Shakespeare Goes Digital: Three Open Internet Editions

Andrew Murphy

➡ For additional information about this article

Shakespeare Goes Digital: Three Open Internet Editions

Andrew Murphy

In 1853, J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps began issuing, through publishers C. and J. Adlard, an extraordinarily elaborate edition of the works of Shakespeare. It ran to sixteen volumes in oversized folio and was copiously illustrated. The edition was intended for a strictly limited market—just 150 copies were printed. The price also reflected the restricted readership at which it was aimed: twenty-five copies were issued with the illustrations on India paper, at 150 guineas per set; the remainder sold for 80 guineas per set. As the final volumes began to appear in the mid-1860s, Halliwell-Phillipps began discussing a very different kind of Shakespeare project with the Adlards. His idea was to strip his edition to its bare bones in order to produce a popular text that would sell for just a shilling, or six percent of the cost of the eighty-guinea folio edition.[1]

Halliwell-Phillipps subsequently explained to the publisher John Camden Hotten what his vision for the shilling edition had been, observing that "one of the chief objects in the original design was the distribution of copies by employers amongst the working classes."[2] The editor was motivated by the emergence of a working-class readership in the early to middle decades of the nineteenth century. This readership, Halliwell-Phillipps sensed, might take to Shakespeare if the playwright's works were made readily available either at a low price or, ideally, free of charge by paternalistic employers. His instinct was correct, even if his own idea never came to fruition: by the end of the 1860s, at least three publishers issued shilling editions of Shakespeare and the texts sold extraordinarily well.[3] The era of "mass Shakespeare" had arrived.

Halliwell-Phillipps's double project anticipates developments in Shakespeare publishing from the end of the twentieth century, as the playwright's text moved from the page to the computer screen. When Thomas Nelson issued the Arden Shakespeare CD-ROM in 1997, the initial (pre–sales tax) selling price was £2,500 in the United Kingdom and $3,995 in the United States. In the nineteenth century, a certain Professor Pyper at the University of St. Andrews had managed to subscribe to Halliwell-Phillipps's edition, but it seems unlikely that any academic of average means could have afforded to buy the electronic Arden.

---

[1] I discuss the 1853–65 edition in *Shakespeare in Print: A History and Chronology of Shakespeare Publishing* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003), 201–2, and Halliwell-Phillipps's proposed one-shilling edition in *Shakespeare for the People: Working-Class Readers, 1800–1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008), 82–83.

[2] Letter from James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps to John Camden Hotten, 26 August 1866, Edinburgh University Library MS LOA 115.

[3] *Shakespeare in Print*, 177.

The same could be said of other early computer-based Shakespeare resources, such as Chadwyck-Healey's *Editions and Adaptations of Shakespeare*, which have always been priced well beyond the budget of individual purchasers (at whom they are not, in fact, marketed).[4]

But just as Halliwell-Phillipps had twin visions of a highly elaborate package sold at the highest possible cost and a basic alternative at a minimal price or wholly free of charge, so too did the digital world split between high-cost packages and cheap or free-access offerings. Early in the 1990s, the plays had been rendered into a form which could be presented on screen, and this version of the text—the so-called "Moby Shakespeare"—was distributed through various Web sites, the most enduring being those established by Matty Farrow in Australia and Jeremy Hylton at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.[5]

The Moby text is based on the Globe edition of Shakespeare, first published by Macmillan in conjunction with Cambridge University Press in 1864.[6] The reasons for choosing this text appear to be lost in the mists of prehistoric digital time. Copyright on the Globe edition had long since lapsed—an important consideration. It may simply have been happenstance that led the Moby text's creator to this particular copyright-free edition, but it remains an interesting choice, nonetheless. The Globe was itself part of a bifurcated publishing scheme. Alexander Macmillan had commissioned William George Clark and William Aldis Wright (with John Glover, who dropped out of the project) to produce a scholarly edition of the plays, the first created by university academics. Just 1,500 copies of this nine-volume Cambridge Shakespeare edition were printed, selling at 10s. 6d. per volume, with the total cost running to almost £5.[7] The reduced Globe edition, edited by Clark and Wright, was a single volume, selling at just 3s. 6d.[8] Macmillan had intended the text specifically for the popular market and was rather chagrined to discover that, within a couple of years of

[4] For details on the pricing of the Arden editions, see Andrew Murphy, "Electric Shakespeares, *The Arden Shakespeare CD ROM*," *Computers and the Humanities* 32 (1998): 411–20. For Pyper's edition, see *The Works of Shakespeare*, ed. James Orchard Halliwell, 16 vols. (London: C. & J. Adlard / J. E. Adlard, 1853–65), University of St. Andrews Library shelfmark sfPR2753.H2. See also the accounts ledger for this edition, held at the University of Edinburgh Library, shelfmark H.-P.Coll.314. For the Chadwyck-Healey Literature Collections, see "About *Editions and Adaptations of Shakespeare*," http://collections .chadwyck.co.uk/marketing/products/about_ilc.jsp?collection=eas. (Unless otherwise indicated, this and other URLs cited in this essay were accessed 21 June 2010.)

[5] James Matthew Farrow, "The Works of the Bard," http://www.it.usyd.edu.au/~matty /Shakespeare/; and Jeremy Hylton, "The Complete Works of William Shakespeare," http://shakespeare.mit.edu/.

[6] *The Works of William Shakespeare*, ed. William George Clark and William Aldis Wright (Cambridge: Macmillan, 1864).

[7] *Shakespeare in Print*, 204.

[8] *Shakespeare in Print*, 175–77.

the Globe's appearance, it was competing against the one-shilling editions mentioned earlier. The Globe, however, held its own and served as the standard reference text for several decades, with many subsequent scholarly editions keying their own citation systems to its act, scene, and line numbers.

It is fitting enough that, out of all the copyright-free texts readily available in the early 1990s, it should have been the Globe that emerged from the primal haze of the early digital world to serve as the standard Internet Shakespeare. And it persists today, not only in the now rather primitive-feeling Farrow and Hylton sites, but also in new projects such as Eric M. Johnson's Open Source Shakespeare.[9] One of the key features of Farrow's site is that it gives users a search function, making the business of tracking quotations and carrying out some basic concordance tasks more easily than ever before. Johnson has built upon this facility very substantially, using the much wider range of programming tools now available to computer specialists. The site is laid out attractively and operates intuitively. The plays are segmented by scene, but by clicking on a "Complete Text" link, it is possible to access the whole text and to read it through by scrolling down. Johnson has set through-line numbers (TLNs) after every five lines (including stage directions). In "Complete Text" mode, act and scene markers are relatively unobtrusive (which is to say, less obtrusive than in most print editions but not as unobtrusive as those used in the Oxford Shakespeare).[10] A nice feature is a version of the text presented as "the Bard for the tiny screens," intended for use with mobile devices.[11] Even on a relatively cheap cell-phone handset, a perfectly readable text can be seen, although one would not want to read all three parts of *Henry VI* in this way.

Where Open Source Shakespeare really comes into its own is with the tools that Johnson has added to the text. In "Complete Text" mode, every word is linked to a concordance function. Double-clicking on any word brings up a screen indicating how many times that word appears in the canon, with a list of the number of instances by play. Another link opens to a full set of all instances with appropriate characters and lines. Somewhere out there in the ether, Mary Cowden Clarke must surely be wonderstruck. Clicking on a character name brings up a full set of lines for that character. This is useful for actors, of course, but Johnson offers an even more useful function: once you reach the character

[9] Eric M. Johnson, "Open Source Shakespeare: An Experiment in Literary Technology," http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/.

[10] *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, gen. eds. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor with John Jowett and William Montgomery (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986). See also Edward Ragg and Paul Luna, "Designing the Oxford Shakespeare: An Interview with Paul Luna," *Typography Papers* 5 (2003): 5–22.

[11] Johnson, Open Source Shakespeare, mobile edition, http://mobile .opensourceshakespeare.org/.

lines that have been "harvested," clicking on "Show cue lines" produces a full set of the character's speeches together with, in each instance, the immediately preceding line of the text. The home page also includes tools for carrying out text, concordance, and character searches.

Also included is a paper entitled "Open Source Shakespeare: An Experiment in Literary Technology," an account of the process of constructing the site.[12] This is essentially a cut-down version of a master's thesis submitted by Johnson at George Mason University. It makes for interesting reading. Much of Johnson's work was undertaken while he was stationed in Kuwait as a Marines reservist during the most recent U.S. invasion of Iraq—a piece of information that could make critics of a certain age nostalgic for the high days of cultural materialism.[13] There are substantial sections on the history of the Globe text and its modern digital incarnations. This material is solid, well informed, and considered, particularly given that Johnson does not have a bibliographic background.

In "The Editing and Structure of the Open Source Shakespeare" section of his paper, Johnson describes his seven-stage working method. He notes, "This procedure might seem very complex, and indeed it took many hours to perfect. However, the last fifteen or sixteen plays went very quickly, as it was just a question of repeating the same process over and over. I got to the point where I could finish one or two plays an hour, depending on how many discrepancies there were in the texts."[14] Johnson's "one or two plays an hour" might be contrasted with John Dover Wilson's comments as he drew to the end of his almost-half-century-long stint of editing the New Cambridge Shakespeare: "Two or three life-times are insufficient for the proper editing of Shakespeare, and I know it well enough. Had I lingered over *Hamlet* alone as long as I ought to have done, and should like to have done, I should still be at it."[15] Johnson's project and Dover Wilson's are very different from each other, and here we get to the heart of the problem of any resource which has as its remit the business of taking the Globe (or any text of similar vintage), standardizing it, and adding electronic functionalities. Manipulating the text in this way may generate a helpful resource, but without *editing* the text, the heart of Open Source Shakespeare remains fundamentally (and often fatally) outdated. By way of comparison, while one probably could fit a Model-T Ford with power steering, antilock

    [12] Johnson, "Open Source Shakespeare: An Experiment in Literary Technology," http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/info/paper_toc.php.
    [13] Johnson, "Introduction: The History of Open Source Shakespeare," http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/info/aboutsite.php.
    [14] Johnson, "The Editing and Structure of Open Source Shakespeare," http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/info/technicaldetails.php.
    [15] Letter from John Dover Wilson to G. V. Smithers, 26 June 1956, National Library of Scotland MS 14324.

brakes, and airbags, it would still remain, in essence, a Model T. The Globe was a good text in its day—and Clark and Wright were fine scholars—but it predates the New Bibliography, not to mention the important developments in textual thinking of more recent decades.

To take just one small example of problems with the Globe: Clark and Wright worked on their edition before W. W. Greg and William J. Neidig demonstrated that the Pavier quartos were all published in 1619, despite the differing imprints on the title pages of some of the texts. As far as the Globe editors were concerned, then, Nathaniel Butter's *King Lear* of 1608 and Pavier's 1619 *Lear* (with its title page falsely dated 1608) were published in the same year. The editors thought—at least initially—that Pavier's was the edition published first and therefore the more authoritative. This confusion is written throughout Clark and Wright's text of *Lear*. Problems of a similar nature arise with other plays, compounded by the fact that Clark and Wright had a tendency to favor eclectic editing methods, sometimes picking and choosing readings from different editions without consistently considering the exact authority of these texts.[16]

Are the shortcomings of the Globe fatal to Open Source Shakespeare? It depends on what you want to do with the text. But for many scholars and students, the answer, unfortunately, is likely to be "yes." One might argue that the Globe was *the* text of Shakespeare for a very broad range of readers for at least a half century after its first release—as Margreta de Grazia has indicated, it was the dominant Shakespeare text of Britain's high period of Victorian imperialist expansion, carried around the world in much the same way that Johnson carried it (electronically) to Iraq and Kuwait.[17] In this sense, Open Source Shakespeare *does* provide an interesting reading text, if we view the Globe as a historical artifact. The trouble is that the concordance tools—among the central resources of Open Source Shakespeare—are the element of the package likely to be of most interest to scholars, and it is difficult to think of how one would usefully deploy these resources when the data set they are being applied to is almost 150 years out of date. (But it depends on the kind of work one is trying to do—see Hope and Whitmore's article in this issue and their spirited defense of their use

[16] See W. W. Greg, "On Certain False Dates in Shakespearian Quartos," *Library*, 2d ser., 9 (1908): 113–31, 381–409; and William Neidig, "The Shakespeare Quartos of 1619," *Modern Philology* 8 (1910): 145–63. On Clark and Wright's eclecticism, see A. W. P[ollard], review of "*William Shakespeare. The Tragedie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke.* Edited by J. Dover Wilson," *Library*, 4th ser., 12 (1931): 116–120, esp. 119; and J. Dover Wilson, *The Manuscript of Shakespeare's "Hamlet" and the Problems of Its Transmission: An Essay in Critical Bibliography*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: University Press, 1934), 1:9.

[17] See Margreta de Grazia, "The Question of the One and the Many: The Globe Shakespeare, the *Complete "King Lear,"* and the New Folger Library Shakespeare," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 46 (1995): 245–51.

of Open Source Shakespeare in the online exchanges during the open review process.) Perhaps the most interesting thing about Open Source Shakespeare is that, in its structure and functionality, it is a good model for how a site of this kind can (and should) work. In effect, it is "Web 2.0 ready," in that the materials are encoded in database form, rather than as page images. Open Source Shakespeare thus enables a very high level of manipulation of the materials included. Very generously, Johnson has made all of his resources freely available, and he expresses the "hope that other people will use the code and database as examples for their own work."[18] If the architecture of this site could be applied to a more up-to-date text, then scholars really would have a worthwhile resource at their disposal.

This is the approach taken by David and Ben Crystal in Shakespeare's Words.[19] At the heart of this package is the New Penguin Shakespeare, with J. M. Nosworthy's Arden2 *Cymbeline* and Giorgio Melchiori's New Cambridge Shakespeare *Edward III* added, as neither of these plays was yet available in the New Penguin when the project was initiated.[20] Here again, the age of some of the texts is something of a problem: Nosworthy's *Cymbeline* was published more than a half century ago, and some of the New Penguin texts are now rather old (the earliest titles in the series date from 1967). To consider *Lear*, G. K. Hunter's 1972 New Penguin edition of the play predates the intense engagement with the multiple-text issue that marked the closing decades of the twentieth century. As was customary up to this time, Hunter's *Lear* is a conflation of Q1 and F. But we have at least traveled some distance from the Globe edition with this package. As with Open Source Shakespeare, Shakespeare's Words segments the plays by scene, but there is no option for accessing the whole play—one moves from one scene to the next by clicking the "next scene" link at the bottom of the screen or a sidebar listing the acts and scenes. Unlike Open Source Shakespeare's use of TLNs, Shakespeare's Words deploys act, scene, and line numbers, placing a full reference against every line of dialogue (such as "Ham I.ii.244"). The light-gray text used for these references means that they are not as obtrusive as they might otherwise be. A brief synopsis of each play is supplied, together with a set of "character circles"—simple diagrams that map out relationships among the individual characters. The character circle for *The Comedy of Errors* is elegantly

---

[18] Johnson, "Conclusion: The Future of Open Source Shakespeare," http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/info/oss_future.php.

[19] David Crystal and Ben Crystal, Shakespeare's Words, http://www.shakespeareswords.com/.

[20] Giorgio Melchiori, ed., *Edward III* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998); and J. M. Nosworthy, ed., *Cymbeline* (London: Methuen, 1955).

conceived and would be a godsend to any student struggling to make sense of the play.

The look of the page is generally very clean, with the text displayed on a central white vertical band, with tabs above for "Dramatis Personae & Circles," "Play Synopsis," and "Definitions." On the right-hand side of the text field, a second definitions column appears, set in a dark-gray background, with brief glosses opposite the lines in which words appear. The user can toggle this option to "hide" or "show this column." Hiding the column removes the glosses while, somewhat oddly, leaving the gray vertical band in place. These definitions are the core of this package, and the Crystals present the rich fruits of their impressive ongoing research into Shakespeare's language. Each word in the text thought to require explanation is clearly defined, generally with three related alternatives. Thus, "invention" in the second line of the Chorus to *Henry V* is glossed as follows: "invention (n.) 1, inventiveness, imagination, creative faculty." Clicking on the word in the gray definitions column brings up a list of other uses in the same sense elsewhere in the canon—for "invention," seventeen hits (for an exact match) from seven plays and five Sonnets. A particularly helpful feature is that these individual hits, as displayed, include a few words of context, for example: "AYL IV.iii.35 [Rosalind as Ganymede to Silvius, of Phebe's letter to Ganymede] such giant rude invention."[21] Clicking on the line reference brings the user to the line (and its accompanying scene) in the playtext.

It is possible to gain direct access to the material that lies at the core of the package by going to the "Glossary" section. Here, all of the words for which definitions are given are listed in alphabetical order. Clicking on any given word brings up a list of all of the definitions associated with it. So, for example, "absolute" is defined in seven separate senses, ranging from "perfect, complete, incomparable" to "curt, peremptory, blunt."[22] Again, clicking on a specific definition generates a list of instances of the word being used in that particular sense. Some Glossary entries cross-reference only other entries. Thus, "tail," which might, one would have thought, have had its own separate entry (given that it is sometimes used as a sexual pun) simply cross-links to "come cut and long tail."

Because Shakespeare's Words has been constructed in collaboration with a commercial publisher, there is a certain amount of hard sell on the site. "The Book" tab on the main page directs users to Amazon, where they can purchase the book version, *Shakespeare's Words: A Glossary and Language Companion*. The "Portal" tab links to other publications by Ben and David Crystal. The "Contrib-

[21] Crystal and Crystal, Shakespeare's Words, "invention (n.) 1," http://www.shakespeareswords.com/Headwords-Instance.aspx?Ref=4908.

[22] Crystal and Crystal, "Glossary," Shakespeare's Words, http://www.shakespeareswords.com/Glossary.aspx.

ute" tab leads to a PayPal link soliciting contributions for upkeep of the site, with any surplus funds generated rather nicely pledged "to help theatre companies engaged in Shakespeare productions which receive no government subsidy."[23] In fairness, however, Penguin and the Crystals post much free material on this site; the central resources—including the glossary and the text of the plays—are free of advertising of any sort, presenting the user with clean, uncluttered screens. Taken all in all, Shakespeare's Words is an excellent resource: while some of the playtexts are rather dated, they present a high level of scholarship; the Glossary function is a scholarly and well-conceived tool.

Neither Eric Johnson nor the Crystals are editors so, as we have seen, other people's texts sit at the heart of their Web sites. Their projects might be contrasted with Internet Shakespeare Editions, conceived by Michael Best back in 1996, when he had "an ambitious vision . . . to create a Web site with the aim of making scholarly, fully annotated texts of Shakespeare's plays freely available in a form native to the medium of the Internet."[24] Best aims to supply facsimiles of all the earliest printings of the texts; searchable transcriptions of those texts (essentially, diplomatic editions); modern, edited versions of each text; texts of the apocrypha; ancillary materials, primarily connected to performance; materials collected under the general category "Life and Times"; and a reference section. The intention is that all of the editions and transcriptions should be peer reviewed.[25] The supporting materials are certainly useful. The *Julius Caesar* pages, for example, include a total of almost a hundred performance records for the play, ranging from Georges Méliès's five-minute film *Shakespeare Writing Julius Caesar* (1907) to a performance of the play at the Victoria Shakespeare Society of British Columbia (2009). Inevitably, there is at times a slightly arbitrary feel to this material. It seems odd, for instance, that two productions of *Julius Caesar* by the Canadian company Shakespeare on the Saskatchewan are logged, but none by the Royal Shakespeare Company. Moving beyond the performance materials, things get patchier still. The *Julius Caesar* pages offer a collection of images relating to the play, but these are all derived from an early edition by Charles and Mary Cowden-Clarke. Doubtless more images will be added in time, but it is hard to see why these illustrations should be the first (and so far the only) ones to be included. Materials are not (yet) being collected in a coherent fashion—presumably what turns up on the site is a function of the

---

[23] http://www.shakespeareswords.com/DonatePayPal.aspx.
[24] Michael Best, "The Internet Shakespeare Editions: History and Vision," Internet Shakespeare Editions, http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/Foyer/ISEoverview.html.
[25] Best, "The Internet Shakespeare Editions: History and Vision," Internet Shakespeare Editions, http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/Foyer/ISEoverview.html.

interests and resources of individual editors (or perhaps of the editorial team). It is clear that a more focused approach, with clearer goals, is needed. There may also be opportunities for opening the site to the collection of materials through crowd sourcing, filtered through editorial mechanisms.

These materials are, of course, relatively peripheral: the heart of this site is its text. It is a little difficult to gain an overview of the current state of this aspect of the project just by looking at the site itself. Table 1 thus collates information from the individual text pages, giving a snapshot of Internet Shakespeare Editions (omitting such apocryphal texts as *Locrine* and *A Yorkshire Tragedy*) as it stood in early 2010. The breakdown of materials that follows is based on the information in this table. For each Folio play, the relevant pages of the Brandeis University and State Library of New South Wales copies of the First Folio have been incorporated, as have the New South Wales copies of the Second, Third, and Fourth Folios. For texts with early quarto (or octavo) editions, facsimiles of at least one of the earliest editions have been provided in about half of the cases. Transcriptions have been included for all F1 texts, although fifteen of them are presented without indication of who has compiled them, and twenty-seven of the F1 transcriptions have yet to be peer reviewed. For texts with editions earlier than F1, there are transcriptions of at least one early text; only five of these thirty-one transcriptions have been peer reviewed. At the time of this writing, only five texts are finished, with relevant facsimiles loaded, transcriptions prepared and peer reviewed, and a modern edition prepared and peer reviewed. These are *As You Like It* (edited by David Bevington), *Cymbeline* (Jennifer Forsyth), *Julius Caesar* (John D. Cox), *Venus and Adonis* (Hardy M. Cook), and *The Tempest* (Brent Whitted). All of the plays listed here first appeared in F1 and so have no associated early quarto texts—in this sense, they are among the easier texts in the canon to edit and prepare. A modern edition of one additional text—*Romeo and Juliet*, edited by Roger Apfelbaum—has also been completed and peer reviewed, but some of the transcription materials still await checking. The modern editions are one of the most important elements of this Web site. While only six modern texts are currently available, many of the other editors have already been appointed. There are more junior scholars on the list than might be typical of a high-profile print edition, not necessarily a bad thing, with oversight by an impressive board of senior scholars. The modern texts currently available are well conceived and presented. As with Open Source Shakespeare, plays can be loaded scene by scene or in their entirety. TLNs are used here, with the numbers appearing every five lines, although it is slightly hard to see what is and is not being counted as a line (this may be a function of how the browser handles prose and partial lines). There are two sets of tools: annotations (basic or advanced) and collations; either can be displayed or hidden (but not both at

Table 1: Internet Shakespeare Editions texts compiled as of 14 February 2010

Text	First Folio			Quarto		Modern text	
	Transcription	Peer review?	Facsimile(s)	Transcription editor, version	Peer review?	Editor	Peer review?
Plays							
All's Well that Ends Well	Helen Ostovich	No	N/A				
Antony and Cleopatra	Randall Martin	No	N/A				
As You Like It	David Bevington	Yes	N/A			David Bevington	Yes
Comedy of Errors	Matthew Steggle	No	N/A				
Coriolanus	Anonymous	No	N/A				
Cymbeline	Jennifer Forsyth	Yes	N/A			Jennifer Forsyth	Yes
Edward III	N/A		No	Sonia Massai, Q1	No		
Hamlet	Anonymous	No	Q1, Q2	Anonymous, Q1	No		
				Anonymous, Q2	No		
1 Henry IV	Rosemary Gaby	No	Q1	Rosemary Gaby, Q0	No	Rosemary Gaby	No
				Rosemary Gaby, Q1	No		
2 Henry IV	Anonymous	No	No	Anonymous, Q1	No		
Henry V	James Mardock	Yes	No	James Mardock, Q1	Yes	James Mardock	No
1 Henry VI	Anonymous	No	N/A				
2 Henry VI	Anonymous	No	No	Anonymous, Q1	No		
3 Henry VI	Anonymous	No	No	Anonymous, 1595 octavo	No		
Henry VIII	Anonymous	No	N/A				
Julius Caesar	John D. Cox	Yes	N/A			John D. Cox	Yes
King John	Michael Best	Yes	N/A			Michael Best	No
King Lear	Anonymous	No	No	Anonymous, Q1	No		
				Pervez Rizvi, Q2	No		
Love's Labor's Lost	Anonymous	No	No	Anonymous, Q1	No		
Macbeth	Anthony Dawson	No	N/A				
Measure for Measure	Kristin Lucas	No	N/A				
Merchant of Venice	Anonymous	No	No	Anonymous, Q1	No		
Merry Wives of Windsor	Anonymous	No	No	Anonymous, Q1	No		
Midsummer Night's Dream	Suzanne Westfall	No	Q1, Q2	Suzanne Westfall, Q1	No		

(*Table 1 continued*)

Much Ado about Nothing	Anonymous	No	No	Anonymous, Q	No		
Othello	Donald L. Bailey	No	Q1	Jessica Slights, Q1	No		
Pericles	N/A		Q1	Tom Bishop, Q1	No		
Richard II	Catherine Lisak	Yes	Q1	Catherine Lisak, Q1	Yes	Catherine Lisak	No
Richard III	Adrian Kiernander	No	Q1	Adrian Kiernander, Q1	No		
Romeo and Juliet	Roger Apfelbaum	No	Q1, Q2	Roger Apfelbaum, Q1 / Roger Apfelbaum, Q2	No / Yes	Roger Apfelbaum	Yes
Taming of the Shrew	Erin Kelly	No	N/A; no *A Shrew* facsimiles	No *A Shrew* transcriptions	Yes		
Timon of Athens	Anonymous	No	N/A		No		
Titus Andronicus	Anonymous	No	No	Anonymous, Q1	No		
Tempest	Brent Whitted	Yes	N/A			Brent Whitted	Yes
Troilus and Cressida	W. L. Godshalk	Yes	Q1	W. L. Godshalk, Q1	Yes	W. L. Godshalk	No
Twelfth Night	Mark Houlahan	No	N/A			David Carnegie	No
Two Gentlemen of Verona	Anonymous	No	N/A				
Two Noble Kinsmen	N/A		Q				
Winter's Tale	Hardin Aasand	Yes	N/A	Anonymous, Q	No	Hardin Aasand	No
Poems							
Lover's Complaint	N/A		Q1	Hardy M. Cook, Q1	No		
Passionate Pilgrim	N/A		No	Hardy M. Cook, 1599 octavo	No		
Phoenix and the Turtle	N/A		No	Hardy M. Cook, Q1	No		
Rape of Lucrece	N/A		No	Hardy M. Cook, Q1	No		
Sonnets	N/A		Q1	Raymond Siemens, Q1	No		
Venus and Adonis	N/A		Q1	Hardy M. Cook, Q1	Yes	Hardy M. Cook	Yes
Prefatory materials, F1	Page not found		N/A				No

once). If displayed, annotated elements in the text are underlined and a single click brings up a text box with the annotation. The notes primarily consist of brief explanatory glosses, but the longer annotations are helpful—for example, David Bevington's 360-word note on "Robin Hood of England" in *As You Like It*, 1.1 (TLN 117), which discusses, among other things, the source texts for the Robin Hood story.

One of the aspects of Internet Shakespeare Editions that indicates its greatest potential is how textual variants are handled. In Bevington's *As You Like It*, variants from twelve editions are registered, ranging from F1 to Michael Hattaway's 2000 Cambridge edition. The different editions consulted are color coded and can be accessed selectively; all variants can be displayed; an individual editor's variants (including those introduced in Internet Shakespeare Editions) can be shown; any combination of editors can be selected. It is a wonderfully powerful facility. Or it would be, if it were used consistently across all the texts. John D. Cox's *Julius Caesar* contains editorial variants for just F1, the 1691 quarto, Theobald, Rowe, Steevens, Capell, and Rowe, in addition to Cox's own emendations—a more restricted set of texts than Bevington's. Whitted's *Tempest* appears not to have any collations at all.

These inconsistencies highlight one of the core problems with Internet Shakespeare Editions. It is a worthy project, but it is very much a work in progress. Using it is a bit like wandering around Barcelona's Sagrada Familia—it is a fascinating structure, to be sure, but one despairs of ever seeing it in its finished form. There is, of course, nothing new in this. Michael Best and his team are attempting to create something that is larger than a standard print edition, and print editions were never built in a day: Arden1 took a quarter of a century to complete, the New Cambridge almost twice as long. There is a difference here, however: print editions have released individual texts of edited plays or poems; with Internet Shakespeare Editions, whole sections are available to users in a provisional state and, frustratingly, it is very hard to tell quite how complete Best and his team consider any given element of the site to be. In theory, texts included in the "Library" have been fully reviewed, with an "Annex" section reserved for works that "have been carefully proofread, but have not yet had a full scholarly review."[26] In practice, however, all textual materials appear simply to have been loaded into the Library section of the site, regardless of their state of (in)completion.

It is important to recognize that *all* texts in a digital world are provisional—that is the great beauty of electronic textuality. But we still need to know whether, for example, Whitted's *Tempest* and Cox's *Julius Caesar* will at some

---

[26] Best, "The Annex," Internet Shakespeare Editions, http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca /Annex/index.html.

point eventually have the same range of collations as Bevington's *As You Like It*. Even the "Editorial Guidelines" do not really answer this question, as they simply indicate that editors should "collate subsequent editions of importance, particularly twentieth-century editions, whenever, but only when, a reading is offered which you deem worthy of serious consideration along with the one you yourself have chosen."[27] Does Bevington's text, by these lights, represent a particularly generous reading of the guidelines provided by the editorial board, or does his edition indicate a "gold standard" that the other texts will eventually reach? It is very hard to answer this question on the basis of the materials on the site. For scholars and teachers, it is precisely the dynamic quality of online resources that makes it so important to have clear statements about the state of progress for a resource such as Internet Shakespeare Editions.

Perhaps the moral of the story is that you pays (or don't pay) your money and you takes your chance. In the nineteenth century, eighty guineas bought you a sumptuous, limited-edition, multivolume *Works of Shakespeare*—a thing of real beauty, edited by one of the foremost Shakespeare scholars of the time. A shilling bought you the complete works in miniscule print in a paper wrapper—essentially a disposable text, with no indication of who had carried out the editing (or when the editing had been done). If you want free Shakespeare on the Internet, perhaps you have to put up with texts that are, similarly, somewhat unsatisfactory in one way or another, and (to a greater or lesser extent) out of date, uneven, or incomplete. Internet Shakespeare Editions is supported by the University of Victoria and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, but it lacks the financial resources that publishers have been willing to invest in large-scale Shakespeare projects, as when Oxford University Press employed Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor for several years to edit the Oxford Shakespeare. Lacking these resources, Internet Shakespeare Editions feels like a slightly disorganized building site. It is not hard to see why relatively few texts have been brought to completion over the course of its existence.

Does this mean that if we want a fully usable electronic text of Shakespeare we must wait for the latest incarnations of the big scholarly editions to be released in electronic form and probably have to pay for access to them (and pay a lot less, it is to be hoped, than Thomas Nelson thought we should pay for electronic access to Arden2)? For scholars, the answer may well be "yes." The general public, less concerned with textual niceties, may feel differently, as in the nineteenth century, when vast numbers of the shilling Shakespeares were sold to general readers. (It is notable that more than a million users have already

[27] Best, "The Modern Edition (3)," Internet Shakespeare Editions, http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/Foyer/Guidelines/g-mod3.html), esp. section 3.6.5, Collation of Subsequent Editions.

connected to Open Source Shakespeare, probably untroubled by the antiquated text that lies at its heart.) It is important, however, not to lose sight of the real value of all three of the sites under review here. Johnson's concordance facility is excellent, as is the glossarial material included in Shakespeare's Words—and we must bear in mind that neither Johnson nor the Crystals ever set out to provide a wholly up-to-date text. Internet Shakespeare Editions presents a vision of what editors can now do with the electronic text—provide scholars with something that really goes beyond the limits of the print edition. Internet Shakespeare Editions's best texts are very good indeed; the difficulty is that it is developing slowly and unevenly and that not enough information is shown on the state of individual segments. The best elements of these three sites are good indications of where new technologies can take us—and it is a world that even Halliwell-Phillipps, visionary pioneer though he was, probably never dreamed of.