course of 35 years. In an effort to show how one representative author accommodated herself to the magazine and its parent company, while also making her own demands, Worth looks at numerous examples of the fiction, non-fiction, periodical writing, and books that Oliphant published under the aegis of *Macmillan's* from the early 1860s until her death in 1897. The chapter serves as a litany of authorial transactions about remuneration, revisions, manuscript length, deadlines, and the right to anonymity. Occasionally bitter, bordering on asperity, Oliphant's letters to (and from) Alexander Macmillan provide a fascinating picture of the vicissitudes typical of a literary relationship between two distinctive personalities, each preoccupied with financial stability. Among the serialized works that originally appeared in *Macmillan's*, Worth considers Oliphant's *A Son of the Soil*, *The Makers of Florence*, *The Count of San Marco*, *The Curate in Charge*, *Young Musgrave*, and *He That Will Not When He May*.

The book's final chapter suggests that *Macmillan's* suffered a marked deterioration in quality and prestige under the brief editorship of John Morley (1883–5), whose long and distinguished career at the helm of the *Fortnightly Review* (1867–82) was not adequate training to thwart the magazine's slow demise. Although Morley managed to contract Hardy's *The Woodlanders* for serial publication, he was gently ousted and succeeded by Mowbray Morris, who edited the increasingly substandard periodical during its last 22 years. Mowbray could claim to have introduced the young Rudyard Kipling to an English audience and to have brought out new periodical work by Henry James and Walter Pater, but he could not revive the "increasingly drab" *Macmillan's* (164), which multiplied its publication of too many run-of-the-mill novels and novellas. By the early twentieth century, *Macmillan's* had entered a period of terminal decline, financially and qualitatively: complacent and out of touch with its readership, it folded in 1907.

PETER W. SINNEMA
University of Alberta

Meredith L. McGill. *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting, 1834–1853*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003. 364 pp.; \$39.95 (US). ISBN: 081223698x.

Two topics of discussion recurred at various book and publishing history conferences this past spring and summer. At the BSC's

2004 meeting in Hamilton the progress of the *History of the Book in Canada / Histoire du livre et de l'imprimé au Canada* was celebrated, and Jacques Michon's work in Quebec publishing history was honoured with the Tremaine Medal. As these national projects reach completion, as is happening or has already happened elsewhere in the world, the question arises: where to from here? National boundaries have been useful for organizing comprehensive history projects along obvious lines such as the language of texts and the location of their producers, but the lines are much more cleanly drawn politically than they are culturally; undeniably, public funding of these huge projects has been a formative influence. Are national boundaries becoming an impediment to the study of the creation, dissemination, and reception of texts? The question is particularly relevant to countries with colonial beginnings; Americanists already refer to an "Atlantic" cultural space. Also, in the case of Ireland or China, for example, diasporic cultural production should not be overlooked. Is an international history of the book possible, or even necessary? How do we deal with the movement of texts across borders?

The other matter of concern centred around a perceived elitism in public libraries and universities in general, and in book disciplines specifically (bibliography, literary criticism, book history, etc.). In her keynote address to the Book History and Print Culture graduate students' annual conference at the University of Toronto, Janice Radway deplored the disadvantaged status in North America of studies of middlebrow culture. In July, the demise of Montreal's *Allô Police*, and the revelation that no complete run of the proudly lowbrow crime tabloid could be assembled from the holdings of our public institutions, inspired some of us who attended SHARP's book history conference in Lyon to reflect on a double-edged impasse that is central to all culture-based history study: on the one hand, the traditional academic and critical focus on canonical texts and aristocratic perspectives, and on the other hand, the ephemeral nature of popular printed texts that hampered the survival of periodicals and their supplements, subscription books, and later, dime novels, comics, and so on.

These debates will not be settled here, but a recent book by Meredith L. McGill makes an important contribution to scholarly discussion of nationalist, author-intention-centred, and book-centred approaches to literature studies and bibliography. McGill's ingenious vantage point is literary "piracy," a familiar term that nonetheless is proved to be a revisionist misnomer, coined by authors who

lobbied U.S. Congress during the nineteenth century for copyright protection of intellectual property. The work of foreign authors was not protected in the U.S. until 1891; even then, the legislation came with manufacturing requirements, and was limited to citizens of reciprocating nations. In the antebellum period of McGill's study, American authors and their publishers owned the monetary rights to actual books they produced, but the act of "publication" was construed as giving one's work to the public, and subsequent reprinting in revised book formats or verbatim in periodicals and magazines was unregulated. This is the key to understanding the traditional American view of limited copyright: it recognizes durable, therefore tradable, print objects – books, not newspapers or magazines – and not the ideas behind their texts.

American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting, 1834–1853 is published in the University of Pennsylvania Press's Material Texts series. Developed over several years, the work is an impressive culmination of McGill's research and teaching in American literature, literary theory, and cultural studies at Harvard and Rutgers universities. She takes this period of American literary "counterfeiting" back to its proper context and peels back the emotional layers of our contemporary judgments on a practice that was not only widespread, but fundamental to the development of North American print culture and literary markets. The opposing arguments are, of course, given equal time, and modern assumptions that reprint publishers were motivated solely by greed and opportunism are challenged. I was astounded that the case against absolute ownership of texts seemed to make a lot of sense for its time and place. For instance, McGill highlights the regional nature of U.S. print markets and makes a convincing connection between fears of centralization through universal copyright and a loss of state autonomy associated with the abolition question. Also, alternatives to expensive multi-volume British editions were sought on economic and populist grounds. The fact that I encountered these and other opposing views for the first time seemed to substantiate McGill's claim that currently prevailing notions regarding the boundaries and nature of a national literature, and ideas about *which* texts qualify to be considered as part of an author's output, are constructs that have been superimposed on the complex historical reality by subsequent academic approaches, for better or worse. McGill's purpose is not academic iconoclasm, but historical inquiry and rhetorical analysis, and her methodology is sound; she follows the debate through court and congressional

records, the editorial press, and authors' own accounts. She begins with an analysis of *Wheaton v. Peters*, the 1834 Supreme Court case that set a discouraging precedent for authors. The court ruled that Wheaton had no claim against the reprinting, in a revised form, of his published work. Both adversaries were Supreme Court reporters, a fact which must have muddied the waters considerably, especially considering that the reprinted texts in dispute were Wheaton's editions of court proceedings. Not surprisingly, they were deemed to belong to the American people and not exclusively to Wheaton. One wonders how differently U.S. copyright history would have been written had the original court challenge been mounted by, say, a poet, who wasn't plying his craft as a state employee!

The greatest virtue of McGill's book lies in the way she puts the much-vaunted interdisciplinary approach of book history into practice. She situates her work at the "intersection between book history and literary criticism and theory," and goes on to present case studies of reprinted works of Dickens, Poe, and Hawthorne. Her focus on their reprinted texts is neither comprehensively bibliographical nor exclusively textual, rather on the "rhetorical origins and interpretive consequences of the practice of reprinting, ... not as an answer to, but a means of reframing questions about the nature and limits of antebellum literary culture." Still, much historical and textual ground is covered in support of the rhetorical, and the documentation is excellent: the extensive endnotes, bibliography, and index are very useful.

There is much here to interest readers from many disciplines and fields. I cannot recommend this book highly enough to all who wish to learn more about the different ways in which Americans conceived of intellectual property and their evolving print culture in a formative period of dramatic expansion and industrialization. These ideas formed the basis for the dissenting position of the United States, throughout the nineteenth and well into the twentieth century, as other nations overwhelmingly moved toward the international copyright and trade agreements (Berne Convention, TRIPS) that today govern the circulation of both material and intangible texts. These accords reflect our modern conceptions of authorship and publishing, and McGill successfully marries new and existing academic approaches to show why the values underlying today's intellectual property treaties were not always universally held.

SHELLEY S. BEAL

University of Toronto