

Eggert, Paul, and Peter Shillingsburg, eds. *Anglo-American Scholarly Editing, 1980–2005*. (*Ecdotica* special issue 6.) Bologna and Madrid: Alma Mater Studiorum, Università di Bologna Dipartimento di Italianistica; Centro para la Edición de los Clásicos Españoles, 2009. 425 pp. Paper. €43.50 (ISBN 978-88-430-5366-7).

Reviewed by GABRIEL EGAN

This volume reprints 21 essays from 1981 to 2005, nearly half of them from the 1980s when a long-standing consensus about intention and authorship suddenly collapsed. Jerome J. McGann's "The Ideology of Final Intentions," from *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (1983), embodies three of the new ideas: a print edition might complete rather than corrupt an author's intentions, writing and publishing are social activities, and notions of "final" intention had to be crow-barred into New Bibliography when it was applied to modern writings for which surviving documents witness the full journey from author to reader. New thinking on intention informs all the essays — explicitly figuring in the titles of five — and the collection illustrates how philosophically sophisticated these debates became by the end of the 1980s. Progress slowed in the 1990s, represented by six essays here. The most important ones arrest the post-structuralist pendulum's swing in order to reassert the importance of authors. Paul Eggert argues that readers are legitimately interested in textual origins, and Trevor H. Howard-Hill decries the new theories' failure to generate new practices, beyond simply giving readers (potentially misleading) facsimiles.

The third millennium begins with Paul Werstine's argument that even setting aside post-structuralist disdain for authors, Greg's author-centric "Rationale of Copy-Text" gives poor guidance for editing early modern dramatists because they necessarily collaborated with their playing companies even in the act of composition. Representing recent developments are four closing essays. Richard Bucci rightly observes that by "copy-text editing" some people mean McKerrowian best-text editing and others its opposite expressed in Greg's "Rationale," and Kathryn Sutherland laments that over-emendation has robbed Jane Austen's works of their grammatical freedom and experimentation. Sally Bushell continues the field's explorations of intentionality, bringing in French and German theories, and David L. Hoover critiques McGann's claims about textual non-self-identity (from *Radiant Textuality*) by rewriting Joyce Kilmer's poem "Trees," much as McGann rescanned and reprocessed a Victorian advert. Although just how he gets there somewhat eluded this reviewer,

Gabriel Egan (Department of English and Drama, Loughborough University, Leicestershire, UK LE11 3TU) wrote *The Struggle for Shakespeare's Text* (Cambridge, 2010) and is exploring digital approaches to analyses of press variants and compositorial stints.

Hoover's agreeable conclusion that "texts are remarkably stable" offers a starting point for new digitally empowered analyses that he only hints at.

Haynes, Christine. *Lost Illusions: The Politics of Publishing in Nineteenth-Century France*. (Harvard Historical Studies, 167.) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010. xvi, 328 pp. Illus. Cloth, \$45.00 (ISBN 978-0-674-03576-8).

Reviewed by SARAH LEONARD

In her deeply researched and carefully argued book, Christine Haynes documents the emergence of a new figure in the nineteenth-century book trade: the *éditeur*, or modern publisher. The *éditeur* was an entrepreneur of the cultural marketplace — a figure distinguished from booksellers and printers and involved in soliciting, financing, and promoting authors and texts. Haynes weaves a complex story around the *éditeur*, linking this new figure to debates about intellectual property, government regulation of the book trade, and the associational efforts of publishers, printers, and booksellers.

The years between 1777 and 1810 marked a period of structural change and conceptual innovation in the French book trade. First the monarchy and later the Revolutionary government broke the monopoly on published works held by the Paris Book Guild, acknowledged the property rights of authors and their heirs, and abolished government control of the book trade. Napoleon's role in this process was characteristically mixed; guilds were not reestablished, authors and their heirs were granted limited rights to intellectual property, and a government-mandated licensing system regulated printers and booksellers. Questions raised during the Revolution remained potent and unresolved well into the nineteenth century. Were literary works the property of individuals or society? Whose interests were served by an unrestricted and competitive book trade (or conversely by licensing systems and restrictions on free trade)? Did the value of corporatism embodied in guilds outlast these institutions?

When Haynes begins her story in 1810, she finds members of the French book trade professionally unsettled by the Revolution and divided over the future of their industry. She identifies two groups — "corporatists" and "liberals" — who took different stances on the development of the book trade. The corporatist camp, dominated by printers and booksellers, looked to the pre-Revolutionary period for models and favored licensing requirements that would limit competition. Dependent upon literary works in the public domain (which they reprinted and sold), they argued that ideas and texts belonged to

Sarah L. Leonard (Department of History, Simmons College, 300 The Fenway, Boston, MA 02115) is Associate Professor of History. She is completing a book manuscript entitled "Fragile Minds and Vulnerable Souls: Print Culture, Modernity, and the Invention of Obscenity Law in the German States, 1815–1890."