ebrated Campaign of 1858, in Illinois, sold nearly 50,000 copies. More important, it accomplished all Lincoln expected. It appeared in the presidential election year of 1860, enhanced his national reputation, and propelled him into the nation’s highest office.

Like myriad books found in the Lincoln canon, this one deserves praise and criticism. To its credit, Mr. Lincoln’s Book is the first book-length treatment of Lincoln’s famous scrapbook (Howard Holzer’s Lincoln at Cooper Union: The Speech That Made Abraham Lincoln President devoted two pages to this subject). The work offers exciting details about Lincoln’s behind-the-scenes involvement in the book’s publication, chronicles the accidental loss and recovery of the original scrapbook, and raises the possibility that a second scrapbook exists. Mr. Leroy is at his best when he offers a cogent explanation of how Political Debates might have turned the election for Lincoln in the six states in which the book was published and sold locally. The timing of the publication, Leroy observed, trumped the numbers of copies sold. Additionally, bibliophiles would also find useful David Leroy’s painstaking census of all known signed copies of the Lincoln-Douglas’ Political Debates.

Mr. Lincoln’s Book, however, has its problems. The author’s failure to cite selectively and his eagerness to interject long passages and images breaks up the narrative, congests our understanding of the subject matter, and probably doubled the size of the monograph. The question of whether Lincoln was the book’s author, to which Mr. Leroy devotes considerable attention, seems tangential; and the reproduction of political cartoons from 1860 is not truly germane to the book’s central subject. Moreover, some of this information (transcriptions of Lincoln’s correspondence, political cartoons, and photographs) is supplied, once again, in the book’s accompanying CD-ROM.

The idea of a short history detailing the publication of Abraham Lincoln’s scrapbook is a welcome one. Mr. Lincoln’s Book: Publishing the Lincoln-Douglas Debates, however, would have benefitted from more critical analysis of the political climate leading to the Lincoln-Douglas debates, additional information on the public’s response to the published scrapbook, and more discriminating use of Lincoln’s extensive body of primary sources.—José O. Díaz, Ohio State University.


Appalachia has received a lot of attention lately: first with the 2008 presidential election, followed by the January 2009 TVA coal sludge disaster, and more recently with Diane Sawyer’s ABC documentary and the four-part PBS series. In 1965, bibliographer Robert F. Munn documented the four major (re)discoveries of the region and the upsurge in bibliographic production during these periods and its decline between them. Perhaps we are now being rediscovered again. The timing seems most auspicious for the appearance of new reference works focused on the region.

The bibliography of Appalachia goes back to at least 1921 and Olive Dame Campbell’s 250-citation bibliography concluding her husband John C. Campbell’s The Southern Highlander and His Homeland. It was followed the next year by LC Chief Bibliographer H.H.B. Meyer’s 161 citations in List of References on the Mountain Whites. The first book-length Appalachian bibliography was the 830 citations compiled by Everret E. Edwards as References on the Mountaineers of the Southern Appalachians in 1935 and published by the United States Department of Agriculture. The next major bibliography on the region produced by Munn in 1961, The Southern
Appalachians: A Bibliographical Guide to Studies, included 1,060 mostly post-1935 citations. The Appalachian Consortium’s 1976 Bibliography of Southern Appalachia included 13,000 entries. West Virginia University Library’s Appalachian Bibliography 1980, focused on the social sciences and education and excluded both fiction and specialized scientific and highly technical publications, included 8,205 citations. Since 1995, the Appalachian Studies Association’s Journal of Appalachian Studies has published extensive annual bibliographies compiled by Jo B. Brown. These annual print bibliographies culminate as the Appalachian Studies Bibliography, which is freely available on WVU Library’s Web page. There have also been numerous specialized Appalachian bibliographies (such as Edward J. Cabbell’s 1984 Like a Weaving: References and Resources on Black Appalachia or Sidney Saylor Farr’s 1981 Appalachian Women: An Annotated Bibliography); a subject search on “Bibliography” in Appalachian State University’s online catalog limited to the holdings of its W.L. Eury Appalachian Collection identified 907 of them in April 2009. This count, of course, does not include all those published in serials like the Appalachian Journal, the late and sorely missed Bulletin of Bibliography, and others.

The new contribution of John R. Burch (Director of Library Services and Online Education Coordinator, Campbellsville University) to the region’s bibliographic literature lacks any explanation of method, coverage, or focus other than that he uses the Appalachian Regional Commission’s (ARC) expansive definition of the region. The citations are arranged into twenty-four subject categories and then presented in alphabetical order by author. It includes subject and author indices. Many of the citations derive from Appalachian Studies’ two primary scholarly journals, Appalachian Journal and the Journal of Appalachian Studies, and from well-known anthologies and readers. If an article appears in more than one place (for example, a journal article reprinted in an anthology), multiple citations for it are included. Citations include basic bibliographic information but no annotations or cross-references.

There are numerous problems with this bibliography: it lacks name authority control (for instance, Pat and Patricia D. Beaver); citation selection appears to be random (for example, it includes Rory Kennedy’s book American Hollow but neither the video documentary upon which it was based nor the extensive “roundtable” discussion it received in Appalachian Journal); it includes material that is from areas not included in ARC’s or any other previous definition of the region (one example being Louisa County, Virginia, to the east of Appalachia and Williamson County, Tennessee, to its west); articles are misclassified (for example, folklorist Richard Blaustein’s article on musician Clint Howard is under Appalachian Studies rather than Music); the subject index was apparently computer generated and egregiously inadequate; and various publications such as the Encyclopedia of Appalachia and three special Appalachian issues of the Black Music Research Journal (full disclosure: I served as guest editor of the latter) were sampled without an explanation of why some articles were included and others were not (for instance, included are Pearson’s article on Appalachian blues, Higby and Wright’s on Appalachian jazz, Lightfoot’s on white blues but not Zolten’s on Appalachian R&B, Davenport’s on great blues singer/poet Ida Cox, or Hay’s on the Appalachian roots of James Brown’s music). Furthermore, since no explanation of method is provided, we can only assume that some citations were discovered by keyword searching without their appropriateness being confirmed by Burke. This would explain why Hamilton’s book, Black Towns and Profit: Promotion and Development in the Trans-Appalachian West, 1877–1915 (1991) is included; yet, of the towns the book covers, the one closest to Appalachia is Mound Bayou, Mississippi.
The selection of subject categories is confusing, and the lack of cross-references forces the user to browse the entire bibliography for relevant materials. For instance, although this volume does include a section labeled “Pre-Industrial Appalachia,” it does not have one for history (especially curious since the compiler has a Ph.D. in history). John Alexander Williams’ award-winning *Appalachia: A History* (2002) is included in the “Reference Sources and General Works” section and, indeed, due to its comprehensiveness, subject specialists often use it as a ready reference work. We also use historian John Inscoe’s *Mountain Masters: Slavery and Sectional Crises in Western North Carolina* (1989) as the best single source of information on antebellum agriculture in western North Carolina. Yet it is included under neither “Reference Sources and General Works” nor “Pre-Industrial Appalachia,” nor even under “Agriculture” or “Ethnicity, Race, and Identity” but under “Warfare.” Similarly, materials on the Cherokee are found throughout the bibliography.

What does Burch’s pretentiously titled *The Bibliography of Appalachia* with its 4,707 citations add to the bibliographic history of the Appalachian region? Not much. The book is a prime example of poor bibliographic scholarship and inadequate publisher review.—Fred J. Hay, Appalachian State University.


The latest volume in the Publishing Pathways series is the first in almost thirty years of annual conferences and publication of the papers to focus on music, and more than ten years have passed since I suggested the idea of a music-related conference to the organizers. In part, this neglect is due to the separations mentioned by the editors in their Introduction: the means of production and distribution have become significantly different from those of the ordinary book trade, the use of printed music is different as is the size of the market (being at the same time specialized but global). Nonetheless, it is astonishing that the printing and publishing of music, which has produced roughly ten million editions worldwide between the 1470s and 1990 (see Donald W. Krummel, *The Literature of Music Bibliography* [Berkeley, Calif.: Fallen Leaf Press, 1992], 69) has had to wait until now for some attention in what is widely regarded as the premier series of its kind.

Of the seven substantial essays, four are focused on England, two on Austria, and one on Iberia. A broad chronological span—from the late sixteenth century to 1903—provides plenty of variety in terms of printing techniques and business models. The approaches of the authors also differ, which leaves the reader with a pleasant intellectual surfeit. This volume does not attempt to provide an overview of the field or even tell a tale that is chronologically or geographically coherent. Rather, it offers specialist studies typically focused on an individual—printer, publisher, composer, collector—thereby emphasizing personalities rather than trends or the most significant technological or economic developments.

Only the first essay, by Iain Fenlon, is actually concerned with the links between the printing of music and the dissemination of its products by the (regular) book trade. Fenlon highlights the trade routes linking Iberia with the rest of western Europe. He also notes that a contemporary estimate suggested that “40,000 breviaries and missals [were] required on an annual basis to supply the 50 bishoprics of the Spanish church.” In contrast, music publications of original compositions, both secular and sacred, along with theory and pedagogy, were relatively few, which Fenlon attributes to “technical factors such as poor investment and an inadequate supply of good paper.”