

Chatterley" (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1981) that the realists "struggle[d] to reconstruct a world out of a world deconstructing . . . all around them" (*The Realistic Imagination*, p. 4). Although it is perhaps beyond the purview of his argument, I do wish that Wright had addressed in some capacity the extent to which his claims about Victorian sexual representation are limited (or not) by this emphasis.

Much (most?) literary criticism on Victorian sexuality has focused on nonrealist genres: sensation fiction, Gothic and supernatural tales, the imperial romance, aestheticist poetry and prose, et cetera. After reading *Bad Logic*, I was left wondering if realism's similarity to ordinary language philosophy means that it is the only genre that partakes of bad logic, or if philosophical approaches to desire in (for example) *Dracula* (1899) would also yield dividends. Is Wright implying that critics have paid insufficient attention to realism as a source of sexual theorization, compared to the more explicit, lurid, and obviously queer representations found in less-respectable genres? Yet the fact that my first impulse was to consider how Wright's claims might be extended indicates how productive this study should prove for encouraging new work on sexuality in Victorian and twentieth-century literature. In its insistence that we take nineteenth-century writers at their word when it came to sexuality, *Bad Logic* takes its place alongside Sharon Marcus's *Between Women: Friendship, Desire, and Marriage in Victorian England* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 2007) and, more recently, Talia Schaffer's *Romance's Rival: Familiar Marriage in Victorian Fiction* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2016) as studies showing us that there are many exciting ways to read desire in the realist novel in what Wright calls a "tautologophilic" manner (p. 5): not as a symptom, but as itself.

DUSTIN FRIEDMAN
American University

THE MULTIGRAPH COLLECTIVE, *Interacting with Print: Elements of Reading in the Era of Print Saturation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018. Pp. xviii + 365. \$45.

"A multigraph is a book written by numerous authors," according to the twenty-two writers of this fascinating and impressively learned book (p. xi). All eighteen chapters were edited, revised, and augmented by any or all of the other contributors. The Multigraph Collective's *Interacting with Print: Elements of Reading in the*

Era of Print Saturation is “one small act of resistance to the academy’s increasing overreliance on measures of accountability” (pp. xvi-xvii). Fittingly, the editors state that “interactivity was to be both our topic and our method” (p. xi); interactions among the media constitute a recurrent theme of the chapters, and so does the almost consistently high quality of the writing. One might have hoped that a collection edited by twenty-two professional academic writers might have been more free of grammatical and typographical errors than most books, but that level of stylistic purity was not here achieved, perhaps in part because of the electronic means of composition and production of books. If so, that fact illustrates and confirms the justice of this book’s emphasis on the material production and forms of the works it discusses.

The chapters are arranged in alphabetical order of keywords (a keyword serving in place of a title for each chapter—e.g., “Advertising,” “Catalogs,” “Engraving”), and they “can be read in any order” (p. 2), a feature that promotes browsing more immediately than it promotes research, though this book is both good and useful in both ways. The coherence of the chapters’ arguments makes reading *Interacting with Print* straight through a rewarding approach as well. The book’s excellently chosen illustrations—sixteen color plates and forty-seven black-and-whites—are well integrated in important arguments, and they are also valuable resources for students of the period.

The book’s introduction effectively contests “three persistent myths about print culture in this period [i.e., the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in the U.K. and Europe]: 1. Print displaced other media. . . . 2. Print equals letterpress (or engraving). . . . 3. Print culture is national culture” (pp. 4–5). Collectively, the chapters of *Interacting with Print* present evidence and original interpretations suggesting that media interact in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, that print in that period embeds a variety of visual forms that refract meanings, and that the book’s chronotope is “an international context of translation, imitation, reprinting, and cultural cross-fertilization” (p. 5).

A topical and polemical concern with commercialism and consumerism is aptly introduced in the first chapter: in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, “advertising moved from the periphery to the center of retail economies” (p. 15). This chapter also focuses usefully on two themes that become leitmotifs of the book as a whole: intermediality (pp. 22–23) and “forging communities” (pp. 24–29), with English, French, and German examples. The chapters on “Anthologies” and “Index” have an equally international range and

similarly emphasize the production of “different types of readerly and sociable communities” amid “heterogeneous medial and social contexts” (p. 34). Both “Anthologies” and “Index” gracefully include histories of their subject; “Index” articulates a distinction between “the Enlightenment index” (p. 164) with its “material notions of wholeness” (p. 165) and “Romantic visions of a total unity of knowledge” (p. 168) appealing to “ideas of totality that actually corresponded to nothing in reality” (p. 165).

The chapter on “Binding” also presents historical explanations with interpretative claims that involve “social and generic hierarchies in the guise of individuation” (p. 65) by way of “the movement from individualized binding practices into market segmentation in the nineteenth century” (p. 64). In contrast, the chapter labeled “Catalogs” shrinks its interpretation to personalism: for example, *Black’s Picturesque Guide to the English Lakes* seeks “to convert the tourist into a subject of memory and ‘imagination.’ . . . their amalgamation . . . enables the imaginative transposition of the self” (p. 83). In the chapter labeled “Conversations,” which follows “Catalogs” (in the randomness of alphabetical order), the argument returns to the sociality wrought by the materiality of media: “salon sociability . . . wove together print, manuscript, oral conversation, images and the plastic and performing arts” (p. 86).

With excellent (and again multinational) examples, “Disruptions” begins with the observation that “several writers, printers, and artists used print to draw attention to its own materiality and fallibility, and thus to disrupt the impression that print was a transparent vehicle for ideas” (p. 97). This chapter shows that “these typographic and visual disruptions [printers’ errors, typefaces, arrangement of the text blocks, counterfeits, printed money] bid readers to question larger social structures” (p. 98). Coherently, “Engraving” shows that “English engravers joined canonical British authors, along with native painters, typesetters and typesetters, printers and papermakers, to produce monumental objects that represented the nation as much in their material as in their intellectual content”; and “commerce played a fundamental, arbitrate role” (p. 120).

Whereas older understandings of marginalia may have been limited primarily to “evidence of private reading,” “Marking” approaches handmade markings in printed books “as signs of larger communities of practice” (p. 205). *Interacting with Print* is not entirely consistent in its discussions of the contrast between personalistic interpretations and thoughts on larger scale: “Proliferation” discusses Isaac D’Israeli’s notion that literature in the nineteenth century had shrunken to

a commodity (p. 246) and that consumerism had brought a decline in the quality of verse (p. 247); but “Thickening” locates meaning in “the customization of individual volumes” (p. 288). “Manuscript” notices the contradiction involved in locating meanings in the small space of a private mind and locating meaning in the larger frame of the society and the world: “The discourse of friendship and the practice of gift giving under which miscellanies were produced were intended to counteract precisely the anonymity of mass circulation that these formats were themselves engendering through their mass production” (p. 193). The final chapter in the book (apparently by random chance, as the chapters are in alphabetical order) is “Thickening,” where the conflict of interpretations (personal and societal) is stated eloquently again: in “a more economically and socially diverse public, the class-coded synoptic goals . . . [were] challenged and remade by competing drives of personalization and commercialization” (p. 294).

Interacting with Print draws impressively but concisely on the collectively good judgment and specific knowledge of its multiple collaborators. It promises (and deserves) to stimulate both research and rethinking of a vast body of textual materials, material media, and the dynamic production of meanings that they produce, even as it awakens nostalgia for the excellences of copyediting in the decades immediately prior to our own.

TERENCE HOAGWOOD
Texas A&M University

SARI ALTSCHULER, *The Medical Imagination: Literature and Health in the Early United States*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018. Pp, viii + 301. \$55.

In this ground-breaking work of historical research and reframing, Sari Altschuler foregrounds the central role of the imagination in the production of medical knowledge in nineteenth-century America. Rejecting the narrow disciplinarity of medical training and practice, a two-culture divide she identifies with the formation of the American Medical Association in 1904 and the Abraham Flexner Report in 1910, Altschuler stresses the formal and epistemological flexibility of early American medicine. The physicians she studies in *The Medical Imagination: Literature and Health in the Early United States* were also philosophers, ethnologists, fiction