

plauded, especially in light of new manuscript discoveries, but the debates summarized here could have been discussed more succinctly elsewhere, for example as a brief introduction to part 2. This might have afforded space to extend Scarborough's fine piece, which would then have functioned as a comprehensive conclusion to the whole.

Celebrated though the publication of this book ought to be, it would be remiss not to note that this mirror of Marguerite and her *Mirror* is by no means untarnished; it contains more spelling and editorial errors than can be ignored. A few examples will suffice here. They include typos (e.g., at 232–33: [Romana] Guarnieri becomes Guarnier and Guarneri), incorrect references (e.g., at 44 n. 25: Edmund Colledge and J.C. Marler become Edmund C. and J.C. Marler Colledge), a bibliography replete with reference marks (“@”) that ought to have been deleted, and notes to the editors that were overlooked (e.g., at 99 n. 7: “[Author’s temporary note to editors: Let’s coordinate this paragraph about geography with a map to be included in the volume.]”; 104 n. 20; 255 n. 53; 350). Given this book’s overlong gestation, it is difficult to understand how these many mistakes were not filtered out over the years.

Furthermore, this volume would have benefited from closer consultation between the authors to avoid the needless repetition of, for example, lists of extant manuscripts (especially given that there is an annotated list at the back of the book) or to agree on certain questions. For example, both Trombley (187 n. 3) and Cré (249–50 n. 35) discuss the provenance of MS Bodleian, Laud Latin 46. They reach different conclusions, however, because Cré is apparently unaware of the German watermarks that Trombley does mention. Such consultation would have been particularly desirable in view of Kocher’s invitation to “share your ideas and other things that people need, . . . check your work, question your assumptions, [and] seek the best data” (119).

Like the Oise, Meuse, Seine, or indeed the Scheldt, ink will continue to flow in the debates around Marguerite and her *Mirror of Simple Souls*, and this book provides a superlative springboard for any aspiring student eager to dive in.

JOHN ARBLASTER, Ruusbroec Institute, University of Antwerp

KATHLEEN TONRY, *Agency and Intention in English Print, 1476–1526*. (Text and Transitions 7.) Turnhout: Brepols, 2016. Pp. xiii, 241; 13 black-and-white figures. €75. ISBN: 978-2-503-53576-0.

doi:10.1086/703737

Kathleen Tonry’s lucid, thoughtful, and consistently interesting book is an exploration of the kinds of agency enjoyed by printers of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century books. One way to think of this book is as an unpicking of the complexities conjured in a colophon like “Caxton me fieri fecit” (Caxton caused me to be made). What intentions and agencies does this brief statement suggest? Another is to see Tonry’s book as the testing of D. F. McKenzie’s now widely discussed concept of the “sociology of print” against an early corpus. In “The Book as an Expressive Form,” McKenzie wrote that “a sociology . . . directs us to consider the human motives and interactions which texts involve at every stage of their production, transmission, and consumption” (in *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* [1999], 15). Tonry works to apply this human-searching methodology to books printed between print’s English arrival in 1476 and the mid-1520s.

If modern critics tend to separate out “text” and “book” as distinct categories, Tonry argues that printers sustained a medieval tradition of combining “the material and intellectual dimensions of textual production,” a conflating of “the physical and imaginative registers of writing” (2), rather as Chaucer’s Knight likens storytelling to labor in the field, and Hoccleve frames writing in terms of bodily effects. Printing, for Caxton, and for Tonry’s other bookmakers (Robert Copland, John Rastell, the St Alban’s printer, Wynkyn de Worde) is partly but not only about textual reproduction: printing is also an intellectual labor, a work combining something like editing,

translating, and correcting. Printing is also, and for Tonry crucially, an activity that observes and advances moral purposes, often articulated in terms of the common good, and often linked to something like the personality of the printer. In his paratextual prose accompanying his translation of Raoul le Fevre's *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye* (1473/4), Caxton—"the most voluble and expressive voice of early print" (7)—locates himself somewhere between *scriptor* and *auctor*, claiming (in Tonry's astute words) "an undefined book-centred posture that nevertheless has a distinct relationship to moral authority" (7). (Caxton's second edition of Chaucer is offered as a correction for the "hurtyng and dyffamyng" of Chaucer's book in the first edition.) And while Tonry recognizes that any such ethical agency on the part of printers is complicated by the commercial imperatives of print, Tonry wants to take seriously, and patiently, these "extra-economic" (18) moral claims, rather than dismissing or trivializing them through a master narrative of financial profitability. Tonry argues that this "non-commercial ethos" (18) ran across the cultures of manuscript and print: here she is pushing back again an assumption that with the shift from manuscript to print, bookmakers had a diminished intellectual and ethical investment in the books they produced.

Part of Tonry's ambition is to critique what we might call the bibliographical paradigm, a desire to move away from the model offered by Bonaventure's prologue to Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, which adumbrates a hierarchy between the physical labor of production and the intellectual work of composing. Tonry instead wants to find a more entangled notion of printer agency. Tonry's book is also valuable for offering ways of reading early printed texts that are not dominated by the telos of a Reformation-to-come: instead of (or in addition to) a binary opposition between Protestant and Catholic, Tonry finds that printers use religious printing as a means to defend and so advance the interests of London's mercantile community.

Tonry's book draws on Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe's work on agency ("the capacity for responsible individual action," in the latter's briskly helpful words; see her *Stealing Obedience* [2012], 13), and makes use of media theorist Jan-Dirk Müller. But while Tonry nicely unravels the complexities of "agency," she does rather less work with the second term of her title, "intention." Tonry historicizes the term via Middle English *entente*, but the book is light on any sustained engagement with the great body of theoretical work on intention: none of (to draw a few names from many possibles) W. K. Wimsatt and M. C. Beardsley, Roland Barthes, or Michel Foucault are cited in the bibliography or the main text.

What is perhaps most useful for scholars of the early printed book is Tonry's concluding argument about dominant period narratives. Tonry is absolutely right about the problems with incunabula ("things of the cradle," 211) as a bibliographical category, both for its arbitrary cut-off point at 1500, and in terms of the arguments of immaturity that the term implies. Tonry is surely correct too in urging critics to resist a version of book history that is dominated by a narrative of print as an always-and-necessarily revolutionary force for Reformation. In place of these broad-and-loud narratives, Tonry offers a commitment to reading the "neglected corners and crannies of early English print" (16) and an emphasis on the local, the particular, and the distinct. The careful path Tonry picks out shows a more various book culture and gives scholars the chance to consider the diverse intentions and agencies of England's early printers—"unpredictable, surprising, and provocative" (214).

ADAM SMYTH, Balliol College, Oxford University