Burnett's informal account of the magazine which he published in 1938 under the satirical title *The Literary Life and the Hell with It*. (One final note on this magazine: possibly because of publishing delays, the fact that *Story Magazine* was revived in 1989 is never mentioned in the text.)

In an attempt to encourage interested readers to pursue original research, Chielens has included a list of archival sources which was compiled by Willard Fox. While the inclusion of American sources is understandable, Fox felt compelled to include a cursory list of Canadian sources for literary magazines which seems merely an afterthought and glaringly incomplete.

In their 1990 survey of the history of the American magazine, *The Magazine in America: 1941–1990*, John Tebbel and Mary Ellen Zuckerman wrote: 'The history of the so-called “little magazines” has never been told in full, nor brought up to date; they await their historian' (p. 216). Edward Chielens is in no sense this historian. However, he has gone to some lengths to identify the major literary magazines and documentary sources. Perhaps a reader of *American Literary Magazines* will be inspired to begin the heroic task that awaits them.

DAVID MCKNIGHT
McGill University


Milton's definition in *Areopagitica*, 'Books are not absolutely dead things but doe contain a potencie of life in them to be as active as the soule was whose progeny they are,' was in part a plea for the preservation of the freedom of the press in 1644 but also a recognition of the power of books. The eight 1986–87 Clark Lectures which make up this volume nicely illustrate what Nicolas Barker calls the mutual and interdependent exchange between the press and the society that feeds upon it. Two further lectures in the series given at the William Andrews Clark Library in Los Angeles are not included: Stan Nelson's 'The Growth of Typefounding as an Independent Trade,' because it was complemented by a practical display, and G. Thomas Tanselle's 'The Nature of Texts,' because it has been published elsewhere. Six of the remaining lectures are roughly chronological case studies, sandwiched between two brilliant Barker efforts from his time as Visiting Professor at the Library.
In the introductory essay, ‘A New Model for the Study of the Book,’ Thomas R. Adams and Nicolas Barker take stock of bibliography and the history of the book and attempt to formulate a model for the study of books in social history and as historical artifacts. They point out that, almost against his will, the bibliographer has seen ‘his field of study . . . unexpectedly dragged into the limelight by academic historians’ (p. 6). The task is now to seek a common way forward. Bibliography has long been seen as an ancillary discipline, serving the establishing of an accurate text, accounting for its transmission, and, recently, as a component of social history. Adams and Barker try turning the tables, looking not at the impact of the book on society but of society on the book. They identify the ‘magic’ of the book not just in terms of the text, but of the physical object, which they trace all the way from St. Cuthbert’s tomb in Durham Cathedral to the coffee table. From popular tract to ‘classic,’ chap-book to canon, the book has become part of the national and international consciousness as a phenomenon beyond the text involving authorial intention, production, publication, reception, dissemination, and survival. But they go on to reject the term ‘printed book’ as imprecise, proposing instead the all-encompassing ‘bibliographical document’ — anything from a multi-volume set to a match-box cover, an electronic file, or even, in Barker’s concluding paper, an unreadable ‘astronomical document’ such as Stonehenge. For old times’ sake, I shall here use the term book.

The papers in this volume expand Adams and Barker’s concept of a circle of connected elements, a communications network of publishing, manufacturing, distribution, reception, and survival in the process of a book. The emphasis is on the book as part of the framework of society, and not just a symptom of the desire to create a text. They describe the rest of this volume as a framework or map for the history of the book, designed to show what is known or perceived, a point of departure, and, admittedly, a pattern that will change with time.

R.H. and M.A. Rouse discuss the commercial production of manuscript books in Paris before printing. The ‘bespoke’ book trade flourished there in the thirteenth century. Book production was a group enterprise with more than one master or apprentice, and even more than one workshop, often involved in a single, collaborative production. Surviving tax lists indicate exactly how many book-makers, parchment-sellers, illuminators and binders there were: thirty bookmen or libraires (literally ‘persons having to do with books’) alone on the Left Bank and near Notre Dame. The Rouses include a map, which, unfortunately, does not even approach the detail of interest of Peter Blayney’s in The Bookshops in Paul’s Cross Churchyard, although they trace the book traders ‘almost to their very shop doors’ and identify family connections, fathers, widows and sons, as well as adjacent traders: doctors, lawyers, notaries, tailor, spice seller, and three poultry dealers. Books were in the vernacular as well as Latin and so served a wider community than the church, priories, and colleges. Interestingly, the University of Paris regulated the academic side of the city’s book trade, including price, profit, and rentals from the bookmen; but the lucrative lay-trade was a free commercial market and served a wealthy, educated market. The Rouses describe one steady customer, Mahaut, Countess of Artois: ‘not a demure lady who sits with her needlework and her lap-dog, caressing her one pretty picture-book of
prayers [but] a vigorous, sometimes belligerent woman of affairs who reads, really reads. She has the wit to know what she likes, the industry to search out where they may be found, and the money to commission copies for her use' (p. 58).

Lotte Hellings describes cataloguing as a not fully adequate way of structuring information about books, and she looks to models which attempt to account for the function of the book in its time. Her work on manuscript and printed codices in the fifteenth century raises interesting problems on communication functions: the codex, whether manuscript or printed, merely as a vehicle for the text, the exact form not always noted in contemporary catalogues, the two existing side by side. She discusses textual transmission and dissemination with illustrative examples which are also emblematic: the author writing his book — a sheet marked into pages, the reader with a bound volume open at a divided page. Manuscript exemplars for type compositors survive from the transition period with lines counted and marked in advance of typesetting. In her example of one of the first books printed in Italy, the Augustine De Civitate Dei [1467], she describes the relation of manuscript exemplar and printed book, where the one records the order of typesetting of the other as far as before and after lunch on a particular day. She goes on to discuss what she terms the tradition of the text, conventionally successive editions, but with an example of much broader dissemination in the case of Poggio Bracciolini's Facetiae. Her stemma shows four separate editions printed, probably from manuscript exemplars, in Rome and Venice in 1470–71. Over the next thirty years there were more than thirty editions printed in Rome, Milan, Paris, Lyon, Nuremberg and elsewhere, with at least six independent of the main sources. The manuscripts as well as the printed versions were thus being widely disseminated, the former as independent, reliable sources for the latter. The quality of the text was deemed essential.

John Bidwell's essay is on American paper makers in the 1819 financial crisis. As he points out, the paper industry, a highly capitalized business, is very sensitive to changes in the economic climate. In the early nineteenth century new technology promised to lower the cost of book production; but investment for the new expanding market, in marketing techniques as well as machinery, put paper makers in a precarious position even before what he labels 'the 1819 Panic' with its bank failures, defaults on debts, and factory closures. His examples illustrate the interconnectedness of the various aspects of the book trade, its traditional reliance on credit, and the large sums of capital involved. Bidwell's story of the Philadelphia publisher, Moses Thomas, and the nearby paper maker, John Willcox, is well worth reading, with its account of trans-Atlantic business, the first American edition of Johnson's Dictionary, and Knickerbocker's History of New York. Disaster was almost inevitable, and while publishers and authors fared reasonably well, paper makers suffered. The 1820 census gave them a separate questionnaire to air their grievances: Bidwell documents examples from the 170 returns.

Mirjam Foot discusses bookbinding and the history of books, the role of the bookbinder in society, and binding as a physical object. Concentrating on the third, she looks at the interrelationship of the purpose and form of the book: its use, its readership, and its construction. She examines the spread of learning and
readership, increases in book production, and consequent changes in bookbinding; and she concludes with a discussion on the structure and price of trade bindings, and how they reflect public demand. It is necessarily an all too brief summary, from scroll to codex, the development of leather bindings, ornaments and clasps, the effects of the invention of printing — chiefly, of course, more books, the demand for cheaper materials and less time-consuming binding practices, and increased mechanization. Foot's evidence on seventeenth- and eighteenth-century standardization of binding prices in London, Westminster, and Dublin is particularly interesting and worthy of a paper in itself. Nine lists survive, dealing with binding styles and methods, sizes and types of book down to titles in some instances.

The title of W.B. Carnochan's paper, 'The "Trade of Authorship" in Eighteenth-Century Britain,' gives little clue to its real focus, an examination of an aspect of Adams and Barker's introductory manifesto: authorship as merely one of the functions of the history of the book. Barker himself returns to authorial and other intentions in an Appendix, concluding that intention, like reception, is an abstraction only to be understood with reference to transmission. Michel Foucault's 1979 essay, 'What is an Author?,' anticipates the disappearance of the author-function, replaced by questions on where the discourse has been used and how it can circulate: Adams and Barker also focus on the 'densely woven network' of distribution and of the 'mixture of motives that makes people want books.' Carnochan illustrates the importance recent history has placed on authorship. Anonymity is suspect, as Swift found with The Tale of a Tub. Carnochan briefly surveys 'the multiplicity of situations that define eighteenth-century authorship,' authorial possessiveness, and the emergence of an authorial, male class, in a selection which he admits leaves out poetry and all but omits women. His examples are fairly predictable: Richardson, Fielding, Johnson, Hume, Coleridge. William Whitehead, poet laureate 1757–1785, is more off the beaten track, but important to Carnochan's case for A Charge to the Young Poets (1762): '... write; but ne'er pursue it as a trade. / And seldom publish': publication necessarily invokes criticism; reject the modern rabble and return to the pure old days when ownership was not all.

The final case study is on Mount and Page, foremost publishers of maritime books in London between 1684 and 1800. Thomas R. Adams describes how the firm held a virtual monopoly of copyright in successful navigational books in the eighteenth-century — manuals, almanacs, tables and so on, collected in an alphabetical short-title list in an appendix. For the purposes of this historical approach a chronological listing might have been more useful. The family history is complex and an important aspect of Adams's work, illustrated with a genealogy and an appendix on forms of the firm's name. The narrative on publications and distribution is dense: 140 titles in 600 surviving editions. As Adams points out, revision and update to make them usable were part of the nature of such books. Business records do not survive, so it is impossible to determine print runs, although Adams has interesting statistics on numbers of navigating seamen: 7,750 in 1702, rising to 18,500 in 1788, by which time there were almost 10,000 ships registered in England and Wales. The potential market was presumably even
greater. Adams has compared copies, but is confusing on editions: he describes a 1711 edition existing 'in two entirely different settings of type.' But his paper is important in the history of the book, partly because of its specialization, partly because of the broad contemporary commercial importance of its subject.

Barker's concluding paper, 'Libraries and the Mind of Man,' is a supplement to his opening model. He labels books 'the best mirror of society,' because they give evidence, outside their texts, about the time in which they were produced. The study of books, he argues, is a vast subject in its own right: summary, selection, and grouping are necessary, and one way is through the history of libraries as intellectual structures. His survey of libraries from the kings of Pergamon and Alexandria to the Fisher Rare Book Library in Toronto emphasizes the expression of 'human dignity and . . . the centrality of books for an informed civilization, the timelessness of material therein which record human thoughts, successes, failures, theorems, dreams' (p. 192). The 'potencie' of books can easily escape definition because they are an independent and yet essential part of the framework of society, and not just a means to the study of something else. Might not their 'potencie,' he asks, suggest or even dictate the company they keep and the structures best fitted to hold them?

GILLIAN FENWICK

_Trinity College, University of Toronto_