
This diverse collection of addresses by eminent scholars to the twenty-first conference in 1985, now belatedly appearing in print, indicates not only that the Conference has happily survived a threat to its annual publishing of the papers presented by finding a new publisher, but also that the University of Toronto's initiative has surely come of age. These essays are particularly welcome in providing a readable conspectus of issues and developments, both ancient and modern, which confront editors and affect all readers interested in a reliable text, be that of the New Testament, *King Lear*, Byron's *Don Juan* or Crane's *The Red Badge of Courage*. What emerges time and again is editing's new confidence in its own scholarly importance and academic respectability; no longer can a cynical colleague in academe be scornful, somehow dismissing editing as busy-work bereft of intellectual challenges.

These essays, all of similar length, offer a variety of focuses, and two should have wide appeal. Narrower contributions are by Bruce Metzger in an earnest review of the editorial history of the Greek New Testament, and by Leonard Boyle in a more lively piece on the place of codicology in the editing of medieval Latin texts. More contemporary in appeal is David Nordloh's reflections on editorial procedures and politics at work in the funding of projects for authoritative texts of American literature. This chapter analyses significant editorial trends, from the McKerrow-Greg clash earlier this century, through the emergence of Fredson Bowers and the primacy of the 'copy-text,' to current guidelines of the Committee on Scholarly Editions in the U.S. His contribution is notably welcome because of its optimism and enthusiasm for 'the [current] wonderful diversity of editorial activity.'

Less committed readers should not skip articles by Stanley Wells and Donald Reiman. Both editors in different ways convey something of the complexity, centrality, and fascination of scholarly editing and textual criticism. Reiman presents a pleasing overview of the past three centuries of editing British literature: of the ways in which texts have appeared before the public (especially when an expanded readership emerges), of publishers (and some authors) who have either wooed or eschewed the mass market, and of the tradition of differing attitudes among authors towards their own works, ranging from a meticulous supervision of publications by a Cowper or Shelley to a casualness by a Dr. Johnson or Byron. Refreshingly undogmatic, Reiman is in favour of reproducing an author's texts 'as they left his or her hands,' and of coming to terms with authors who revise their published work extensively; he insists on the need to understand the difference between 'manuscripts that were rough or intermediate drafts and those intended as polished press copies.' He reaches thoughtful conclusions, supported by ample allusions, and looks forward to the emergence of a few enlightened publishers producing paperback textbooks which embrace contemporary high standards of editing and are commercially viable, supported by a new, broad-based literate audience.

Taking on the orthodoxy of the New Bibliography, Stanley Wells in 'Revision in Shakespeare's Plays' writes persuasively of the need for editions of individual plays.
to reflect the possibility that Shakespeare revised his work. With a wealth of evidence for different kinds of revision that modern scholarship has detected, Wells convinces one that owing to censorship, to the dramatist's own practical experience with a theatre company, and to a developing literary sophistication, Shakespeare did indeed have second thoughts, and therefore rewrote words and phrases, reassigned speeches among characters, and both made cuts and added scenes. The editorial challenge is obvious: to make sense therefore of the various readings among the Quartos and the Folio. Many editions of Shakespeare present footnotes documenting the defeat of sundry editors' readings; clearly the demise of reputations has not diminished in the past few decades. Wells dislikes conflated editions and argues for a publishing of two substantive texts of, say, Hamlet or Othello, but especially King Lear, thereby allowing readers to see each play at two different stages of composition. In his survey of previous scholarship Wells is allusive and cogent, informative and entertaining, reasoned and careful—qualities one looks for in a sound editor.

Richard Landon has provided a crisp introduction to this book; the level of editing is generally high. One can only fault his inclusion of G.E. Bentley's banquet address, a self-indulgent performance which may have charmed its first audience, but now in cold prose, unsupported by an auditor's sherry or port, appears merely bloated.

JOHN S. BATTS
University of Ottawa


This book is the sixth produced by the CEECT, though the Centre was established in 1981. First published [in English] by John Lovell of Montreal in 1864, it is a fine 'old-fashioned' novel, centring on still-current interests—romantic love and French-English relationships in Quebec province—and a book much deserving its high place in Canadian fiction.

There have been two republications of the novel in English since 1864—the University of Toronto Press photographic reprint in 1973 of the John Lovell edition and the New Canadian Library edition of the same year. Since, however, no manuscripts or proofs of the first book remain and since the French translation of it in 1865 has no textual authority, the establishment of a copy-text would seem to have been comparatively easy. Yet the CEECT, with its usual concern for the meticulous and an 'ideal copy,' made five microfilm copies of the Lovell edition and processed them with light-table and oral collations. Later, to assure correctness, a typist entered the chosen microfilm on a computer. Then, by means of a specially prepared computer programme, the staff corrected it again, and, finally, proofread it 'at each stage of the printing process.' Such care has surely made some earlier CEECT texts, especially Wacousta (surely an antidote to the NCL edition), significant in our literature. Here,