



Taylor & Francis  
Taylor & Francis Group

---

The Rhetoric of Citation Systems, Part I: The Development of Annotation Structures from the Renaissance to 1900

Author(s): Robert J. Connors

Source: *Rhetoric Review*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Autumn, 1998), pp. 6-48

Published by: [Taylor & Francis, Ltd.](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/465742>

Accessed: 17-08-2014 14:20 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Taylor & Francis, Ltd. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Rhetoric Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## The Rhetoric of Citation Systems

### Part I

#### The Development of Annotation Structures from the Renaissance to 1900\*

Communication structures are inescapably social, and humanity throughout recorded history has striven to evolve conventions signaling the fair and proper use of the discourses of other people. Speakers and writers have always known that their “own” words are constantly co-evolving from and with the words of others, and from the earliest written records we see authors’ attempts to quote and credit the works of those they used or admired. The field of rhetoric, especially in its written forms, where citations had to be visible and reproducible, inevitably evolved the most formalized conventions for signaling ethical use of others’ work. The gradual formalization of written citation systems should not, however, blind us to their essentially rhetorical nature. Every formal structure implies a universe of meanings. Every formal structure

---

\* Readers will notice that this essay violates *Rhetoric Review*’s own citation style, which follows New MLA in asking for endnotes rather than footnotes. I specifically requested this change of the editor, and she has graciously assented. As I will detail in the second part of the article, endnotes were a system that MLA went to in 1977 as the field of English became more populist and the main concern in manuscripts began to be ease of typing and cheapness of typesetting; no one argued, then or since, for any rhetorical superiority of endnotes over footnotes. Indeed, most people agree that from a reader’s point of view, endnotes are a pain, whether they are citational or discursive. They force you to search and flip pages when a footnote would allow you to glance at the bottom of the column. The only virtue of endnotes is that they are easier to type on a typewriter.

This move to endnotes was a situational decision by the MLA. The great word-processing revolution, which would within ten years create a technology that automatically measures and sets footnotes, came just a few years too late; now, of course, all WP programs and graphic programs used by printers can set footnotes automatically and without extra cost. So we’re still living in the backwash of a pragmatic decision about note placement that predates our current typographic abilities. Of course, some authors, like Gibbon, may prefer to have their manuscripts run clean-page, without footnotes, as if they were not scholarship. That should be the call of each individual author. The reason I asked specifically that footnotes be used here is the same reason most literary journals have refused to switch to New MLA: I want to make my decisions about how my page will look to readers on a “rhetorical” basis. I have simply found footnotes a more precise system, allowing for a text/note dialogism that endnotes kill completely. And given the fact that the only footnotes still allowed by New MLA are discursive, that dialogism is even more important.

declares allegiances and counteralliances. Every formal structure suggests the ethical and pathetic as well as the logical nature of a discourse. The seemingly “transparent” structures used in formal citation systems have always been as much products and reflections of social and rhetorical realities as all other elements of discourse. In this essay I want to trace the development of the rhetoric of citation systems in Western culture, especially as it has come to exist in the humanities and the social sciences.

Today, of course, the whole issue of ownership, use, and citation of others’ works is more vexed than ever before. Scholars have begun to look very seriously into the genesis of the concept of authorship, the ideas behind copyright and limits of intellectual property rights, ownership, and proprietorship of text. There is a small but growing literature on glosses and annotations of texts, and scholars begin to debate the meanings and property values of the margins of text and the foot of the page. I need to delimit the task I hope to accomplish here, since these questions ramify out in so many fruitful and dizzying directions. I want here to concentrate not on legal issues or even broad epistemological issues, but on the specific rhetorical, social, and stylistic questions that have been tied up in formal citation systems. I want to speak to the reasons why these systems evolved and proliferated, what they suggest about authors’ feelings of debt and ownership, how they effect the ways we read and process text and the intentions behind it, and, finally, the effects on reading and writing of social decisions to promote and valorize new citation systems and subsystems.

## Glossing and Citation during the Renaissance

How far back should we go? Glossing and annotation are as old as literature; the Hebrew Midrash glossing tradition has *comprised* a literature for twenty-four hundred years. Before the development of printing technology, every manuscript was copied by hand, usually for specific purchasers or for specific purposes. Those who have studied these older manuscripts have described how each one carried the imprint of a scribe; every text is commented on tacitly by the scribe or editor, even if it is copied faithfully. Each palimpsest is a sort of citation system; every annotated manuscript is an example of glossing and of the struggle for proprietorship (Lipking). To begin with individually scribed manuscripts and incunabula simply opens up the field too widely, which is why I propose to begin this inquiry with the advent of the newer forms of public communication made possible by movable type.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For discussion of some of the earlier forms of glossing and notation, see the essays in Barney as well as Grafton, *The Footnote*, 27-31.

The structure of the type-printed page is the ground on which all glosses, annotations, and citations exist; it is like the sculptor's marble or the artist's canvas and pigments, allowing some possibilities and constraining others. Johannes Gutenberg printed his Forty-Two Line Bible in Mainz in 1455, after developing his typefaces, casting methods, presses, type alloys, and inks in secret for at least ten years before. It took time, however, for printers to learn more complex uses of the printing frame structure that Gutenberg developed to lock his sticks of type into. The first marginal annotations used in printed texts do not appear until 1481 (Tribble 59); before that time, commentaries from editors were printed separately, or at least on separate pages. But once printers caught on to the possible uses of the locking forms, they quickly adapted manuscript styles of annotation to typography.

The classic annotation form developed by scribal technology consisted of the widely spaced original text written in large, ornate letters, surrounded by opportunistic remoras of glossing text in much smaller letters. These were the scribal texts coming down into the printing technology of the High Renaissance, the cultural point at which a growing *secular* culture of learning was forced to come to grips with its relationships both to ancient texts and to contemporary commentators. The classical texts being rediscovered in monasteries and old villas spoke to the people of the Renaissance about a developed society, its thought and culture, its arts and philosophies, in an intoxicating manner. After a millennium of heavenly preoccupation, Europeans began seeking again the kingdom of earth, and the old texts were a way in. But the texts disagreed and were often incomplete, so careful comparative editing was needed to establish good texts. Arising from such editing came a need for informed historical and linguistic commentary, and from these industries came the first great wave of Western secular scholarship.

Much has been written about the process through which classical learning began to become secular authority during the Renaissance.<sup>2</sup> From Latin being the language of the Church and its doctors and clerks came the secular culture based around learned Latin that Walter Ong has described, a secular culture that lasted until the nineteenth century.<sup>3</sup> Knowledge of the Latin and Greek classics in great detail (and with great and unforgiving rigor) became intellectual coin of the realm for European scholars from 1400 through 1900. And it was during the Renaissance that citation formats began to coalesce, to proliferate, and to disagree. Evelyn Tribble's *Margins and Marginality* provides thoughtful coverage of some of the elements of these beginnings.

<sup>2</sup> See, for considerable detail on the specifics of this process, Grafton, *Commerce with the Classics*.

<sup>3</sup> See Ong, *Rhetoric, Romance, and Technology*, 113-41, and *The Presence of the Word*, 241-55.

The first editions of the classical authors to be printed did not use margins or page bottoms, but included notes and annotations in separate printed signatures or appended after the works themselves. In 1481 a Venetian edition of Horace appeared with marginal commentaries by Acro and Porphyry, and after that point printers used the margins for glosses and notes in order to save the cost of paper—then, as now, the most costly of their materials. The early scholarly editors were often also the printers, and as soon as printers discovered the uses of margins, they immediately began to compete to see who could gather the most glossing commentary into margins. Editions of Horace appeared with two complete commentaries, then four, and in 1546 an edition appeared with five complete commentaries in the margins and notes by ten more humanists! These texts *cum notis variorum* (with the remarks of different commentators) were set up adjacent to each other in a complementary, additive way rather than as competitors, but by their sheer bulk, they came to overwhelm the original text, as Figure 1, a page from Sebastian Brant's 1502 edition of Virgil indicates.<sup>4</sup>

But humanist scholarship was learning quickly that the simple ability to produce heaps of commentary in the margins might not mean that such additive comments were the most useful form. Aldus Manutius, the Venetian printer and editor who invented italic type, published in 1501 an edition of Horace that simply printed Horace's odes alone on the page. Aldus had done the necessary comparative scholarly editing, and he did include a few notes at the back of the book, but his edition was meant to showcase the edited text rather than merely to accrete the commentaries. It was Aldus's example that gradually prevailed, and by the 1570s, printers were printing classical works that showcased the original text while using the resources of typography to allow readers easy access to notes and comments, usually at the end of each original work.

By this latter part of the sixteenth century, the humanist use of glosses, commentaries, and notes had become a whole discourse world unto itself. Constant reference to classical sources became a staple of all learned talk and writing, and the scholarly uses and correct citation of these sources had become demanded passwords into the discourse community of educated people. Tribble specifically cites the example of Ben Jonson, the printed versions of whose masques and plays were filled with a constant marginal roar of classical citation. More than any other English writer of the High Renaissance, Jonson seemed to feel that he needed to back his work up with endless references to his learning, and thus to insulate himself from the rejection of the *hoi polloi* by appealing to "the Learned." His *Sejanus His Fall* of 1605, for instance, carefully cites the

<sup>4</sup> Tribble reproduces a page of Ascensius's 1519 Horace on which only two lines of an Horatian ode fit, the rest of the page being taken up with commentary.



classical authors from which Jonson drew his material in long marginal notes in Latin (Figure 2). Jonson takes advantage of the complete marginal glossing structure that scholars had been assembling for the previous century, citing with lower-case letters, mentioning specific editions, tomes, and pages, and in general battering any potential critics into silence with the weight of his research and learning. Such citation is, as David Bartholomae has said of writing itself, an act of aggression disguised as an act of charity. Jonson is not only signaling his own accomplishment here but is also indicating the nature of a “fit”—that is, an educated—audience. It is no accident of history that he was never as popular a playwright as the less overtly learned Shakespeare.

Jonson considered himself both an author and a scholar, but the issue of the proprietorship of the margins of a page was a natural site for conflicts and disagreements between authors and scholars. Writers were beginning to realize that they had rhetorical choices to make about their uses of notes and annotations, and that the typographic structures they chose would mark them as members of one or another kind of discourse community. In general, authors and writers chose to use fewer marginal notes and to use informal sets of citation symbols while scholars identified themselves through use of the complex full-cite, letter-and-number systems that used Latin terms. By the turn of the seventeenth century, these appurtenances of scholarship—and the ethos they projected—had become so well established in writing and publishing that they could be fit subjects for satire and criticism.

One extraordinary example of the authorial attack on scholarly citations came in Thomas Nashe’s hilarious *Have With You to Saffron-Walden* of 1596, an attack on the Cambridge scholar Gabriel Harvey. The basis of their quarrel is not apposite to this inquiry, but Nashe uses a huge armamentarium of sarcasm, parody, and outright insult against Harvey and the scholarly tradition he represented. In an earlier work, *Pierce Pennilesse*, Nashe had used scholarly Latin footnotes, but Harvey attacked him for searching “every corner of his Grammar-schoole witte, (for his margine is as deeplie learned, as *Fauste precor gelida*)” (1:195) in order to do so.<sup>5</sup> *Have With You*, which is a response to Harvey’s *Pierce’s Supererogation*, is structured as a dialogue, and it is clear that Nashe has disdainfully left the field of scholarly annotation to Harvey. One of the questioners asks Nashe why he does not use marginal notes, and his response is classic:

---

<sup>5</sup> Harvey seems to be attacking Nashe here for his use of some poetic citations in marginal notes in Nashe’s previous blast, *Pierce Pennilesse*. Harvey may also be asserting that Nashe’s learning is not truly classical, going no farther back than the neo-Latin poet Mantuan, whose eclogue “Faustus: On Happy Love” is quoted here.



## SEIANVS.

Now, for she hath a Fury in her brest  
 More, then Hell euer knew; and would be sent  
 Thither in time. Then is there one <sup>a</sup> *Crematius*  
*Cordus*, a writing fellow, they haue got  
 To gather Notes of the præcedent times,  
 And make them into *Annals*; a most tart  
 And bitter spirit (I heare) who, vnder coulor  
 Of praying those, doth taxe the present state,  
 Censures the men, the actions, leaues no trick,  
 No practise vn-examin'd, parallels  
 The times, the gouernments; a profest Champion  
 For the old liberty: *Tib.* A perishing wretch.  
 As if there were that *Chaos* bred in things,  
 That Lawes, and Liberty would not rather choose  
 To be quite broken, and tane hence by vs,  
 Then haue the staine to be prefer'd by such.  
 Haue we the meanes to make these guilty, first?  
*Sei.* Trust that to me; let *Cæsar*, by his power,  
 But caue a formall meeting of the *Senate*,  
 I will haue matter, and Accusers ready.  
*Tib.* But how? let vs consult. *Sei.* We shall mispend  
 The time of action. "Councells are vnfit  
 "In businesse, where all rest is more pernicious  
 "Then rashnesse can be. Acts of this close kinde  
 "Thriue more by execution, then aduise:  
 "There is no lingring in that worke begonne,  
 "Which cannot praised be, vntill through donne.  
*Tib.* <sup>b</sup> Our *Edict* shall forthwith, commaund a Court.  
 While I can liue, I will præuent Earths fury;  
<sup>c</sup> *Εἰ μὴ δαμόντιο γὰρ μυχότατο πρῶτι.*

## POSTVMVS. SEIANVS.

*Pos.* My Lord *Seianus*? *Sei.* <sup>c</sup> *Iulius Postumus*,  
 Come with my wish! what newes from *Agrippina's*,  
*Pos.* Faith none. They all lock vp themselues, a'late;  
 Or talke in character: I haue not seene  
 A company so chang'd. Except they had  
 Intelligence by Augury' of our practise.

E

<sup>a</sup> *vid. Tac.*  
*Ann. lib. 4.*  
*pag. 83.*  
*Dio. Hist.*  
*Rom. lib. 57.*  
*pag. 710.*  
*et Senec. conf.*  
*ad Mar.*  
*cap. 1. et*  
*Julius. cap.*  
*22.*

<sup>b</sup> *Edicto vt*  
*plurimum*  
*Senatores*  
*in curiam*  
*vocatos cō-*  
*stat. Tacit.*  
*Ann. lib. 1.*

*pag. 3.*  
<sup>c</sup> *Vulgaris*  
*quidā ver-*  
*sus, quem*  
*sæpe Tiber.*  
*recitasse*  
*memoratur.*  
*Dio. Hist.*  
*Rom. lib. 58.*

*729.*  
<sup>d</sup> *De Iulio*  
*Postumo.*  
*vid. Tacit.*  
*Ann. lib. 4.*

*Sei. pag. 77.*

Figure 2 Ben Jonson, *Sejanus His Fall*, edition of 1605



*Import:* . . . I wonder thou setst not downe in figures in the margent, in what line, page, & folio a man might find everie one of these fragments, which would have much satisfied thy Readers

*Respon:* What, make an *Errata* in the midst of my Booke, and have my margent bescratcht (like a Merchants booke) with these roguish Arsemetrique gibbets or flesh-hookes, and cyphers or round oos, lyke pismeeres egges? Content your selfe, I will never do it: or if I were ever minded to doo it, I could not, since, (as I told you some leaves before,) in more than a quarter of that his tumbrell of Confutation, he hath left the Pages unfigured; foreseeing by devination (belike) that I should come to disfigure them. (44)

Here Nashe is engaging in his trademark flyting language, but he is also making a serious point about the slavish overreliance Harvey himself displays on classical sources, with only a quarter of his pages free of marginal notes. Nashe analogizes such notes to an *Errata*, or list of printing or research errors, often bound into books after they had been printed. In the few marginal notes he does use, he is never citational or scholarly. His notes are in English, are marked by Greek letters (“Arsemetrique gibbets or flesh-hookes”) in a jibe at the scholarly apparatus of his opponents, and exist as parodic asides in a dialogue with the main text. Nashe is creating a new form here, using conventional marginal forms in order to make fun of scholarship and propriety (Figure 3).

The satire of scholarly overkill that we see in Nashe is one of the earlier evidences of the author/scholar duality that was to present serious writers of the next two centuries with such complex rhetorical choices. On the one hand, serious writers during the period 1600-1800 knew that they could be rendered respectable only by showing their membership in the community of classical learning that defined education as control of the Greek and Latin writers. On the other hand, the gradually developing conception of “original composition” and a fear of scholarly affectation meant that one’s classical learning must be worn lightly, must be in the service of precision rather than pedantry. This could be a difficult line to which to hew, and during this period we see authors attempting a variety of different solutions to the problem of how to indicate one’s deep classical learning without the braggadocio of Harvey-style marginal notes. From the available models—biblical glosses, humanist classical annotations, even the railing satires of the Marprelate controversy and Nashe, Renaissance writers began to construct a rhetorical world of citation styles.

*The Epistle Dedicatorie.*

noble Science of & decision and contraction is im-<sup>For di-</sup>  
 mortally beholding to him, for twice double his <sup>uifio &</sup>  
 Patrimonie hath he spent in carefull cherishing & <sup>contrac-</sup>  
 preferuing his pickerdeuant : and besides a deuine <sup>tion.</sup>  
 vicarly brother of his, called *Astrological Ri-*  
*chard*, some few yeares since (for the benefit of his  
 countrey) most studiously compyled a *profound*  
*Abridgement vpon beards*, & therein copiously  
 dilated of the true discipline of peakes, & no lesse  
 frutelessly determined, betwixt the Swallowes  
 taile-cut, & the round beard like a rubbing brush.  
 It was my chaunce (O thrice blessed chaunce) to  
 the great comfort of my Muse to peruse it, al-  
 though it came but priuately in Print : and for a  
 more rarefied passport (in thy opinion) that I haue  
 read it and digested it, this title it beareth, a *De-* <sup>There-</sup>  
*fence of short haire against Synefius and Pieri-* <sup>fore be-</sup>  
*us* : or rather in more familiar English to expresse <sup>like bee</sup>  
 it, a Dash ouer the head against baldnes, verie ne- <sup>gane it</sup>  
 cessary to be obserued of al the looser sort, or loose <sup>that ti-</sup>  
 haired sort of yong Gentlemen & Courtiers, and <sup>cause it</sup>  
 no lesse pleasant and profitable to be remembred <sup>was</sup>  
 of the whole Common-wealth of the Barbars. <sup>most of</sup>  
 The Posie theretoo annexed, *Prolixior est breui-* <sup>it short</sup>  
*tate sua*, as much to say, as Burne Bees and haue <sup>haire his</sup>  
 Bees, & hair the more it is cut the more it comes: <sup>made</sup>  
 lately deuised and set forth by *Richard Haruey*, <sup>ropes of</sup>  
 the

Figure 3 Thomas Nashe, *Have With You to Saffron-Walden*, 1596

## The Agon of Biblical Glosses

If secular writers were evolving a part of citational rhetoric, the religious controversies of the same time were central to the development of another part. The Reformation battle over glosses of the Bible also provides important background to the ways in which textual annotation works in Western culture. The beginnings of the religious glossing tradition were not agonistic, though they were complex. Figure 4 is a page from the *Glossa Ordinaria*, a thirteenth-century manuscript of a standard textbook-style work used in training priests and theologians in scriptural commentary. The biblical text was surrounded and penetrated by a variety of marginal and interlinear glosses and notes from different theologians and teachers, the more important of whom included Walafrid Strabo, Anselm of Laon, and Peter Lombard (Smalley 197-207). In this version the scribes have used medium-sized glossing letters for large blocks of rhetorical commentary and very small interlinear lettering for comments on specific words. (This is a system still used today by teachers of composition.) Printers adapted this structure by placing all the original text in the middle of the page, and creating a whole world of commentary from editor or theologians in large surrounding margins.

By 1528 printing technology had advanced to the point where Nicholas of Lyra's printed *Glossa Ordinaria* could allow full marginal glosses, interlinear word-level glosses, and even extramarginal biblical citations (Figure 5). This *Glossa* was printed at Lyon; France was even then becoming famous for the precision and sophistication of its printers. Printed versions of the *Glossa* quickly found themselves at the center of the tremendous religious controversies swirling through the sixteenth century. It's not hard to see why. If we read the essential impulse behind the Reformation as a desire to free the word of God from layer upon layer of dogmatic institutional corruption, then the complex scriptural glosses of the *Glossa Ordinaria* could easily be read as that corruption made into text. The *Glossa*, with its layers of *commentaria*, *commentariola*, *expositiones*, *glossae*, *glossulae*, *lectiones*, *lecturae*, and *postillae*, represented the "official word" of canonical interpretation of all scriptural text, and thus Protestant writers condemned it as at best obscuring a direct relation with the scriptures and at worst providing incorrect or misleading ideas about them. As Philip Melanchthon wrote in 1518, "Now let's get rid of all these frigid little glosses, concordances, discordances and other such obstructions to our natural abilities. When our hearts have reflected upon the sources, we shall begin to discern Christ."<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> This was Melanchthon's inaugural address at Wittenberg, from the Latin *Melanchthonis Opera* in the collection of Reformation documents *Corpus Reformatorum*, 23. My amateurish translation.





The best treatment of this war of glosses is found in Tribble's first chapter, which details the wars of biblical glossing that went on in England during the period 1500-1630. The European Protestant intellectuals from Luther on attacked the whole tradition of marginal and interlinear glossing of biblical text that had gone on since the beginning of scholasticism in favor of exposing readers to the unmediated truth of scripture. They especially objected to the *Glossa Ordinaria*, in which even the large type of the scriptural passage does not prevent its being "swallowed up," as Tribble says, "in a sea of commentary both marginal and interlinear" (12). As William Tyndale put it, Catholics had "blinded the scripture . . . with glosses and traditions," and Tribble reads the Reformation as in part a struggle for control of textual margins and their proprietorship over the text they purport to serve.

As might be guessed, Catholics generally supported the canonical readings found in the centuries-old *Glossa*, making the claim that they had the imprimatur of the holy councils and doctors of the church. The scripture itself was not, however, given centrality.<sup>7</sup> For the Catholic Church, the traditions and doctrines found in canon law, in breviaries, and in missals were enough textual universe for average (literate) communicant, and there was little need for a direct, nonmediated source of scriptural text. Protestants, however, claimed complete primacy for scripture and for the individual's understanding of its meaning. At first, they simply condemned glossing, but since doctrinal divergences with Catholic traditions soon became evident and even standardized, and since Protestantism was so essentially text-based anyway, there soon arose a contesting set of Protestant glosses of scripture to rival orthodox Catholic ones.

As the Reformation got under way, more than doctrine began to be at stake in the selection of one's biblical glosses. In England the uncertainty about what glosses might be acceptable under the new dispensation of Henry VIII's Church of England led to the printing in 1539 of the *Great Bible*, sponsored by Henry. The editors had originally meant to include annotations, but the entire question of which were doctrinally acceptable, and to whom, was so vexing that Miles Coverdale, the main editor, finally settled on a series of small pointing hands throughout the text, indicating passages that *would* have been glossed (with

---

<sup>7</sup> We might make the epistemic case, indeed, that citation itself, with the whole universe of socially sanctioned and institutionally underwritten knowledge it represents, is an essentially Catholic impulse. Uncited prose is out to find truth by itself, antinomian, animated by an inner light, and thus quintessentially Protestant. We might make that case. But we won't.

endnotes) had the glosses been allowed.<sup>8</sup> Coverdale warned that those specific passages were pointed out so readers would know that no “private interpretation” of them would be countenanced; these passages were the property of the Church of England. The margins were mostly white space (Figure 6).

Such doctrinal delicacy would not last long in the controversial world of the sixteenth century, however. The Protestants had too many actual doctrinal quarrels with Catholic dogma to long refrain from using the inviting margins of their bibles as battlefields. Edmund Becke’s version of Matthew’s Bible of 1547, the English-made Geneva Bible of 1560, and the Bishops’ Bible of 1568 all plunged heavily into marginal glossing and complex, polemical citation systems. The Geneva Bible, free from the fears about state approval of controversial annotation because printed outside of England, was the most openly elaborate and particular in its marginal glossing, filling the margins of its pages with commentary. The Geneva Bible and Bishops’ Bible show how typographical sophistication had grown by the 1560s; they both use textual letter citations—a, b, c, d—to refer to glosses printed in small type in the margins and at the foot of the page. The Bishops’ Bible also uses a system of reference symbols ranging from the pointing hands of the Great Bible to asterisks and brackets. The discursive notes in these bibles are not signed and they do not reference specific theorists, but they do create a coherent Protestant reading using “expositions” or commentaries, “annotations” or specific translation/explanation notes, and references to typological precedents and cross-meanings in other biblical books.

As might be expected, the Catholics fired back in this battle of annotation, bringing out in 1582 the Rheims New Testament. As opposed to the “heretical

---

<sup>8</sup> Our popular citation systems might have been very different if Coverdale had been allowed by Henry to use the original system of citations he proposed. In a letter to Cromwell, Henry’s Lord Privy Seal, in August of 1538, Coverdale proposed a much more complete system of annotations for the Great Bible. In addition to the pointing hand, indicating “some notable annotacion,” Coverdale wanted to use a three-leaf clover, indicating that “vpon the same texte there is diuersite of redynge amonge the hebrues, Caldees and Grekes and latenystes,” the feather, showing “that the sentence written in small letters is not in the hebrue or Caldee, but in the latyn,” and finally the dagger, indicating that “the same texte which followeth it, is also alledged of christ or of some apostle in the newe testament” (Pollard 237-38). Cromwell refused permission for any marks except the pointing hands, and then refused permission for Coverdale’s proposed table explicating them. Had he not, we might today be using tiny clovers and feathers rather than asterisks and crosses.





p wordes of this booke, to doo according vnto  
to all that which is written therein for vs.

So Helkia the hye preast and Itham,  
Achob, and Saphan, and Asaphia wnt vnto  
Hulda the prophetesse the wyfe of Shallu  
the sonne of Gedonia the sonne of Harham  
keeper of the warthepe: whych prophetesse  
dwelt in Jerusalem in the honie of the  
doctryne, and they commaned with her. And  
she answered the: thus sayth the Lord God  
of Israel. Tell the man that sent you to me:  
thus sayth the Lord: beholde, I will byynge  
emell vpon this place, and on the inhabitants  
therof: (eue all þ wordes of the booke which  
the kynge of Iuda hath red) because they  
haue forsaken me, & haue burnt incense vnto  
other Gods, to angre me with all þ wordes  
of theyr handes: they wyth alio shalbe  
kynbled agaynst this place, and shall not  
be quenched.

Wnt to the kynge of Iuda (whych sent  
you to aske counsell of the Lord,) so shall ye  
saye: thus sayth the Lord God of Israel,  
as touchynge the wordes whych ye haue  
heard: Because thynge here byd me, & be-  
cause thou hast humbled thy selfe before me  
the Lord, wher thou heardest what I spake  
agaynst this place, and agaynst the inhabi-  
tants of the same (how that they shuld be de-  
stroyed and acursed:) and hast rent thy clo-  
thes and wepte before me: of that alio haue  
I hearde, sayth the Lord. Beholde therefore,  
I will receaue the vnto thy fathers, & thou  
shalt be put into thy graue in peace, & thynne  
eyes shall not se all the euill, which I will  
brynge vpon this place. And they brought þ  
kynge wordes agayne.

#### ¶ The .xxiii. Chapter.

¶ Josias readech the booke before the people. He  
preacheth before the people, after he had red the booke  
of the law. He was thynke. He was thynke in the  
booke, & was thynke. He was thynke in the  
booke, & was thynke. He was thynke in the  
booke, & was thynke.

¶ And then the kynge sent, and  
they gathered vnto him all þ  
elders of Iuda and of Jeru-  
salem. And the kynge went vp  
into the house of the Lord, w  
all the men of Iuda and all þ  
enhabitours of Jerusalem, with the pre-  
sides, and prophets and all the people both  
small and greete. And he red in the eares of  
them all the wordes of the booke of the co-  
nsumment, which was found in the house of þ  
Lord. And the kynge stode by a pyller, & made  
a couenaunt before the Lord, & they  
shuld walke after the Lord, and kepe his  
commandementes, his witness, and his  
statutes with all their herte, & all their soule,  
and make good the wordes of the lawe ap-  
pointment that were written in the booke.  
And all the people consented

And the kynge commaunded to take the  
hye preast, and the inferioure preastes and  
the keepers of the ornamente, to bynne out  
of the temple of the Lord, all the vesselles  
that were made for Baal, for the groues, & for  
all the hoste of heauē. And he burnt the  
without Jerusalem in the feldest of Cebion,  
and caried the ashes of them into Bethel.  
And he put downe the mynistres of  
Baal, whom the kynge of Iuda had sou-  
red, to burne incense in the þ balaunters and  
caryes of Iuda, that were round about Je-  
rusalem, and also the that burnt incense vnto  
Baal, to the sonne, to the mone, to þ pla-  
nettes, and to all the hoste of heauen. And he  
brought out the groue from the temple of þ  
Lord without Jerusalem into the broke  
Cebion, and burnt it there at the broke Ce-  
bion, and stampet it to poudre, and cast  
the dust therof vpon the graues of the chil-  
dren of the people. And he brake downe the  
celles of the male sters that were by the  
house of the Lord, where the women wone  
hanginges for the groue.

And he brought all the prestes out of the  
cities of Iuda, and defiled the balaunters,  
where the prestes had burnt incense: euen fro  
Serba to Berseba, & destroyed the aulters  
of the Gates, that were in the entreynge of  
the gate of Josias the gouernour of þ cite,  
which were (as a man goeth in) on the lefte  
hande of the gate of the cite. And therof  
the prestes of the balaunters came not vp  
to the aulters of the Lord in Jerusalem, save  
onlye they byd eate of the swete wybe a-  
monge their brethren.

And he defiled the Temple, which is  
in the valeye of the children of Humon, be-  
cause no man shoulde offer his sonne or his  
daughter in fyre to Moloch: he put downe  
the hostes that the kinges of Israel had  
gruen to the sonne at the entreynge in of the  
house of the Lord, by the chambere of Sa-  
thanmelech the chāberlayne which was ru-  
ler of the suburbs, & burnt the charrettes  
of the sonne with fyre. And the aulters that  
were on the tope of the parlour of Abaz  
(which the kynge of Iuda had made) and  
the aulters which Manasse had made in þ  
two courties of the house of the Lord, did þ  
kynge brake downe, & ranne thence, & cast  
the dust of them into the broke Cebion.

And the balaunters that were before Je-  
rusalem on the right had of the moūre Di-  
uete (which Salomon the kynge of Israel  
had builded for Astaroth the Idoll of the sy-  
dons, and for Chamoth the Idoll of the Mo-  
abites, & for Achibom the Idoll of þ children  
of Ammon) those the kynge defiled: and  
broke the ymagines, & cut downe the groues,  
& fylled their places with the bones of men.

Figure 6 The Great Bible, 1539

corruptions and false deductions” found in the Protestant bibles, the Rheims version proposed to show “the Apostolike traditions, the expositions of the holy fathers, the decrees of the Catholike Church and the most auncient Councils.” Whoever ignored these solid sources in favor of “his private judgement or the arrogant spirit of these Sectaries,” says the Preface, “shall worthily through his own wilfulness be deceived.” The Rheims New Testament used a system of endnote glosses following each chapter of each book of the New Testament. This is one of the first usages of endnotes I have found, and they are used here to solve a Catholic rhetorical problem: how do you *appear* to foreground the scriptural text when you actually have such a massive glossing apparatus to purvey? The older marginal method of the *Glossa* was not meant to be put into agonistic play in this way, and it was under attack itself. The Rhemish scholars therefore determined on endnotes—a method we will see authors turn to again and again to minimize the rhetorical effect of extensive notational apparatus. The source of each gloss is marked in the text with a double quotation mark (“), referring the reader to the notes at the end of the chapter (Figure 7). The notes, which sometimes take up considerably more space than the passages they gloss, are written in a mixture of English and specialized citational Latin; they assume an audience already educated in the Vulgate and in biblical notation. The interpretations in these notes, unlike the anonymous Protestant notes in the Geneva Bible, were often attributed to orthodox Catholic theologians from Ambrose to Cyprian to Augustine to Gregory. They are overtly polemical, often referring to Protestants as “the adversaries” or “the hereticks.” The work assumes familiarity with a body of commenting literature; it uses specialized Latinate “insider” terminology to direct readers around within its field of interlocking claims and support; it uses these citations to support specific textual positions recognizable within a discourse community; and it backs its positions by careful reference to accredited masters working previously within that community. The Rheims New Testament is, in other words, a scholarly work of a completely recognizable sort.

The Rheims New Testament also introduces in a very clear fashion the two elements of citation style that would ever after exist: the dialogic (or substantive or discursive) note and the citation (or reference) note. The dialogic note, which carries on a running subcommentary in relation to elements of the main text, is still used today in all systems of citation; it simply represents rhetorical possibilities that can’t be achieved through any other typographical convention. The citation note is meant to provide a very specific kind of access to the sources used or quoted by the author. Instead of vaguely declaring, “As St. Augustine says . . . ,” the citation note states that “This quote is found in St. Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, Book 4, Augsburg edition of 1501, page

**HOLY 78** **THE GOSPEL** **CHA. XXVI.**  
**weeks** face vvith the palmes of their hands, † saying, Prophecie vnto 68  
 vs O Christ: vwho is he that strooke thee?  
 † But Peter fate vvithout in the court: and there came to 69  
 him one vvenche, saying: Thou also vvas vvith I E S V S the  
 Galilean. † But he denied before them all, saying, I vvot not 70  
 vvhat thou sayest. † And as he vvnt out of the gate, an other 71  
 vvenche savv him, and she saith to them that vv ere there,  
 And this felovv also vvas vvith I E S V S the Nazarite. † And 72  
 againe he denied vvith an othe, That I knowv not the man.  
 † And after a litle they came that stode by, and said to Peter, 73  
 Surely thou also art of them: for euen thy speache doth be-  
 vvray thee. † Then he began to curse and to sweare that 74  
 he knevve not the man. And incontinent the cocke crevve.  
 † And Peter remembered the vvord of I E S V S vv which he had 75  
 said, Before the cocke crovv, thou shalt deny me thrile. And  
 going forth, he vvept bitterly.

To this time  
 the LAYERS do  
 answer in the  
 Churches Ser-  
 vice.

#### ANNOTATIONS CHAP. XXVI.

- Cost vp6 Churches, altars, &c.** *8. This was 3.* Cost bestowed vpon Christs body then alive, being to the same not necessary, seemed to the disciples lost and fruitles: so the like bestowed vpon the same body in the Sacrament, vpon altars, or Churches, seemeth to the simple lost, or lesse meritorious, then if the same were bestowed vpon the poore.
- Releeve of the poore.** *10. Good Worke* Cost bestowed for religion, deuotion, and signification, is a meritorious worke, and often more meritorious then to geue to the poore, though both be very good, and in some case the poore are to be preferred: yea in certaine cases of necessity, the Church wil breake the very consecrated vessels and iewels of silver and gold, and bestow them in workes of mercy. But we may remember very wel, and our fathers knew it much better, that the poore were then best selected, when most was bestowed vpon the Church.
- Christ alwaies vvith vs in the R. Sacrament.** *11. Haue not.* We haue him not in visible maner as he conuersed on the earth vvith his disciples, needing releeve like other poore men: but we haue him after an other sort in the R. Sacrament, and yet haue him truly and really the self same body. Therefore he saith, they should not haue him, because they should not so haue him, but after an other maner, as when he said *Luce. 22.* as though he were not then vvith them, *When I vv as vvith you.*
- A wonderful mysteric in the institution of the R. Sacrament.** *20. Twelue.* It must needes be a great mysterie that he vv as to worke in the institution of the new Sacrifice by the marvelous transmutatiō of bread and wine into his body and bloud. whereas he admitted none: although many present in the citie: but the twelue Apostles, vv which were already taught to beleue it vvithout contradiction *10. 6.* and were to haue the administration and consecration: hereof by the Order of Priesthood, vv which also was there geuen the to that purpose. & hereas at the eating of the Paschal lambe al the familie vv as vvnt to be present
- The holy Eucharist is both a Sacrifice and a Sacrament.** *24. He took bread.* Here at once is insinuated, for the continuance of the external office of Christs eternal Priesthood according to the order of Melchisedee, both a Sacrifice and a Sacrament, though the Scriptures geue neither of theise names to this action: and our Adversaries vvithout all reason or religion except in a sort the one, and viterly deny the other. A Sacrifice, in that it is ordained to continue the memory of Christs death and oblation vpon the Crosse, and the application of the general vertue thereof to our particular necessities, by consecrating the severall elements, not into Christs whole person as it was boine of the virgin or now is in heauen, but the bread into his body apart, as betrayed, broken, and geuen for vs: the wine into his blood apart, as shed out of his body for remission of sinnes and dedication of the new Testament, vv which be conditions of his person as he was in sacrifice and oblation. In vv which mystical and vnspeskeable maner, he vvould haue the Church to offer and sacrifice him daily, and he in mysticall and Sacramentall dyeth, though

Figure 7 The Rheims New Testament, 1582

31.” The *full* citation is the key here, for it assumes that the reader is immersed enough in the universe of the discourse to want to follow it back to specific points in the source works. It invites the reader to doublecheck the point and accuracy of the quotation or idea cited. Citation notes thus assume a dialogic seriousness themselves, treating the reader as a respected co-owner of textual knowledge who is owed a full exposition of the workings and backing of the argument.<sup>9</sup>

The predictable outcome of the battle of biblical glosses that took up the last part of the sixteenth century was a version in which the scriptural text itself represented only a minor percentage of the work, with the majority of text being devoted to glossing controversy and agonistic refutation. This book, a New Testament published by William Fulke in 1589, was a direct refutation of the Rheims New Testament. For every note created by the Rheims commentators, Fulke created a counternote, publishing the entirety of the Catholic gloss and then his refutation of it side by side (Figure 8). Determined to undermine the authority of the Rheims text by using what Bruce Lincoln calls “corrosive discourse” (*Authority* 78), Fulke was as adept at using patristic sources as the Rhemish scholars, and his New Testament reads less like scripture than like extended warfare. As Tribble says, “The plain text, which Tyndale so boldly foregrounded some fifty years before, itself almost disappears in this battle for control. The central impression of Fulke’s volume is that of competition and contestation: competing typefaces, competing notes, competing interpretations. In this manifestation the printed page becomes a locus for a bitter struggle over possession of the text” (50).

Finally, this battle of glosses was brought to an end in England by James I’s determination that his approved biblical translation would contain no glosses. James was concerned by the increasing vituperation in glossing and by the antimonarchical tone in some of the glosses of the Geneva Bible. In 1603 he called his counselors together and gave orders for a new translation. “Marry, withal, hee gave this caveat . . . that no marginall notes should be added, having found in those which are annexed to the *Geneva* translation . . . some notes very partiall, untrue, seditious, and savouring too much of daungerous and trayterous conceites” (*Summe and Substance*, in Pollard 46). James’s instructions to his bishops and translators was to use no marginal glosses except small cross-marked comparative notes referencing parallel passages in other biblical books

---

<sup>9</sup> For the Rheims scholars, sending readers back to Augustine was also use of the topic of authority. But direct reference to specific sources is a double-edged sword for authors whose readers are antagonistic and may disagree about interpretations—as Fulke’s Bible was to show.



or variant readings of words. (This usage marks the first time crosses as well as asterisks were used in citation systems.)

Thus the English-speaking world was presented with the stripped-margin Authorized Version of 1611, which we know as the King James Bible. It became the standard English Bible, bringing to a sudden halt the contention of agonistic glosses that threatened to make the Holy Scripture a perpetual battleground. But despite the forced conclusion to this war of glosses—in England, at least—it left in the hands of Renaissance editors, scholars, and printers an entire heritage and technology of annotation methods, page and form setups, citation structures, and the necessary symbol and italic fonts. We might think of the sixteenth century, with its quickly developing printing technology, its linguistic inventiveness, its political and religious disagreements, as having created a sort of hothouse within which our entire system of scholarly authorization and citation grew rapidly. Its evolution of classical scholarship with all of the hierarchical and competitive elements of comparative work, its battles of competing bible glosses, driven by passionate emotional commitments to truth and the creation of reality through textuality, and its ever-increasing access to texts of all kinds were the cradle of modern Western literacy practices. Although, as Tribble says, at the beginning of the seventeenth century “the legal and cultural mechanisms that will result in a fully proprietary conception of authorship have yet to be formed,” the physical and textual structures through which they *will* be formed have been invented (57).

### Enlightenment Experimentation and Formalization

The *technae* of citations and annotations would move forward through experimentation. Several formats were tried and abandoned by the gentleman-authors of the seventeenth century. Robert Burton, in his 1621 *Anatomy of Melancholy*, used a system of text-based translations into English of his classical sources, with the original Greek and Latin (and citation information) in numbered marginal notes (Figure 9). Burton was one of the few early users of citations to present actual quotations from his sources rather than summaries or paraphrases. Though his quotation structure has some problems of readability because it interrupts the reading of the main text for citation information, using the margins for Latin and Greek original versions, at least Burton is using quotes.<sup>10</sup> Thomas Browne, in his *Urn-Burial* of 1658, eschewed the specific

<sup>10</sup> Burton's rhetorical choices here probably reflect the linguistic transition of his times. More and more English people were being taught reading and writing in their native language, and Burton used the system he did to provide readers who had no classical languages with translations they could read while allowing classical language speakers to check and rate his translations. Burton may also be continuing



## Part. 1. Sec. 2.

## Causes of melancholy.

## Memb. 5. Subf. 3.

226

only. I am of *Capivaccius* mind for my part. Now this humor according to *Salvianus*, is sometime in the substance of the Braine, sometimes contained in the Membranes and tunicles that couer the Braine, sometimes in the passages of the Ventricles of the Braine, or veines of those Ventricles. It followes many times <sup>a</sup> *Phrensie*, long diseases, agues, long abode in hote places, or under the Sun, a blow on the head, as *Rhesis* informeth vs: *Piso* addes solitarinesse, waking, inflammations of the head, proceeding most part <sup>b</sup> from much vse of spices, hote wines, hote meats; all which *Montanus* reckons vp *consil.* 2. 2. for a Melancholy Iew; and *Hernius* repeates *cap.* 1. 2. de *Mania*, hote bathes, garlick, onions, saith *Guianerius*, bad aire, corrupt, much <sup>c</sup> waking &c. retention of seed, or abundance, stopping of *hemorrhagia*, the Midriffe misaffected; and according to *Trallianus* l. 1. 16. immoderate cares, troubles, griefes, discontent, study, meditation, and in a word, the abuse of all those 6. non-naturall things. *Hercules de Saxonia* *cap.* 16. lib. 1. will haue it caused from a <sup>d</sup> cautery, or boyle dried vp, or any issue. *Amatus Lusitanus* cent. 2. *cura* 67. giues instance in a fellow that had a boyle in his arme, and <sup>e</sup> after that was cured, ran mad, and when the wound was open, he was cured againe. *Trineuolius* *consil.* 13. lib. 1. hath an example of a melancholy man so caused by overmuch continuance in the sun, frequent vse of Venerie, and immoderate exercise. And in his *consil.* 49. lib. 3. from an <sup>f</sup> headpeece overheated, which caused head melancholy. *Proffer Calenius* brings in Cardinal *Cesius* for a patterne of such as are so melancholy by long study: but examples are infinite.

<sup>a</sup> *Melancholia capitis accedit post phrenesim aut longam moram sub sole, aut percussione in capite.* *cap.* 23. lib. 1.

<sup>b</sup> *Quibilibet vini potentia, et septi sunt sub sole.*

<sup>c</sup> *Cura valde largior vini et aromatatum vsu.*  
<sup>d</sup> *A Caeteris et vbiere expiscato.*

<sup>e</sup> *Ab vlcere curato iocundus in festiuitate, aperto vulnere curauit.*  
<sup>f</sup> *Agalea nimis calefacta.*

## SUBSECT. 4.

## Causes of Hypochondriacall or windy Melancholy.

IN repeating of these causes, I must *crambē bis collam apponere*, say that againe which I haue formerly said, in applying them to their proper Species: of Hypochondriacall or flatuous

Figure 9

Robert Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, 1621

in his citation forms the elaborate knowledge game he is playing with the reader. But it is an inescapably transitional system and provides a bumpy read.



citation structures of Burton, and provided no source information except author's name and title, but his margins were still active with overt display of classical learning (Figure 10). Without wanting to appear antiquarian, or "scholarly" in a pedantic way, Burton and Browne still need to appear learned and "authorial," and they cannot do so without some classical structure.

By the end of the seventeenth century, the scholar-author division had become fairly rigid, largely as a result of the rise of empirical science and of the first great generation of serious textual scholars at English universities. It is difficult for those trained up in standard English literary history to see these men in any original light, for they have come down to us in literary tradition as comic figures, pedants and buffoons. They had the bad fortune to be the enemies and butts of Alexander Pope and Jonathan Swift in one of the best-documented—and one of the most partially reported—intellectual controversies of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries: the "Ancients and Moderns" battle. Though the scholars may have won this intellectual battle against the authors, they lost the historical war and are known today, if at all, as hapless targets. The three greatest of this first generation of textual scholars were William Wotton, Richard Bentley, and Lewis Theobald. Their defense of Enlightenment learning was the first serious indication that English culture had reached a point at which it could begin to transcend rather than merely to merely appropriate the classical sources and writers.

Wotton, Bentley, and Theobald, though they may not have been entertaining or popular figures as Pope and Swift, were the first Englishmen to apply the tenets of critical thought and the relatively new discipline of textual editing and analysis to modern as well as ancient sources. Respect for the findings of the new science, careful comparative scholarship ranging easily from the classics through Milton, and willingness to stand their ground against powerful and sometimes aristocratic intellectual foes mark the work of these writers. The first gun was fired in 1692, when Sir William Temple's "Essay on Ancient and Modern Learning" made the case that the ancients surpassed the moderns in all branches of human endeavor. Contemporary scholars fought back in print. Wotton's 1694 work *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* was less a condemnation of Temple or of classical works than it was an impressive demonstration of the scope and power of modern discoveries. The book looks familiar to us today because the scholarly apparatus in it is essentially modern—a simple and easily read form of the humanist marginal citation notes that had been evolving for the previous century, defined by repeating alphabetical notes that give complete bibliographical information (Figure 11). Wotton's page is clean, his marginal citations clear and apposite.

116

*Cyrus-Garden, Or*

square. For though they might be sixteen in Rank and file, yet when they shut close, so that the first pike advanced before the first, though the number might be square, the figure was oblong, answerable unto the Quincunciall quadrature of *Curtius*. According to this square *Thucydides* delivers, the *Athenians* disposed their battle against the *Lacedemonians* <sup>f</sup> brickwise, and by the same word the Learned *Guellius* expoundeth the quadrature of <sup>g</sup> *Virgil*, after the form of a brick or tile.

<sup>f</sup> εν πλα-  
σιφ.

<sup>g</sup> Σεξο via  
limite qua-  
dret. Com-  
ment. in  
*Virgil*.

And as the first station and position of trees, so was the first habitation of men, not in round Cities, as of later foundation; For the form of *Babylon* the first City was square, and so shall also be the last, according to the description of the holy City in the Apocalyps. The famous pillars of *Seth* before the flood, had also the like foundation, if they were but *antediluvian* Obelisks, and such as *Cham* and his *Egyptian* race, imitated after the Flood.

But *Nineveh* which Authours acknowledge to have exceeded *Babylon*, was of <sup>a</sup> *Diod. Sic.* a <sup>b</sup> longilaterall figure, ninety five Fur-  
longs

Figure 10 Thomas Browne, *Urn-Burial and Cyrus-Garden*, 1658

174

*Reflections upon*

learn who first found out the Properties of Convex and Concave Glasses in the Refraction of Light. Dr. Plot has collected a great deal concerning F. Bacon, in his *Natural History of Oxfordshire*; which seems to put it out of doubt that he knew that great Objects might appear little, and small Objects appear great; that distant Objects would seem near, and near Objects seem afar off, by different Applications of Convex and Concave Glasses; upon the Credit of which

(n) Diop-  
tric. Pag.  
256, 257,  
258.

Authorities, Mr. *Molineux* (n) attributes the Invention of Spectacles to this learned Friar, the Time to which their earliest Use may be traced, agreeing very well with the Time in which he lived; but how far F. Bacon went, we know not: So that we must go into *Holland* for the first Inventors of these excellent Instruments, and there they were first found

(o) Borel-  
lus de vero  
Inventore  
Telescopii,  
pag. 30.  
(p) Ibid.  
Pag. 35.  
(q) Ibid.  
Pag. 30.

out by one *Zacharias Joannides* (o), a Spectacle-maker (p) of *Middleburgh* in *Zeland*; in 1590 (q) he presented a Telescope of Two Glasses to Prince *Maurice*, and another to Arch-Duke *Albert*, the former of whom apprehending that they might be of great Use in War, desired him to conceal his Secret. For this Reason, his Name was so little known, that

(r) Diop-  
tric.

neither *Des Cartes* (r) nor *Gerhard Vossius* (s)

Figure 11 William Wotton, *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning*, 1694

A few years later, the battle became specifically textual. Bentley's 1697 *Dissertation upon Phalaris*, a critical examination of Charles Boyle's careless edition of the spurious *Epistles of Phalaris*, drew down upon him the satire of Jonathan Swift, friend of Boyle and Temple, in *The Battle of the Books* and *The Tale of a Tub*. And Theobald angered Pope when in 1723 he took the poet to task for his careless editing of Shakespeare in *Shakespeare Restored*, leading to Pope's attack on him—and on Bentley—in the *Dunciad* and then in the *Dunciad Variorum*, Pope's satire on pedantic scholarship. These works show that citation systems were shifting. Printers were finding that their older methods—based in their imitation of the scribal techniques of leaving large margins for learned annotations—were harder to set in type, requiring two sticks per line per form. Paper, too, was dearer than ever, and extending the text closer to the edge was a natural move. But what, then, could be done with the marginal notes as the margins contracted? They could be placed at the bottom of the page and marked, as marginal notes had been marked, by letters, numbers, or symbols. Thus, around the turn of the eighteenth century, we finally come to the use of footnotes.

They probably began on the Continent. The evolution of scholarly apparatus had been ongoing, especially in continental Europe, for more than two hundred years, and by the later seventeenth century, it had attained considerable sophistication and analytical methodology. One key text is Louis-Sebastien le Nain de Tillemont's massive *Ecclesiastical Memoirs* of 1693, which is a history of the first six centuries of Christianity. Tillemont exhibits clearly how sophisticated authors and printers on the Continent had become since the 1650s (Figure 12). In this English translation from 1731, we see that Tillemont was using no fewer than three forms of citation structure: a numbered marginal system cross-referencing other parts of the book, a Greek-letter footnote system referencing the scriptures and the church fathers, and a symbol footnote system underneath it for dialogic notes and commentary. Here, indeed, is God's plenty.

But Tillemont's church history was a specialized book. Anthony Grafton's *The Footnote: A Curious History*, which deals with the epistemic evolution of footnote content in historical scholarship, places the birth of modern footnoting methodology with Pierre Bayle's *Dictionnaire Critique et Historique* in 1697 (192-99). Beginning with the credulous and sometimes fictionalizing antiquaries and compilers of the earlier Renaissance and with the ecclesiastical historians from Eusebius on, careful comparative and analytical historical methodologies gradually emerged during the sixteenth century and were tested and refined during the seventeenth. Jacques-Auguste de Thou, Joseph Scaliger, Cesare Baronio, Athanasius Kircher, Mosheim, Tillemont, and many other Renaissance historians and scholars helped to create the early Enlightenment intellectual

## Saint P A U L.

165

his particular friend, but as a General of the christian army, as a lion, as a burning and shining lamp, as a voice capable of founding through the whole earth. † Having found him, he brought him to † Antioch, where they † lived a whole year, † going to the assembly of the church, and instructing a great number of infidels. \* No one disturbed the progress of the faith by any perfecution, [which proceeded so far as to oblige S. Paul to remove; though there might be one of less violence:] \* For in the fourth century they shewed some caverns at the foot of the mountain near Antioch, whither they held that this apostle retired, and concealed himself.

‡ It was no small happiness to Antioch to have been the \* first city, says S. Chrysostom, that had S. Paul for it's preacher, and to have enjoyed him so long: [For we shall see, that he returned thither several times.] But the preaching of S. Paul procured to it another honour, which renders it illustrious throughout the whole church. † For it was at Antioch, that the disciples began at that time to be called by the name of *Christians*; † which title communicating to us the adorable name of J E S U S C H R I S T our Saviour, renders us also partakers of all the others that belong to him, and obliges us to shew forth the virtues and perfections thereof in our life. † S. Gregory Nyssen says, that it was † by the order of the apostles, that we were called by this title. † Another Father is of opinion, that the Holy Spirit was pleased in this manner to fulfil what the prophets had promised, that God would give a new name to his servants. † And since there was no name upon earth to be found that was common to us, because we are not one people, but a collection of different nations, it was necessary that we should receive one from heaven. † Hitherto they who had embraced the faith, were called *Trope of the way*, [which signifies nothing in particular,] or Disciples, or Believers. But the title of Christians prevailed in a little time above all the others. [It was immediately carried from Antioch to Rome, if it be true, that S. Peter, who uses the word in his first epistle, wrote that epistle this year, † as some are of opinion. The Pagans had hardly any other name for our religion:] † but not knowing the mystery of the divine unction, from whence the word Christian is derived in the Greek, they took it from † another word of the same language, which signifies good and useful.

\* While S. Paul was at Antioch, several prophets came thither from Jerusalem, one of whom named Agabus foretold, that there would be a great famine throughout the whole earth; † which accordingly happened in the days of Claudius who reigned [at that time,] † and in the fourth year of his † reign. † This famine, by which God punished the sins of the Pagans and the malice of the Jews against the apostles, was an advantage to the Christians. For it gave them an opportunity of practising divers virtues; † and contributed to unite the Gentiles, [who were the principal part of the church of Antioch,] to the Jews who had embraced the faith in Judaea. [The latter † had quitted their estates, or been pillaged of all that they had,] † For which reason the Faithful of Antioch resolved to send them relief, every one according to his ability. † S. Paul and S. Barnabas carried their alms to Jerusalem, where they delivered them into the hands of the priests.

‡ Acts 11. v. 25, 26. \* Chry. h. 25. p. 235. d. e. † Thdr. v. P. c. 2. p. 782. c. † Chry. p. 233. a. † Acts 11. v. 26. † Nyf. chri. c. 3. p. 270. l. perf. p. 295. d. † Cyr. cat. 17. p. 205. b. † Amb. pf. 36. p. 685. m. † Chry. in Act. h. 25. p. 233. b. † C. à Lap. ib. p. 205. l. Bar. 43. §. 13. † Acts 11. v. 27, 28. † Euf. chr. † Chry. in Act. h. 25. p. 233. d. e. † p. 235. b. † Acts 11. v. 29, 30.

\* [S. Paul had already preached the faith at Damascus, and perhaps likewise in Arabia and other places. But it may be said, that he was not, as far as appears, looked on then as any more than as an ordinary disciple,] whereas he preached at Antioch in the capacity of a doctor. † Acts 13. v. 1. † Instead of *Christiani* they said *Chrestiani*, from the greek word *χρησται*. † Just. ap. 2. p. 35. a. l. Terr. ap. c. 3. p. 5. a. l. Lact. l. 4. c. 7. p. 367. U u † The

Figure 12 Louis-Sebastien Le Nain de Tillemont, *Ecclesiastical Memoirs of the Six First Centuries: Made Good by Citations from Original Authors*, 1694, translation of 1731.

culture within which claims must be supported by marginal or footnoted evidence, and Bayle's *Dictionnaire* took full advantage of their work.

Bayle was an extraordinarily learned polymath, and his typographical choices were to have a powerful effect on subsequent writers and printers. The *Historical and Critical Dictionary* was printed in large folio volumes with tall columns of small print. Each page is set up with a relatively small amount of entry text at the top of the folio columns, followed by the larger bulk of Bayle's dialogic "Remarks" (indicated by capital letters) underneath, and finally, with citation notes in the margins (Figure 13). Like Tillemont, Bayle colonized the foot of his page, and the dialogic possibilities it offered him were definitive of his work. The *Dictionary* was seen as a vital, if polemical, work of learning and reference throughout learned Europe. The book was translated, widely read, heatedly argued over, and almost every educated European came to know its typographic formula. After Bayle, the foot of the page becomes a much more important site for notes (though his own citation notes were in the margins), and marginal notes gradually give way to footnotes.<sup>11</sup>

Though it may have been Tillemont or Bayle, no one knows for sure what book was first printed with footnotes rather than marginal notes. The two systems continued side by side for some time. The first English book I have found with true footnotes is the 1710 fifth edition of Swift's *Tale of a Tub*. The first edition of 1704 had used only marginal notes in the old style, but by 1710 Swift had changed the typography to use *both* marginal notes and footnotes marked by symbols.<sup>12</sup> Swift meant this promiscuous use of notational structure as part of his satire of the new learning, but he did not invent it (Figure 14). By 1720 footnotes were a standard system, and marginal notes became rarer and rarer. The last purely marginal notes I have found in a serious scholarly book are

---

<sup>11</sup> Even in the atmosphere of proliferating scholarly seriousness of 1703, however, we still see some serious divisions on the question of notes and their contents. Grafton quotes Jean-Baptiste Thiers' criticism of Boileau's *L'Histoire des Flagellans* of 1700, which Thiers considered full of officious and unnecessary citation information. "Often," huffed Thiers, "he cites the year and place of publication of books, the names of the printers or publishers, the pages and leaves of the books. . . . What purpose do all of these meticulous and affected citations serve, except to enlarge his history?" (qtd. in Grafton, *The Footnote*, 219-20). Such criticism may seem strange to us, but to Thiers, used to the older gentleman-amateur-antiquarian tradition, Boileau's "booksellers' learning" was pedantic and superfluous. Boileau was operating within a newer scholarly tradition that would, during the next hundred years, coalesce into something very like modern historical methodology; naturally, we tend to understand him better.

<sup>12</sup> The genesis of these various symbols presents an interesting problem. They seem to have been cast as type by early printers and to have been added to as needs arose. In order of their generality of use, they came to include the asterisk, the cross or dagger, the double asterisk, the double cross, the double dagger, the two vertical lines, the three vertical lines, and the doubled parentheses (section mark or whirlwind).

## A R I S T O T E

359

une belle mort (Q), & il jouit de la (R) félicité éternelle. Il composa un \* *Page*  
très-grand nombre de livres, dont une assez bonne partie est parvenue jusqu'à *très-faibles*  
nous. Il est vrai que certains Critiques forment mille doutes sur cela. Nous de l'article *remarques*  
parlons des aventures de ces livres dans les remarques \* sur l'article *Tyrannion*. *Andronicus*  
Il fut extrêmement honoré dans sa (J) patrie, & il y a eu des hérétiques (T) 271. 272. *cus. 172.*  
qui vénéroient son image conjointement avec celle de JESUS-CHRIST. Je n'ai *cap. 172.*  
point trouvé que les Antinomiens portaient plus de respect à ce sage Payen qu'à \* *cap. 172.*  
la sagesse incréée, \* ni que les Aeticiens aient été excommuniés, parce qu'ils don- *Andronicus*  
noient d'Aristote *Andronicus*

(a) Cap. 3. *Andronicus*  
donnés beaucoup de Docteurs Catholiques, sont *Andronicus*  
et les 3. *Andronicus*  
routés chérissés, qui ont pris leur origine & *Andronicus*  
fondement sur ce qu'il dit en son premier li- *Andronicus*  
vre du ciel parlant du nombre ternaire; Ad *Andronicus*

(b) Proli- *Andronicus*  
gion de il- *Andronicus*  
las mou- *Andronicus*  
necesse *Andronicus*  
c'est-à- *Andronicus*  
dire, Qu'ap- *Andronicus*  
propter hoc à na- *Andronicus*  
tura sumus *Andronicus*  
sunt perinde *Andronicus*  
atque quadam *Andronicus*  
illius *Andronicus*  
luge, & in *Andronicus*  
Deorum *Andronicus*  
sacrificiis *Andronicus*  
celebrandis *Andronicus*  
ut so- *Andronicus*  
lentis. Duquel *Andronicus*  
passage on ne *Andronicus*  
saurait con- *Andronicus*  
clure *Andronicus*  
sur cela *Andronicus*  
autre chose, *Andronicus*  
sinon qu'Aristote *Andronicus*  
dit que l'on se *Andronicus*  
servoit en son *Andronicus*  
tems du nombre *Andronicus*  
de trois aux *Andronicus*  
sacrifices, ce *Andronicus*  
qui nous est *Andronicus*  
aussi témoigné *Andronicus*  
par *Andronicus*  
Theophraste. *Andronicus*  
Après cela *Andronicus*  
Naudé *Andronicus*  
remarque *Andronicus*  
que le Cardinal *Andronicus*  
Bellarmine (a) *Andronicus*  
se moque de *Andronicus*  
Trapezus, de *Andronicus*  
ce qu'il avoit *Andronicus*  
tant pris de *Andronicus*  
peine pour *Andronicus*  
prouver par *Andronicus*  
ce texte qu'Aristote *Andronicus*  
avoit en une *Andronicus*  
certaine *Andronicus*  
consistance *Andronicus*  
la Trinité.

(Q) Il fit une belle mort. Se sentant (b) *Andronicus*  
proche de la fin il versa un torrent de larmes, *Andronicus*  
& tout pénétré de douleur & d'espérance il *Andronicus*  
implora la miséricorde du souverain Etre. Il *Andronicus*  
s'aprouvoit extrêmement une sentence d'Home- *Andronicus*  
re, qui porte qu'il ne sied pas mal aux Dieux *Andronicus*  
de le revoir de la nature de l'homme, afin d'é- *Andronicus*  
claircir le genre humain. C'étoient des presen- *Andronicus*  
tifications, que l'âme de l'incarnation du fils de Dieu. Voilà *Andronicus*  
ce que nous lisons dans Celsus Rhodiginus. *Andronicus*  
Son autorité d'un fait de cette nature ne *Andronicus*  
vaut gueres mieux que rien. D'autres parlent *Andronicus*  
bien sûrément des dernières heres d'Aristote. *Andronicus*  
(c) Les 3. disent qu'il mourut de déplaisir de n'a- *Andronicus*  
voir pu comprendre la cause du flux & du *Andronicus*  
reflux de l'Euphrate. Sur quoi quelques Mo- *Andronicus*  
dernes ont inventé cette fable qui depuis a eu *Andronicus*  
cours, que ce Philosophe se précipita dans *Andronicus*  
l'Euphrate en disant ces paroles, Que l'Euphrate *Andronicus*  
me engloutisse puis que je ne le puis comprendre. *Andronicus*  
Digne L'E. ce (d) cite un Auteur nommé *Andronicus*  
Eumelus, qui avoit dit qu'Aristote s'étant resu- *Andronicus*  
géré à Chalcis s'empoisonna à l'âge de 70. ans. *Andronicus*  
Apolodote (e) me paroît plus digne de foi: il a *Andronicus*  
dit que ce grand homme mourut de maladie à *Andronicus*  
l'âge de 63. ans.

(R) Il jouit de la félicité éternelle. Sepul- *Andronicus*  
veda (f) l'un des plus sages hommes du XVI. *Andronicus*  
siècle, n'a point hésité à le placer parmi les *Andronicus*  
bienheureux: il a soutenu publiquement son *Andronicus*  
opinion, & par écrit. Le Jésuite Gresserus (g) *Andronicus*

le reprend d'avoir été trop hardi; mais nean- *Andronicus*  
moins il avoue qu'il incline en faveur d'Aristote *Andronicus*  
aussi bien que Sepulveda, dont il s'impressionne *Andronicus*  
en cela que la façon de parler affirmative. J'ai *Andronicus*  
donc à cet égard ce que j'ai cité de Celsus Rhodi- *Andronicus*  
ginus, & ce que des gens de poids ont remar- *Andronicus*  
qué touchant la raison qui obligea Aristote à *Andronicus*  
se jeter dans l'Euphrate. Albert le Grand a soutenu *Andronicus*  
la même chose. *Andronicus*

(\*) *Andronicus*  
Qu'on ne se méprenne pas sur le P. Rapin voyez la remar- *Andronicus*  
que Z. (c) *Andronicus*  
est de l'op. p. 321. la Morale le Voyez tom. 5. pag. 324. *Andronicus*

qu'on le chassa à cause de ses bonnes mœurs; *Andronicus*  
Propter morum rectitudinem pulsus (b) Athenis. (b) Lib. 5. *Andronicus*  
Gresserus (i) dans sa dispute contre S. pulveda *Andronicus*  
touchant le salut d'Aristote, ne doute point qu'il n'ait *Andronicus*  
voulu éviter par ce bannissement volontaire la *Andronicus*  
nécessité où on vouloit le réduire, de rendre à des (c) De va- *Andronicus*  
l'idées un culte qu'il croyoit n'être dû qu'à Dieu seul *Andronicus*  
cult. Nous avons donc en sa personne un illustre *Andronicus*  
Religieux pour la vraye Religion. Origène (d) *Andronicus*  
(b) a favorablement interprété cette fable d'A. le Voyez *Andronicus*  
Aristote, car lors qu'il explique le précepte que *Andronicus*  
notre Seigneur (h) donne à ses Apôtres, de s'en- *Andronicus*  
fermer dans une ville où ils seroient persécutés, dans une ci- *Andronicus*  
té, il dit à Celsus que le moqueur de cela avoit fait *Andronicus*  
ses profanations ordinaires, que l'enseignement d'A. *Andronicus*  
est de l'Evangile, & qu'il fit la même chose d'ant. *Andronicus*  
pour s'enfuir calmement, que JESUS-CHRIST. *Andronicus*

(S) Extrêmement honoré dans sa patrie. El- *Andronicus*  
le avoit été vaincu par le Roi Philippe, mais *Andronicus*  
Alexandre la fit rebâtir à la prière d'Aristote. *Andronicus*  
Les habitants pour reconnoître ce bienfait (m) con- *Andronicus*  
sacrerent un jour de fête à ce Philosophe, & *Andronicus*  
lors qu'il fut mort à Chalcis dans l'île d'Éubée, *Andronicus*  
ils transportèrent ses os chez eux, ils dressèrent *Andronicus*  
un autel sur son monument, ils donnèrent à ce *Andronicus*  
lieu le nom d'Aristote, & y tinrent dans la suite *Andronicus*  
leurs assemblées. Mandeville (n) dans la suite *Andronicus*  
de ses voyages dit que tout cela étoit une *Andronicus*  
fable, mais encore de son tems, c'est-à-dire dans le *Andronicus*  
XIV. siècle.

(T) Il y a eu des hérétiques qui vénéroient *Andronicus*  
son image. . . . que les Antinomiens por- *Andronicus*  
taient plus de respect. Voici un passage du P. Rapin. *Andronicus*  
(o) Les Carpocratens (p) furent condamnés *Andronicus*  
pour avoir mis l'image de ce Philosophe avec *Andronicus*  
celle de JESUS-CHRIST, & pour l'avoir *Andronicus*  
adorée par une extravagance de zèle pour la *Andronicus*  
doctrine. Les Aeticiens (q) furent excommuniés *Andronicus*  
par l'Eglise, & par les Aetiens même dont *Andronicus*  
ils étoient sortis, parce qu'ils donnoient à leurs *Andronicus*  
disciples les Catégories d'Aristote pour Ca- *Andronicus*  
thèses. Les Antinomiens (r) alloient jus- *Andronicus*  
qu'à cet excès d'impieeté, que de porter plus *Andronicus*  
de respect à ce sage Payen qu'à la sagesse in- *Andronicus*  
créée. Je n'avois jamais si bien connu qu'en *Andronicus*  
cet endroit-ci, que cet agréable Ecivain ne se *Andronicus*  
donnaît pas la peine de consulter les originaux.

J'avoue que Baronius sous l'année que le P. *Andronicus*  
Rapin cite dit que les Carpocratens avoient *Andronicus*  
des images, & entre autres celle de JESUS- *Andronicus*  
CHRIST qu'ils disoient avoir été faite par *Andronicus*  
Pilate, celle de Pythagoras, celle de Platon, *Andronicus*  
celle d'Aristote, & qu'ils leur rendoient la ve- *Andronicus*  
nération que les Payens rendoient aux idoles; *Andronicus*  
mais cela ne meroit pas d'être allégué: car *Andronicus*  
outre que Baronius ne dit point que c'étoit *Andronicus*  
la raison pourquoi on condamna ces hérétiques, *Andronicus*  
il ne paroît pas qu'ils aient eu plus de zèle *Andronicus*

Figure 13 Pierre Bayle, Dictionnaire Historique et Critique, 1697



---

## SECTION XI

---

195

Curiosity attracted Strangers to Laugh, or to Listen; he would of a sudden, with one Hand out with his *Gear*, and piss full in their Eyes, and with the other, all to-bespatter<sup>1</sup> them with Mud.

\*IN Winter he went always loose and unbuttoned, and clad as thin as possible, to let *in* the ambient Heat; and in Summer, lapt himself close and thick to keep it *out*.<sup>2</sup>

†IN all Revolutions of Government, he would make his Court for the Office of *Hangman* General; and in the Exercise of that Dignity, wherein he was very dextrous, would make use of ||no other *Vizard* than a *long Prayer*.<sup>3</sup>

HE had a Tongue so Musculous and Subtil, that he could twist it up into his Nose, and deliver a strange Kind of Speech from thence. He was also the first in these Kingdoms, who began to improve the *Spanish* Accomplishment of *Braying*;<sup>4</sup> and having large Ears, perpetually exposed and arrect,<sup>5</sup> he carried his Art to such a Perfection, that it was a Point of great Difficulty to distinguish either by the View or the Sound, between the *Original* and the *Copy*.

HE was troubled with a Disease, reverse to that

• *They affect Differences in Habit and Behaviour.*

† *They are severe Persecutors, and all in a Form of Cant and Devotion.*

|| *Cromwell and his Confederates went, as they called it, to seek God, when they resolved to murder the King.*

Figure 14 Jonathan Swift, *A Tale of a Tub*, fifth edition, 1710

in Theobald's 1723 edition of *Shakespeare Restored*, and Theobald was using a specific taxonomic system of Pope's editing errors that would have made footnotes less effective for his purposes.

Footnotes, like marginal notes, could take different forms. They declared their cultural allegiances by the forms they took; those writers who wished to appear learned but not scholarly used footnotes marked by symbols and a freer range of citation forms. Scholars, whose work was accountable to other scholars in a way that could be very polemical, marked their trail through the forest with more formal letter- and number-marked systems. We see an example of the first of these systems in Bernard Mandeville's *Free Thoughts on Religion* of 1720 (Figure 15), which is almost nonchalant in the informality of its cited information. The second is satirized by Pope in his *Dunciad Variations* of 1729. As we see in this page (Figure 16), Pope is completely familiar with what by then were the conventions of the scholarly, as opposed to the gentlemanly, footnote: the numbers, the Latin references—*ibid*, *op cit*, *loc cit*, *pag. ult.*, etc.—the nitpicking edition and page numbers.<sup>13</sup>

If footnotes were largely standard by 1740, they were brought to a state almost completely modern by the later part of the century. David Hume's *History of England* from 1767 gives an idea of how standard historical works were footnoted around midcentury. (Figure 17) Hume tells us here what he has read, but, like Tillemont's, his citations make no judgments about the trustworthiness or acuity of his sources. Hume's footnotes are flat, passive, purely citational—albeit with little publication information. The footnote was awaiting its definitive artist, and in Edward Gibbon he arrived. The bottom note as a literary form probably reached no higher point than it did in the hands of Gibbon, whose 1776 *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776-1787) remains today both a research wonder and a stylistic masterpiece. Gibbon excelled at both citation and discursive notes, melding them into a consistent learned descant that weaves through his text.<sup>14</sup> His citation notes are very

<sup>13</sup> Probably the greatest satire on pedantic scholarship ever written, the *Dunciad Variorum* was a true variorum, to which Pope invited Swift and other friends to submit parodic "notes" (which were signed "Bentley" and "Theobald" among other names). The language's most scathing satire on scholarly forms thus evolved hardly three decades after the forms themselves coalesced.

<sup>14</sup> We are so used to reading Gibbon as a dialogue, with one eye on the notes, that it comes as something of a shock to learn in Gibbon's *Memoirs* that his preference was for his notes to be at the end of each volume, or, better yet, bound into separate volumes at the end of the series. (The Basel octavo edition of 14 volumes, Gibbon's favorite, was without footnotes; all notes were packed into the last two volumes.) Indeed, his first volume of the first edition of *Decline and Fall*, printed in February 1776, contains no footnotes; all notes are at the end of the quarto volume. Not until the second and third volumes were published in 1781 do we see the familiar complex footnotes. Gibbon states regretfully in the *Memoirs* that "public importunity" had forced him to move his notes from end of volume to foot of

---

## SECTION XI

195

Curiosity attracted Strangers to Laugh, or to Listen; he would of a sudden, with one Hand out with his *Gear*, and piss full in their Eyes, and with the other, all to bespatter<sup>†</sup> them with Mud.

\*IN Winter he went always loose and unbuttoned, and clad as thin as possible, to let *in* the ambient Heat; and in Summer, lapt himself close and thick to keep it *out*.<sup>2</sup>

†IN all Revolutions of Government, he would make his Court for the Office of *Hangman* General; and in the Exercise of that Dignity, wherein he was very dextrous, would make use of ||no other *Vizard* than a *long Prayer*.<sup>3</sup>

HE had a Tongue so Musculous and Subtil, that he could twist it up into his Nose, and deliver a strange Kind of Speech from thence. He was also the first in these Kingdoms, who began to improve the *Spanish* Accomplishment of *Braying*;<sup>4</sup> and having large Ears, perpetually exposed and arrect,<sup>5</sup> he carried his Art to such a Perfection, that it was a Point of great Difficulty to distinguish either by the View or the Sound, between the *Original* and the *Copy*.

HE was troubled with a Disease, reverse to that

\* *They affect Differences in Habit and Behaviour.*

† *They are severe Persecutors, and all in a Form of Cant and Devotion.*

|| *Cromwell and his Confederates went, as they called it, to seek God, when they resolved to murder the King.*

Figure 14 Jonathan Swift, *A Tale of a Tub*, fifth edition, 1710

page, though it was probably pressure from his printer, William Strahan, who had received a letter from David Hume praising the book but complaining about the note structure of the first edition.

Gibbon's preference for endnotes over footnotes is almost inexplicable except in terms of his own internal conflicts over issues of readability. Looking at the rare copies of his first volume without footnotes, one can see that the page is less busy and more inviting than the more familiar be-noted pages of later volumes. Gibbon also had no ready models of genuinely well-written and completely sourced writing; within the immense world of antiquarian learning he had explored for twenty years before beginning his project, there were beautifully written books and there were completely cited books, but almost no books that coupled scholarly apparatus with modern stylistic appeal. Bayle came closest, but his dialogic textual relations were arbitrary and scattered (though often delightful and witty). Most footnoted texts were turgid and pedantic. Gibbon himself had no Gibbon as his model for successful dialogic and citational integration. Thus, despite his book's success, he distrusted to the end of his life the stylistic possibilities of notational strategies that he (and Strahan) had invented in the *Decline and Fall*, complaining in 1791 that "I have often repented of my compliance" with the public importunity for footnotes (194).

## 2 TESTIMONIES OF AUTHORS.

tors are wont to insist upon such, and how material they seem to themselves if to none other. Forgive me therefore gentle reader, if (following learned example) I ever and anon become tedious; allow me to take the same pain to find whether my author were good or bad, well or ill-natured, modest or arrogant; as another, whether his were fair or brown, short or tall, or whether he wore a coat or a cassock?

We purposed to begin with his Life, Parentage and Education: but as to these, even his Cotemporaries do exceedingly differ. One saith, he was educated at home<sup>1</sup>; another that he was bred abroad at St. Omer's by Jesuits<sup>2</sup>; a third, not at St. Omer's, but at Oxford<sup>3</sup>; a fourth, that he had no University education at all<sup>4</sup>. Those who allow him to be bred at home, differ as much concerning his Tutor: One saith, he was kept by his father on purpose<sup>5</sup>; a second, that he was an itinerant priest<sup>6</sup>; a third, that he was a parson<sup>7</sup>; one calleth him a secular clergyman of the church of Rome<sup>8</sup>; another, a Monk.<sup>9</sup> As little agree they about his Father; whom one supposeth, like the father of Hesiod, a tradesman or merchant<sup>10</sup>; another a husbandman, &c.<sup>11</sup> Nor hath an author been wanting to give our Poet such a Father, as Apuleius hath to Plato, Iamblicus to Pythagoras, and divers to Homer; namely a *Dæmon*: For thus Mr. Gildon.<sup>12</sup> "Certain it is, that his Original is not from Adam but the devil, and that he wanteth nothing but horns and tail to be the exact resemblance of his infernal father." Finding therefore such contrariety of opinions, and (whatever be ours of this sort of generation) not being fond to enter into controversy, we shall defer writing the life of our Poet, till authors can determine among themselves what parents or education he had, or whether he had any education or parents at all?

<sup>1</sup> Giles Jacob's Lives of Poets, vol. 2. in his life.    <sup>2</sup> Dennis's reflect. on the Essay on Crit.  
<sup>3</sup> Dunciad distilled, p. 4.    <sup>4</sup> Guardian, No. 40.    <sup>5</sup> Jacob, *ib.*    <sup>6</sup> Dunc. diff. *ibid.*  
<sup>7</sup> Farmer P. and his son, *ibid.* verse 32.    <sup>8</sup> Dunc. diff.    <sup>9</sup> Characters of the Times, p. 45;    <sup>10</sup> Female Dunciad, pag. ult.    <sup>11</sup> Dunc. diff.  
<sup>12</sup> Whom Mr. Curl (Key to the Dunc. 1st. edit.) declares to be author of the *Character of Mr. Pope* and his writings, in a letter to a friend, printed for S. Pepping. 1716. where this passage is to be found, pag. 10.

Proceed

Figure 16 Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad Variorum*, 1729

## R I C H A R D I. 333

the rabble set fire to the houses, and made way thro' the flames to exercise their pillage and violence\*; the usual licentiousness of London, which the sovereign power with difficulty restrained, broke out with fury, and continued these outrages; the houses of the rich citizens, tho' Christians, were next attacked and plundered†; and weariness and satiety at last put an end to the disorder: Yet when the King impowered Glanville, the justiciary, to inquire into the authors of these crimes, the guilt was found to involve so many of the most considerable inhabitants, that it was deemed more prudent to drop the prosecution; and very few suffered the punishment due to this enormity‡. But the disorder stopped not at London. The inhabitants of the other cities of England, hearing of this execution of the Jews, imitated the barbarous example§; and in York, five hundred of that nation, who had retired into the castle for safety, and found themselves unable to defend the place, murdered their own wives and children, threw the dead bodies over the walls upon the populace, and then setting fire to the houses, perished in the flames¶. The gentry of the neighbourhood, who were all indebted to the Jews, ran to the cathedral, where their bonds were kept, and made a solemn bonfire of the papers before the altar‡.

Chap. X.  
1189.

THE antient situation of England, when the people possessed little riches and the public no credit, made it impossible for the sovereigns to bear the expences of a steady or durable war, even on their frontiers; much less could they find regular means for the support of such distant expeditions as those into Palestine, which were more the result of popular frenzy than of sober reason or deliberate policy. Richard, therefore, knew, that he must carry with him all the treasure requisite for his enterprize, and that both the remoteness of his own country and its poverty made it unable to furnish him with those continued supplies, which the exigencies of so perilous a war must necessarily require. His father had left him a treasure of above an hundred thousand marks\*; and the King, negligent of every interest, but that of present glory, endeavoured to augment this sum by all expedients, however pernicious to the public, or dangerous to royal authority†: He put to sale the revenues and manors of the crown; the offices of greatest trust and power, even those of forester and sheriff, which antiently were so important‡, became venal; the dignity of chief justiciary, in whose hands

\* Ann. Waverl. p. 163. Knyghton, p. 2471. † Hoveden, p. 657. Bened. Abb. p. 560. M. Paris, p. 108. W. Heming, p. 514. ‡ Diceto, p. 647. Knyghton, p. 2401.  
§ Chron. de Dunst. p. 43. Wykes, p. 34. W. Heming, p. 516. Diceto, p. 651.  
¶ Hoveden, p. 665. Bened. Abb. p. 586. M. Paris, p. 111. † W. Heming, p. 518.  
• Hoveden, p. 656. ‡ Bened. Abb. p. 568.  
‡ The Sheriff had antiently both the administration of justice and the management of the King's revenue committed to him in the county. See *State of Sheriff's Accounts*.

Figure 17 David Hume, *History of England*, edition of 1767

complete, including author, title, volume, place of publication, and section or page; and his discursive notes are impressive and wide-ranging in their learning, blending immense comparative reading with Gibbon's own cool wit and subtlety. Gibbon's footnotes act as a textual antistrophe, juxtaposing his decline narrative of the millennia-long decay of Rome with a progression narrative about the rise and development of defensible analytical historical methods culminating in him, Gibbon, and his book, a phoenix out of the ashes of Rome (Figure 18).<sup>15</sup>

### Professionalization and Formalization

During the nineteenth century, the footnote techniques of Gibbon's time were formalized but not radically changed. The term *footnote* itself does not enter the language, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, until 1841. The great formalizers of scholarly writings were, of course, the German scholars and scientists of the early and middle nineteenth century. Leopold von Ranke, Hermann von Helmholtz, Alexander von Humboldt, Wilhelm Wundt, and other famous German scholars set a tone and created methodologies that no scholar anywhere in the Western world could afford to ignore. But in terms of citation structures, they added little to the synthesis that Gibbon had already achieved. In Figure 19 we can see a page from the 1844 English translation of Ranke's magisterial *History of the Reformation in Germany* of 1839. Ranke, like Gibbon, masterfully mixes citation and discursive notes (though his discursive notes are nowhere near as witty or dialogic-with-text as Gibbon's). His extraordinary command of his sources, from ancient church documents through contemporary nineteenth-century scholarship, is clear. But Ranke's footnotes assume a bifurcated readership more clearly than Gibbon's, in part because "historian" is already becoming a professional self-definition for Ranke that it never completely became for Edward Gibbon, Esquire.

Gibbon's audience in 1776 had consisted of general intellectual readers—most of them men who had been educated, as he had, in the classics. When he was attacked for his cool and agnostic assessment of early Christianity, it was on doctrinal rather than on methodological grounds. Gibbon's notes reflect enough bibliographical information to allow such an audience to find the texts he was using and to check him if they so desired, but the audience for his notes was

---

<sup>15</sup> And when one picks up one of the synoptic nineteenth-century editions of Gibbon, like H. H. Milman's, which evaluate his use of sources with their own footnotes, one gets the vertiginous dialogic prospect of hearing a conversation in which, for instance, Milman comments on Guizot's comments on Ste. Croix's comments on Gibbon's comments on Quintus Curtius.

180

## THE DECLINE AND FALL

CHAP. XX. who, in the first moments of his reign, acknowledged and adored the majesty of the true and only God<sup>2</sup>. The learned Eusebius has ascribed the faith of Constantine to the miraculous sign which was displayed in the heavens whilst he meditated and prepared the Italian expedition<sup>3</sup>. The historian Zosimus maliciously asserts, that the emperor had imbrued his hands in the blood of his eldest son, before he publicly renounced the gods of Rome and of his ancestors<sup>4</sup>. The perplexity produced by these discordant authorities, is derived from the behaviour of Constantine himself. According to the strictness of ecclesiastical language, the first of the *Christian* emperors was unworthy of that name, till the moment of his death; since it was only during his last illness that he received, as a catechumen, the imposition of hands<sup>5</sup>, and was afterwards admitted, by the initiatory rites of baptism, into the number of the faithful<sup>6</sup>. The Christianity of Constantine must be allowed in a much more vague and qualified

<sup>2</sup> Lactant. Divin. Institut. i. i. vii. 27. The first and most important of these passages is indeed wanting in twenty-eight manuscripts; but it is found in nineteen. If we weigh the comparative value of those manuscripts, one of 900 years old, in the king of France's library, may be alleged in its favour; but the passage is omitted in the correct manuscript of Bologna, which the P. de Montfaucon ascribes to the sixth or seventh century (Diazium Italic. p. 409.). The taste of most of the editors (except Isæus, see Lactant. edit. Dufresnoy, tom. i. p. 595.) has felt the genuine style of Lactantius.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. in Vit. Constant. l. i. c. 27—32.

<sup>4</sup> Zosimus, ~~l. i. c. 27—32.~~

<sup>5</sup> That rite was *always* used in making a catechumen (see Bingham's Antiquities, l. x. c. 1. p. 419. Dom. Chardon, Hist. des Sacrements, tom. i. p. 62.), and Constantine received it for the *first* time (Euseb. in Vit.

Constant. l. iv. c. 61.) immediately before his baptism and death. From the connection of these two facts, Valesius (ad loc. Euseb.) has drawn the conclusion which is reluctantly admitted by Tillemont (Hist. des Empereurs, tom. iv. p. 628.), and opposed with feeble arguments by Mosheim (p. 968.).

<sup>6</sup> Euseb. in Vit. Constant. l. iv. c. 61, 62, 63. The legend of Constantine's baptism at Rome, thirteen years before his death, was invented in the eighth century, as a proper motive for his *donation*. Such has been the gradual progress of knowledge, that a story, of which Cardinal Baronius (Annal. Ecclesiast. A. D. 324, No. 43—49.) declared himself the unblushing advocate, is now feebly supported, even within the verge of the Vatican. See the Antiquitates Christianæ, tom. ii. p. 232; a work published with six approbations at Rome, in the year 1751, by Father Mamachi, a learned Dominican.

Figure 18 Edward Gibbon, History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Volume 2, 1781 (with footnotes rather than endnotes)



days, others to which one for 7000 or 8000 years are attached: one morning benediction of peculiar efficacy was sent by a pope to a king of Cyprus; whosoever repeats the prayer of the venerable Bede the requisite number of times, the Virgin Mary will be at hand to help him for thirty days before his death, and will not suffer him to depart unabsolved. The most extravagant expressions were uttered in praise of the Virgin: "The eternal Daughter of the eternal Father, the heart of the indivisible Trinity:" it was said, "Glory be to the Virgin, to the Father, and to the Son."<sup>1</sup> Thus, too, were the saints invoked as meritorious servants of God, who, by their merits, could win our salvation, and could extend peculiar protection to those who believed in them; as, for example, St. Sebaldus, "the most venerable and holy captain, helper and defender of the imperial city of Nürnberg."

Relics were collected with great zeal. Elector Frederick of Saxony gathered together in the church he endowed at Wittenberg, 5005 particles, all preserved in entire standing figures, or in exquisitely wrought reliquaries, which were shown to the devout people every year on the Monday after Misericordia.<sup>2</sup> In the presence of the princes assembled at the diet, the high altar of the cathedral of Treves was opened, and "the seamless coat of our dear Lord Jesus Christ," found in it; the little pamphlets in which this miracle was represented in wood-cuts, and announced to all the world, are to be found in the midst of the acts of the diet.<sup>3</sup> Miraculous images of Our Lady were discovered;—one, for example, in Eischel in the diocese of Constance; at the Iphof boundary, by the road-side, a sitting figure of the Virgin, whose miracles gave great offence to the monks of Birklingen, who possessed a similar one; and in Regensburg, the beautiful image, for which a magnificent church was built by the contributions of the faithful, out of the ruins of a synagogue belonging to the expelled Jews. Miracles were worked without ceasing at the tomb of Bishop Benno in Meissen; madmen were restored to reason, the deformed became straight, those infected with the plague were healed; nay, a fire at Merseburg was extinguished by Bishop Bose merely uttering the name of Benno; while those who doubted his power and sanctity were assailed by misfortunes.<sup>4</sup> When Trithemius recommended this miracle-worker to the pope for canonization, he did not forget to remark that he had been a rigid and energetic supporter of the church party, and had resisted the tyrant Henry IV.<sup>5</sup> So intimately were all these ideas connected. A confraternity formed for the purpose of the frequent repetition of the rosary (which is, in fact, nothing more than the devout and affectionate recollection of the joys of the Holy Virgin), was founded by Jacob Sprenger, the

<sup>1</sup> Extracts from the prayer-books: *Hortulus Anime*, *Salus Anime*, *Gilgengart*, and others in Riederer, *Nachrichten zur Büchergeschichte*, ii. 157-411.

<sup>2</sup> The second Sunday after Easter, so called from the Introit for that Sunday in the Roman Missal, which begins, "*Misericordia Domini plena est terra*," and gives the key to the variable parts of the Mass. *Zaygung des Hochlobwürdigsten Heilighums*, 1509. (The Showing of the most venerable Relics, 1509.) Extract in Heller's *Lucas Kranach*, i., p. 350.

<sup>3</sup> Chronicle of Limpurg in Hontheim, p. 1122. Browerus is again very solemn on this occasion.

<sup>4</sup> *Miracula S. Bennonis ex impresso*, Romæ 1521, in Mencken, *Scriptores Rer. Germ.* ii. p. 1887.

<sup>5</sup> His letter in Rainaldus, 1506, nr. 42.

Figure 19 Leopold von Ranke, *History of the Reformation in Germany*, 1839, translation of 1844

assumed to be gentleman-scholars like him—men who had not read as deeply or widely as he had, perhaps, but not historical specialists.<sup>16</sup> Ranke is not in quite the same position, though his notes look much the same. By 1839, within a German scholarly tradition then over fifty years old, Ranke's audience was divided. He did have lay readers, who could read his detailed narrative of the sixteenth century for the important cultural history it was without consulting or judging his use of sources, but he was also writing for other specialist historians—some of them his enemies—who could and would scan his footnotes closely for evidence of what he had found and what he had missed. For the former audience, detailed publication information about nonarchival materials in citation notes was not needed; for the latter audience, it was redundant. Ranke does not have to give a complete reference citation to Milman's *History of Latin Christianity* because there was only one edition of it; his audience either would not seek it out or probably already owned it.

But Ranke had to consider such issues, as do we.<sup>17</sup> It is this gradual professionalization of German scholarship, with its competitive and even agonistic edge, that would drive the forms and methods of citation systems henceforward, especially in the developing American academic world. When American scholars returned from German universities in the nineteenth century to establish the American university system of graduate research institutions superadded to undergraduate colleges, they brought with them the German attitude toward citation rather than the English. This loyalty to scholarly precision met the more indigenous English-based attitude of gentleman-amateurism in writing from sources, and the resulting mixture of attitudes took more than a century to sort out. Should sourced writing conceive of a popular or a specialist audience? Were footnotes a necessity or mere "booksellers' learning"? From 1865 onward the movement in citation systems in America—which increasingly provided the world a model—was toward more professional formalization. More and more, in all fields, scholarly work was seen as written

---

<sup>16</sup> Says Gibbon in his *Memoirs*, "Twenty happy years have been animated by the labour of my history; and it's [sic] success has given me a name, a rank, a character in the world to which I should not otherwise have been entitled. . . . [An author] should not be indifferent to the fair testimonies of private and public esteem. Even his social sympathy may be gratified by the idea, that, now in the present hour, he is imparting some degree of amusement or knowledge to his friends in a distant land: that, one day his mind will be familiar to the grandchildren of those who are yet unborn" (187-88). Twenty happy years! Amusement or knowledge! This is a voice antithetical to professionalism. For Gibbon, it was his mind that would live in his history, not his professional methodology.

<sup>17</sup> See Grafton's excellent chapter on Ranke and his professional methodological detractors and enemies in *The Footnote*.

for a delimited discourse community that wanted specific sorts of information about, attitudes toward, and access to the works that undergird the text at hand. But what forms were to be used, standardized upon? Early disciplinary journals—even *PMLA*—show a riot of different notational systems at work, ranging from rudimentary symbol-based notes to completely modern-looking numbered notes à la Gibbon. There were no formal rules.

Here is the historical point at which the genre of printers' manuals, which had existed in cruder forms at least since the seventeenth century, begin to segue over into formal manuals for authors and editors—into style manuals. The US Geological Survey published its *Suggestions for the Preparation of Manuscript* in 1892, beginning the regularization of formats within the government. The booklet, authored by William Croffut, proposed footnote format consisting of author, full title, place of publication, date, and page (13).<sup>18</sup> In 1894 the US Government Printing Office issued its first *Manual of Style*, which relied on Croffut and on the earlier English *Hart's Rules for Compositors and Readers* from the Oxford University Press. These were still primarily printers' manuals, however, that detailed the conventions of word-splitting, spellings of names of countries, and of punctuation usage for professional compositors (Howell x-xi). The first style manual really to be used primarily by authors and editors was the University of Chicago Press *Manual of Style*, whose first edition was published in 1906. Though this book was still largely for use within the publishing house, it does contain four pages of "Hints to Authors and Editors" and three pages on "Footnotes" (Figure 20).

It was not until this first *Manual of Style* appeared that some real standardization appeared in footnoting. The Chicago *Manual* formalized the elements of footnoting that scholars had recognized de facto for centuries as necessary for useful source searching: It provided for consecutive numbered footnotes, for a limited amount of latinized reference to prevent repetition, and for standardized publication information. For book references, it suggested author, title, place of publication, date, and pages; for periodical references, it required journal title, volume number, date, and pages. Both of these *Manual of Style* formats assumed that readers might want to search out and use all the sources mentioned by an author, and the information required was meant to do that, and nothing more.

---

<sup>18</sup> Croffut's pithy little book is still worth reading today. "The primary function of a foot-note," he says, "is the publication of matter which is unimportant to most readers but important to a few. It is also legitimately used for parenthetical and partially irrelevant matter of such extent that its insertion in the main text would interrupt the logical sequence. These considerations should determine doubts as to whether given matter should be included in the text or in foot-notes" (7).

## FOOTNOTES

214. For reference indices, as a rule, use superior figures. Only in special cases should asterisks, daggers, etc., be employed; for instance, in tabular or algebraic matter, where figures would be likely to cause confusion. Index figures in the text should be placed after the punctuation marks:

. . . . the niceties of style which were then invading Attic prose,<sup>\*</sup> and which made . . . .

<sup>\*</sup> In particular the avoidance of hiatus.

$F = \gamma^2 + \gamma^3$ ;<sup>\*</sup>

<sup>\*</sup> Schenk's equation.

When figures are not used, the sequence of indices should be:

\* ("asterisk" or "star"), † ("dagger"), ‡ ("double dagger"), § ("section mark"), || ("parallels"), ¶ ("paragraph mark").

215. Where references to the same work follow each other closely and uninterruptedly, use *ibid.* instead of repeating the title. This *ibid.* takes the place of as much of the previous reference as is repeated. *Ibid.* should, however, not ordinarily be used for the first footnote on a verso (left-hand) page; it is better usage either to repeat the title, if short, or to use *loc. cit.* or *op. cit.*:

<sup>\*</sup> Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, chap. 4.

<sup>\*</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>\*</sup> *Ibid.*, chap. 5.

<sup>\*</sup> Spencer, *loc. cit.*

Figure 20 University of Chicago Press, *Manual of Style*, 1906

The Chicago format was gradually adopted, either formally or informally, by many presses and most humanities disciplines. It was used with elasticity, however, and a flexible adaptation to the “house style” of different journals. The Modern Language Association, which had been founded in 1884 to promote the study of the vernacular languages, had from the beginning provided de facto models of citation style for the humanities in its journal, *PMLA*, but for many years its requirements were informal. Authors for early numbers of *PMLA* could, for instance, still choose to use the “gentlemanly” English system of footnote symbols rather than numbers. After 1906, however, many *PMLA* articles began to move toward Chicago style (Figure 21). Through the first half of this century, few changes were rung on Chicago footnote style within the humanities, and hundreds of thousands of students were put through their paces on footnote conventions for research papers. By 1927 the *Chicago Manual* had grown considerably, to a ninth edition of four hundred pages, and it had become a rather forbidding and specialized tome. The University of Chicago Press asked Kate Turabian, who was Dissertation Secretary at the Harper Library, to write a simpler and more directive version of the *Style Manual*’s guidelines for dissertation and thesis writers, and in 1937 the first edition of Turabian’s *Manual for Writers of Dissertations* appeared. Turabian’s book became the popular version of the *Style Manual*, and “Turabian style” came over the next six decades to be a standard for the humanities.

By the middle of the twentieth century, most citation formats had been brought to a recognizable state of modernity. In the second part of this essay (*Rhetoric Review* 17.2, *Spring* 1999), we will see how those formats demanded different epistemic values and how different fields made self-defining choices by their use of them.

### Works Cited

- Achtert, Walter S., and Joseph Gibaldi. *The MLA Style Manual*. New York: MLA, 1985.  
 Agger, Ben. *Soci(onto)logy: A Disciplinary Reading*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1989.  
 Barney, Stephen A., ed. *Annotation and Its Texts*. New York: Oxford UP, 1991.  
 Browne, Thomas. *Urn-Burial*. London: Henry Brome, 1658.  
 Burton, Robert. *Anatomy of Melancholy*. Oxford: John Litchfield, 1621.  
*The Chicago Manual of Style, Thirteenth Edition*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1982.  
 Cochrane, J. A. Dr. Johnson’s Printer: *The Life of William Strahan*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1964.  
 Conarroe, Joel. “Editor’s Column.” *PMLA* 97 (May 1982): 307-08.  
 Conference of Biological Editors. *Style Manual for Biological Journals*. Washington, DC: CBE, 1960.  
 ———. *Scientific Style and Format: The CBE Manual for Authors, Editors, and Publishers*, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Now the least Christian feature in the legend is the Fisher King and his cult. The parallelism with Christ apparently stops with the name Fisher. If we disregard for the moment the version of Robert, the ritual in which he appears is certainly not founded on the synoptic accounts of the Last Supper, and the striking features of it have no immediate counterpart in Christian or Biblical lore.<sup>1</sup> The true explanation I believe is to be sought elsewhere. Before proceeding further, however, it will be well to grasp clearly his salient traits as they present themselves in the various versions of the legend.

The following abbreviations will be used :

- C. Crestien, before 1180.<sup>2</sup>
- W. Wolfram, about 1217.<sup>3</sup>
- Wa. Wauchier de Denain.<sup>4</sup>
- G. Gerbert de Montreuil.<sup>5</sup>
- M. Manessier.<sup>6</sup>
- R. Robert de Boron.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I do not wish to imply that the Eucharist and the Grail ceremony may not go back to similar primitive rites ; see Eisler, *Origins of the Eucharist*, cited below.

<sup>2</sup> Wechsler, *Sage*, 148 ff. The *Conte del Graal* is dedicated to Philip of Flanders. Inasmuch as Philip was a patron of letters (cf. Brakemann, *Les plus anciens chansonniers français*, 1891, p. 13), Crestien's praise of him requires no special explanation. Thus we can agree with Gaston Paris (*Journal des Savants*, 1902, p. 305), that the poem was written about 1175.

<sup>3</sup> Martin, *Parzival*, p. xiii.

<sup>4</sup> Paul Meyer, *Rom.*, xxxii, 583. For the best synopsis see Jessie L. Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval*, London, 1906, ch. II. Wauchier also translated a series of Saints Lives for Philip, Marquis de Namur. I do not here distinguish between Wauchier and Pseudo-Wauchier (see Feinzel, *op. cit.*), as I am not yet prepared to take sides on the question ; see Jeanroy, *Revue des lang. rom.* (1907), L, 541-544.

<sup>5</sup> Also author of the *Conte de la Violette* ; see Kraus, *Ueber Gerb. de Montreuil*, 1897 ; Wilmotte, *Gerb. de M. et les écrivains qui lui sont attribués*, Brussels, 1900, and Gröber's *Grundriss*, II, 509.

<sup>6</sup> Martin, *op. cit.*, p. li.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. above ; the abbreviation (R.) will be used only for the Metrical *Joseph*.

- Croffut, W. A. *Preparation of Manuscript and Illustrations for Publication by the U.S. Geological Survey*. Washington, DC: USGS, 1892.
- Gibaldi, Joseph, and Walter S. Achtert. *The MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: MLA, 1984.
- Gibbon, Edward. *Memoirs of My Life*. Ed. Georges A. Bonnard. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1969.
- Grafton, Anthony. *Commerce with the Classics: Ancient Texts and Renaissance Readers*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1997.
- . *The Footnote: A Curious History*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1997.
- Harvey, Gabriel. *Four Letters and Certain Sonnets. The Works of Gabriel Harvey*. Ed. Alexander B. Grosart. 3 vols. London: Privately printed, 1884-85.
- Heilbrun, Carolyn G., et al. "Report of the Advisory Committee on Documentation Style." *PMLA* 97 (May 1982): 318-24.
- Howell, John Bruce. *Style Manuals of the English-Speaking World: A Guide*. Phoenix: Oryx, 1983.
- Hume, David. *Letters of David Hume*. Ed. J. Y. T. Greig. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1932.
- "Instructions in Regard to Preparation of Manuscripts." *Psychological Bulletin* 26 (Feb. 1929): 57-63.
- Lincoln, Bruce. *Authority: Construction and Corrosion*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1994.
- Lipking, Lawrence. "The Marginal Gloss." *Critical Inquiry* 3 (Summer 1977): 609-55.
- Loewenstein, Joseph F. *Idem: Italics and the Genetics of Authorship*. *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 20 (Fall 1990): 205-24.
- Louttit, Chauncey M. "The Use of Bibliographies in Psychology." *Psychological Review* 36 (July 1929): 341-47.
- Manual of Style: Being a Compilation of the Typographical Rules in Force at the University of Chicago Press, To Which are Appended Specimens of Types in Use*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1906.
- Melanchthon, Philip. "Inaugural Lecture." *Melanchthonis Opera, Corpus Reformatorum*. Ed. Carolus Bretschneider. Vol. xi. Halis Saxonum: C. A. Schwetschke, 1834. 21-30.
- Modern Language Association. *The MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*. New York: MLA, 1977.
- . "The MLA Style Sheet." *PMLA* 66 (April 1951): 3-31.
- . *The MLA Style Sheet, Second Edition*. New York: MLA, 1970.
- McFarland, Thomas. "Who was Benjamin Whichcote? or, The Myth of Annotation." In Barney, 152-77.
- Nashe, Thomas. *Have with you to Saffron-Walden. The Works of Thomas Nashe*. Ed. Ronald B. McKerrow, III. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958. 1-139.
- Ong, Walter J. *The Presence of the Word*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1967.
- . *Rhetoric, Romance, and Technology*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1971.
- Pollard, Alfred W., ed. *Records of the English Bible*. London: Oxford UP, 1911.
- "Preparation of Articles for Publication in the Journals of the American Psychological Association." *Psychological Bulletin* 41 (June 1944): 345-76.
- "Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association." *Psychological Bulletin* 49 (July 1952): 389-449.
- Rose, Mark. "The Author as Proprietor: Donaldson vs. Becket and the Genealogy of Modern Authorship." *Representations* 23 (Summer 1988): 51-85.
- Smalley, Beryl. "The Bible in the Medieval Schools." *The Cambridge History of the Bible*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1969: 197-219.
- Sprat, Thomas. *The History of the Royal Society of London*. London: J. Martyn, 1667.
- Timperley, C. H. *The Printer's Manual*. London: H. Johnson, 1838.
- Tribble, Evelyn B. *Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England*. Charlottesville: U of Virginia P, 1993.
- Turabian, Kate L. *A Manual for Writers of Dissertations*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1937.



Turabian, Kate L. *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1955.



Robert J. Connors is Professor of English and Director of the Writing Center at the University of New Hampshire. He is the author or coauthor of a number of articles and books on rhetorical history and theory and on the history of composition. Winner of the 1982 Richard Braddock Award and cowinner of the 1985 Mina P. Shaughnessy Award, his historical monograph on the development of modern composition teaching and studies, *Composition-Rhetoric*, was published by the University of Pittsburgh Press in 1997. He is coauthor of the fourth edition of Edward P. J. Corbett's *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*.