New Bibliographers working in the early twentieth century (30). Adams makes important points about the need to reconsider 'and dismantle the kinds of binaries intrinsic to foundational scholarship in the field of bibliography and textual

scholarship', whilst urging us to recognize the 'political power of the archive' and *unfair* structures that continue to prevent equal access (30). As she insists, "'foul" papers, or the technical aptitude needed to edit Shakespeare's plays, have always been held in decidedly "fair" spaces', such as research libraries and universities that for a long time 'were not particularly welcoming to white women and certainly not hospitable or open to Black, Indigenous or other People of Colour interested in the field' (42–3). If discussions about 'whiteness, fairness and race are just beginning to happen in bibliography and book history despite over fifty years of concentrated study on the history of race in early modern England', then it is, she poignantly concludes, precisely because 'fair spaces' and conversations 'were never quite accessible to the *unfair*' (43). Adams's call to welcome new voices in the field echoes that made by Young at the end of her review of the Arden Shakespeare Third Series, where she noted both the progress that series made in its inclusion of female editors and the 'urgent need for further diversity in scholarly editing' (*Shakespeare Survey* 74 (2021), 371).

The work and theories of New Bibliographers – which, Adams rightly notes, went 'unquestioned' for a disproportionate amount of time – are reassessed in great detail in Zachary Lesser's *Ghosts, Holes, Rips, and Scrapes: Shakespeare in 1619, Bibliography in the Longue Durée*, a remarkable work of analytical bibliography that will become this generation's go-to study for anyone wishing to read about or examine the so-called 'Pavier Quartos' for themselves. Lesser's book – which he describes as an extended case study – addresses the infamous collection of ten plays (nine playbooks as *The Whole Contention* contains versions of 2 and 3 *Henry VI*), known since the early twentieth century as the 'Pavier Quartos' (by Lesser labelled the 'Jaggard Quartos'), which are or were once connected to Shakespeare. These quartos can frequently be found bound together in libraries.

Much mystery has surrounded the quartos, some of which are undated (*Whole Contention*), whilst others are dated 1600, 1608 or 1619. Many 20th-

and 21st-century scholars have proposed their own theories in response to the hypotheses of Pollard and Greg, but Lesser is the first to return to examine the material evidence in detail. In a remarkable feat of solo and collaborative analysis, he was able to consult an impressive 92 per cent of the 372 extant copies of these quartos, 289 himself and 53 with the help of others. Indeed, whilst research on the quartos will forever be associated with Greg and Pollard, it must be noted that Lesser has consulted far more copies than the two men put together, and that, whilst Greg's work on the so-called 'Pavier Quartos' first helped to establish analytic bibliography as an important method of enquiry, Lesser's study both reaffirms the value of material bibliography and showcases the ways in which techniques and tools of analysis – such as multispectral imaging – have developed over the course of the last hundred years.

Having come across two volumes in which the quartos were bound together as sets, Pollard initially suspected that the collection consisted of remaindered copies; in other words, left-over copies of editions that had not sold well. In 1908, Greg famously undermined Pollard's suggestion when he analysed the watermarks within the paper on which the quartos were printed and found that playbooks with different purported title-page dates contained the same mixed paper stocks. This did not add up because one simply does not find the same paper stocks in books printed so many years apart, as paper was an expensive and perishable commodity that Stationers sought to utilize soon after it was purchased. As Lesser remarks, when coupled with his analysis of printer's devices and typographical features of the title pages, Greg's evidence demonstrated that 'the plays dated earlier than 1619 were deliberately falsified. In fact, they were all printed at the same time in the shop of William and Isaac Jaggard, the same printers who would soon be involved in the First Folio' (9). William Neidig then added to these findings, exploiting developments in composite photography to demonstrate that the title pages of the different quartos had been printed 'from standing type within days of each other' (12). These

quartos have had important implications for the story of Shakespeare's rise to cultural prominence because the idea of remaindered copies suggested that his plays did not sell well, whilst a publishing venture designed to release a collected edition of his plays (four years prior to the 1623 First Folio) implied that the opposite was true.

Lesser's Introduction sets out the views of Pollard and Greg, noting what they did and did not suggest, as well as the ways in which their thinking about the quartos developed, and the various responses of revisionist scholars such as Gerald Johnson, Peter Blayney, Andrew Murphy, David Scott Kastan, Lukas Erne, Sonia Massai, James J. Marino and Cyndia Clegg. The important questions at the heart of the mystery surrounding these quartos are then rehearsed – Who was behind the project? What were the aims of the publishing venture? Why were dates falsified and was this to conceal evidence from other Stationers, the King's Men, the Lord Chamberlain? – before Lesser proceeds to present new evidence that sometimes supports 'the revisionists, sometimes the New Bibliographers, sometimes neither', and which often leaves him with more questions than answers (32).

The study's three main chapters are organized around evidence provided by ghosts, holes, and rips and scrapes. In other words, around the material features of copies of the quartos that have enabled Lesser to draw new conclusions. Chapter 1, 'Ghosts', builds on the work of Jeffrey Todd Knight and a form of bibliographical evidence whereby one is able to identify copies of books once bound and/or pressed together by observing how the rich oils within printers' ink have transferred between adjacent leaves after reacting with the acidity levels in paper. Ghostly images, usually showing images of title-page text, do not always appear as their development depends on the levels of acidity within a given sheet of paper. Such transferred images thus enable Lesser to make observations about the plays included and the order in which they were bound, whilst other forms of 'ghostly evidence' – including old library catalogue entries and annotations made by previous

owners – are said to draw attention to more volumes of the Pavier Quartos that are now lost (47).

He surmises that quarto collections were less uniform than New Bibliographic narratives of their production would have us believe, that they were sold as a set more often than was first suspected, that their order of binding varied, and that the venture was not designed as a single-author collection. Indeed, he plausibly argues that *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, a Thomas Heywood play that was clearly attributed to Heywood on its title page, was not added to the series later by an owner (as Knights suggested in 2010), but instead ‘formed part of it from the start, offered for sale with the 1619 Shakespeare quartos and possibly with other plays altogether’ (55). Heywood’s inclusion in the collection is also a key reason why Lesser refers to the quartos as Jaggard’s Quartos, since Isaac Jaggard printed and published Heywood’s play ‘in the same shop where the 1619 quartos were printed’ (77).

‘Holes’ adds to Aaron Pratt’s impressive work on stab-stitching, with Lesser focusing on the absence of stab holes in the majority of copies of the quartos to deduce that approximately half of the surviving copies ‘seem to have initially been sold as part of a bound volume’ (74). When sold individually, most playbooks were sold stab-stitched – i.e., they were held together by a single piece of thread that passed through the assembled quires. Lesser reports that evidence of stab-stitching was found in only 39 per cent of the 265 copies he examined. This chapter also makes inferences based on the disproportionately high survival rate of the quartos when compared with other Shakespeare quartos as ‘another indication that many Pavier Quartos were offered from bookshops specifically as bound collections, not merely left up to individual book buyers to purchase as a group or not’ (75–6) – the logic here being that playbooks bound within *Sammelbände* are statistically more likely to survive than more ephemeral publications – before addressing his theories as to why Jaggard may have chosen to include Heywood’s play in the collection.

Chapter 3, ‘Rips and scrapes’, is arguably the most novel and exciting section of Lesser’s project.

Here, he turns his attention to copies of quartos that demonstrate how easy it is ‘to turn an accurate imprint into a less-than-truthful-one’, by observing how, after printing, the paper of some title pages has been ‘torn and extremely skilfully repaired’, with pen facsimile used to modify the date (87, 89), whilst others have had their paper scraped thin to remove original print before being inked. These acts of modification, often invisible to the naked eye, can be detected through the application of transmitted light, even though ‘great care was taken to disguise the repair, going so far as to match the chain lines and wires lines of the papers’ (87), and by observing the lack of impression on the verso of the date where printed numbers would have bitten into the paper. Lesser provides a convincing case for thinking that ‘these title pages were altered early in the life of these copies’, but ultimately, and understandably, comes up short when trying to find a satisfactory explanation as to precisely why this may have occurred (123).

In addition to the fascinating new ‘facts revealed by a return to primary bibliographical analysis of the Jaggard Quartos’ (134), Lesser’s study is to be praised for its emphasis on the importance of adhering to the evidence contained within individual copies of a given edition. He stresses the importance of observing what he terms the ‘multiple temporalities’ of copies, and the need to consider both the ‘before’ and the ‘after’ (22–3), particularly as it was the New Bibliographers’ focus on print production that blinded them to the evidence provided by ‘the circulation of books after the sheets left the press’ and ultimately limited the narratives they proposed about the quartos (46). Put differently, Lesser astutely argues that ‘thinking bibliographically must involve not merely *seeing behind* the later historical accretions that intervene between us and the “finished book,” although that remains important, but also *thinking through* this long history’, because ‘the book is a palimpsest: we can use sophisticated tools to read what is written underneath, but if we fail to grapple with how what has been overlaid can rewrite the substrate, we may misread both texts’ (23).

Lesser ends his study – as all responsible bibliographers ought – not with the forceful assertion of a new Sherlock-Holmesesque revelation, but instead with clear questions, reflections, and invitations for future scholars to build on the field-reshaping evidence presented. A key aim of *Ghosts, Holes, Rips and Scrapes* is to highlight the extent to which an unquestioning acceptance of the narratives that New Bibliographers attached to their material analysis has ‘shaped the material existence [of the quartos] in the Shakespeare archive and obscured the evidence of their earlier form, both from the New Bibliographers themselves and from us, their inheritors’ (146). It thus seems apt for Lesser to end with a series of provocative questions and insights.

His prose is clear and engaging throughout and he makes a constant effort to convey complex bibliographical evidence to non-experts. (That said, I think even hardcore book nerds may need a shot of espresso before they can fully get to grips with the wonderful example of the ‘ghostly palimpsest’ presented in his conclusion.) Lesser’s study is, moreover, furnished with two excellent appendices to assist those willing to take on the mantle and tackle the remaining mysteries for themselves: ‘a census of known sets of the 1619 quartos’ and ‘the order of plays in known bindings of the 1619 quartos’ (147–8 and 149–50). He also lists the different copies of each quarto consulted in his study and illustrates his analyses with a wealth of colour images – many taken with the aid of different light sources (ultraviolet light, raking light, etc.) – which offer a sumptuous showcase of the beautiful, complex topography of handmade laid paper, showing variously: the small ridges created by the wire and chain lines of the paper mould, the bite of type and tacky printers’ ink, the transfer of oils and pressure from leaves once bound together, and increased transparency where small sections have been scraped thinner than the remainder of the leaf. It is like being transported to the numerous libraries where Lesser conducted his meticulously researched study as he guides us through his interpretation of the evidence without ever concealing it from us.

Molly G. Yarn’s *Shakespeare’s Lady Editors: A History of the Shakespearean Text* is another important contribution that leaves the door open for future scholars to build on its author’s exciting discoveries and find more ‘undiscovered treasures’ (203). It is a timely contribution and a much-needed study, the usefulness and interest of which is so immediately apparent that it is hard to believe that it has not previously been attempted. Yarn’s work details the ways in which the history of Shakespeare editing has been constructed, and why it is important to recognize its biases. She presents a unique body of original documentary evidence, diligently gathered from libraries across the US and UK, in order to make connections that help to write women back into the history of Shakespeare editing, 1800–1950, whilst also questioning how and why the received history of Shakespeare editing incorrectly presented the field as being male dominated until the late twentieth century.

As she demonstrates, the ‘story is far more complex, and far more consequential, than it has seemed’; the number of editions prepared by women decreased during the later twentieth century, with eighty-one appearing between 1910 and 1940 and only thirteen between 1940 and 1970, but at least sixty-nine female editors working in the period 1800 to 1950 have nonetheless been ‘excluded from the editorial record’ (15). She suggests that the drop in editions by women – and the failure of modern critics to appreciate fully the contributions of those working in earlier periods – may in part be explained by the rise in influence of New Bibliography. She is by no means suggesting that Greg, R. B. McKerrow, Pollard, Fredson Bowers, Charlton Hinman, John Dover Wilson et al. were ‘consciously hostile to female-scholars’ (171). Rather, she suggests that their work had important implications for the ways in which ‘true’ editorial labour came to be defined as ‘hard science’ and saw the ranks of those deemed qualified to edit largely restricted to research universities, a kind of monopoly that she likens to the Tonson house’s control of editorial authority in the eighteenth century (201). This situation changed

when ‘the merging of the textual and the critical, spearheaded by critics such as Jerome McGann and D. F. McKenzie’ opened scholarly editing up to “non-specialist” editors, whose alternative viewpoints were seen as both intellectually viable and increasingly marketable’ (201). Like Sonia Massai, who alerted us to the need to avoid the teleological narratives of editing that have seen the work of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century print houses overshadowed by the advent of so-called ‘modern’ editing in the eighteenth century (see Sonia Massai, *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor* (Cambridge, 2007)), Yarn highlights the problems of judging nineteenth-century editorial labour by twentieth-century standards: ‘demanding proleptic modernity from nineteenth-century editors results in an unjustified elision of a large span of editorial activity’ (16).

Previous studies have considered individual figures, such as Mary Cowden Clarke and Charlotte Porter, but Yarn’s is the first to study women editors as a collective group. Her monograph is divided into chapters that address ‘Recovering women editors of Shakespeare’; ‘Female collaborators and ambiguous literary labour’, which focuses on issues of gendered editorial labour by considering male–female collaborations within the network of the New Shakespeare Society; ‘Women editors and scholarly networks in America’, in which she analyses communities of female editors found in American women’s colleges; ‘Women and the New Bibliography’, discussing the idea of bibliography, which focuses on the value of studying editors and their contributions through the lens of their own biography. She also includes two short chapters, referred to as ‘Sidenotes’. The first, on ‘Women editing not-Shakespeare (or not editing)’ takes her field of enquiry beyond Shakespeare studies to recognize women editing early modern texts by other writers for scholarly societies, such as the Malone Society and the Early English Text Society, under the general editorship of Greg and Frederick Furnivall, respectively (sometimes after her cut-off date of 1950), and women who carried out textual work beyond editing, such as transcription and the creation of concordances. The second is entitled ‘Early student editions of Shakespeare’,

an important inclusion given that we are told that, up until the 1940s, women edited a significant number of Shakespeare texts for school children.

Yarn covers more than 160 editions, predominantly produced by female editors, and introduces readers to the work of almost 70 female editors. The study opens with the story of Laura Valentine and her involvement with the Chandos Classics series’s *Works of William Shakespeare*, an affordable home library series, which was for a long time advertised without naming an author, before finally naming Valentine as the text’s editor in 1894. As Yarn rightly argues, the story of Valentine demonstrates how ‘the Shakespearean editorial tradition, as it is currently known, remains fundamentally incomplete’; indeed, the evidence to connect Valentine with the Shakespeare editorial tradition was there, ‘the connection simply has not been made before now’ (7). In reading Yarn’s work, we discover that women produced a range of different types of Shakespeare texts for a number of series, and that the Shakespeare plays most frequently edited by women – alone or in collaboration with men – between 1800 and the present day are: *As You Like It* (37 editions), *Twelfth Night* (32), *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* (32), *The Merchant of Venice* (30), *Julius Caesar* (30), *Macbeth* (30), *Hamlet* (29), *The Taming of the Shrew* (28), *Othello* (28), *The Tempest* (28) and *King Lear* (27). Yarn also draws on ‘material from letters, diaries, ledgers, contracts, census documents, published reports, reviews, advertisements, wills, life records, and even novels’ to give readers ‘as detailed an account as possible’ of these important nineteenth- and twentieth-century women editors (7).

As with Lesser’s invitation for scholars to build on his work, Yarn too aids her successors by providing helpful appendices. There is a table of all known ‘Shakespeare editions prepared by women, 1800–2021’, organized chronologically by play and including – importantly – volumes that were commissioned but never completed, but (due to space limitations) not including editions abridged, marked up or adapted for performance (Appendix B). There is also a quick reference guide to women involved in the preparation of editions between

1800 and 1950 (Appendix A: 'Women editors of Shakespeare, 1800–1950'), though readers will find more detailed accounts of most of these women in the main body of the monograph. Where relevant, readers are also guided to existing biographies for more extensive coverage. The study also contains wonderful illustrations that help to bring Yarn's revisionist history to life.

In sum, Yarn has produced a study that many of us have been longing to read, and her exploration of the important contributions women made to the history of Shakespeare editing does not disappoint. In addressing the topic of women editors, Yarn simultaneously offers a lucid account of how Shakespeare editing as a field has developed between the eighteenth century and the present day and redefines what being a Shakespeare editor has meant at different points in time. Looking to the future, her epilogue notes how more women editors have been commissioned for series such as *The Norton 3* (21 women editors to 19 male editors) and *Arden4* (a 50/50 breakdown is expected), before rightly stressing the need for the field of Shakespeare and textual studies to 'continue to actively engage with expanding diversity beyond binary gender to engage with questions of race, sexual orientation,

gender identity, gender expression, nationality, and institutional affiliation' (203).

WORKS REVIEWED

- Acker, Faith, *First Readers of Shakespeare's Sonnets, 1590–1790* (New York, 2020)
- Bourne, Claire M. L., ed., *Shakespeare / Text: Contemporary Readings in Textual Studies, Editing and Performance* (London, 2021)
- Erne, Lukas, ed., *The Arden Research Handbook of Shakespeare and Textual Studies* (London, 2021)
- Erne, Lukas, and Devani Singh, eds., *Bel-vedere or the Garden of the Muses: An Early Modern Printed Commonplace Book* (Cambridge, 2020).
- Knowles, Richard, ed., *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare's King Lear* (New York, 2020)
- Lesser, Zachary, *Ghosts, Holes, Rips, and Scrapes: Shakespeare in 1619, Bibliography in the Longue Durée* (Cambridge, 2021)
- Murphy, Andrew, *Shakespeare in Print: A History and Chronology of Shakespeare Publishing*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 2021)
- Proudfoot, Richard, Ann Thompson, David Scott Kastan and H. R. Woudhuysen, eds., *William Shakespeare: Complete Works* (London, 2020)
- Yarn, Molly G., *Shakespeare's Lady Editors: A History of the Shakespearean Text* (Cambridge, 2021)