

and sociosexual spaces, and non-traditional engagements with equally non-traditional archives allowed these women to carve out a central space for themselves in national histories. While *Archives of Desire* theorizes and redefines many of the terms it deploys (desire, queer, historicism, and regionalism), the archive—as a space, a set of practices, and an episteme—is explored less directly. However, this study certainly deploys a theory of the archive, one that emerges through the chapters as deeply connected to desire and embodiment, and that expands in formative ways Diana Taylor’s understanding of the relationship among archive, empire, and performance as developed in her *The Archive and the Repertoire*. While the book’s primary focus on white elite women (Hopkins excepted) provides avenues for reassessing our thinking about gender, sexuality, and historical work, it would also be interesting to think about how the lens of queer theory may challenge the racial exceptionalism regionalists promoted. That said, this is a rich contribution to nineteenth-century American studies. The deeply researched histories and diverse corpus of materials central to *Archives of Desire* expand narrow understandings of American regionalism, show how regionalism is essential to nineteenth-century historical and literary studies more generally, and theorize how queer historicism may provide a model for thinking about both the historical and contemporary work of history making.

Danielle Skeehan is an assistant professor in the English department at Oberlin College where she specializes in early and nineteenth-century American literature.

ERRATUM:—I wish to acknowledge my error in Professor Cindy MacKenzie’s review of Cristanne Miller’s edition of *Emily Dickinson’s Poems: As She Preserved Them* that appeared in our December issue. My oversight produced a sentence fragment. Lines 18–21 in volume 89, page 685 should have read: “Although the identifying numbers that editors Thomas H. Johnson and Richard W. Franklin assigned to the poems in their editions, published in 1955 and 1998 respectively, are not placed near the poems, in keeping with the books primary intent, Miller does provide the numbers from Franklin’s edition.” My apologies go out to Professor MacKenzie and thanks to our reader for bringing this error to my attention.

—Jonathan M. Chu