

Supplementary references found on additional pages are also included. While subjects are not exhaustively indexed, fourteen topical entries provide tantalizing possibilities for research. These include subject listings for archaeological, biblical, scriptural, and bibliographic forgeries; fiction as forgery; imaginary books; imaginary or forged maps; and travel forgeries.

Potential uses of the collection are also explored in the 2014 Johns Hopkins exhibition catalogue *Fakes, Lies, and Forgeries: Rare Books and Manuscripts from the Arthur and Janet Freeman Bibliotheca Fictiva Collection*. Edited by Earle Havens, the Sheridan Libraries curator of rare books and manuscripts, this complementary publication to the work under review includes five extensive, illustrated essays by Johns Hopkins faculty and graduate students based on material in the collection. While *Bibliotheca Fictiva* will be of most immediate interest to researchers already concerned with literary and historical forgeries, the remarkable range of texts gathered and documented in this volume may also provide inspiration for new avenues of research concerned with issues of authenticity and incorporating examples of fabrications, falsifications, and forgeries.

Daniel J. Slive

Bridwell Library, Southern Methodist University

GAILEY, Amanda, *Proofs of Genius: Collected Editions from the American Revolution to the Digital Age*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2015. ISBN 978-0-472-05275-2. Pp. 162. Paper \$29.95.

“Editorial choices have stealthily shaped the American literary canon for centuries”, Amanda Gailey reminds us, “forging authorial legacies, producing regional and national propaganda, and generally working as a determinant for what and how we consider American literature” (1). *Proofs of Genius* is based on a clear formal observation: collected editions reflect ideas about authorship, including a surviving emphasis on Romantic authorial genius. Out of this claim, Gailey builds a tightly constructed book that that lays deep foundations for future comparative studies of canonization.

Gailey lays out her findings thoroughly, but demonstrates her methods with élan and wry humor. She begins with comparisons to the British context, which was crucial both for modeling the genre and as a foil for those attempting to establish U.S. cultural sovereignty through writers’ collected editions. From the Early Republic through the antebellum, spirit was

key—authorial, national, and divine. Editors did not share common principles in choosing and presenting text. “When American readers beheld an American genius—enshrined in a collected edition honoring the fruits of his creative labor”, Gailey writes, “they beheld evidence of God’s blessings on the new nation, evidence that the country was capable of producing minds with a divine connection and prosperous enough to develop them” (4). As the century progressed, collecting “served as a special memorializing genre for a growing belletristic middle class”, with tomes distributed locally and gathered and written by amateurs (10).

For the most part this is an exercise in distant reading. When close reading happens, it’s of introductions, title pages, and other paratexts. The question mark remains over Emily Dickinson’s work, panned by reviewers early on, and, in the wake of Gailey’s chapter re-contextualizing that first edition among other amateur female authors collected at the time, unsurprisingly so. “Only the power of the poems within”, Gailey writes, “propelled them past the fate of so many similar volumes” (51). But, one wonders, why did the collection get so many reviews in the first place? Was the co-editor Thomas Wentworth Higginson’s name still powerful enough to draw fire, and fire enough to draw attention, and the poetry good enough to make the volume sell?

Gailey carefully assesses a range of factors in the history of collected editions. Copyright changes matter, but so do business practices. “The shift from consumer binding to publisher binding” in the nineteenth century helped “establish certain textual genres as natural ways of organizing texts”, but such technologies were no less important than the anxieties about national prowess that shaped literary debates (27). The chapter titled “Whitman’s Shrines” deftly reads the poet’s famous monumental tomb (based on a William Blake image) and his end-of-life collections *Complete Poems and Prose* and *Leaves of Grass* (1891–92) as “two complementary memorials” (67). A shrine and an “authorized” book would work in tandem to cement Whitman as a standard writer both in public and in the hearts of Americans.

The fourth chapter, “Cold War Editing and the Rise of the ‘American Literature Industry’”, is particularly compelling for textual scholars. Situating the rise of the Greg-Bowers intentionalist editorial approach—and the controversies about the texts that resulted from it—in the framework of the scientization of knowledge work during the Cold War, the chapter re-focuses the collected works of writers that emerged during this time. “The Greg-Bowers method resonated with Cold War textual scholars”, Gailey

writes, because “it easily cohered with dominant American political ideology” and “complemented the scientific gestalt taking hold of American academic research” (85). This drew both furor and followers, as critics like Edmund Wilson and Lewis Mumford derided the cumbersome editions of major writers that emerged from this new technique and as academic editors rallied around a new method.

Scholars unfamiliar with digital humanities or book history will find a model in this book, a showcase of both depth and scope of research. The fifth chapter takes a compelling methodological turn, from examining texts and paratexts to analyzing the disciplinary processes that make up digital archives. Gailey argues that the very structure of the standard markup language XML, using TEI vocabulary, scripts a single-author, single-work focus. “XML itself”, she writes, “with its prohibition against conflicting hierarchies and nesting structures, lends itself to a view of literature that considers texts (and sometimes works) as discrete, self-contained entities with their own internal coherence” (129). In this way, Gailey shows how the accepted technologies by which digital archivists code their findings, far from putting to rest author-centered, New Critical approaches, sustain a Romantic conception of authorship, “implicitly [supporting] projects that examine authors and texts as self-contained units more than ones that don’t” (130). The way most digital archives, like the *Whitman Archive*, code their findings, Gailey argues, “supports less controversial, less politicized views of texts, over more contentious kinds of interpretive claims” (130).

Offering a counterexample of a digital collection organized thematically, Gailey discusses her work with *The Tar Baby and the Tomahawk*, a heavily annotated “digital collection that aims to . . . examine how adults wanted children to think about race during Jim Crow” (131). The contents of this collection “seem almost defined by their unsuitability for a conventional scholarly editing project”, including short stories, merchandise tie-ins, advertisements, menus, and more (132). TEI’s demand for hierarchical organization cannot adequately convey an archive defined by horizontal associations among cultural forms, making it cumbersome as a framework when a collection aims to capture a concept (“how adults wanted children to think about race”), not an author. Gailey suggests that editors consider ontological frameworks instead, such as RDF, but more broadly she calls for us to consider the relationships among canonicity, technology choice, and editorial theory.

Gailey’s argument is significant for those thinking about authorship, editing, and digital humanities, but it also shows how an interdisciplinary

orientation can embrace not simply authorship as a problem but all kinds of cultural phenomena. New forms of questioning are provoked by this backward glance at editorial history. “What did adults want children to think?” as a prompt, for example, decenters “What did an author’s editors change?” With this book, Gailey makes room for politics in what has, she claims, often presented itself as an apolitical, if not anti-political, activity.

Aubrey Plourde

Matt Cohen

The University of Texas at Austin