REVIEWS

Fr. Michael Collins et al., *Books That Changed History*, Kathryn Hennessy, senior editor; foreword by James Naughtie. London: Dorling Kindersley, 2017. ISBN: 978 0 2412 8933 4 (hardcover). 256 pp. A$45.

Reviewed by Paul Tankard

This glamorous coffee-table volume warrants reviewing here not so much as a work of scholarship as a representative example of a phenomenon that ought to be of interest to scholars of bibliography and book history. The ever-larger sections of bookshops devoted to the appealing niche of publishing, collecting, and "books about books," is one of the phenomena that signifies a growing self-consciousness among those interested and engaged in book culture. There have always been such books, but they have been until recently a mainly specialist interest. Now, there is something of a boom in the publication of such texts, including biblio-memoirs, reading diaries, anthologies of book-related quotations, "biographies" of books, books about the alphabet, typefaces, and bookshops, as well as scholarly monographs about the nature, culture and future of reading. One interpretation might be that the readers and purchasers of real books are appreciating the medium itself more than ever, and taking it less for granted, as the reading and particularly the ownership of books become more of a niche taste and a cultural marker.

The books selected for description and depiction in the volume under review are not books that are—or ever were, necessarily—for reading or even study. So, *Books That Changed History* is not to be compared with various books of "great books" or "best books," such as Harold Bloom's famous *The Western Canon* (1994), or more pop-treatments such as the *1001 Books You Must Read Before You Die* (2006), both of which are about what books (at their best) contain: that is, pleasant, profitable or historically important reading experiences—what we call literature. In this book, described on the rear cover as a "guide to more than 80 of the world's most celebrated, rare, and important written works," some of the books featured are books for knowing, and some of them books for knowing about. Many are books that you could not conceivably read before you die, even if you wanted to.

Books with which it might be usefully compared include:

1956. Robert B. Downs, *Books that Changed the World*: selects for chapter-length discussion sixteen books, mainly books of politics /society, or science, published from the sixteenth to the twentieth century.

1998. Martin Seymour-Smith, *The 100 Most Influential Books Ever Written: The History of Thought From Ancient Times to Today*: starts with the *Upanishads* and concludes with B. F. Skinner. Whilst not entirely excluding works of literature (narrowly defined), the book is focused on works of philosophy,

science, and sacred texts: the foundation texts of the various academic disciplines and schools of thought.

2006. Melvyn Bragg, *12 Books that Changed the World*: overlooking the usual "great books" and casting his generic net more widely, to emphasise texts which caused revolutions in science (Newton, Faraday) or society (Wilberforce, Wollstonecraft) and includes the original rule book for "football" (soccer). The only literary text is the First Folio of Shakespeare.

2008. Andrew Taylor, *Books that Changed the World: The 50 Most Influential Books in Human History*: a thoughtful and varied collection, including Horace, Machiavelli, Goethe, Adam Smith, Ptolemy, the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, Mercator's *Atlas*, J. D. Salinger and J. K. Rowling.

2014. Roderick Cave and Sarah Ayad, *A History of the Book in 100 Books*: this is clearly "book history," with each of the 100 books presented as having been chosen as representing or inaugurating some development in the craft or function of book-making.[1]

The last of these bears the closest resemblance to *Books That Changed History*: both books are generously illustrated, to show off the selected books as physical objects, and in fact at least 20 of Cave and Ayad's 100 books are also featured in *Books That Changed History*. But the latter is clearly a less academic production and is aimed at a different and more popular readership.

The rear blurb of *Books That Changed History* says there are "more than 80" books described, but this figure seems to include one two-page spread devoted to the first 10 Penguin paperbacks and another to the Baedeker guidebooks. There are 70 other books featured in one-, two-, four- and six-page spreads, and a further 66 described at paragraph-length in gatherings at the end of each of the five chronological chapters. Some of the "books" are unique things: the Blue Qur'an, the Exeter Book, the Dead Sea scrolls, Leonardo's Codex Leicester, the *Trés Riches Heures* of the Duc de Berry. Some are particular editions, usually the first (the 1640 *Bay Psalm Book*, Samuel Johnson's 1755 *Dictionary of the English Language*), but sometimes not: that is, not the Bible, but the Gutenberg Bible; not the Plays of Shakespeare in the first quarto editions, but the First Folio; not Dante's *Divine Comedy* per se, nor the first edition of 1472, but an illustrated Venetian edition of 1497. Some are important in the history of book craft and technology (the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, Baskerville's edition of Virgil, David Roberts' lithographic prints of *The Holy Land*, the Kelmscott Chaucer). Some—particularly among the more recent ones—are important as "texts," but as physical books hardly at all: Darwin's *Origin of Species*; Marx's *Das Kapital*,

[1] One further more recent book that fits well into this micro-genre is Scott Christianson and Colin Slater, *100 Books that Changed the World* (London: Batsford, 2018).

Einstein's *General Theory of Relativity*, Betty Friedan's *Feminine Mystique*. The precise importance of some of them, such as Sterne's *Tristram Shandy*, or the 1909 English translation of *Fairy Tales of the Brothers Grimm* with the illustrations by Arthur Rackham, is hard to discern, other than that they are good books in what would be nice editions to own.

The 26 early pre-print books selected for description are very rare and valuable things, of immense historical value and/or aesthetic interest. Some such as the *Book of Kells* are works of art in the form of books. Others, like the Dead Sea Scrolls or Egyptian Books of the Dead, are important for the unique light they shed on times and peoples, as well as testifying to the cultural functions and importance that a book might have in a pre-print society. But those books and others are unique items that were never in meaningful circulation, and which were unknown and unremembered for centuries (or more), so the claim that they "changed history"—book history or any other—is rather dubious. Privately owned and used in their own time, lost for millennia and discovered only in modern times, they have had (at least, not until recently) no intellectual afterlife.

Of the 72 books dated after 1650, 30 out of 36 are conventional printed works; the other six are photograms (Anna Atkins's *British Algae*), lithographs (Robert's *Holy Land*), embossed on paper (Louis Braille), engraved and hand-painted (Blake's *Songs*), newsprint (Russian artist El Lissitzky's *Pro Dva Kvadrata*, 1922), and an autograph book, with exercise books and loose-leaf pages (Anne Frank's diary). Why the *manuscript* of Anne Frank's diary—rather than the published book—was selected as having "changed history" is a bit mysterious: many of the other published books included also have extant manuscripts.

Perhaps this suggests that not a great deal of careful thought was given to the contents; but I suppose that it is not easy or even possible to be precise about what has "changed history." Some of the books that have clearly influenced or signified historical processes, such as Simone de Beauvoir's *Le Deuxième Sexe*, Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique*, Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*, or *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung*, are mass-produced artefacts, of which little could be said about their book-historical qualities, strictly speaking. So, while some of the books are selected for their uniqueness, beauty or other particular physical qualities, others are included for their wide circulation, and socio-cultural penetration. There are a number of children's books: *Aesop's Fables* (in Newbury's edition of 1765), *Alice in Wonderland*, *Peter Rabbit*, *The Wizard of Oz*, *The Fairy Tales of the Brothers Grimm* (with Rackham's illustrations, 1909), and *Le Petit Prince*.

Books That Changed History is not a contribution to the discipline of book history, but a handsome and varied celebration of the history of books, with something for everyone. The editor Michael Collins is a Catholic priest and hard-working writer for a general readership, and his contributors seem to be professional researchers. The book is not completely reliable as a scholarly source:

I found two errors in the account of Johnson's *Dictionary*. But it is an attractive, well-made and agreeably-priced hardback that could make a fine gift-book for a budding book historian.

Eric Marshall White, *Editio princeps: A History of the Gutenberg Bible*. London and Turnhout: Harvey Miller, 2017. 465 pp., 103 colour and 14 monochrome illustrations. ISBN 978 1 909400 84 9. €120.00.

Reviewed by Anthony Tedeschi

In February 1873, the agent Henry Stevens arranged for a consignment to be shipped from London to Hartford, Connecticut. Inside the crate was a copy of the Gutenberg Bible, which Stevens had acquired on behalf of the collector George Brinley (1817–1875). On the shipping invoice, Stevens wrote a postscript in which he requested due respect be paid, including the direction that no one was to see the Bible "without first reverentially lifting their hats." Whilst it is unknown whether Stevens's instructions were obeyed, the story demonstrates the veneration paid to the first substantial book printed in Europe by means of moveable type, the subject of Eric White's erudite and meticulously researched *Editio princeps*.

The book is the result of twenty years of investigation, begun when White was a curator at the Bridwell Library, Southern Methodist University, and completed in his present role as Curator of Rare Books at Princeton University. Its text is divided into three main parts. "Part One: Editio princeps" begins with an overview of the development of printing, starting with xylography and early experiments with moveable types in East Asia centuries before Gutenberg. This is followed by an account of Gutenberg's own invention and the resurrection of his reputation as Europe's first printer after competing theories emerged in the sixteenth century that sought to diminish or erase Gutenberg's name. White, whose prose style is very enjoyable to read, contextualises this nicely at the beginning of Chapter 3: "A Book without a History": "Within a relatively short season of human history the fertile fruits of those first typographic overtures in East Asia and Europe have yielded millions upon millions of printed books and exerted incalculable cultural influence around the world. However, cultural impact and historical significance by no means guarantee lasting fame" (63).

Although this history and research will be familiar ground to some readers, White is to be commended for his careful and insightful analysis of the surviving archival evidence by which he debunks some long-held myths. The most notable story White dismantles is the legend that Gutenberg lost the court case brought against him by his financier Johann Fust, which resulted in Gutenberg forfeiting his presses. Here White builds upon the argument set forth in Hans-Michael Emphell's *Gutenberg vor Gericht. Der Mainzer Prozess um die erste gedruckte Bibel*

(2008) that the Helmaspergersche Notariatsinstrument, the name of the sole surviving court document concerning the case, stated nothing of the sort and that the actual evidence does not support the theory. White also points to Gutenberg's intact reputation in the years following the trial and his continued activity as a printer as further evidence that he was far from ruined.

In "Part Two: A History of the Gutenberg Bible," White traces and in many instances expands upon the ownership history of all known surviving copies. This section makes for highly engaging reading, serving effectively as a microcosm of broader themes in book history, such as the fashionable acquisition during the eighteenth century of books as typographical monuments and the great dispersal of libraries during the Napoleonic Era and dissolution of German monasteries in the nineteenth century. The section is arranged in order of discovery: from the end of the seventeenth century when Christoph Hendreich, head librarian at Berlin's Electoral Library, identified a surviving copy of the 42-line Bible as the Bible printed by Gutenberg, to the identification of a vellum fragment from a lost copy in 2017.

By White's count, there are sixty-four known copies, either complete or fragmentary, meaning just over one-third of Gutenberg's entire print run has remarkably survived. While there is some repetition of information this can be forgiven, for within these 244 pages White has amassed a trove of new and old scholarship, some of which was long forgotten. On this latter point, White notes in his Preface that during his research he "gradually … learned that as much as the tradition of Gutenberg studies has accumulated new information over the years, it has also dropped and forgotten substantial quantities of older information along the way – including [for example] the earliest published reference to a Gutenberg Bible that identified it as Europe's first printed book, which appeared in 1745 but was promptly ignored" (14). For each entry, White also cross-references citation numbers to earlier censuses compiled by Seymour de Ricci, Paul Schwenke, Ilona Hubay and Paul Needham, as well as to Roland Folter's excellent study of the sales history of Gutenberg Bibles in *Incunabula: Studies in Fifteenth-Century Printed Books presented to Lotte Hellinga* (1999).

"Part Three: A Census of Gutenberg Bibles" is divided into five sections: surviving copies, including fragments; additional recorded survivals, their current location unknown; "notional copies (not otherwise recorded)"; accessory fragments (not from complete Bibles)"; and doubtful copies and "ghosts." As White rightly states, "All books have their destinies, and even those copies that have come to disastrous ends remain books nevertheless, and their fates are no less a part of the larger story" (13). Under the final section "ghosts," one cannot help but find humour in the story of the Blandings Castle copy, created by P. G. Wodehouse in *Something New* (1915), the first of his novels set in that fictional Shropshire location. This invented copy made its way into the bibliographic literature, being

"briefly listed in the [Incunabula Short Title Catalogue] … in 2009" and having earlier "caught the eyes" of eminent early printing scholars Frederick Goff and Curt F. Buhler and the formidable book dealer H. P. Kraus.

Leaves held by Australasian institutions were not overlooked. Having provided this information it was therefore a surprise to find listed in the provenance index only the State Library of New South Wales, which in 1940 acquired a leaf from the 'Vienna copy' (19 leaves only) from a South Australian gallery (p. 323, leaf II:128). There was, however, no entry in the index for Dunedin, New Zealand.

The sole Gutenberg Bible leaf in Aotearoa known to date was bought by the Dunedin City Library, with assistance from one of its greatest benefactors, Alfred Hamish Reed (1873–1973), from the London firm of Charles Sawyer in 1955 to commemorate the 500th anniversary of the Bible's printing. This leaf is from volume one of the fragmentary copy known as Trier II, the main parts of which are held by the Bibliothèque centrale du Centre universitaire in Mons, Belgium and the Lilly Library, Indiana University.

Turning to the corresponding entry for Trier II in the census, readers will find a useful list of known locations of its leaves and quires, including Dunedin (p. 316, leaf I:106). The reason Dunedin was not indexed is mentioned in passing in the opening note to the provenance index, which states the decision was made to exclude the owners of Trier II leaves and single 'Noble Fragments'. The latter refers to leaves from the Mannheim copy, broken-up for individual sale in 1921 by New York book dealer Gabriel Wells (White has located 457 leaves so far). While the reasons for not including the owners of these leaves can be surmised, a line of justification or explanation would have been welcomed.

Of course, not finding an expected location in an index and the lack of rationale for such exclusion are mere quibbles. As an object, *Editio princeps* is an attractively printed and beautifully illustrated book. The 1,000 endnotes, extensive bibliography, three indexes, and wealth of information will surely establish it as a standard resource for anyone interested in the foundations of European printing and the cultural history of one of the world's most famous books. Its receipt of the 2018 DeLong Book History Prize awarded by the Society for the History of Authorship, Reading and Publishing is richly deserved.

Elspeth Jajdelska, *Speech, Print and Decorum in Britain, 1600–1750: Studies in Social Rank and Communication.* Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2016. xxiv + 238 pp. ISBN: 978 1 472 46725 6 (hardcover). £120.

Reviewed by Shef Rogers

Although this title does not appear to be aimed at bibliographers, the study in fact focuses quite intensely on readers and the ways that readers 'hear' or 'imagine' the

narrative voices of texts published mainly in the second half of the seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth centuries. While there are a few examples that precede 1650, most discussion is limited to the century following. Drawing on theories from anthropology and linguistics, Jajdelska sheds new light on what it may have felt like to live through the transition from a much more hierarchical, deferential, oral and socially constrained world to what was, by 1750, a print culture much closer to our own.

Essentially a series of case studies, the book's greatest strength is that it supports its claims by drawing on a variety of genres (diaries, personal and business correspondence, sermons, romances and novels) composed by authors from different professions and social strata. These contrasts are sharp enough to amplify the often subtle tonal shifts and assumptions about readers that evolve over the course of the century. Her final chapter on the common reader shows just how far authorial practices have moved from the days of Samuel Pepys and John Evelyn, even as she acknowledges that Samuel Johnson's common reader is still not the same as a twenty-first century common reader.

Divided into seven chapters plus a brief introduction and conclusion, *Speech, Print and Decorum* proceeds chronologically from Sidney's *Arcadia* (1590), by way of Richard Baxter, Samuel Pepys, John Evelyn and a host of less famous letter writers, businessmen and poets, to conclude with the rise of the review periodicals in English from 1751. Working from Richard Bauman's anthropology of verbal art, Jajdelska reminds us that reading is a performative act, and is consequently subject to all of the social norms of rank and decorum that governed face-to-face speech during these centuries. Only with the rise of the professional critic as a voice external to the text can authors and readers separate the experience of reading a text into the positions of implied author and imagined reader. Which is not to say that writers for the *Monthly* and *Critical* reviews approached texts in the same way as modern literary scholars—as is obvious to anyone reading those reviews, which strike twenty-first-century scholars as very descriptive and yet very judgmental—but those who wrote for the review journals constituted a distinct group of readers that in turn enabled the remaining majority to be classed by Johnson as "common readers." By contrast, earlier authors had conceived primarily of their audiences as people personally known to them or at least in relation to them in such a way that they could adopt the correct forms of address. Jajdelska's book reminds us throughout that readers before 1800 were always intensely conscious of social hierarchies and had learned to approach formal expression, whether oral or in print, through the structures and techniques of rhetoric.

Jajdelska analyses two reading phenomena that arose during this period: "opportunistic reading" and the concept of "stranger readers." She attributes both developments to greater urbanisation and much wider access to printed texts. "Opportunistic reading" is the form of reading that results from simply picking

up a piece of print and browsing it. Today we may be very familiar with such opportunities, but in a world less saturated with print, those opportunities were less common. Jajdelska reminds us of Gary Taylor's important insight that "the largest print run [for most books] … was less than the number of spectators that could be accommodated for a single performance at the Globe" (18). Only the advent of the periodical press and the development of coffee-house libraries from the turn of the eighteenth century made print more democratically available. "Stranger readers" were not just readers unknown to an author (writers had imagined "universal readers" in previous centuries), but those readers relative to whom an author was unsure how to judge his or her status. As population growth led to more open social networks in which a reader was less likely to be related to or share religious or political affiliations with the writer, authors found it "easier to disregard the decorum of communication in print" (153). The London publishing world of the first half of the eighteenth century may still seem tight-knit by modern standards, but it was cosmopolitan and somewhat confusing for authors of the day, who continued to fear that readers might deem a title 'impertinent' if they believed the author neglected or misjudged nuances of social hierarchy. Counteracting that fear was the increased potential for financial reward from a successful publication, encouraging authors to breach the older norms of decorum.

Jajdelska demonstrates the presence of these readerly assumptions across a wide range of works. Samuel Pepys's reading practices exemplify the traditional norms. Pepys's standard response to a book was evaluative, but the "evaluations in the diary tend not to distinguish between the merits of the author and the merits of his or her text. A text is often treated as an extension of its author" (60–61). Where texts had such potential to reflect on an author's personal reputation, appearances in print by women were especially fraught. It was essential that a female author correctly portrayed her status relative to her audience, though, as Jajdelska demonstrates, "the degree of transgression implied by any woman's printed text" could also depend on the social standing of her father or husband (115). For authors of "works of practical knowledge by experts," on the other hand, "the stranger reader is not a rival, … but an expert in a different field, grateful for the author's help" (152). Each of these relationships between author and readers is distinct; Jajdelska's talent is to depict the subtleties that distinguish them, then reveal how they can be arranged along a continuum and are shaped by population growth and publishing developments.

In reviewing Jajdelska's first monograph, *Silent Reading and the Birth of the Narrator* (2007), I concluded that "it is tempting to see her study as the missing link in showing why narrators develop" (*Script & Print* 32.2 [2008]: 119–20). Her second book has moved beyond attention to grammar and punctuation to examine tone and relation to readers. I am eagerly hoping for a third study that explores the implications of her first two across publications from the Restoration to the

late eighteenth century. I am confident the arguments she has presented here will lead to valuable new insights. As a sample of possible implications, in reflecting on this book while sorting old essays on satire, I suddenly realised that Jajdelska's arguments would also help account for the rise of satire in the first half of the eighteenth century. Satire always imagines its own intended audience (those who agree with the satirist), so in some ways it is a conservative form, but in the early eighteenth century, as authors became more conscious of the gap between self and speaker, they could also experiment with personae and expand the gap between author and narrator to create irony. As that technique became common over the next half century, the attraction of irony diminished and readers sought greater 'authenticity' (and reliability) in the narrative voice, resulting in novels such as those of Jane Austen with distinct narratorial and character voices, as opposed to earlier novels such as those of Defoe or Richardson, where sceptical readers like Gildon and Fielding perceived hypocrisy in the narratorial voice. I am sure I have simplified Jajdelska's ideas in my formulation, but I look forward to seeing how the implications of her work thus far might be elaborated.

One disappointment of this book is the apparent lack of editorial intervention by the publisher, Routledge. There are missing apostrophes (22, 185), missing commas (155, 182), an unhyphenated compound adjective ('present day assumptions', 192), and a string of confusions around the name Giles Jacob, who sometimes appears as Jacob Giles (132), has an index entry for both forms of his name, and has his book listed in the bibliography to chapter five as 'Jacob, Giles', but placed between Gildon and Granville (226). When a book sells for over £100, readers have a right to expect the publisher to commit some resources to copyediting. The author has also elected, somewhat unorthodoxly, to cite quotations from books viewed in Early English Books Online (EEBO) by image number rather than signature or page number. Consequently, a reader who wishes to consult a physical copy of the book must first consult the digital version. None of these faults undermines Jajdelska's arguments, but they do not do full justice to the scholarship of her book.

Katherine Acheson, ed. *Early Modern English Marginalia*. New York and London: Routledge, 2019. xvi + 302 pp. ISBN 978 0 415 41885 0 (hardcover). US$140.00; A$179.00.

Reviewed by Patrick Spedding

Early Modern English Marginalia is a recent addition to the Routledge series "Material Readings in Early Modern Culture." This series includes more than twenty volumes, many on subjects within the purview of the BSANZ and *Script & Print*, such as "Defining Print Popularity," typographic aesthetics, and the place of

"Manuscript Miscellanies" in early modern England.[1] Given how few books have been published on the subject of marginalia, the addition of a new title dedicated to this subject is particularly welcome.

Katherine Acheson's collection contains eleven essays, organised into three groups with reasonably self-explanatory titles: "Materialities" (four essays), "Selves" (four) and "Modes" (three). There is also a brief "Introduction"—more than half of which is comprised of single paragraph summaries of each of the essays—and Alan Stewart's "Afterword," which combines a much briefer account of the foregoing essays, mixed with material that would have been a very welcome addition to the section on "Selves."

Typical of most of the work in this area, the volume is dominated by case studies of marginalia by a particular individual (Jason Scott-Warren on Robert Nicolson, Georgianna Ziegler on Lady Anne Clifford, Alan Stewart on Richard Topcliffe) or group (Emma Smith on Thomas and Isabella Hervey, Austen Saunders on clergymen's copies of the thirty-nine articles, Acheson on early modern women in general), and marginalia contained in a particular work or works (Saunders; but also Claire Bourne on a single copy of the First Folio while Adam Smyth draws on multiple copies of Shakespeare's First Folio; Harriet Archer on marginalia in the works of John Higgins) or in works of a narrowly defined sub-genre (Elizabeth Patton on early Tudor books of hours). The remainder of the volume contains essays that seek to explain the absence of marginalia (Joshua Calhoun discusses the prevalence of paper on which it is either difficult or impossible to write), call for a broadening of the taxonomy of marginalia (Adam Smyth seeks to include impressions of objects), or which discuss the presence of marginalia on social media (Sjoerd Levelt on Twitter).

As in any collection, there are high and low points for the reader. The essay by Saunders is an example of the former: it is clearly organised and defined, a model of interpretative subtlety (on page 125 he nicely contrasts an elegant italic with old-fashioned secretary hand), sprinkled with surprising and amusing facts (on page 121 he describes how a sinecure was secured by reading the thirty-nine articles in an empty pasture), but also insights into the wider social function of marginalia. Saunders explains the reasons why printed copies of the articles were subscribed (why so many copies contain a manuscript memorandum certifying that they had been publically read and consented to), and the ways in which these public statements functioned to standardise doctrine and guarantee religious conformity (119), but also how the recording of memoranda involved many small,

[1] Emma Smith and Andy Kesson, *The Elizabethan Top Ten: Defining Print Popularity in Early Modern England* (2013), Rachel Stenner, *The Typographic Imaginary in Early Modern English Literature* (2018), *Manuscript Miscellanies in Early Modern England*, edited by Joshua Eckhardt and Daniel Smith (2014); Routledge have also included reference works in this series, such as *A Handbook of Editing Early Modern Texts* by Claire Loffman and Harriet Phillips (2017).

local office holders, drawing parishioners into a "participatory public life" (125), establishing social ties (126), and conferring "a small dignity" on people who were often unable to sign their name (125).

The essay by Levelt on #earlymoderntwitter, by contrast, contains very little on the subject of, and even less of interest concerning, marginalia. Rather than dwelling on the ways in which Twitter could, or has proven, uniquely useful as a finding or research aid, Levelt's chapter focuses—between brief and unconvincing discussions of Twitter-as-metaphoric-marginalia (234–36, 252–54)—on some of the things "I myself" did on Twitter (236, 240, 250), "Twitter Activism" (240–45)—reaching its nadir by introducing such an inconsequential march-fly as Milo Yiannopoulos (245)—and the tweeting of quotations from famous authors (246–47). There is no serious consideration of the many predecessors of, and competitors to, Twitter, or any suggestion that a Twitter exchange about scorch marks (240–41), for instance, could have occurred, or still may occur, elsewhere. Levelt need not have reached back to early journals that focused on academic correspondence, such as *Notes & Queries*, but social media competitors such as Facebook and Instagram are mentioned only in passing and as metaphoric marginalia (234), and there is no mention at all of other types of online communications, e.g. blogging, chat boards, RSS feeds, academic email groups or electronic mailing lists such as SHARP-L.

Collectively, the essays in this volume make a solid contribution to marginalia studies. In the first section, Calhoun questions the implications of Bill Sherman's findings, that 20% of the pre-1640 English books at the Huntington library contain manuscript notes (17–18), suggesting that Sherman's sample is skewed in many ways (18, 28). Acheson notes that women are named far less frequently than men in ownership inscriptions on books of this type (i.e., STC items). Although she does not spell out how rare such ownership inscriptions are, as a proportion, it is easy to work out: the Folger contained 13,631 STC items in 2016;[2] of these, only 358 (88, n. 18) bear female ownership marks—about 2.6%. Calhoun makes a compelling case for the reclassification of some of the marks presently described as "pen trials" as "paper trials" (27), drawing attention to just how poorly-suited the margins of many books were for any form of annotation. Scott-Warren shows a similar interest in descriptive terminology, referring to the type of marginalia made by readers who marked up their books in order to make it easier for later readers to navigate the text, as "public-service marginalia" (39). Smyth's description of marks made by "a sustained period of non-reading" (59) is a similarly useful turn of phrase. Sustained periods of non-reading leave many traces—more than just the slowly-forming stains that Smyth focuses on. A careful examination of all of these marks might demonstrate just how rarely and intermittently most books are the subject of "active reading" (65)—which is so consistently (and unsurprisingly)

[2] "Collection size," *Folgerpedia* (13 December 2017) online <https://folgerpedia.folger.edu/Collection_size>.

the focus of marginalia studies as to give a mistaken impression about the life of books and the nature of reading.

In the second section, Patton demonstrates (like Saunders) interpretative subtlety in characterising the different ways passages were expurgated from Tudor books of hours, detailing the damage done to paper by forceful movements of a quill tip, and the carelessness and haste implied by the offsetting of ink (105). Ziegler demonstrates a similar interest in dog-eared pages (134, 141, 144, illustrated on 145), and the "physical trail" left by reading. Ziegler's contribution to the emerging critical lexicon is "transactional reading"—a phrase used to describe an arrangement where texts were read aloud and passages marked up, at the direction of Lady Anne Clifford, so that she could later return to "overlook" them (138), sometimes adding marginalia of her own. Smith describes the ways in which many early-modern books were designed to encourage "manuscript participation" (155), and makes an excellent point in relation to libraries: that there is a natural tendency—a biographical bias, and a preference for permanence and fixity—that leads scholars to treat all the books that may once have belonged to a library as properly belonging to that collection (168–69). As Smith argues, libraries are always in flux, with loss and intentional de-accessions—driven by changing personal circumstances and constraints of space—just as much a part of their character as gifts and purchases (170). That is, Smith makes an argument about libraries, similar to that made by Smyth in relation to reading: many books may only belong to a library for a brief period, but since that brief period is consistently (and unsurprisingly) the focus of marginalia studies, it gives a mistaken impression about the life of books and the nature of reading.

The highlight of the third section is Bourne's essay on the Free Library of Philadelphia copy of the First Folio. Bourne's starting point appears to have been the *New World Census of First Folios* by Anthony West and the first folio *Descriptive Catalogue*, edited by West and Eric Rasmussen,[3] but he corrects the many errors and omissions of these works. The other two essays in this section are weak. Levelt's essay is discussed above. Archer's argument and subject matter somewhat obscured by her theoretical interests—and the occasional over-reliance on metaphor that these interests seem to support. Archer suggests that "The spectrum which stretches from [A] to [B] offers a way to view [C] as a spectrum" (176) and, just as lucidly, discusses "lifting the bonnet of [a] catalogue, to reveal its mechanics as a repository of … gleanings" (182). Acheson's essay in the first section is

[3] Anthony James West, *The Shakespeare First Folio: The History of the Book: A New World Census of First Folios* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); *The Shakespeare First Folios: A Descriptive Catalogue*, edited by Eric Rasmussen and Anthony James West (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011). For a devastating assessment of the many flaws in *The Shakespeare First Folios: A Descriptive Catalogue*, see Ian Jackson's review, "The Shakespeare First Folios, a Descriptive Catalogue," *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 108, no. 2 (June 2014): 243–54.

similarly weakened by its over-use of literary theory (Derrida and Foucault both get a nod; 73, 82) and an over-indulgence in metaphor (the whole essay is organised around metaphoric "spaces"), but—since Archer does not use her metaphors as an organising principle—her essay is clearer and more useful than that by Acheson.

Peter Rutledge Koch, *Peter Koch Printer: A Descriptive Bibliography [1974–2016]*. Berkeley, CA: Editions Koch and Stanford University Libraries, 2017, 3 vols, 496 pp. Two-colour text, full colour images, hand-printed card covers, card slipcase. ISBN 978 0 911221 60 2. Edition of 400, 15 reserved for a special edition. US$225.00.

Reviewed by Caren Florance

Produced to accompany a 2017 survey exhibition at Stanford University, these three volumes celebrate 40 years of intensive press activity and the larger-than-life presence of American master printer Peter Rutledge Koch. There are few active grand printeries left in the world today and those that have survived have done so by paying careful attention to the market and its desires. Some have teamed up with commercial businesses as specialist services and (upmarket) jobbing printers. Koch has been a Renaissance man in the true original Italian sense of the term: "a man who can do all things if he will" (Alberti).

A self-taught printer and autodidact, Koch studied the work of, and was deeply influenced by, the California press scene of the 1970s and 1980s and was mentored by designer Adrian Wilson. Koch then mentored others: one of his studio alumni is type designer and printer Russell Maret, who introduces the third volume. Over his career, Koch has hosted and fostered a community of writers and artists and other printers. He operates in the role of print diplomat: connecting with university libraries and patrons, forging internal and international connections, and creating a new marketplace for artist books as well as encouraging a renewed awareness of contemporary fine printing.

As often happens late in a career, one's origin story becomes highly narrative, and there are plenty of opportunities to relate the key points in the direct interviews throughout this boxed set. It's a rollicking good story. Ranging between Montana, Europe and California, it is full of cowboy tales and strange opportunities, with art and typographic references that manage to connect Koch to the grand narratives of cultural history. He is also fond of grand gestures: invited to Venice as a resident printer in 2006, he went with "an entourage of assistants and visiting artists and two printing presses on loan from the Tipoteca Italiana" which he transported to the Scuolo Internazionale di Grafica via gondola (1:27).

His work had a number of press incarnations, from his early days of the Montana-based Black Stone Press (1974–1984) to his ultimate destination, Editions Koch, a large well-equipped studio in Berkeley, California. His output,

almost always in collaboration with writers, runs in parallel streams: poetry volumes, ancient Greek reprints, political elegies, and light-hearted ephemera to blow off steam. All executed with extreme classical elegance and an articulate awareness of material poetics and typographic legacy.

The three volumes are signature-sewn and softbound, with two-colour letterpressed card covers and an unprinted slipcase of the same black card. Each volume is numbered, and spine-titled provocatively when boxed: 1: PETER KOCH PRINTER, 2: HARD WORDS, 3: AGAINST DESIGN, accompanied by Koch's personal *ouroboros* logo – a snake eating its own tail – printed across to unite the three spines. The covers were set and printed in Koch's studio. They are immaculately designed, using silver and copper ink against the black stock. The pages are commercially printed: lavishly illustrated with generous margins and thoughtful, classical typography in black with red headings and highlights.

Volume 1: *Peter Koch Printer: A Descriptive Bibliography [1975–2016]* is an introduction to the man and his body of formal work. The cover date is wrong, as the first publication listed was printed in 1974. An academic error but also proof of the human touch in its production, Koch admitted when queried, as the cover was printed well before the page-blocks were completed. This timing glitch manifests in other ways: in each volume, the cover title is different to the front page title. In this case, the title-page reads *Peter Koch Printer: Embodied Language and the Form of the Book*. This is the title of one of the three essays that accompany the descriptive bibliography compiled by Nina M. Schneider. Another problem is overall editorial inconsistency: the three volumes are united only by their design. One major example is that the contributors are not uniformly acknowledged across the volumes. In the first, writers have a descriptive by-line but no biography, in the second, the first writer has a short biography at the end and others have nothing, and in the third, the editors have extensive biographies at the end but essayist Russell Maret has nothing.

Schneider's descriptive bibliography itself (1:95–169) is thorough, listing 178 publications and their parts. They are in chronological order, citing all contributors, colophon information, printing and binding details, page order, and occasional notes. Where possible there is a cover image of the work next to its listing, with further, often full page, colour images scattered through the volume and linked to the works via the Names and Titles Indexes (1:178–185), which only refer to this first volume. The bibliography is only devoted to major works, with the ephemera separated into volume 3, where they are discussed casually in interview form, unlisted and unindexed. This is a shame, because ephemera is often the playground where press ideas are unguardedly tested, and is extremely collectible.

As a generation of robust book collectors has waned, institutional galleries have joined libraries as primary purchasers, encouraging printers to experiment with visual art output. Koch, always inspired by the Surrealist movement's

determination to jump boundaries, has pushed his ideas in different directions through the years. Volume 2: *Hard Words: Memory and Death in the Wild West*, is dedicated to a project that feels closest to Koch's heart. Informally titled *The Montana Quartet*, it consists of three books and a body of wall-mounted printwork. Aaron Parrett's essay describes it thus:

> The four instalments are, in the order of their composition, *Hard Words*, *Nature Morte*, *The Lost Journals of Sacajewea*, and *Liber Ignis*. Together they articulate in an unusual way the conflicted history of the West and the philosophical anxiety born of an American story that is rife with cultural destruction, including the wholesale genocide of the Indians, environmental disaster through industrial excess, and Sisyphean labour and disappointment in a hostile landscape, to name just one trio of the themes resounding through this opera, all of which Koch distills through the coils of his complex relationship with Montana. (2:7)

The highlight (perhaps of the entire boxed set) is a 1:2 scale full-page facsimile of *The Lost Journals of Sacajewea*, a book designed around a poetic narrative on the eponymous Indian heroine by Debra Magpie Earling. The excellent reproduction does its best to convey the beauty of the real object, which was printed on Japanese Kozo paper and bound with handmade Cave Paper and bullet casings sewn into the spine (2:63–149).

Volume 3: *Against Design: On Thinking and Printing*, has the title-page *Against Thinking: An Interview with Peter Rutledge Koch*. The interview, by designers and studio mentees Monique Comacchio and Camden Richards, was undertaken in 2013 and meanders, as mentioned earlier, through an uncatalogued array of ephemera, from jobbing work (covers, menus, cards, flyers) through to book prospectuses, launch invitations (often in the form of drink coasters) and what Koch fondly calls 'cowboy kitsch', roughly organised into time-spans. Volume 3 also touches upon the CODEX Foundation, which is another grand idea that has, to date, opened up an important market for fine press publications and artist books. Koch calls it "a global collaboration in the spirit of the Grand Bazaar (1:29) … a participatory market and ideas laboratory" (3:85); the market consists of a physical biannual market but also associated websites, and the 'lab' includes fostering ideas through the radical CODE(X) monograph series, which are hand-printed by Editions Koch and feature book arts writers from around the world (3:82–85).

The common thread running through these three volumes is the diversity of Koch's output, and that it is hard to categorise him beyond 'printer'. In contemporary printing, this is not unusual as practitioners struggle to find audiences and markets. Koch has worked hard to educate contemporary markets and cultivate his communities, and he is conscious of his legacy: the entire archive of the Black Stone Press, "five linear feet of material," is held by the The University of Delaware Library Special Collections Department, and the Stanford University Libraries Department of Special Collections now holds

the Peter Koch Papers, spanning "1972 to the present, [comprising] more than two hundred linear feet, (some five hundred manuscript boxes full)" (1:8). Both collections have online guides via the institutions, and there is a sales catalogue available on the www.peterkochprinters.com website.

In summary, the boxed set is more than just a descriptive bibliography, in keeping with Koch's wide-ranging ideas on design and culture, his long-walked line between meeting and subverting formal expectations, and his refusal to let anything get in the way of a good story. To borrow Maret's words, "it is a process of discovery that can feel like a ride on a runaway train, a thrilling, nail-biting encounter with an artist hell bent on forging a connection between his interior vision and the world outside" (3:23).