Introduction

Margaret Jane Kidnie and Sonia Massai

Editing and textual studies achieved an unprecedented visibility in the 1980s and 1990s alongside the advent of a certain type of historically oriented scholarship. Critical analysis extended from the interpretation of Shakespeare's texts to include widespread discussion of early modern print culture and rationales underpinning modern editorial methods. This interest was further intensified by the launching of such projects as the *Arden Shakespeare* third series (Arden 3) and *The Oxford Collected Middleton*, long-term efforts that draw on the expertise of scholars who may not have previously thought of themselves as editors and who brought with them new perspectives on materials and process. The debates generated through these years and in the decade that followed not only redefined editorial practices but also prompted new directions in textual scholarship.

    This collection gathers a wide range of contributions from leading Shakespearean scholars in the fields of editing, textual studies, book history and digital humanities. Their contributions give a comprehensive overview of the current state of play in these fields and their development since the so-called materialist turn that marks an important point of departure from earlier New Bibliographical methods of textual and bibliographical analysis. Building on the lessons learned from their predecessors, textual scholars and editors committed to the study of the transmission of Shakespeare's works have queried received notions of authenticity, originality and textual stability, carrying out a major re-examination of archival evidence. These efforts are supported by the vast number of textual artefacts from the period now made available, and more easily searchable, by digitization projects such as *Early English Books Online* (*EEBO*) and the *English Short-Title Catalogue* (*ESTC*). Contributors to this collection have been at the forefront of this important movement, often referred to as 'New Textualism', and collectively offer an unprecedented insight into the magnitude of the

1

paradigmatic changes that have affected textual scholarship and the editing of Shakespeare and early modern drama in recent years. More specifically, they propose a different understanding of, or altogether new alternatives to, central categories that may otherwise continue to shape editorial theory and practice, including problematic distinctions between 'foul papers' and 'prompt-books', 'editions' and 'reprints', or 'substantive' and 'accidental' variants in the texts of the early editions of Shakespeare's works.

In this respect, this collection fulfils an important dual purpose: it takes stock of recent developments in Shakespeare textual studies and begins to chart how evolving conceptions of the conditions of textual production in the early modern period will impact on editorial approaches to the reproduction of Shakespeare for the modern reader. This collection takes as its special focus key issues in the history of the textual production and readership of Shakespeare's plays and poems from the publication of the earliest editions to the present day. Essays progress through authorship and manuscript studies (Part I), to book history and reading studies (Parts II and III), to the legacies and practices of Shakespeare's editorial tradition (Parts IV and V), to the fashioning of knowledge by means of editorial apparatuses (Part VI). In an effort to address the textual particularity of specific moments of this history, contributors illustrate the issues under discussion through reference to individual plays and/or poems. They also draw on the textual complex-ities associated with the transmission of non-Shakespearean drama whenever it can lend fresh insights or reveal blind spots in the way in which Shakespeare's texts have been edited over time.

Mapping new territory: the whole and its (augmented) parts

The six parts into which this collection is arranged – 'Scripts and manuscripts', 'Making books; building reputations', 'From print to manuscript', 'Editorial legacies', 'Editorial practices' and 'Apparatus and the fashioning of knowledge' – cover areas of research interest within which recent scholarship has made the greatest impact on the study of Shakespeare and the text. The contributions in each part consider specific topics that have come to the forefront of scholarly debates in the field as a result of the momentous transition from a predominantly receptive deployment of New Bibliographical principles and rationales, which characterized the editing of Shakespeare from the mid- to the late twentieth century, to the production of a new body of textual knowledge,

which affects the way in which Shakespeare is now being re-presented to readers.

The publication of Walter Greg's influential study *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses* (1931) led earlier textual scholars to classify early modern dramatic manuscripts according to categories ('foul papers', 'fair copies', and 'prompt-books'), which under-represent the variety and the complexity of the 'precious few' extant specimen from the period. Part I, 'Scripts and manuscripts', tests post-Gregian accounts of manuscripts produced and used by early modern playwrights and the theatres for which they wrote against a selection of representative documentary evidence. It begins with a preliminary account of playwrights and authorship. Heather Hirschfeld weighs the intrinsically collaborative conditions of theatrical production in Shakespeare's theatre against emergent models of proprietary authorship, moving then to consider the challenges confronted by attributionists. Tackling the theoretically and empirically difficult notion of 'style', Hirschfeld comments on how modern attribution studies are conducted within, and are in part shaped by, the funding exigencies of a modern humanities academy for whom computational stylistics and big-data analysis carry a certain institutional appeal.

Paul Werstine takes up considerations of textual agency with a discussion of the contributions made by Ralph Crane and Edward Knight, the two scribes associated with Shakespeare whose names we know. Werstine sets out each scribe's different characteristic practices and their relative textual accuracy, and challenges arguments for attribution to Crane, rather than to 'Anonymous', Folio plays such as *Othello, Henry IV, Part 2* and *The Comedy of Errors*. James Purkis rounds out this part with a reconsideration of the manuscript of *Sir Thomas More*, drawing connections between this manuscript and *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* and *The Captives*. Close examination of 'the traces left by the agents on the surfaces of the manuscripts' in light of recent developments in textual studies leads Purkis to develop a more complex model of collaborative writing than one that either privileges, or effaces, the author.

Part II, 'Making books; building reputations', focuses on early modern stationers as a key category of agents, who, by investing time, money and their professional expertise in printing and publishing the first editions of Shakespeare's works, transformed Shakespeare from popular poet and playwright into a best-selling author. This part therefore marks an important point of departure from earlier approaches to the study of the

transmission of Shakespeare's works into print, according to which the process of publication diluted or distorted their meaning as intended by their author. Eighteenth-century editors, for example, notoriously described the transmission of Shakespeare's works from manuscript to print during his lifetime and throughout the seventeenth century as a process of increasing deterioration of his language and of his original intentions. The advent of sociological approaches to the study of early modern print cultures has led Shakespeare scholars to regard the process of textual transmission and publication as formative rather than de-formative. A competitive and antagonistic model of theatrical and textual production, which tended to regard publication as separate from, or even detrimental to, performance, has given way to revisionary accounts of early modern stationers as non-authorial and non-theatrical collaborators, who nevertheless were entrusted by Shakespeare and his company with the realization of his works on the page. This part is therefore devoted to a close analysis of the making of Shakespeare's early printed playbooks in different formats and for different types of readers and to a re-evaluation of the impact of early modern printing house practices and publishing strategies on the rise of Shakespeare in print.

Chapters 4 to 8 explore the networks of collaborators who contributed to the publication of Shakespeare in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and consider how focusing on this group of agents makes us think differently about Shakespeare's works (as texts *and* as books). Sonia Massai, for example, argues that the sudden drop in the number of first editions of Shakespeare's plays in the early seventeenth century was due to the rise in print popularity of playbooks which originated with the newly re-established children's companies, thus showing that Shakespeare was not uniformly popular with early readers during his lifetime. Similarly, Helen Smith qualifies the recent theory about Shakespeare's popularity in print (see, for example, Erne 2013) by considering the Elizabethan editions of Shakespeare's plays and poems within the wider context of their publishers' overall outputs. Collaborations among members of the book trade and specific publishing strategies and trends seem to have played as significant a role in determining the rise of Shakespeare in print as any plan that Shakespeare and his company may have had regarding the publication of his works.

Alan Farmer, on the other hand, building on recent scholarship on the preparation of dramatic copy for press (see, for example, Massai 2007), reinforces the idea that Shakespeare's transmission into print already

marked him out as exceptionally admired by his contemporaries as a 'literary dramatist', because of the frequency with which the title pages of his playbooks refer to the correction, revision and augmentation of the texts they reproduce. Zachary Lesser and Peter Stallybrass, lending resonance to the narrative of Shakespeare's 'mixed fortunes' in print put forward by Massai and Smith, argue that the Jacobean editions of Shakespeare's playbooks show no straightforward trajectory towards the establishment of Shakespeare's reputation as 'literary dramatist', by considering the marketing strategies deployed by his publishers on a selection of title pages. They conclude by advancing a new theory about the genesis of the so-called 'Pavier Quartos'. The last chapter in this part by Emma Smith strikes another sobering note in its re-assessment of the literary qualities usually ascribed to the First Folio by scholars who concentrate their attention on the preliminaries, which are indeed aimed at fashioning Shakespeare as a literary author (see, for example, Marcus 1996 or de Grazia 1991b). By focusing on character lists instead, Smith highlights both the ingenuity and the half-hearted effort that must have gone into their preparation: these lists display a degree of the literary connotations associated with this paratextual feature in the period, but they are only sporadically prefaced to individual plays in the Folio and they are often marred by local inaccuracies and oversights.

'From print to manuscript' highlights the idiosyncratic reading practices brought to Shakespeare's text from the seventeenth century to our own day. Recent developments in the history of reading and the consumption of vernacular literature in early modern England have led to a re-assessment of how Shakespeare was experienced not only on the stage but on the pages of the earliest editions of his works. Seminal studies into literacy and attempts to fashion readers' taste and reading habits, along with growing numbers of case studies devoted to early modern private libraries, have created a renewed interest in how Shakespeare was read, annotated, collected and curated. This consideration of 'active' readers is then extended forward to the present day, to embrace strategies of reading by actors and others that are enabled by digital technologies. Laura Estill broadens our sense of who read Shakespeare during the early modern period and how reading practices may have differed from our own. The commonplaces discussed by Estill show that Shakespeare was indeed enjoyed by a 'great variety of readers', as anticipated by the famous address prefaced to the Folio, and that writing, or the re-inscription, contextualization and (often radical) adaptation of printed lines into commonplacing books, was integral to this thoroughly interactive mode of reading. Jean-Christophe Mayer considers

a different category of more specialized readers, who annotated printed editions or manuscript transcriptions of Shakespeare's plays for performance. Amidst a wide range of annotating practices, Mayer identifies two of the most recurring types of interventions – cuts and corrections – which aimed to adapt Shakespeare's plays to the very specific needs of different kinds of theatrical events.

A different kind of interpretive performance is the topic of Jeffrey Todd Knight's chapter, which examines the practice, widespread among early modern book collectors, of 'collective binding'. Knight argues that the selection and juxtaposition of printed texts within a bound collection shapes the way in which individual texts, including Shakespeare's plays, were read by their original owners, producing meaning in a bibliographical context that is provisional and unfixed. The fourth chapter in this part, Alan Galey's 'Encoding as editing as reading', shows how a process of transfer and recontextualization continues to have interpretive implications in our modern digital moment. Challenging the view that, from an encoding perspective, 'all texts are simply content to be copied and pasted from one form into another', Galey illustrates some of the ways in which choices about how to translate from one medium to another provoke literary discovery. W. B. Worthen approaches digital textuality by thinking about do-it-yourself postcard plays that allow reader–performers to reflect not only on '(post) dramatic performance, but on the performance of writing in postprint media'. The performance of professional scholarship, Worthen notes, is likewise already an intermedial experience – dependent on materials and methods of dissemination as varied as books, manuscripts, libraries, databases and blogs – and apps for Shakespeare should be understood within this broader textual and performative context. Worthen explores apps such as *Explore Shakespeare, The Tempest for iPad*, and *Actsophia*, noting that apps aimed at actors seem more permissive than those aimed at students of forms of readerly intervention that transform/deform the text into personalized events.

The collection's fourth part, 'Editorial legacies', takes the long historical view on current editorial practice, revealing its sometimes surprising genealogies. The five chapters in this part reflect from various perspectives on how the book trade, theatrical traditions and literary markets have shaped, and continue to shape, both the canon and individual plays and poems within it. The first two chapters, by Peter Holland and Keir Elam, tackle from different perspectives issues of performance and editing. Holland, in a chapter that connects in certain respects to Mayer's work in the previous part on

theatrical adaptation, considers the 'versions of Shakespeare in print that theatre generates'. The textual ambiguities of theatrical adaptations such as Davenant's 1676 edition of *Hamlet*, ostensibly as acted at the Duke of York's Theatre, and Michael Grandage's edition of the same play as performed at the Donmar Warehouse in 2009, mark for Holland the 'messy' worlds of theatre and theatre research. This leads into an analysis of modern performance editions, which Holland identifies as the 'progeny' of eighteenth-century acting versions such as those by Bell and Gentleman. Elam's 'Editing Shakespeare by pictures' offers a semiotic analysis of illustrated editions, up to and including modern graphic novels, in order to argue that images are typically more interpretively integral to the editorial work than scholars have previously recognized, playing within the covers of a book 'a number of "editorial" and paratextual roles'. Where early scholars have seen illustrations freezing a theatrical moment – an effort they consider counter-intuitive to the experience of performance – Elam sees the desire to illustrate Shakespeare as generically consistent with theatrical representation, which balances (or even privileges) images and sounds against text.

Andrew Murphy likewise ranges across a 400-year publishing history, and one of his many insights in a chapter which details the 'intimate relationship between formats and readerships' is the intertwining of theatrical performance and small-format publication. Murphy shows how publishers' desires to open new markets for Shakespeare – beginning with Pavier, but extending through the nineteenth century and into modern-day forms of digital packaging – generate innovation in terms of format, pricing models and, latterly, platform that have continued to redefine the publishing industry. John Bell's eighteenth-century theatre editions feature in four of the chapters in this part. Leah Marcus picks up the tradition of the introduction with Bell to show that the long, formal editorial introduction with which we are now so accustomed is a relatively recent phenomenon, the origins of which can be traced back to the British Empire, and specifically to the teaching of Shakespeare in India. In our own vastly different cultural, political and technological moment – one characterized by the brevity and polyvocality of contributions to debates on the World Wide Web – Marcus speculates that we may have arrived at a point in the history of Shakespeare publishing when the tide is about to turn, at least in terms of editorial introductions, in a quite different direction.

The topic of the last chapter in this part, 'Emendation and the editorial reconfiguration of Shakespeare', by Lukas Erne, provides a strong

transition into the next part, 'Editorial practices'. For Erne, Shakespeare editing is characterized by 'two opposed trends' that are particularly evident in attitudes towards emendation. Where some scholars advocate a hands-off approach to the text in order to arrive at a richer under-standing of its meanings, other scholars insist that those meanings are only revealed by means of editorial intervention. Erne provocatively labels these trends 'Protestant editing' and 'Catholic editing', arguing that editorial leanings one way or the other not only shape the editions we read, but grow out of attitudes towards textual mediation, authority and the value of tradition that first came into sharp focus within Reformist and Counter-Reformist movements in the sixteenth century.

'Editorial practices' centres on the basic principle that the presentation of Shakespeare's text on the page has a significant impact on how it is read and received. All of the contributors to this part address a particular aspect of the editorial process in order to explore its broader methodolo-gical and, where relevant, theoretical implications; in some cases such reflection points to future possible directions, while in others it sharpens our perception of the costs and benefits of current practices. John Jowett opens this part by revisiting procedures for the editing of early modern pointing. This methodologically groundbreaking chapter argues that Greg's famous distinction between accidentals and substantives is mis-guided: Greg himself recognized that there was little likelihood that authorial manuscript punctuation would survive transmission into print. To preserve copy-text punctuation in old-spelling editions then, when pointing so powerfully shapes sense, is 'a kind of faux-conservatism'. Jowett proposes abandoning Greg's distinction in order to deal simply with emendations, which one would record without regard to Gregian differences between 'substantive' words or 'accidental' (or 'semi-substantive') punctuation.

Matthew Dimmock takes up an edited play's verbal texture in 'Shakespeare's Strange Tongues'. Dimmock's interest is in those voices that are conspicuously different – along with the particular ways in which a voice can register on Shakespeare's stage as ethnically different – in order to reflect further on how such lines are transmitted (or even translated) editorially. Drawing on examples that illustrate the signifying potential of features of the text even as seemingly small as irregular punctuation, Dimmock illustrates how modernization potentially risks effacing early modern fictional encounters with strangeness. Alan Dessen and Tiffany Stern explore act and scene breaks, and how they are managed in modern editions. In keeping with Dimmock, Dessen alerts us to the interpretive

losses potentially associated with modernization. He considers, in particular, the fourth act of *Henry IV, Part 2* (specifically, the lack of any break in either quarto or folio between what are conventionally understood as the fourth and fifth scenes) in order to think about a possible ironic patterning of this sequence in performance. Taking as her starting point Arden Early Modern Drama's policy of marking act breaks with a treble clef, Stern asks why some of the earliest performative moments in a play are marked and not others. This question prompts a detailed exploration of what might have happened on the earliest stages before and after the actors delivered their lines, an analysis of performance that in turn begs the question of what a 'play' is, theatrically and editorially.

The final part examines how features of the modern edition such as commentary and collation organize and so create forms of knowledge. The kinds of information that an edition 'remembers' for its readers and the means it uses to disseminate that knowledge is a major focus of all three of these contributions. Jill Levenson, in a chapter that speaks to Marcus's examination of the rise of the long introduction as a response to the pressures of Empire, documents the evolution of critical introductions, especially from the mid-nineteenth century to the present day. Her emphasis rests on the way innovation tends to be accommodated and tradition perpetuated through a combination of pedagogy (especially editorial training in the graduate classroom), series guidelines and personal mentorship. She concludes with a consideration of three major recent types of project – the Cambridge Jonson, the Middleton *Collected Works* and two internet editions (the *Internet Shakespeare Editions* and *Digital Renaissance Editions*) – as standing 'at different points on a spectrum of possibilities' in relation to apparatus. Eric Rasmussen describes how the much-maligned collation line serves as a volume's 'editorial memory', and he takes account of new developments in formatting (especially in terms of digital visualization) that allow readers to attribute emendations more easily than print editions (and some electronic editions) have previously made possible.

David Weinberger wraps up this part, and the collection, with a chapter on networked knowledges in our internet age. He begins with an extended consideration of the challenges *Hamlet* – which exists as quartos, folios, performances, editions, recordings and films – presents to library cataloguers. Rather than attempt to adjudicate these generic boundaries, Weinberger proposes managing them, and ultimately benefiting from their ontological variety and confusion, through an imaginative shift to the model of a network without centre or edges. In a move that is

consistent with current Open Access initiatives such as those with which the Folger Shakespeare Library, for example, is experimenting, Weinberger envisions how networked scholarship is likely to alter existing publishing models, both economically and in terms of what scholars traditionally consider publication-worthy (or publication-ready). For Weinberger, this model of knowledge dissemination is in keeping with our understanding of Shakespeare the man and his works, since both exist as 'messy links, always in contention'.

Collectively, the chapters in this collection present, and reflect on, the new bodies of textual knowledge that inform the editing of Shakespeare in the early twenty-first century. They provide students and scholars new to the field with a wide-ranging introduction to current approaches and debates, especially in relation to the study of early modern drama. These research-led contributions will also give established textual scholars, editors and book historians much with which to engage in ongoing conversations about the recovery of an early period of composition and publication, and the subsequent appropriation and transmission of Shakespeare's plays and poems by means of manuscript, print and digital technologies.

Shakespeare textual scholars and Shakespeare editors have learned important lessons from the momentous advent of poststructuralism and digital technologies in the late twentieth century but they have also achieved a more complicated perspective on the most immediate response to these two major events, namely the dictum that editors should now edit without the 'author' and without the 'work' as their guiding principles. Even editors who have championed the cause of 'unediting' Shakespeare in order to show their readers what Shakespeare in print would have looked like before the rise of the editorial tradition would agree that any form of textual (re)production is a form of textual mediation, and therefore a form of editorial (re)presentation of an earlier textual artefact. Restarting from the assumption that editing is unavoidable and that 'rather than expect an infinite array of textual and dramatic possibilities to be unfolded within a given edition, we should expect and encourage a greater range of editions than presently available' (Marcus, in Murphy 2007: 142), the scholars gathered in this collection provide a critical re-evaluation of what we think we know about textual (re)production in Shakespeare's time and since (Parts I–III), and how this knowledge is shaping or might continue to shape editorial practice (Parts III–VI).