révolutionnaire de l'imprimerie. Ainsi la culture de l'imprimé s'est longtemps développée dans ces zones indépendamment des modèles européens, parfois en privilégiant des techniques concurrentes de l'imprimerie, comme la xylographie au Japon, mieux adaptées aux besoins des marchés locaux.

L'ouvrage se referme sur le thème de l'internationalisation du commerce du livre. Ce vaste thème, qui occulte sciemment l'édition électronique, est introduit par l'étude de l'évolution des associations d'éditeurs en Europe et au Québec, et par un portrait du rôle de la Francophonie dans le commerce du livre, trois contributions qui mettent en lumière l'institutionnalisation croissante du monde du livre contemporain. Enfin, les deux derniers articles de l'ouvrage tentent de démontrer que l'internationalisation de l'édition et des autres médias, responsable d'une certaine homogénéisation de la culture, n'est pas le seul fait d'un impérialisme culturel américain omnipotent, mais résulte des stratégies commerciales de grands conglomérats autant européens qu'américains.

Voilà donc un ouvrage extrêmement complet et de grande qualité scientifique, qui permet à la fois de faire le point sur l'état de la recherche actuelle dans le domaine de l'histoire du livre en divers points du globe, mais aussi de poser les jalons des nombreuses pistes qui restent encore à explorer.

SANDRINE FERRÉ-RODE
Université de Versailles Saint Quentin-en-Yvelines


This is the first full descriptive author bibliography of George Eliot. There have been other bibliographies of first editions of her books, particularly of the major prose fiction, and various checklists and so-called catalogues, recorded here by the current authors. But scholars, institutions, and private collectors have long needed a full analytical and historical bibliographical study.

The authors make clear in their Introduction that their aim is to account for early British and what they describe as the “more substantial” American editions, as well as certain cheap editions up to George Eliot's death on 22 December 1880. That they are not
absolutely rigid on this point allows them to include editions in which she might have had a hand into the early 1880s, as well as some even later editions produced from reused plates of editions in her lifetime. What an enormous task this is. The inevitable problems of working on a popular author occur: cheap editions now impossible to locate, undated editions, and editions advertised but perhaps never produced. Where some American editions are concerned the problem is especially difficult. As the authors point out, the inclusion of certain items not seen by them does not authenticate them and nor does the exclusion of others authoritatively rule them out. There is material enough for this substantial bibliography within the confines the authors have set themselves, but there is clearly scope for even more work. They have not, for example, examined the Blackwood ledgers after 1880. The decision means that the quantifiable evidence of Eliot’s reception and reputation even, say, up to the end of the nineteenth century, is missing.

The bibliography is arranged in the conventional way: Major Works, Minor Literary Works, Essays and Reviews, Miscellaneous items, Collections and Collected Works, five sections of appendices, an index of works by George Eliot, and a general index. The authors identify twelve items as major works in Section A. They include the eight best known works of fiction. A case could perhaps be made for making these items a separate section since they are the works for which she is primarily known and for which the bibliography may well be most consulted. Why some of the other items in this section are classed as major works is difficult to understand. In the first edition of Strauss’s *The Life of Jesus*, for example, her name is not even on the title-page as its translator. The introductory paragraphs to each of the eight major books are interesting and informative, as far as they go. They lack footnotes on archival sources though they do record journal entries and letters. In a section such as *Middlemarch*, fifty-one pages long, the introduction covers only five pages. But it is one of the better preliminary sections, getting into the interesting detail of George Henry Lewes’s negotiations with Blackwood about the novel, and the possible ways of circumventing libraries like Mudie’s. There is information about the manuscript, proofs, stereotyping, and advertisements, in other words far more of the context of publication than the authors give elsewhere. Too soon, however, it runs into the dry listing of dated and undated American editions, in paragraph form. These surely would have been more clearly explained in tables and charts.
Because Section A is 372 pages long and yet deals with only twelve books, finding your way around it is difficult. The table of contents at the start is some help, although individual titles cover up to fifty pages, so identifying a particular edition in hand is far from easy. The section needs sub-headings. Beyond this, the assumption is that you have read Gordon Haight, the George Eliot Letters, and the Journals. In their absence a biographical chronology here in the bibliography would have been useful. I don't like the fairly loose colour descriptions. For example, one edition of Felix Holt is said to be bound in "brown instead of chocolate-coloured cloth," and one of The Mill on the Floss in "Moderate yellowish pink wrappers." Nor do I like the individual notes following the book descriptions being labelled: Note one, Note two and so on, sometimes as far as the pale italic Note five in each of four separate volumes of a novel. It doesn't make navigating a book this size any easier.

Section B, on minor literary works, consists of descriptions of nine short items including some periodical publications. These are separate from Section C, George Eliot's essays and reviews: not as many as might be anticipated given her reputation as a woman of letters. There are 70 items, three so-called "Plausible Attributions," and another seven "Wrongly or Dubiously Attributed." That she wrote more is a distinct possibility because most of her magazine work was unsigned. The best record is her journal, although someone apparently destroyed the leaves covering the period 1849-54, so those years are particularly open to speculation. She wrote frequently for the Coventry Herald and Observer and yet only five of her articles have been traced. The authors choose not to note whether pieces are signed, and if so how, or unsigned. Section D, miscellaneous items, includes writings not published within George Eliot's lifetime, compilations of extracts, jointly-authored publications, and autobiographical writings not published in her lifetime. Juliet McMaster's 1995 Juvenilia Press edition of the fragment of the novel, Edward Neville, is nicely illustrated here with its titlepage and a sample of the 1834 manuscript. Other entries include various poems in notebooks, translations – one of which is untraceable, the draft of a novel barely begun, and some essays. Further on are collections of sayings in prose and verse, the inevitable Blackwood Birthday Book, recollections, diary entries, and John Cross's Life, edited from her journals and diaries and published in 1885. Section E is collections and collected works, interesting not least for the fact that it traces a few of her publications up to the early twentieth century. The
appendices include sequels to some of the novels, written by other authors, settings for songs from *The Spanish Gypsy*, and some illustrative plates including William Baker's own very nice set of the so-called satin proofs of sixty-one illustrations for a complete works edition, though which edition is not clear.

There are problems of accessibility in the bibliography. Somewhat annoyingly, the authors employ abbreviations of names and places within the running text. This breaks the flow of the documentary sections. For example, in the notes on *Felix Holt* we are told, "A manuscript in GE's hand containing 18 mottoes used in the novel is at CtY Eliot /IV, 7, with notes for this novel and SG at Eliot/ IV, 10." It's not the case that the pages of the bibliography are full of names and places, so writing them out in full would not have added much to its length and would have considerably improved its readability. The individual entries are full of references to publishing records, company ledgers and statistics but all run into each other in ways that make them unmemorable. Charts and tables would have made them so much clearer. The layout of the periodical publication of the fiction is also difficult to assimilate. It is set out in running paragraphs with volumes, issues, dates, pages, parts, and chapters all run together, separated only by periods, commas, colons, and square brackets. The information is all there, it's just not easily accessible.

There are several fundamental errors and omissions and some serious mistakes in transcriptions. Hyphenation in quasi-facsimile title-page transcriptions is unforgivable, and there are dozens of examples in this bibliography. Any student in a research methods course would know better. Randomly playing around with different sized typefaces in such transcriptions is similarly careless. It's easy to blame the typesetter, anxious to get as many words on the page as possible, but bibliographers have to be firm about the integrity of bibliographical description. Further, quasi-facsimile transcriptions of half-titles and covers should be that, as they are in most but not all cases. Occasionally they inexplicably go into inverted commas. This is especially confusing since some of the paper wrappers do in fact contain inverted commas. There are examples of italicised text underlined, suggesting that this is how it is on the page, when in fact examining copies reveals that this is not the case. Illustrating title-pages invites comparison with the transcriptions and reveals that there are many more careless errors. Most are sloppy proof-reading, such as omitted periods, upper case transcribed as lower case, the caption "illustration" for illustration, and whole lines of text omitted.
in transcriptions. There are errors in names, the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center occasionally spelt Centre, the University of London Library wrongly called the Senate House Library, the National Library of Scotland called the Scottish National Library. Sadly most bibliographies don’t run to a second edition to allow such errors to be put right.

The bibliographers have been given the luxury of 140 illustrations. They are in places helpful additions to the descriptions, although the poor quality of some suggests they may be photocopies rather than photographs, and their almost ghostly graininess limits their value. I don’t believe, for example, that anyone will be much the wiser for the reduced and poor quality picture of five Felix Holt binding variants, although no doubt the original intention was good, and I challenge anyone to read anything on the spine of illustration 18. Nor is there a lot of value in separate full-page illustrations of second and third editions where the only difference between the title-pages is the edition number and the date, and a subsequent fourth edition illustration with one extra line of text. On the other hand there are good illustrations of the 1888 forged edition of the Brother and Sister sonnets including the title-page, an Edmund Gosse bookplate, a four-page letter from the forger Thomas J. Wise to Gosse, and a note in Wise’s handwriting on how he had supposedly acquired the book. The illustrations of rare wrappers that most of us cannot easily see in libraries are also valuable. Material like this brings the bibliography to life. This is how the illustrations allocation should really have been used.

In the end I’m not convinced by the title. It is a good, solid bibliography, and there’s nothing wrong with that. But to call it a bibliographical history suggests, to me at least, that it will make a nod in the direction of Don McKenzie’s idea of the sociology of texts, the genesis, evolution, transmission, and reception of texts, and bibliography as the biography of books. The sparks of life are there that might have made this a milestone in the history of the book. As it is, it is a good bibliography as far as it goes, tinged, as Eliot herself might have said, with spots of commonness.

GILLIAN FENWICK

University of Toronto