

described in other papers in this collection: making resources openly available, developing advanced analytical methods, and promoting a culture of scholarly collaboration.

Claire Clivaz' article focuses on the collaborative possibilities the internet provides to change the culture of textual criticism. It also sets out three conditions for the continued success of online collaboration: 1) scholars need to see a benefit for themselves, especially for tenure and promotion, 2) communities need shared methods that can be used to resolve disputes, and 3) all "data and scientific knowledge" must be open.

And, finally, Russell Hobson's critical comparison of the closely related fields of Old Testament scholarship and Assyriology shows how the openness of resources and tools of the latter can act as a call for reform and a model for the former. The article focuses especially on how open-source tools are more "responsive to real usability" and how the open-access publication of data on the web, especially through APIs, allows data to be reused in multiple formats, freeing it from the constraints described in the introduction to this review.

In the end, this volume presents the state of three disciplines that stand more at the beginning than in the middle of the digital turn. As Mr. Hobson's closing article makes clear, even the basic resources for good computational research, the texts and the tools, are lacking in biblical, early Jewish, and early Christian studies. If we take the state of the disciplines described in this collection to represent reality, then it should be clear that those articles that lay out the requirements and the plans to improve the impoverished digital state described (Garcés, Clivaz, and Hobson) are of greatest importance while the other papers serve to give concrete examples of how these improvements can be accomplished. It is these calls and these plans that, if realized, could help to digitally enhance the three fields to which this collection is dedicated.

David Munson
Universität Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany

STOKES, John and Mark W. Turner, eds. 2013. *The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde, vols. VI and VII, Journalism Parts I and II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 978-0-19811964-7, 978-0-19811963-0, Pp. lxiii+430, xi+622. \$237.50 ea.

As the titles suggest, these latest volumes from the Oxford English Texts series of *The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde* cover Wilde's journalism.

These volumes are an excellent collection of Wilde's journalism that not only chronicle his journalistic career but also tell us much of British journalism in general in the late nineteenth century. While noting the somewhat fluid boundary between Wilde's criticism and his journalism, the editors of these volumes reiterate the distinction this series made earlier with the 2007 edition of Wilde's criticism (edited by Josephine M. Guy), arguing that his extended critical essays ("The Decay of Lying", "The Truth of Masks", "The Critic as Artist", "Pen, Pencil, and Poison", "Historical Criticism", and "The Soul of Man") serve a different purpose from his journalism. This is a reasonable argument, but it is helpful that the editors of these volumes acknowledge the degree to which Wilde's journalism strays into the realm of literary criticism.

The prefatory material is extensive and helpful. The editors do a good job of chronicling Wilde's contributions to the journalism of his day and how he in part shaped the direction of some of those venues with which he was associated, such as *Women's World*. Furthermore, this material is one of the better overviews of Wilde's relationship to the rise of the new journalism, which challenged the conventional and conservative journalism in Britain during the latter decades of the nineteenth century. The editors explain the effect of the new journalism, Wilde's role in it, and its relationship to his own critical and creative writing that would follow. Similarly, the explanatory notes offer background information on issues both large and small that arise surrounding these writings, not only identifying people and places but also providing reasons for including certain reviews in the *Dubia* section. In all, they are far more extensive than anything that had appeared previously. Along with the prefatory material and explanatory notes, the editors have included two appendices. One is the manuscript for an incomplete review, and the other is an article from the *New York Daily Tribune*, which was based upon an earlier lecture Wilde had delivered in England. Both were useful, the first in demonstrating Wilde's composition process when reviewing, and the second in showing his revision process when he developed earlier ideas for later publications.

The editors have been equally good with textual and editing issues. As with all the other volumes of this edition, they have done a thorough and sensible job in editing Wilde's journalism. Such editing work, of course, does not present the same kinds of challenges that confronted Ian Small, for example, in editing the *De Profundis* writings. The almost complete lack of extant manuscripts, typescripts, and/or multiple versions of these short essays and reviews frees the reviewers from some of the trickier textual editing that so many of the other volumes in this series required. Nevertheless, the editors do a good job of explaining the difficult tasks they

confronted that were unique to these writings. Not the least of these difficulties was determining which unsigned works were Wilde's. As the editors note, although Robert Ross included a number of unsigned pieces in his 1908 edition of Wilde's writings, there is often little evidence to suggest how he determined that these writings were Wilde's. A similar problem exists with Stuart Mason's 1914 *Bibliography*. Consequently, the editors rightly felt that they could not rely solely on Ross's or Mason's assertion that a particular writing should be attributed to Wilde without other corroborating evidence. The editors judiciously determined which writings to attribute to Wilde, which to reject entirely, and which to relegate to their "Dubia" section, carefully considering both external and internal evidence in coming to their determinations. I have to admit that my heart sank when I read that in the early 1950's the British Library had declined the offer of marked-up runs of a number of British newspapers, which would have identified anonymous contributors, and that collection was subsequently destroyed. The existence of such a collection would have gone a long way toward identifying so many of Wilde's contributions (as well as those of many other authors). Even without such a resource, the editors have done a fine job of producing a responsible selection of Wilde's journalism in these volumes. They have been conservative in their approach, such that one feels confident that the unsigned selections that they have attributed to Wilde were almost certainly produced by Wilde. I was particularly pleased that they included their "Dubia" section, since many or perhaps even most of the writings in this section may also be Wilde's work.

One further issue is worth mentioning. As with the other editorial choices made in these volumes, the presentation of the writings themselves is an important one. The editors could have chosen to regularize these writings for style, punctuation, and other similar issues, or they could have chosen to work from Ross's 1908 edition of the writings (for those Ross included), but they chose to do neither and instead reproduced these writings as they appeared when originally published. This choice was, I think, the only reasonable course of action given the variety of venues in which they appeared, and without manuscript or typescripts it would be impossible to determine what was Wilde's preferred style and what was house style. As a result, the editors have presented what is likely the closest we can get to what Wilde originally wrote, given the resources available. In summary, this is an excellent edition of Wilde's journalism and should be a crucial resource for students and scholars for decades to come.

John Peters
 University of North Texas