

phrase **good wine needs no ivy-bush**” (OED). In fact, later in *The Wonderful Year* Dekker himself writes of the citizen who “spied a bush at the end of a pole, (the ancient badge of a Country Alehouse)” (243). Thus, whenever possible, readers are advised to check the original sources or EEBO before quoting.

*The Plague in Print* is a useful collection, the introductions and choice of examples excellent, and the three glossaries — a Medical and Herbal Glossary, a Glossary of Names, and a General Glossary — very helpful. Totaro, as a scholar of this critical, if unpleasant, aspect of early modern life, also cogently recognizes its current relevance. Writing in 2010 she reminds us that the sources she reprints, unfamiliar as are some of their genres, “give original voice to current thoughts about the relationship between disease and human populations, even as the world braces for the next pandemic” (xvi). Now, in the midst of that very pandemic, it is enlightening to see how similar our responses — medical, theological, governmental and imaginative — are to those from half a millennium ago.

Suzanne Gossett  
Loyola University Chicago

## Works Cited

- O'FARRELL, Maggie. 2020. *Hamnet: A Novel of the Plague*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- TOTARO, Rebecca, and Ernest B. GILMAN, eds. 2010. *Representing the Plague in Early Modern England*. New York: Routledge.
- WELLS, Stanley. 1979. *Modernizing Shakespeare's Spelling*. Oxford: Clarendon.

TURPIN, Zachary and Matt MILLER, eds. 2020. *Every Hour, Every Atom: A Collection of Walt Whitman's Early Notebooks & Fragments*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press. Pp. xxxiv + 373. ISBN 9781609387037, Paper \$25.00. ISBN 9781609387044, eBook, \$25.00.

The publishing of the rich fragmentary writings found in Whitman's notebooks and among his other papers began not long after the poet's death, with the poet's literary executor Richard Maurice Bucke's *Notes and Fragments* in 1899. Among others, Clifton Furness, the editors of the New York University Press collected writings of Whitman, Joel Myerson, and most recently the online *Walt Whitman Archive* in various ways followed suit, but even collectively have come far from a complete representation of what remains in the archives. Zachary Turpin and Matt Miller's *Every Hour*,

*Every Atom* makes no pretense either of thoroughness or of order, but instead appeals to the “joy and excitement” in the discovery and proximity to the poet’s composition process afforded readers by these documents (xix).

This collection reproduces eighteen pre-Civil War Whitman notebooks and part of another one, along with fifty-three documents referred to as “fragments”, many of which were once integral with the notebooks. Some of these texts, such as “Calamus-Leaves. Live Oak,—with Moss,” have been much discussed in Whitman scholarship, while others are less frequently cited. While digital facsimiles of many of these documents are available at the *Walt Whitman Archive* or among the Library of Congress’s online Whitman materials, this edition draws together transcriptions of materials that have not hitherto been assembled in one place. The editors’ criteria for what to include are unapologetically subjective and haphazard in a Whitmanian way: “relevance to Whitman’s poetry, relevance to scholarship, quality of writing, and insight offered into Whitman’s mind, especially his poetic imagination” (xviii).

As those criteria make clear, and despite the mention of scholarly relevance, this is not a scholarly edition, though the transcriptions are detailed and accurate and the locations of source manuscripts and some of the scholarship about them are indicated in a brief set of notes in the back of the volume. Nor is it a facsimile edition; there are only ten photographic reproductions taken from the source documents, and there is no list of these at the start of the book. The collection is a hybrid of which Whitman, whose sense of the fluid relationship between manuscript and print Jay Grossman has labeled “manuprint”, might well have approved: something of a type-facsimile of manuscript pages. The pages are, for the most part, diplomatically transcribed, including indications of Whitman’s hash marks through entire sections or pages, as well as the circles, lines, brackets, manicules, and other metamarks with which his manuscripts are rife. The editors have rotated text that was written upside down “for readability”, but the transcriptions remain challenging in a good way (xxvii). Drawings, and the newspaper clippings and other ephemera that Whitman clipped or pasted into his notebooks are for the most part not reproduced. What results is a kind of post-critical edition, more an evocation of Whitman’s poem-generating process than a platform for textual-scholarly disputes about what is represented in the manuscripts or how to read the poems as eventually published.

Miller and Turpin know these materials well. Whitman’s notebooks and fragments served as the documentary basis for Miller’s monograph *Col-lage of Myself* and Turpin’s bombshell discovery of Whitman’s pseudony-

mous novel *Life and Adventures of Jack Engle*. Between this volume and the recently published electronic variorum of the 1855 edition of *Leaves of Grass*, readers now have unprecedented access to the composition processes that led to one of the most remarkable acts of poetry in literary history. As Turpin points out in his introduction, that process involved an extraordinary range of material documents and sources of inspiration, as Whitman's notebooks "are crammed to the edges with a hodgepodge of journalistic notes, housebuilder's calculations, lists of men's names, doodles, shopping lists, and trial verses for *Leaves of Grass*", a "compendiousness [that] began seeping into his poetry" (xxii).

With the editors' intention of a handy reader's collection in mind, it seems reasonable to set aside certain questions we might usually ask of scholarly editions. (Though even the casual Whitman-interested reader might wonder why the editors separated out the notebooks and the fragments by format, rather than promiscuously mixing them.) There are, however, other questions that may be worth asking about the appearance of *Every Hour, Every Atom* at this moment, in this form. What might it indicate that a publisher was willing to issue this book, in these digital facsimile-flush times and given the presence of edited versions of many of these texts on the freely accessible *Walt Whitman Archive*? The Iowa Whitman series publishes editions of the Good Gray's work regularly (including *Jack Engle*, for example), and previous print editions of these kinds of materials have been fragmentary, have tended to suppress the non-textual dimensions of these documents, or have been scholarly tomes that were expensive or difficult to find. Perhaps it's simply that there seems to be an endless market for books relating to Whitman, particularly when his own text is represented. But perhaps the appearance of this volume also indicates something about what kinds of readerly needs are met by electronic editions, and what needs remain to be satisfied. Other recent editorial experiments with hybrid forms and formats range from the patently scholarly edition by Marta Werner of Emily Dickinson's "master" letters, available in both print and open-access PDF format, to Barbara Heller's edition of *Pride and Prejudice*, which includes nineteen fictionalized facsimiles of the characters' letters. It is exciting to see Turpin and Miller's edition, given Whitman's own focus on material texts — many examples of his handwriting, including facsimiles of poetry manuscripts, were published during his own lifetime — and the interpretations made possible by the edition's type-facsimile-poetic mode of presentation. But a caveat might be issued that it remains to be seen if non-canonical material can receive this kind of treatment in the digital age, given the shifting priorities of publishers

and granting agencies alike. Writers from the fringes of literary hegemony might show us much about textuality were their manuscripts subject to the kinds of editorial experimentation Whitman, Dickinson, and Austen have long been receiving.

Still, the experiment is an engaging one. Whitman's notebooks are famously capacious — notes to self, annotations on his reading, recollections, self-abasement, and drafts of anything he was writing for publication at the time. The poetry will to many readers seem, in draft form, if anything more daring than the published verse. Prose fragments in some cases hint at texts whose published versions, if they exist, have not yet been found. New York, the United States, the wisdom and angst of a young writer, and the feel of the nineteenth century are all captured there, faceted in fragmentary, evocative ways that would have delighted an overwrought urban wanderer like Charles Baudelaire. Turpin and Miller's transcriptions elegantly capture not only this cornucopia, but the intense struggle with language in which Whitman engaged. His grapplings with the idiom of racial prejudice — “the ~~red~~ <sup>^</sup> ~~brown~~ savage, lashed to / the stump” — with that of nationalism — “~~Primal~~, <sup>^</sup> ~~arrogant~~ <sup>coarse</sup> luxuriant, ~~coarse~~, and ~~combative~~ . . . I ~~make~~ send the poems / of The States” — with that of Eros — “~~Loveroot~~, / <sup>juicy</sup> ~~reacher~~ <sup>climber-blossomer-mine</sup> / ~~Verdure~~, <sup>crotch</sup>, ~~branch~~, <sup>erotech</sup> ~~fruit~~ bulb and vine” — are all palpable here, sometimes riveting in their suspensefulness (4, 136, 342). Indeed, at times the limits of writing itself emerge poignantly as a function of the act of transcription: “The greatest of thoughts and truths, are ~~not~~ <sup>never</sup> ~~to~~ ~~illegible~~ be put in ~~language~~ <sup>writing</sup> or print.—” (331). While the transitions in the notebooks are at first jarring, one becomes accustomed to them after a spell. “Because the book is a collection of fragments”, Miller writes in his foreword, “I suspect many readers will prefer to read it nonlinearly, skipping around and following where their fancies lead them. If a section seems trivial or boring, skip ahead, but do consider returning to such sections again, because these notebooks can give the illusion of having changed while readers are away from them” (xv). For this reader, at least, Whitman's fancies were both linear and nonlinear enough, profound, provocative, and generative. I suspect many others will find *Every Hour, Every Atom* the same.

Matt Cohen  
University of Nebraska–Lincoln

## Works Cited

- AUSTEN, Jane. 2020. *Pride and Prejudice: The Complete Novel, with Nineteen Letters from the Characters' Correspondence, Written and Folded by Hand*, curated by Barbara Heller. San Francisco: Chronicle Books.
- BUCKE, Richard Maurice, ed. 1899. *Notes and Fragments: Left by Walt Whitman and Now Edited by Dr. Richard Maurice Bucke, One of His Literary Executors*. London, Ontario: Printed for the editor.
- GROSSMAN, Jay. 2019. "Manuprint". *Walt Whitman Quarterly Review* 37.1: 46–65.
- MILLER, Matt. 2010. *Collage of Myself: Walt Whitman and the Making of Leaves of Grass*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- WERNER, Marta, ed. 2021. *Writing in Time: Emily Dickinson's Master Hours*. Amherst, MA: Amherst College Press. @ <https://www.fulcrum.org/concern/monographs/gf06g491w?locale=en>.
- WHITMAN, Walt. 2020. *Leaves of Grass (1855) Variorum*, edited by Nicole GRAY. @ <https://whitmanarchive.org/published/LG/1855/variorum/index.html>.
- . 2017. *Life and Adventures of Jack Engle*, edited by Zachary TURPIN. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

WERNER, Marta, ed. 2021. *Writing in Time, Emily Dickinson's Master Hours*. Amherst: Amherst College Press. Pp. 128. ISBN 9781943208180, Paper \$35.00. ISBN 9781943208197, Open Access.

## On Inner Circulation

Both Jay Leyda and Theodora Ward, who worked with Thomas H. Johnson on editing Dickinson's letters, thought of editing as an activity profoundly shaped by the mind of the editor. For them, there was no practice of editing that would simply follow objective protocols, generating texts as they were intended. Instead, both thought of the final outcome of the process as impacted not only by the editor's understanding of what constitutes a text but also by their aesthetics or ideas, and even by their own personal values and preferences. For both, neutrally or objectively edited texts remain deeply subjective. In Leyda's case, editing is closely related to what kind of narrative the editor prefers: well polished with everything fitting nicely, or rough on the edges, and contradictory. He thus noted that the difference between his way of accepting new evidence that could contribute to editing a text, and Johnson's, lies "in the fact [that Johnson] always seems more disturbed than delighted by troublesome new evidence. He loves neat, finished shapes — and I have to suppress my wish to knock