Renaissance and Reformation
Renaissance et Réforme

Hooks, Adam G., and Zachary Lesser, project leads. Shakespeare Census; Stapleton, Michael, project lead. SHAKEDSETC.ORG. Other

Andrew Griffin

Volume 43, numéro 1, hiver 2020

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1070182ar
DOI : https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v43i1.34094

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (imprimé)
2293-7374 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer ce compte rendu

Griffin, A. (2020). Compte rendu de [Hooks, Adam G., and Zachary Lesser, project leads. Shakespeare Census; Stapleton, Michael, project lead. SHAKEDSETC.ORG. Other]. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, *43*(1), 194–200. https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v43i1.34094

recipes. While the interface is a bit clunky, the project itself is remarkably robust and has been publishing consistently for seven years, making it likely that *The Recipes Project* will continue to be a useful resource for scholars working with historical recipes in the years to come.

JESSICA MARIE OTIS
George Mason University

Hooks, Adam G., and Zachary Lesser, project leads.
Shakespeare Census.
University of Pennsylvania Libraries and the Price Digital Humanities Lab, 2018. Accessed 26 June 2019.
shakespearecensus.org.

Stapleton, Michael, project lead.
SHAKEDSETC.ORG. Other.
Accessed 26 June 2019.
shakedsetc.org.

More than any other subfield of literary studies, archival bibliography has been transformed over the past twenty years by the adoption of digital methods. Even if (as we often hear) the move from "humanities computing" to the "digital humanities" (hereafter DH) was understood to be a move away from such strictly textual concerns, certain facets of humanities computing—the archiving, retrieval, and descriptive cataloguing of textual objects—have utterly upended the field in a way that seems shocking when compared with the disciplinary impact of DH more broadly. The outsized impact of digital methods on bibliography is perhaps at its clearest when we look at the early, foundational DH work of Jerome McGann as an exemplary case. In the case of McGann, his capacious but focused Rossetti Archive and its critical-analytic tools have outperformed and been wildly more influential than his Ivanhoe game, which was itself an attempt to develop digital methods away from the labour of "sorting, accessing, and disseminating large bodies of materials."[1] Rather

1. Jerome McGann, "The Ivanhoe Game," accessed 26 June 2019, www2.iath.virginia.edu/jjm2f/old/Igamesummaryweb.htm.

than gamifying literary study, say, or rather than appealing to a multimedia form as we reimagine the style and character of literary scholarship, digital innovation has most radically transformed the practice of literary study with its archives—which aim at either comprehensiveness, as in Early English Books Online (EEBO) or Early Century Collections Online (ECCO) or the English Broadside Ballad Archive (EBBA), or something more narrowly curated, as in Database of Early English Playbooks (DEEP) or the Internet Shakespeare Editions (ISE). The sheer recognizability of these acronyms suggests just how ubiquitous digital archives have become, and how widely they've informed the practice of literary study today.

While these innovations in cataloguing and retrieval methods are fundamentally technological, their transformative power is also tied to a variety of systemic pressures that affect both university budget priorities and the market for scholarly publications. A database like EEBO or ECCO is attractive to universities not only because it "fosters innovation" (or something similarly attractive to administrators at a twenty-first-century university), but also because universities find it less expensive to subscribe to these resources than to fund research trips to international libraries. Similarly, we might find more idiosyncratic digital repositories today—"boutique archives," to use Mark Greene and Dennis Meissner's useful phrase[2]—not only because easy-to-use digital tools allow for novel ideas to flourish, but also because, prior to the advent of less expensive digital archiving techniques, few publishers would consider investing time and money in a massive compendium that might attract fewer than two dozen readers in the world. In this sense, the bibliographical and archival works under review here—a census of Shakespeare's quartos (shakespearecensus.org) and a database/website attempting to record the tradition of Shakespeare editing (shakedsetc.org)—could only be produced today in a digital form.

The census of quartos is a necessarily digital project not only because it seems unlikely that a university press would publish such a work in book form today, but also because current systems of tenure and promotion would never support such research in any other form. When Henrietta C. Bartlett and Alfred

2. See Laura Estill, "Digital Humanities' Shakespeare Problem," *Humanities* 8.45 (2019): 1–16, esp. 4. See also Mark A. Greene and Dennis Meissner, "More Product, Less Process: Revamping Traditional Archival Processing," *The American Archivist* 68 (2005): 208–63.

W. Pollard produced their *Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto* in 1916,[3] it was the result of decades of work, reams of correspondence with everyone from W. W. Greg to Joseph Quincy Adams, and a generous subvention from Yale's Elizabethan Club.[4] The print census also emerged from a very different critical milieu, in which Bardolatry and the empirical study of books were far easier sells than they are now, and were far more central to the critical conversation. The digital Shakespeare Census, on the other hand, created by Adam Hooks and Zachary Lesser and developed by Scott Enderle, draws heavily on Bartlett's work but is published—if it can be said to be "published" at all in the traditional sense—by the University of Pennsylvania Libraries and the Price Digital Humanities Lab at Penn. Through their servers, it sits online for however many readers might need to locate and compare at a distance all eight extant copies of the 1600 *Midsummer Night's Dream* quarto. This new, more fluid, infinitely updateable, always-available document costs, one must assume, a fraction of what Yale University Press and the Yale Elizabethan Club paid for the original census.

The Shakespeare Census is at its most useful when it simply performs the same work that Bartlett and Pollard's census performed. Anyone interested in bibliographic history can locate and find more-or-less comprehensive notes on the locations and conditions of extant quartos of Shakespeare's plays. A quick click on the easy-to-read, icon-forward interface can immediately show, say, the two extant quartos of Q1 *Hamlet*, along with their shelf marks at the Huntington Library and the British Library. The records kept by Shakespeare Census also helpfully contain a note on the quarto's provenance, along with the bibliographic notes from both the original Bartlett and Pollard, as well as the subsequent Bartlett update, meaning that the Shakespeare Census contains familiar, crucial bibliographical minutiae about, for instance, the Trinity College, Cambridge copy of *Richard II* (e.g., "K1 cropped at top, injuring headline. The Capell (presented, June, 1779) copy. Bound in brown calf, with other old plays"). The online census proves even more helpful by including supplementary material that wasn't or couldn't have been found in the original

3. Henrietta Bartlett and A. W. Pollard, eds., *A Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto, 1594–1709* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1916).

4. The Henrietta C. Bartlett Papers can be found at archives.yale.edu/repositories/11/resources/695?stylename=yul.ead2002.xhtml.xsl&pid=beinecke:bartlett&query=&clear-stylesheet-cache=yes&hlon=yes&big=&adv=&filter=&hitPageStart=&sortFields=&view=all.

censuses. Here, it includes the STC/Wing numbers—Pollard and Redgrave wouldn't publish the STC until 1926—ESTC numbers, DEEP links where available, and information on critical sources that refer to individual copies. Clicking on a link about the Huntington's Q1 *Hamlet*, then, shows that the volume is discussed at length in Arthur and Janet Freeman's essay from *The Library*, "Did Halliwell Steal and Mutilate the First Quarto of Hamlet?"[5] (The answer, according to the Freemans, is no.)

As a source for bibliographic information, then, the Hooks and Lesser census usefully, even if slightly, supplements what Bartlett and Pollard published previously. Where it seems particularly novel, though, is in its very digital-ness and in the suppleness that the digital format provides. Not simply a reiteration of Bartlett and Pollard, the work takes seriously the capacities of the digital, including the openness and liveness of the form. The small digital differences are substantive when "confirmed" entries receive a check mark, when updates are issued regularly (if, problematically, silently), and where the work can keep up with the surrounding research. In this liveness, the digital saps bibliographical scholarship of monumentality only to replace static completion with a sense of cumulative openness. What needs to be seen, however—as with all other living digital projects—is whether this liveness can persist over time. Digital architectures may be lighter and more open to growth, but institutions and individuals still need to maintain works that aim to remain alive. One great thing about a monument is that once you've built it, you can walk away from it.

While the perpetual liveness of the Hooks and Lesser census is its unique strength, its currentness also offers a perspective from which to challenge a variety of bibliographic assumptions that shape it. With a commendable display of intellectual modesty, the digital census wears its debts to Bartlett and Pollard (and Sir Sidney Lee to a lesser extent) on its sleeve, but it seems burdened by an inherited idea of Shakespeare's canon that seems outmoded, if it was ever sensible to begin with. Considering the century of scholarship on Shakespeare's authorship between the first Bartlett-Pollard census and the Hooks-Lesser census, it seems curious that Hooks and Lesser would "include all items attributed to Shakespeare in print during the period, but not those attributed to him only by modern scholarship" (shakespearecensus.org/about/). While

5. Arther and Janet Ing Freeman, "Did Halliwell Steal and Mutilate the First Quarto of *Hamlet*," *The Library* 2.4 (2001): 349–63.

the principle itself seems potentially justifiable, it remains unjustified in the decidedly light explanatory apparatus, and it muddies the waters for any of the likely people to turn to a census of quartos. Does anyone find the digital Shakespeare Census when looking for information on *The Birth of Merlin*? Or, *Cupid's Cabinet Unlocked*? Or, Thomas Lord Cromwell? While the question of the apocrypha was more open in 1916, it seems less meaningful today and hardly seems like it should inform an otherwise tidy database. Of course, digital databases allow for such capaciousness, and they ultimately seem to encourage bibliographic hoarding. Why throw away a perfectly good note on the British Library's *Birth of Merlin* when there are no meaningful limits to the size of a digital census of Shakespeare's quartos?

The relative obscurity of archival principles is also an issue with SHAKEDSETC.ORG, a website "devoted to historic editions of Shakespeare, &c." that have appeared since the eighteenth century. The "&c." in its self-description is something of a tell here, pointing to the loose openness of a digital project that seems unwilling to complete itself, or even to establish the terms through which "completeness" might be measured. Eschewing familiar digital archival practices, SHAKEDSETC.ORG doesn't establish a comprehensive history of editions from Rowe through Norton 3, but operates instead according to an undeclared principle and seems most successful when it deals with eighteenth- and nineteenth-century editions. At bottom, the project is scholarly in a loose sense, but it remains useful for anyone interested in the history of editing. Methodologically underdetermined, it provides a suggestive and useful collection of links to historic editions of Shakespeare's plays that are available in other databases, including archive.org, ISE, Google Books, the Folger Library, and the British Library, and it includes scanned PDFs of editions not available in other repositories. Similarly interesting if similarly partial is the collection of links to historical Shakespeare criticism. Rather than provide a historical narrative or a rationalized archive, then, it provides a "sampling"—a word I borrow from the site—and its accomplishment needs to be measured against such a goal.

As a sampling of some historical editions of Shakespeare's plays, SHAKEDSETC.ORG, accomplishes its goal, though the principles of selection are ultimately scattershot or—to me, at least—obscure. Consider, for instance, the section on "20th century editions" (shakedsetc.org/20th-century-editions). It begins with a note on C. H. Herford's 1899 edition, and it does so by

tying—according to what rationale?—Herford's edition to the editions of Sir Sidney Lee and Charlotte Porter, under the heading "Herford, Lee, Porter." In this section, we learn little about the Herford edition, its editorial principles, or its contribution to the history of Shakespeare editing, but get instead an eclectic assortment of information on Herford, excluding information on his scholarship but including a note on the son he lost in WWI. Apart from the potted biography, the site then links to each of the ten volumes of Herford's Shakespeare on archive.org before providing a Google Books link to Herford's *The Normality of Shakespeare Illustrated in His Treatment of Love and Marriage*, a volume that doesn't seem to have much to do with the history of editing. Below this section on Herford is a similarly thin biography of Sir Sidney Lee and links through to his editions, followed by a mention of Charlotte E. Porter and Helen E. Clarke's edition of the plays. Porter and Clarke also appear in the section of the site dedicated to "Women Edit[ing] Shakespeare," which offers an interesting heuristic for thinking through the editorial tradition—how do we understand the history of editing where it intersects with the history of gender?—but refuses to say much about that tradition other than simply acknowledging it. The section on Herford, Lee, and Porter is then followed by a section dealing with three series of Shakespeare editions—"New Variorum, Arden 1, and Yale 1"—which is then followed by a section "Kitteridge, Harrison, Sisson," and a final section, "Arden 2, Cambridge 3, Pelican."

At this point, it becomes clear that the site's goal is something other than comprehensiveness or curatorial interpretation. Instead, SHAKEDSETC.ORG is a *Wunderkammer* dealing with the tradition of Shakespeare editing and needs to be approached as such. These are, of course, all important editions, though visitors to the site wouldn't know why they seem important in light of editorial history. After attending to the project, they might even rightfully ask why, say, Cambridge 1 and 2 are ignored, and where the Norton editions—editions that have done as much to shape the popular understanding of Shakespeare as any other currently thriving series—might fit in the broader story of Shakespeare editing, reception, and scholarship. From its gnomic URL to the eclectic collection of images featuring a number of beautiful photos of shipyard workers, the site feels more like a garage sale than a library. As with any good garage sale, however, there are surprising finds, like a comprehensive set of links to the Furness Variorum Shakespeare (shakedsetc.org/new-variorum-i-1871-1955), and a fascinating collection of various nineteenth- and twentieth-century

works of scholarship that emerged from that "variorum commentary tradition" (shakedsetc.org/conjectures-and-notes). The high point of the collection of links on the site is perhaps found in the "Red-Letter Shakespeare" section, which features links to particularly beautiful editions of Shakespeare, including the volumes of Shakespeare edited by E. K. Chambers and designed by Talwin Morris (shakedsetc.org/red-letter-shakespeare).

While idiosyncratic and undertheorized, SHAKEDSETC.ORG points, perhaps, to the future of digital repositories. While libraries and government depositories deal with the long and enduring headaches of mass digitization or Googlization, the "minor archive," or the heavily curated archive, seems to be the only way to deal with the glut of information that threatens to overwhelm researchers who turn to something like EEBO. The editor of such digital archives ultimately makes the archive into the stuff that might found a critical argument, and the scholar becomes a curator who has figured out how to rationalize a mass of data or organize data in a more usefully coherent way. Such narrowness and focus seem to point to how intellectual labour shows itself in the field.

ANDREW GRIFFIN
University of California, Santa Barbara