

Early-Modern
“Speech” Marks

;

Nick Blackburn

ABSTRACT

The essay presents a revised history of the punctuation mark [“], drawn from the earliest communities who made it their own. By situating the development of [“] in its historical context, from first uses of the dipole [>] by the Greek scholar Aristarchus, it explains how it was the general applications which persisted into the sixteenth century and beyond, before the mark finally settled into its modern use to enclose quotations. While literary and bibliographical scholars have suggested that emphatic marking was primarily attached to rhetorical figures such as sententia, it is shown that printed marks were used by authors to achieve a rich variety of semantic effects and by their readers to create personal editions.

Beginning with a modern comparison, the adoption of [/] as a new mark of punctuation for modern British drama, the essay explains how peculiarities in the deployment of [“] in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century texts—including works as central to the literary canon as Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*—are situated at a transition point between a small or ‘privy’ group and what the Shakespeare folio called ‘the great variety of readers.’

A stroke (/) indicates the point of interruption in overlapping dialogue.
(Author's Note, in Sarah Kane, *Cleansed*, 1998)

Here is to be noted, that such partes and chapters which be marked and noted
' with such semy circles at the head of the vearse or line, with such other
' texts, may be left unread in the publique reading to the people, that therby
' other chapters and places of the scripture makyng more to their edification
' and capacitie may come in their roomes. '

(Editor's Note, in Matthew Parker, *The holie Bible*, 1568)

INTRODUCTION

Signposts respond to something new in the landscape. Sometimes though, that new feature turns out to be visitors. As time passes it can be hard to know whether a sign appeared at a certain time because of a physical addition or because the local community expanded to a point at which not everyone could be assumed to know their way to the post office. As with visitors, so too with readers. A word or symbol begins its life in a language or a genre of literature with a small group of innovators and spreads through the work of those who share their values; gaining its meaning in both cases from the transactions of a community of users. The two explanatory notes above both appeared in print around the time their chosen mark of punctuation was gaining authority in English printed books. Providing a narrative for the stroke [/] and those 'semy circles' in Parker's margin ['] is harder than might be expected, but in both cases the results are rewarding. Shared behavior is one of the things that helps observers to define one community from another. With punctuation, observing these shared forms and how their usage changes over time also makes it possible to distinguish normal practice from that which is more unusual.

In the case of [/], its appearance in the Author's Note to *Cleansed* was printed sixteen years after the initial printed use of that mark in a play-text, the first edition of Caryl Churchill's *Top Girls* in 1982. The mark was introduced as follows:

when one character starts speaking before the other has finished, the point of interruption is marked / .

eg. ISABELLA: This is the Emperor of Japan? / I once met the
Emperor of Morocco.
NIJO: In fact he was the ex-Emperor.¹

Churchill had actually begun to use oblique lines in her 1980 play *Three More Sleepless Nights*, a short work that was not to be published until ten years later:

I wrote the dialogue in the first scene as two columns, with the slashes. I'd got the idea from some sociology book I'd read which used slashes when transcribing actual conversations of teenagers I think. But I can't remember what book. Soon after I realised how useful slashes would be for the dinner party in *Top Girls*.²

The slashes Churchill encountered were one of the transcription conventions for conversation analysis developed by Gail Jefferson in the mid-1960s and subsequently adopted across the social sciences. Jefferson's story might have appealed to her. She was enrolled as a dance student at UCLA when she began her first transcriptions as a typist at the Department of Public Health. Her transcriptions became part of the material for the sociologist Harvey Sacks's research on conversation and Jefferson became his Ph.D. student. It was the beginning of a life's work spent excavating the minutiae of the human voice, culminating in ten years spent transcribing the Watergate tapes. Jefferson had used double obliques [//] to represent 'the point at which a current speaker's talk is overlapped by the talk of another.'³ This has since been replaced in conversation analysis transcriptions by the use of a left bracket to indicate 'the point of overlap onset' as follows:

Louise: 'N how tall [are you, Al,
Roger: [How tall 'r you Al.⁴

In this way Churchill's note records a moment of exchange between two communities at particular times in their development. There is a specific social and literary

1. Caryl Churchill, *Top Girls* (London: Methuen, 1982), 4.

2. Email correspondence from Caryl Churchill received 9th September 2010. I am grateful to both Caryl Churchill and her literary agent Mel Kenyon for clarifying this point.

3. Gail Jefferson, 'Glossary of transcript symbols' in Gene H. Lerner, editor, *Conversation Analysis, Studies from the first generation* (Amsterdam, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2004), 13-31, 24.

4. Jefferson, Glossary of transcript symbols.

context for the markings, rooted in one artist's attraction to the work of scientists. Placed alongside similar notes in the work of Martin Crimp, Mark Ravenhill, Kane and others it is possible to chart the way that interest spread and some networks of sympathy between those writers. As Beckett and Pinter had used [...] as a way of exploring breaks or breaking-points in on-stage relationships, so playwrights of the 1980s and 1990s were drawn to the possibilities for overlapping speech.

It will also be possible for future bibliographers to make use of unusual instances of [/] and the absence of explanatory notes in a particular edition. For example, the use of [/] without further explanation is one of several features of the 1996 edition of Ravenhill's *Shopping and Fucking* which suggests it was put together in particular circumstances.⁵ It may be that these circumstances arose out of a need for late revisions to the play; the relatively low priority of producing a spotless text for what would probably first have been a version to be included in the program for the premiere; some other deadline; the author's other commitments or personal life. These concerns may be much closer to the reasons for what Shakespeare scholars once dismissed as 'bad' quartos of plays like *Hamlet* and *King Lear* than was once supposed.⁶ The inverted comma also spread across the English printed page according to patterns of emulation. Emulation of both marks had a primary visual cue. As the editions of previous writers were circulated and approved in the 1980s and 1990s, so too were landmark editions of dramatic and other texts circulated and used as models for *mise-en-page* throughout the early modern period.⁷ [“] is also a mark of punctuation locked in time and to sets of social and bibliographical conditions. Its early life in English is also tied to dramatic texts and reveals a narrative quite different to the one that is usually written.

The earliest name for [‘] and [“], the Greek word ‘diple’ (from ‘diplous’ meaning ‘double’), refers to its two-pronged shape. The prongs are easier to identify in the earliest, arrowhead form of the markings which survive in the French guillemets [«]. Diplai were developed as part of a new series of more precise editorial

⁵ Mark Ravenhill, *Shopping and Fucking* (London: Methuen, 1998). Incorrect attribution to ‘Lulu,’ 39; ‘*of*ver’ for ‘*o*ver,’ 48. Changes of direction are often indicated to the actor or reader by unusual parentheses or dialogue beginning on a new line.

⁶ For a spirited commentary see Randall McCloud, writing as Random Cloud, ‘The Marriage of Good and Bad Quartos,’ *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33.4 (1982), 421–31.

⁷ The most famous early-modern document recording this kind of emulation is John Harington's note to the printer of his *Orlando Furioso*, asking him to include ‘some pretty

knotte’ after the final canto and to set the prose sections ‘in the same printe that Putnam's book ys’; the book in question being *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589, printed two years before *Orlando Furioso*). Both instructions were followed. See British Library, Additional MS. 18920, fol. 336^r. For a fuller discussion see Simon Cauchi, ‘The “Setting Fourth” of Harington's Ariosto,’ *Studies in Bibliography*, 36 (1983), 137–68. Robert Estienne's editions of the tragedies of Robert Garnier were emulated in Mary Sidney's translation of his tragedy *Antonius* and the examples of [“] in the French margins were translated through to the English version.

conventions in the second century BC by the Greek scholar Aristarchus, the sixth librarian at Alexandria, and are preserved in his annotations to the earliest surviving copies of Homer's *Iliad*. At this point in history (in which manuscripts themselves were primarily official records of a work rather than copies for readers) text and commentary were contained in separate papyrus rolls, each fragile and difficult to navigate. Diplai were a way of sounding a general note of caution in the margins of the text which could then be cross-referenced with the commentary if it was available. [“] was a way of highlighting a passage, the meaning of which might be doubtful or thought to be a corruption. The marks continued to be used in Greek manuscripts throughout the medieval period and when Aldus Manutius included them in his widely emulated printed edition of Aristotle (1495) he ensured their transmission across Europe. The form of printed diplai soon began to alter the manuscript conventions which had prompted them: curved-form uses multiplied in sixteenth-century examples, used by Thomas More in his *de Tristitia Christi*, Sir John Cheke in the copy of his Latin version of two Chrysostom homilies presented to Henry VIII and later by the scribe used to prepare the manuscript copy for Hooker's *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiasticall Politie*.⁸ The general applications of the dipole which lent itself to use in Parker's 1568 bible were absolutely in line with the life of the mark over nearly two-thousand years.

Information gathered from the earliest uses of the dipole makes two major contributions to the understanding of [“] as it appears in texts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. First, it makes clear that the meaning of these markings was always specific to context, a general mark of emphasis comparable to a change of color, the addition of a pointing hand or star or a shift into italic. The second contribution derives from that early separation of text and commentary. As contact was lost with the individuals and the intellectual milieu which made the marks, hypersensitivity developed towards the importance of retaining the marks themselves. Edited texts tended to outlive their commentaries and as print culture began to exist in parallel with manuscript culture, diplai were sometimes reproduced out of context, fossilized in the margins of printed books. As manuscript texts were taken up by printers, marks which were originally the reaction of an individual or privy group were broadcast in print to the great variety of readers. I have found exactly the same process at work in the medieval and the early-modern periods.

⁸ See Malcolm Beckwith Parkes, *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993), 58. His plates 55-6 compare the scribal copy of Hooker's Book V, marked up in pencil for the press, with the printer's text.

Misunderstanding general, context-specific marks had been a longstanding problem for editors but the scale of transmission afforded by print increased its range. As a result, sporadic annotations to a text were sometimes given more respect by printers than one might expect. Joseph A. Dane has described in detail the ways in which a particular group of English printers reacted to annotations in their copy texts in his study of Chaucer folios from the 1530s to the 1600s.⁹ Dane's study follows a continuing struggle on the part of the folios' publishers and printers to provide a context for the marks which integrated them into the overall edition. In the edition of 1532, the following three marks occur in the center of fol. 316, part of the second book of Chaucer's *House of Fame* (sig. 316^v).

The marks appear to relate to lines 837, 848, 858, but it is difficult to be sure whether to apply them to the left or right column of the text, to the text with which they share a line or to a larger passage (*figure 1*). In the edition of 1542, the same section is marked, and the marks are also made by combining round brackets and colons (*figure 2*), but the marks relate to different lines (848 and 853, sig. 213^v).

The pattern of marking follows the general application of emphases customarily employed by medieval scribes, where what was preserved was an essentially personal scholarly encounter with the text.¹⁰ The earliest Chaucer folios fossilized a particular moment of confusion, in which printers had to bring an unruly text into conformity with the rigid lines of the galley and the available repertoire of metal type. It is with some care that the preceding text has avoided referring to marks which do not mark speech as 'speech marks.' In an early-modern context, however, it is usual for scholars to classify all instances of ["] as drawing the reader's attention to short, pithy phrases or aphorisms, thus calling them *sententiae* marks or the equivalent word in Greek, *gnomai*. The problem with classifying ["] according to these descriptions was noted by John Lennard in 1991:

G.K. Hunter appears to consider that marked *sententiae* should not be mistaken for anything else: "eighteenth- and nineteenth-century scholars seem to know little of [the practice of marking]. Even in the early years of this century one finds considerable scholars interpreting

⁹ Joseph A. Dane, 'Fists and Filiations in Early Chaucer Folios 1532-1602,' *Studies in Bibliography*, 51 (1997), 49-62, 55. Here references are to Thynne's edition of 1532 (STC 5068) and an edition of 1542 adding the Plowman's Tale (STC 5069-5070). Images © The British Library Board (G.11623 and G.11624 respectively).

¹⁰ John Stowe is known to have accurately reproduced what he found in medieval manuscripts such as Trinity College MS R.3.19. See Bradford Y. Fletcher, 'Printer's Copy for Stowe's *Chaucer*,' 186; Gavin Bone, 'Extant Manuscripts Printed from by W. de Worde with Notes on the Owner, Roger Thorney,' *The Library*, fourth series, 12 (1932), 303-304; Alexandra Gillespie, 'Stowe's "Owlde" Manuscripts of London Chronicles' in *John Stowe (1525-1605) and the Making of the English Past*, 57-68.

Nowe haue I tolde/ if thou haue mynde
 howe I speche of so wnde/ of pure vnde
 Enclyned is vp wards to meue
 This mapst thou felle wel by picue
 And that some stede ywps
 That euery thyng enclyned to is
 hath his vndoythe stede
 That seuweth it without diede
 That vndoyt the maneyoun
 Of euery speche of euery souy
 We it eyther soule or sapie
 hath his vnde place in epre
 And syth that euery thyng ywps
 Out of his vnde place ywps
 Woueth thyder for to go
 If it a way be therfro
 As I haue before proued the
 It seuweth euery soune perde
 Woueth vndely to pare
 As vp in to his vnde place
 And this place of whiche I tel
 There as fame syth to dwel
 In set a myddes of these thie
 heuen/ resthe/ and eke the see
 As most conseruatyse the souy
 Thay is this the conclusyoun
 That euery speche of euery man
 As I the tel first began
 Woueth vp on heygth to pare
 kyndly to JAMES place
 Tel me this nowe saythfully
 haue I not proued thus symply
 Without any subtylle
 Of speche/ or great plosypte
 Of termes of Philosophie
 Of fygures of Portre
 Of colours of resthorpe
 Perde it ought the to syse
 for harde langage/ and harde matere
 Is encombrous for to here
 At ones/ wost thou not wel this
 And I answered and sayd yea
 Ah ha (quod he) so so I can
 Leudy vnto a leude man
 speke/ and shewe hym suche bylles
 That he may shabe hem by the bylles
 So passable they shuden be
 But tel me this nowe pray I the

(:):)

(:):)

(:):)

Howe thynketh the my conclusyon
 A good perswasyon
 (Quod I) it is and syse to be
 Right so as thou hast proued me
 By god (quod he) and as I seue
 Thou shalt haue yet or it be eue
 Of euery worde of this sentence
 A prose/ by experyence
 And wuth thyne eares heren wel
 Toppe and taple/ and euerydel
 That euery worde that spoken is
 Cometh in to JAMES house ywps
 As I haue sayd/ what wyle thou more
 And wuth this woide vpper to fore
 he began/ and sayd by saynt JAME
 Nowe wyl we speke al of game
 Howe sacrest thou nowe (quod he) to me
 Wel (quod I) nowe se (quod he)
 By thy trouth yonde adowne
 Where that thou vnowest any towne
 Or house/ or any other thyng
 And whyan thou hast of aught vno wyng
 Love that thou warie me
 And I anon shall tel the
 Howe farre that thou arte nowe therfro
 And I addwne gan to soeken tho
 And behelde scldes and playns
 Nowe hylles/ and nowe mountayns
 Nowe vales/ and nowe forestes
 And nowe vnneth great bectes
 Nowe ryuers/ nowe lites
 Nowe to wnes/ nowe great trees
 Nowe shippes saylyng in the see
 But thus soone in a whyte he
 Was stowen fro the grounde so hpe
 That al the woulde as to myne eye
 No more seemed than a puche
 Or els was the epre so thyebe
 That I might it not descerne
 With that he spade to me so perue
 And sayd: Serst thou any toben
 Or aught/ that in this woulde is of spoken
 I sayde nay/ No wonder is
 (Quod he) for neuer halfe so hpe as this
 Was Alexander of Macedon
 kyng: Or of Rome day Sapion
 That sawe in dreame at poynt deuyse
 Henry and crthe/ hel and paradyse

Acche

Figure 1 (above) and Figure 2 (opposite)

The seconde boke of fame.

By experience, for yf that thou
 Thew in a water nowe a stone
 well wost thou it wyl make anone
 A lytle roundle as a cerele
 In a ventur, as brode as a conrele
 And ryght anone thou shalt se well
 That whele cerele wyl cause another whele
 And that the thynde, and so for the brother
 Every cerele causynge other
 Broder than hym selfe was
 And thus seo roundel to compass
 Eche aboute other goynge
 Causeth of others sterpnge
 And multiplyng euermo
 Tyl it be so farre go
 That it at bothe bynykes be
 Al though thou may it not se
 Aboute, yet gothe it alway vnder
 Though thou thynke it a greate wonder
 And who so saythe of trouth I vary
 Wydde hym prou the contrary
 And right thus every woerde ywys
 That loud or pryue spoken is
 Mouth first an eye aboute
 And of his mouynge out of doute
 Another eye anone is moued
 As I haue of the water proued
 That every cerele causeth other
 Right so of eye my leue brother
 Everyche eye in other stereth
 More and more, and speche by berech
 In voyce or noyse, woerde or towne
 By through multiplicatiowne
 Tyl it be at the house of fame
 Take it on eruel or in game
 nowe haue I tolde, yf thou haue mynde
 howe speche or towne, of pure kynde
 Euchen d was bywarde to meue
 Thys mayst thou sele well by proue
 And that some stede ywys
 That every thyng enclyned to is
 hath hys kyndlyche stede
 That seuerth it wythouturde
 That kyndly the mancyoun
 Of every speche of every soun
 Be it eyther soule or layre
 hath hys kynde place in eye
 And syth that every thyng ywys
 Out of hys kynde place ywys
 Mouth thys det for to go
 If it a waye be thereto
 As I haue before proued the

It seuerth every soune perde
 Mouth kyndly to pace
 As by into his kynde place
 And thys place of which I tell
 There as fame lyst to dwell
 Is sette a myddes of these the
 heuen, erth, and eke the see
 As moost conseruatyfe the soun
 Than is thys the conclusoun (:)
 That every speche of every man
 As I the tell lyst began
 Mouth by on heghth to pace
 kyndly to fames place

Tel me this nowe saythfully
 haue I not proued thus simply
 wythout any subtyle (:)
 Of speche, or great prolixite
 Of termes of Philosophy
 Of lyguers of Poetrie
 Of colours of orthoynke
 Perde it ought the to lyke
 For harde langage, and harde matere
 Is encombrous for to here
 At ones, wost thou not well thys
 And I answered and sayd yes
 Ya ha quod he, lo so I can
 Leudly vnto a leude man
 Speke and shewe hym suche shyllies
 That he maye shake hem by the bylles
 So palpable they shulden be
 But tell me thys nowe praye I the
 howe thynkerth the my conclusoun?

A good pectiasoun
 (Quod I) it is and lyke to be
 Ryght so as thou hast proued me
 By god, (quod he) and as I leue
 Thou shalt haue per or it be eue
 Of every woerde of thys sentence
 A pte, by experience
 And wyth thyn eares heren well
 Coppe and tayle, and every dell
 That every woerde that spoken is
 Cometh into fames house ywys
 As I haue sayde what wyle thou more
 And wyth thys woerde byper to soie
 he began, and sayde by saynt I ame
 Nowe wylt we speke all of game
 howe farst thou nowe (quod he) to me
 well, quod I) nowe se (quod he)
 By thy trouth ponde adowne
 where that thou knowest any towne
 Or house, or any other thyng

And

commas and inverted commas as quotation marks indicating indebtedness." Less than a page later, however, Hunter concedes that, "gnomic pointing frequently shades into other kinds of emphatic printing, e.g. to indicate a proverb or a quotation or lines important by position, and the distinction is bound to be affected by personal bias." A part of the problem is that although Hunter appears to understand a *sententia* as something specific, neither proverb nor quotation, he gives no definition of the term, except to imply in his opening sentence that it is a rhetorical figure and a maxim. Although he later distinguishes between books in which "a majority of the *sententiae* are marked" and "those which are sporadically marked," a distinction which implies that it is not the mark which marks the *sententia*, it is impossible in practice to identify what Hunter considers to be *sententiae* other than by reference to the typographical conventions which he specifies as having been used to mark them.¹¹

Lennard identified that G.K. Hunter's enquiry, still the main authority for discussions of *sententiae* or gnomic marking in recent criticism, lacked a clear definition of either the thing that was being marked or the marks themselves. A *sententia*-mark: the mark which usually marks a *sententia*. A *sententia*: a phrase most easily defined when marked with *sententia*-markings. In fact the precise definitions of 'sententia,' 'gnome,' 'proverb' and 'maxim' vary according to context. As Mary Thomas Crane has written, 'all of the writers in antiquity who thought carefully about these small forms knew that their connection to truth and rationality was riddled with problems, problems inherent in any product of human thought and language.'¹²

It is a problem for those interested in Elizabethan and Jacobean drama that, out of around a hundred early-modern printed books and manuscripts that contain what has been described as this 'gnomic pointing of one kind or another'—many of which are pieces of comma type being placed in the margins of printed plays at no little expense of time by the compositor—the vast majority are marked in a sporadic and confusing way that seems to have little relevance to rhetorical dissection. Marked, contemporary editions of works by Shakespeare offer a particular challenge to interpretation. They also give a sense of the arbitrary quality that was to define the majority of uses of ["] in the period. The challenge, however, is not how to define the markings but how to provide a context for their presence in a particular edition.

In modern editions the sections marked in the quartos of Hamlet all appear in the third scene of the first act. The quarto does not include act and scene divisions (this was not unusual) and so the reader experiences different movements of the play

¹¹ John Lennard, *But I Digress: The Exploitation of Parentheses in English printed Verse* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), 29. The parentheses are Lennard's own.

¹² Mary Thomas Crane, 'Proverbial and Aphoristic Sayings: Sources of Authority in the English Renaissance,' unpublished doctoral thesis (Harvard University, 1986), 80.

as a series of entrances and exits. Act one, scene three is the scene before Hamlet meets the ghost of his father for the first time. It is to be the moment at which it is revealed that the old King Hamlet was murdered by his brother Claudius, who is now married to Hamlet's mother. His insistence that Hamlet remember him and avenge his murder channels events towards their tragic conclusion. The previous scene is slower and lighter in tone in order to give the audience more of a sense of transition into what is to follow. Both scenes are centrally about giving and receiving advice from family. First Laertes, who is returning home to France now that Claudius has been crowned, warns his sister Ophelia to guard herself against Hamlet's advances. She agrees, warns him to listen to his own advice and to act with equal virtue, and their father Polonius arrives (named Corambis throughout the quarto), who is a member of the Danish privy council. With comic effect, Polonius gives his son a great deal of advice to take away with him, and then proceeds to reiterate Laertes's advice to Ophelia, also at length. 1.3 is an interesting scene given that Ophelia goes on to succeed in resisting Hamlet sexually, but is driven to madness and suicide by his rejection of her love. *Hamlet* is a play in which people are constantly saying 'Pay attention to this'; 'Remember this'; 'I must write that down'—these senses of the word 'mark' occur fifteen times over the course of the play, more than anywhere else in Shakespeare's work. But using what is marked in order to live a long and happy life is not something any of the characters achieve within the frame of the play.

Both quartos of *Hamlet* are marked with diplai and both are marked only in the C gathering, although different phrases are chosen in each case.¹³ In the first quarto it is the recto and verso of the second leaf of C. A run of ten lines is emphasized with diplai (*figure 3*).

The second quarto of *Hamlet* contains only three sets of diplai, on the verso of the third leaf of C (*figure 4*). Here Laertes warns his sister about the dangerous effects of Hamlet's desire:

Feare it *Ophelia*, feare it my deare sister,
 And keepe you in the reare of your affection
 Out of the shot and danger of desire,

¹³ William Shakespeare, *The tragicall historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke* by William Shake-speare. (London: [Valentine Simmes] for N[icholas]. L[ing]. and Iohn Trundell, 1603); *The tragicall historie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke*. By William Shakespeare (London: I[ames]. R[oberts]. for N[icholas]. L[ing]., 1604). Images © The British Library Board (C.34.I.16).

Enter Corambis.

Cor. Yet here *Leartes?* aboard, aboard, for shame,
The winde sits in the shoulder of your saile,
And you are staid for, there, my blessing with thee
And these few precepts in thy memory.

“ Be thou familiar, but by no meanes vulgare;

“ Those friends thou hast, and their adoptions tried,

“ Graple them to thee with a hoope of Steele,

“ But do not dull the palme with entertaine,

“ Of euery new vnfleg'd courage,

“ Beware of entrance into a quarrell; but being in,

“ Beare it that the opposed may beware of thee,

“ Costly thy apparrell, as thy purse can buy.

“ But not exprest in fashion,

“ For the apparrell oft proclaimes the man.

And they of *France* of the chiefe rancke and station

Are of a most select and generall chiefe in that:

“ This about all, to thy owne selfe be true,

And it must follow as the night the day,

C 2

Thou

Figure 3

Cor. *Ofelia*, receiue none of his letters,
“ For louers lines are snares to intrap the heart;
“ Refuse his tokens, both of them are keyes
To vnlocke Chastitie vnto Desire;
Come in *Ofelia*, such men often proue,
“ Great in their wordes, but little in their loue.

Ofel. I will my lord.

exennt.

Figure 4

" The chariest maide is prodigall inough
If she unmaske her butie to the Moone
" Vertue it selfe scapes not calumnious strokes
" The canker gaules the infants of the spring
Too oft before their buttons be disclos'd,
And in the morne and liquid dewe of youth
Contagious blastments are most imminent[.]

The only other marked quarto is *Troilus and Cressida*, which contains four sets of diplai on two leaves.¹⁴ The first is the recto of B3:

Yet hold I off: women are angels woing,
" Things woone are done, ioyes soule lies in the dooing.
That shee belou'd, knows naught that knows not this,
" Men price the thing ungained more then it is,
That she was neuer yet that euer knew
Loue got so sweet, as when desire did sue,
Therefore the maxim out of love I teach,
" Atchiuement is command; ungaind beseech,
Then though my hearts content firme loue doth beare,
Nothing of that shall from mine eyes appeare.

The second example is on the verso of leaf K3:

What error leads must erre: O then conclude,
" Mines swayed by eyes are full of turpitude.

There is also an emphasized phrase on B4^v, where a line has been set in italic type but not otherwise marked:

Strength should be Lord of imbecillitie,
And the rude sonne should strike his father dead.
Force should be right or rather right and wrong,
(*Betweene whose endlesse iarre lustice recides*)
Should loose their names, and so should lustice to ?

¹⁴ William Shakespeare, *The famous historie of Troilus and Cresseid*. (London: G. Eld for R. Bonian and H. Walley, 1609).

When the folio was printed by William Jaggard in 1623, the only two marked couplets were from different plays. They are emphasized in italics, as is common for songs and foreign phrases throughout the work, but further emphasized with diplai.¹⁵ This happens once in the third play, concluding a speech by Ford in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (sig. D5^v):

*"Loue like a shadow flies, when substance Loue pursues,
Pursuing that that flies, and flying what pursues.*

And once in a reply by Posthumus in *Cymbeline* (sig. 3B3^r), the last play of the collection, where the emphasized section makes a couplet of the Lord's previous line:

Lord. This was strange chance:
A narrow Lane, an old man, and two Boyes.
Post. Nay, do not wonder at it: you are made
Rather to wonder at the things you heare,
Then to worke any. Will you Rime upon't,
And vent it for a Mock'rie? Heere is one:
*"Two Boyes, an Oldman (twice a Boy) a Lane,
Preseru'd the Britaines, was the Romanes bane.*

These emphases coincide with an additional shift of voicing in the passages (something the speaker was taught to say; a rhyme Posthumus makes out of what is said to him), but the way the emphasis has been executed is still unusual. Use of diplai for any purpose was rare for Jaggard's press and its occurrence may represent special circumstances of some kind.¹⁶

In each case, the marked lines draw the reader's attention to the kinds of general precepts or useful phrases that might be noted by a reader and added to a commonplace-book. But does attributing the emphasis of fourteen marked lines in a text from a choice of over a thousand from 'the readiness is all' to 'a cat will mew, a dog will have a day' say more about the printers of *Hamlet* or its readers? On the recto of leaf C2, does the run of diplai break in order to give priority to Corambis's most important precept: 'This aboue all, to thy owne selfe be true,' or because

¹⁵ William Shakespeare, *Mr. VVilliam Shakespeares comedies, histories, & tragedies. Published according to the true originall copies* (London: Isaac Iaggard, and Ed. Blount [at the charges of W. Iaggard, Ed. Blount, I. Smithweeke, and W. Aspley], 1623).

players I warrant you my Lord.
Ham. And doe you heare? let not your Clowne speake
 More th'n is set downe, there be of them I can tell you
 That will laugh themselves, to set on some
 Quantitie of barren spectators to laugh with them,
 Albeit there is some necessary point in the Play
 Then to be obserued: O t'is vile, and shewes
 A pittifull ambition in the foole that vseth it.
 And then you haue some agen, that keeps one sute
Of icasts, as a man is knowne by one sute of
Apparell, and Gentlemen quotes his icasts downe

F 2

Ia

Figure 5

The Tragedy of Hamlet

In their tables, before they come to the play, as thus:
 Cannot you stay till I eate my porridge? and, you owe me
 A quarters wages: and, my coate wants a cullifon:
 And, your beere is sowre: and, blabbering with his lips,
 And thus keeping in his cinkapafe of icasts,
 When, God knows, the warme Clowne cannot make a iest
 Vnlesse by chance, as the blinde man catcheth a hare:
 Maisters tell him of it.

Figure 6

setting two commas before 'And they of *France* of the chiefe rancke and station' would have pushed the end of the line further to the right than space would allow?

Annotations present in the known printed copies actually complicate these questions more than they ease them. There are only two known copies of *Hamlet* QR: one held by the British Library and the other by the Huntingdon. In the British Library copy a reader has chosen to underline a number of different phrases,

16 There is also one passage emphasized in this way in Jaggard's printing of Augustine Vincent's *Discourse of Errors* (sig. 4D3^v). The printing of Vincent's work is known to have led to a break in the production of the Shakespeare folio, although E.E. Willoughby showed that this took place at the end of Quire B on the second leaf of *Richard II* (before *Cymbeline* but long after *Merry Wives*). See E.E. Willoughby, *An interruption in the printing of the first folio* (Chicago, IL: University of

Chicago Press, 1928), 262-6. Compare Peter W. M. Blayney, *The First Folio of Shakespeare* (Washington, D.C.: Folger Library Publications, 1991). There are no diplai in Andre Favyn, *The theater of honour and knight-hood* (London: William Jaggard, 1623), printed at the same time as Fr.

comparable but different to those emphasized in print, furthering that emphasis in two cases with manicules in the margin on the recto and verso of leaf F2 (*figure 5*).

Manicules (the pointing hands with neat Elizabethan cuffs) are not uncommon in renaissance books (*figure 6*).¹⁷ These examples are worth dwelling on, however, because of their involvement with a stance that is specific to the first quarto.¹⁸ Robert Weimann has noted that Hamlet's audience get the best of both worlds from this version of his advice to the players: 'humanistically sanctioned, mimetic precepts associated with Donatus and Cicero' and some of the best lines of the clowns he is censuring.¹⁹ Hamlet impersonates those he sets out to criticize 'in the teeth of their rejection': but are the markings on one side of the divide or the other?²⁰ One might read them as written in the teeth of a rejection of Hamlet's advice; as remembering a particularly artful impersonation witnessed in performance; as reading the reference to gentlemen quoting a clown's jests 'In their tables' (against or oblivious to the context in which Hamlet utters the lines in the scene) as an instruction to do the same. While a number of other words and phrases are underlined in the same copy, there are only three instances in which noticing something of interest in the text led the annotator to stop for long enough to draw pointing fingers, complete with their hand and the cuff of a shirt.

One way forward for interpretation of the quarto emphases is to take these ambiguous and personal manuscript annotations as our guide to the marks in print. It seems likely that the copy for *Hamlet* Q1 may have contained similar marks in ink, a suggestion which allows the book an earlier life as a circulated text. If, as Roger Chartier and Peter Stallybrass have suggested, the copy-text for Q1 was provided by individuals, who became famous for a particular mode of reading, it is possible that the manuscript they handed over would have contained traces of that reading.²¹

The peculiar annotations which found their way into Chaucer folios proves that it was possible for the voices of authors or editors and the more private sounds of readers to be treated as one in the printing house, there is also contemporary evidence for how a Shakespeare play could have been marked up in as sparse a way

17. See William H. Sherman, 'Toward a History of the Manicule' in Robin Myers, Michael Harris, and Giles Mandelbrote, editors, *Books on the Move: Tracking Copies through Collections and the Book Trade* (London: Oak Knoll Press and The British Library, 2007).

18. This is not to establish a date for the annotations themselves. The first annotation (sig. B1', against the opening stage direction 'Enter two Centinels') provides names for the Centinels: 'now call'd Bernardo +Francisco—.' While this was first specified in Q2, the set

round-hand in which the words are written is Caroline or later seventeenth-century.

19. Robert Weimann, *Author's Pen and Actor's Voice: Playing and Writing in Shakespeare's Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 21–8, 23. George Ian Duthie has described how the speech draws on specific jests associated with the clown Richard Tarlton, *The 'Bad' Quarto of Hamlet: A Critical Study* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1941), 232–7.

20. Weimann, *Author's Pen*, 23.

Every eye great portion the best difference.
 The more the seemed diamond to glasse.
 It may my speche take for an offence,
 I thinke men take moment with for forgiveness.

Figure 7

as the *Hamlet* quartos. British Library MS Add. 41063 contains a slip of paper used as a bookmark, found in a German book of the 1620s (figure 7).²²

Written in a neat Elizabethan secretary hand, it contains a couplet from *Pericles* followed by eight quotations from *Richard III* and then a further three from *Pericles*. Given that *Hamlet* Q1 carries emphases only on leaves in close proximity, it is interesting to note that the *Pericles* excerpts are also taken from a small area of the book: the verso of leaf U3 and the recto of U4 (facing pages in a bound quarto) and overleaf on U4^v.

There is certainly evidence to suggest that *Lucrece* was emphasized under the pen of a variety of private hands. Lennard has already contrasted the eleven printed diplai in the 1594 *Lucrece* with the seventy-nine manuscript commas and points in the Bodleian copy, owned by Malone (for example, sig. Br^v, below).²³

, Beautie it selfe doth of it selfe perswade,
 „The eies of men without an Orator,
 What needeth then Appologie be made
 To set forth that which is so singular?
 , Or why is Colatine the publisher
 , Of that rich iewell he should keepe unknown
 , From theeuish eares because it is his owne?

21. Peter Stallybrass and Roger Chartier, 'Reading and Authorship: The Circulation of Shakespeare, 1590–1619' in Andrew Murphy, editor, *A Concise Companion to Shakespeare and the Text* (London: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 35–56.

22. The variant 'Envy' in this version of 3.2.25–6 suggests the reader was probably using Q4 (1619). The quotations are slight variants on *Pericles* 2.2.56–7 (not pictured) and 2.3.25–6, 36 and 68. All line references are to *The Riverside Shakespeare*, second edition, G. Blakemore Evans et al. (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1997). Image © The British Library Board (MS Add. 41063).
 23. Lennard, *But I Digress*, 30.

The number of marks in the printed editions of *Lucrece* were also subject to variation. Q3 added a further seventeen, whereas from 1616 onwards only the first two diplai were preserved (sig. B5^r, below):

This earthly *Saint* adored by this *Diuell*,
Little suspecteth the *false worshipper*:
" For thoughts unstain'd do sildome dreame on *euil*,
" *Birds* neuer limb'd, no secret *bushes* feare[.]

As with the changing emphases of the *Hamlet* editions, there are more motives for inclusion or excision than are dreamt of in our philosophy.

The circulation of poetry is already well documented: the work of Woudhuysen, Harold Love, Beal and others has illuminated manuscript as an important means of publication with professional services and networks of transmission in place to support it.²⁴ Less work has been done on how dramatic texts may have formed part of this circulated material. Controversial manuscripts like Middleton's *A Game At Chesse* have tended to be viewed as more exceptional than may have been the case:

This, which nor Stage, nor Stationers Stall can shoue,
(The Common Eye maye wish for, but ner'e knowe)
Comes in it's best loue wth the New-year forth,
As a fit present to the Hand of Worth.²⁵

Manuscript transmission is, however, a known source for printers' copy. Shakespeare's sonnets were apparently drawn together in part from those circulated among 'private friends' and later in the century the printer Humphrey Moseley also made a selling-point of the provenance of the manuscripts for the Beaumont and Fletcher folio: they were derived both 'from such as received them from the

24. Mary Hobbs, *Early Seventeenth-Century Verse Miscellany Manuscripts* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1992); Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993); Arthur F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995); H.R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts 1558-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); Peter Beal, *In Praise of Scribes: Manuscripts and Their Makers in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998). Donne and Sidney have been important centers of gravity for less specialist approaches.

25. Bodleian Library MS Malone 25, fol. 20^r. See T. H. Howard-Hill, "Nor Stage, Nor Stationers Stall Can Shoue": The Circulation of Plays in Manuscript in the Early Seventeenth Century' in *Book History*, 2 (1999), 28-41: 33. More recent accounts including Hill's essay have sought to erode a sense that authors of works circulating in manuscript disdained print, for which the central essay was J.W. Saunders, 'The Stigma of Print: A Note on the Social Bases of Tudor Poetry' in *Essays in Criticism*, 1 (1951), 139-64. See also Steven W. May, 'Tudor Aristocrats and the Mythical "Stigma of Print",' *Renaissance Papers*, 10 (1980), 11-18.

Authours themselves' and from the actors who 'when private friends desir'd a Copy' had transcribed versions of what they had to hand.²⁶

The kinds of things those private friends did to their copies of privy manuscripts, circulating in a text's first years of life, could contribute importantly to the forms later materialized in print. The Countess of Pembroke had what Woudhuysen describes as 'a cache of manuscripts' from which the 1598 edition of Philip Sidney's *Arcadia* was printed. The early history of these documents remains obscure but many of them remained at Penshurst until the beginning of the nineteenth century.²⁷ However the first, 1590 edition now referred to as the *Old Arcadia*, was a radically different text produced without either Mary's cache or its deceased author. That first edition is the only contemporary printing in which passages are emphasized with diplai.²⁸

When Fulke Greville received troubling news from a publisher about the imminent, unauthorized publication of the *Arcadia*, he decided to write a letter to Sidney's influential father-in-law, Sir Francis Walsingham:

Sr this day one ponsonby a bookebynder in poles church yard, came to me, and told me that ther was one in hand to print, sr philip sydneys old arcadia asking me yf it were donn, with your honours cons[] or any other of his friends, I told him to m{y} knowledge no, then he aduysed me to giue wa[rn]inge of it, ether to the archebishope or doctor Cosen, who haue as he says a copy of it to pervse to that end[.]²⁹

The conversation with Ponsonby had suggested to Fulke Greville that an existing problem of supply and demand was about to take a damaging turn for those who wished to control Sidney's legacy. Copies of both the *New Arcadia* and the *Old Arcadia* were circulating in manuscript, in various forms but in different quantities. Greville was in possession of a corrected copy of the *New Arcadia* which he had just sent to Walsingham's daughter, 'a correction of that old one donn 4 or 5 years since w[h]ich he left in trus[t] w[i]th me wherof ther is no more copies, & fitter to be printed then that first w[hi]ch is so com[m]on'.³⁰ There were no more copies of

26 See Howard-Hill's discussion, "Nor Stage, Nor Stationers..." On the privacy of manuscript as compared to the public nature of print, see for example the introductory matter to Sir W. Cornwallis, *Essayes* (STC 5775; 1600), A2^v; B1: 'The World is a booke: the words and actio's of men Com[m]entaries vpon that volume: The former lyke manuscriptes priuate: the latter common, lyke things printed.'

27 H.R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney*, 223.

28 Philip Sidney, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia, written by Sir Philippe Sidnei* (London: John Windet for William Ponsonby, 1590).

29 National Archive, SP 12/195, fols 51^r-52^v: fol. 51^r. See Woudhuysen's revised transcription and discussion, *Sir Philip Sidney*, 416-21: 416.

30 H.R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney*, 416-21: 416.

the *New Arcadia* and Greville had just sent his own to Philip's widow. Before his death and over the space of about two years, Sidney had allowed at least eight copies of the *Old Arcadia* to be made and it is these and their offspring which are now 'so com{m}on.'

The eight known manuscript copies of the *Old Arcadia* show that Sidney's work was transmitted in a variety of forms. The work of different scribes, a variety of bindings and formats and the attentions of different groups of owners contrived to make each copy a separate materialization of the text. One of these versions was annotated by readers who chose to emphasize *sententiae* and other phrases. It is the Helmingham Hall manuscript and Woudhuysen describes its emphases as follows:

A large number of *sententiae* are marked throughout the manuscript by double inverted commas or two points. Other marginal marks may reflect the scribe's copying habits, but it is hard to make much of them. However, one comment is of some interest. On fol. 24^r the word 'incomparable' (*OA*, p. 68, 19) has been underlined, and in the left-hand margin, in a hand which does not appear to be that of Hm's scribe, has been written 'thus farr is coppid out'. This cannot apply to the copying out of Hm, because it would be obvious if the copying had only got to that place in the text; rather it supplies powerful evidence that a copy was taken from Hm.³¹

While it may be related to the manuscript which was used to produce the 1590 printing, *Hm* is not the manuscript itself. It is simply one marked copy in which readers thought it useful to mark passages of interest.

When printed copies became available readers treated them in similar ways to the manuscript copies. Some are marked with emphases. There is a copy of the 1590 *Arcadia* in the Bodleian library in which both short, more sententious phrases and passages of more general interest are underlined on the same page: for example '(like a rose out of a brier) an excellent son of an euill mother' and 'in my presence their tongues were turned into eares, and their eares were captiues vnto my tongue.'³² As there was nothing particularly unusual in the annotation of Sidney's works to a variety of purposes, it seems like overstatement when Fred Schurink describes the 1590 emphases as evidence of a desire to educate the reader:

The paratextual apparatus of the first edition of Sidney's *Arcadia* (1590), for example, guides the interpretation of the text by its readers in ways similar to schoolmasters directing the

³¹ H.R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney*, 395.

³² Bodleian shelfmark Buxton 6, sig. XI^r.

understanding of a classical text by their pupils, both orally in the classroom and through notes and commentary in printed books. The marks in the margin of *sententiae* and the chapter headings, in particular, are significant in this respect.³³

This may be one effect of the edition on certain readers: whether or not it was the edition's intention is less clear.³⁴

T.H. Howard-Hill has suggested that manuscript circulation of poetry and the conception and circulation of dramatic manuscripts are not comparable.³⁵ This is less true for University plays and the few dramatic texts which were performed on the public stage but also seem to have circulated within the same literary milieu. It should also be noted that in drawing modern parallels with the best ancient dramatists, Frances Meres in 1598 shifts without distinction from manuscript tragedies of the Universities (the work of Edes and Legge), private and public drama (sig. 2O3^r).³⁶ Of a number of marked, manuscript plays for which there are variant copies, several reproduce what Woudhuysen's examples show to have been the case for manuscripts of the *Arcadia*. Of the multiple versions of Legge's *Ricardus Tertius*, only two copies are marked with emphases. BL Harleian MS. 2412 is unmarked save for two sets of diplai which emphasize a couplet (fol. 4^r). However, in the other copy owned by Henry Lacy over a hundred lines are emphasized: written in red ink, underlined or marked with three dots, in the following manner (*figure 8*).³⁷

It is not unusual for several of these techniques to be brought to bear on the same lines. The two marked lines in the Harleian copy are also marked in Lacy's version, where they are underlined and marked with three dots. That Lacy was held to be the author of his manuscript for many years is in a sense not an error: the manuscript was Lacy's creation and punctuated to serve his turn.³⁸ He is the author of this material artifact although he was not the author of the text known as *Ricardus Tertius*.

As with many of his contemporaries at the Universities, Inns of Court and aristocratic country houses, Henry Lacy fashioned a text he valued into a material

33. Fred Schurink, 'Education and Reading in Elizabethan and Jacobean England,' unpublished doctoral thesis (Oxford University, 2004), 182.

34. Compare Victor Skretkowitz, 'Building Sidney's Reputation: Texts and Editors of the *Arcadia*' in Jan V. Dorsten, Dominic Baker-Smith and Arthur F. Kinney, editors, *Sir Philip Sidney: 1586 and the Creation of a Legend*, (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 111–124: 112–13 on the use of headings to structure reading. On the political aims of the *Arcadia* Schurink follows Blair Worden, *The Sound of Virtue: Philip Sidney's 'Arcadia' and Elizabethan Politics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).

35. T. H. Howard-Hill, "Nor Stage nor Stationer's Stall", 36–37.

36. Francis Meres, *Palladis tamia. VVits treasury being the second part of Wits common wealth. By Francis Meres Maister of Artes of both Vniuersities* (London: P. Short, for Cuthbert Burbie, 1598).

37. Image © The British Library Board (MS Harleian 6929), fol. 38^r.

38. There is an informative discussion of Lacy and other Cambridge manuscript owners in Douglas Paine, 'Academic Drama at Cambridge,' unpublished doctoral thesis (Cambridge University, 2008), chapter four: "Books for the Tragedy": Cambridge Plays in Circulation, 120–163.

Bracfenburus ordinis Equeſtris. Tirellus

O rector alme calitū, et terra oecus
quisquis gubernas parce Bracfenburio
clemens furorem ſiſte duri principis
panaꝫ certa libera gramꝫ fidem.
horreꝫ magna ceſſat miſerij ſitis.
curis nec unqua ſoluntꝫ agra ambitio.
regni metu Richardus aſtꝫat, ferox
mūſta ſceptra poſſidet treſpida mamꝫ
nonaſqꝫ ſuſpicatꝫ in ſidias ſibi
ſtꝫbante dꝫm magna raterua rex ſumꝫ
miſerꝫt Gloceſtriana famam ancꝫſans
incerta ſortis cogitans ludibria
quangꝫ facile ruit mūſta impetu ſotentia
regniꝫ, lubricū nimis ſtatꝫm tremens
O dꝫ ſpiritu veſcatur atherio neſos
mox ut ſuo reddat dolori ſpiritum
gemimis neſos, et ſanguine extꝫꝫꝫat ſuo
regni metu ſuꝫri ferox patrꝫꝫ ſtꝫdet.
miſer Ioānes Greꝫꝫꝫ intentus ſacris
mihi traditas a rege literas dedit.
parare tritemꝫ regulis imbet necem,
et principibus afferre crudelꝫ manus
quos unꝫꝫis præſectus arcis comprꝫꝫo
ſolus poſteſt mactare Bracfenburus
natos tuos Eduardeꝫ ſolus perdere
ſtirꝫem tuamꝫ mandata regis exꝫꝫat
lubens, tibi Richardꝫe promptus ſerꝫio.
necare ſtirꝫem fratꝫꝫ ah ſietas uetat
intus iacent ſqualente miſeri carcere

form that suited his needs. His is one of the 'microhistories' by which Heidi Brayman Hackel has suggested early-modern reading must be interpreted in order to capture its true range, 'stories of many readers, who have left material traces of both the common and idiosyncratic practices in which they engaged.'³⁹ Lacy might be a marginal figure easily forgotten, but it may be that his traces and those of his peers have been fossilized in print in the margins of editions held central to the canon of renaissance literature in English.

Anthony Grafton's account of the humanist reading experience provides cues for an account of why private marks were retained in subsequent editions of a text:

The humanist text celebrated its editor and its benefactors as eloquently as its author. And it led the reader to look—much as the modern reader does in a critical study of a major writer—for two sorts of narrative in a single book. An annotated text naturally had as its core a classical tale told by an ancient, which might be poetic or historical or philosophical. Alongside that, however, it wove a double modern narrative by the editor, which might be dutifully rhetorical and philological in its manifest content, but was often alluringly autobiographical in its subtext. Annotated copies of such books reveal the eagerness with which readers—especially those in remote places—scrutinized them for evidence not only about the ancient world, but also about the modern literary circles that graced the Florence of the Medici or the Louvain of Erasmus. [... H]umanist commentary became the warrant that a text belonged to the high culture of its day; it also linked that text, as firmly as the glosses of Accursius had, to a specific literary and pedagogical regime.⁴⁰

The element of 'alluringly autobiographical' display that Grafton describes in early fifteenth-century texts continued to be an important motive for later editorial and authorial behavior regarding the literary 'high culture of its day.' As attempts at humanist commentary, diplai have appeared poorly executed, to be included by authors and editors garlanding their work as a kind of intellectual ballast, reproduced or not as dictated by the higher priorities of the printing house. As markers of alluring subtext however they read much more effectively and this is the case even where they occur in small numbers. English authors could have encountered these visually and conceptually, either in editions of the French and Italian tragedies set with emphases or in poetical treatises celebrating the virtues of *sententiae*.

³⁹ Heidi Brayman Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender, and Literacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 141.

⁴⁰ Anthony Grafton, 'The Humanist as Reader' in *A History of Reading in the West*, Guglielmo Cavallo and Roger Chartier, editors, Lydia G. Cochrane, translator (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003), pp. 179–212: p. 205.

Differing from the anatomical interest of treatise-writers, marked works displayed personal and autobiographical elements of the text, energizing the role of an edition within its social milieu. For the reader with the knowledge to pick up on it, a marked text offered a narrative that was not only 'double' but triple: text, marginal commentary and the personal or autobiographical secondary comments implied by the commentary itself. Each formed part of a contemporary reading experience: in displaying in public a phrase that could only fully be interpreted by a private group, a mark simultaneously offered the purchaser something exclusive and a chance to eavesdrop on a private world.⁴¹

Critics like G.K. Hunter have struggled to find concrete terms in which to describe the relationship between a genuinely anatomical, 'dutifully rhetorical and philological' attention to the text and behavior that spills over into more personal, autobiographical and conversational territory.⁴² Grafton adopts a metaphorical approach with Freudian vocabulary—his 'manifest content' if not also his choice of the word 'double' itself—which has some benefits and some disadvantages.⁴³ These choices are motivated in part by the language of his sources, which locates the unconscious at the center of associative modes of reading. Machiavelli records a reflective state as a natural element of his encounter with an author. In his letter to Vettori he writes of an encounter with Dante, Petrarca, Tibullus or Ovid: 'I read about their amorous passions and about their loves, I remember my own, and I revel for a moment in this thought.'⁴⁴

It was Freud's work on dreams that led him to ascribe manifest and latent content to narratives and Grafton suggests that annotations arise in a comparably discursive way from the pauses between periods of reading.⁴⁵ It is a space for thinking both about personal associations and about those within the text: 'their loves' and 'my own.'⁴⁶ Both dreaming and annotation are abstract modes of

41 Compare Stanley Fish, 'Authors-Readers: Jonson's Community of the Same' in *Lyric Poetry*, Chaviva Hošek and Patricia Parker, editors (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), 132–147; 146, 'Although the poems restrict access to the community, at the same time and in the same action they generate the community by providing a means of identifying its members, both to themselves and to each other.'

42 Compare Hunter's phrase, 'gnomic pointing frequently shades into other kinds of emphatic printing,' G.K. Hunter, 172.

43 Sigmund Freud, *The interpretation of dreams*, by Prof. Dr. Sigmund Freud. Authorized translation of 3d ed. with introduction, by A.A. Brill, A.A. Brill, translator (London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd, 1913). Freud discusses his concept of the double in "The 'Uncanny'" (1919), see for example Sigmund Freud, *The standard edition of*

the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud, James Strachey, editor and translator, 24 vols (London: Hogarth Press, 1953–74, this volume, 1954), XVII, pp. 217–56.

44 'leggo quelle loro amoroze passioni e quelli loro amori, ricordomi de' mia, godomi un pezzo in questo pensiero': see Grafton, 179–80.

45 For a lucid account of the personal element of annotation see H.J. Jackson, *Marginalia: Readers Writing in Books* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1991), in particular 83–100.

46 A.S. Byatt and Ignes Sodre prompt a number of associations between dreaming and annotation in their chapter 'Dreams and Fictions' in *Imagining Characters: Six Conversations about Women Writers* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1995), 230–57.

interpretation, most potent in their private significance to readers and dreamers but often of compelling interest to outsiders, thrilled by an unrealized capacity for interpretation. In a personal, psychologically-inflected context it is less surprising that a marked edition should be doing a number of different things in different places, or that certain markings should appear arbitrary or contradictory, marginalia being no less prone to over-examination than dream narratives. Such a framework prepares the ground for conclusions to be drawn which admit the more complicated, more human, desires and projects of their authors.⁴⁷

A mark on the page celebrates and cements the relationship between a reader and an area of text. The nature of such a desire to leave a trace of the personal effects of a reading experience is an important but understudied element of emphatic behavior. This personal attachment was a valued element of renaissance reading, and Grafton notes that sixteenth-century scholars might even go as far as to copy out an entire work in order to foster a closer relationship with the text:

Just as the schoolboy might know his text word for word because he had memorized and recited it, the mature scholar often knew his because he had copied it out line by line—and enjoyed consulting it not in a form that he shared with others, but in that imposed by his own script as well as his own choice of readings.⁴⁸

A piece of text which has affected the reader leads that reader to create the double of that effect, a mark on the page. Grafton's readers 'in remote places' who annotated their books 'with eagerness' are eager for the companionship of a book as well as its news of more exciting lives lived in the city.⁴⁹

Machiavelli's reflective experience finds a companion in the mid-seventeenth-century scholar P.D. Huet, who as a member of an age of humanists swept aside by the advances of mathematics 'felt like a revenant, a ghostly witness to the lost world of his youth.'⁵⁰ As that age passed, both the annotators and their textual

47 Compare Wittgenstein's comments on Freud's work in *Wittgenstein: Lectures and Conversations on Aesthetics, Psychology, and Religious Belief*, C. Barrett, editor (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966), 46: 'In considering what a dream is, it is important to consider what happens to it, the way its aspect changes when it is brought into relation with other things remembered, for instance.' For a discussion see Steven S. Osheroff, 'Wittgenstein: Psychological Disputes and Common Moves' in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 36 (1976), 339-63.

48 Grafton, 207.

49 Grafton, 205.

50 Grafton, 211.

† *Lear.* Dost thou call me fool?

‘ *Fool.* All thy other titles thou hast given away; that thou
‘ wast born with.

‘ *Kent.* This is not altogether fool, my lord.

‘ *Fool.* No faith, Lords and great men will not let me; if I
‘ had a monopoly on’t, they would have part on’t: nay the Ladies
‘ too, they’ll not let me have all fool my self, they’ll be snatching.
Give me an egg nuncle, and I’ll give thee two crowns.

Lear. What two crowns shall they be?

Fool. Why after I have cut the egg i’t’h’ middle and eat up
the meat, the two crowns of the egg: when thou clovest thy
crown i’t’h’ middle and gav’st away both parts, thou bor’st thine
afs on thy back o’er the dirt; thou had’st little wit in thy bald
crown, when thou gav’st thy golden one away: if I speak like
my self in this, let him be whip’d that first finds it so.

Figure 9

markings were cut off from later audiences. Marks that cannot be reunited with their original milieus stand as the revenants of lost readers: ghostly witnesses on the page. Diplai were used to emphatic effect in Pope marking ‘shining passages’ which the editor recommends to the reader and evidently this practice had become unusual enough by Malone’s time that he should spend decades trying to attribute them to previous authors.⁵¹ Observed in the wider context of his work, Pope’s emphases start to look more antiquarian than state-of-the-discipline: Edmund G.C. King has highlighted Pope’s approval of both ancient and Erasmian annotation practices and his desire to emulate them.⁵² Emulation and the diplo travelled together well into the eighteenth century.

51 Alexander Pope, editor, *The Works of Shakespeare*, 6 vols. (London, 1723–25), I, 23.

52 Edmund G. C. King, ‘In The Character of Shakespeare: Canon, Authorship, and Attribution in Eighteenth-Century England,’ unpublished doctoral thesis (University of Auckland, 2008). See in particular King’s section ‘Pope, Erasmus, and Humanistic

Reading Practices,’ 80–85; 84. A version of the chapter has been published in essay form, see ‘Pope’s 1723–25 *Shakespeare*, Classical Editing, and Humanistic Reading Practices’, *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 32 (2008), 3–13.

What Malone failed to realize in the years he spent trying to trace sources for these supposed quotations was that the marks in Pope's edition of Shakespeare were as personal and context-specific as they had been for more than a thousand years (figure 9).⁵³ Arbitrary though they were in their placement, Pope's marks honored the traces of the earliest editors of Shakespeare in print: his readers.

⁵³ Illustration from Alexander Pope, *The Works of Shakespear*, I, sig. D1^r.

REFERENCES

- Churchill, C. 1982. *Top Girls*. London, UK: Methuen.
- Cloud, R. 1982. The Marriage of Good and Bad Quartos. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 33.4, 421-31.
- Crane, M.T. 1986. Proverbial and Aphoristic Sayings: Sources of Authority in the English Renaissance. Unpublished doctoral thesis: Harvard University.
- Dane, J.A. 1997. Fist and Filiations in Early Chaucer Folios. *Studies in Bibliography*, 51, 49-62.
- Freud, S. 1913. *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Translated by A.A. Brill. London, UK: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd.
- Grafton, A. 2003. The Humanist as Reader. In Cavallo, G. and R. Chartier, editors. Translated by L.G. Cochran. *A History of Reading in the West*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hackel, H.B. 2005. *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender and Literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunter, G.K. 1951. The Marking of Sententiae in English Plays, Poems, and Romances. *The Library*, 5.6, 171-188.
- Jefferson, G. 2004. Glossary of Transcript Symbols. In Lerner, Gene H. editor. *Conversation Analysis, Studies from the First Generation*. Amsterdam, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 13-31.
- Kane, S. 1998. *Cleansed*. London, UK: Methuen.
- Lennard, J. 1991. *But I Digress: The Exploitation of Parentheses in English Printed Verse*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Parker, M. 1568. *The Holie Bible*. London, UK: Richard Jugge.
- Ravenhill, M. 1998. *Shopping and Fucking*. London, UK: Methuen.
- Schurink, F. 2004. Education and Reading in Elizabethan and Jacobean England. Unpublished doctoral thesis: Oxford University.
- Sidney, P. 1590. *The Countesse of Pembroke's Arcadia*. London, UK: John Windet for William Ponsonby.
- Shakespeare, W. 1603. *The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmark*. London, UK: Valentine Simmes for Nicholas Ling and John Trundell.

Shakespeare, W. 1604. *The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke*. London, UK: James Roberts for Nicholas Ling.

Shakespeare, W. 1609. *The Famous Historie of Troylus and Cresseid*. London, UK: G. Eld for R. Bonian and H. Walley.

Shakespeare, W. 1623. *Mr William Shakespeare Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies*. London, UK: Isaac Jaggard and Edward Blount.

Stallybrass, P. and R. Chartier. 2007. Reading and Authorship: The Circulation of Shakespeare, 1590–1619. In Murphy, A., editor. *A Concise Companion to Shakespeare and the Text*. London, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 35–56.

Weimann, R. 2000. *Author's Pen and Actor's Voice: Playing and Writing in Shakespeare's Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woudhuysen, H.R. 1996. *Sir Philip Sidney*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

AUTHOR NOTE

NICK BLACKBURN completed his Ph.D. on gnomic marking in Elizabethan and Jacobean drama at Trinity College, Cambridge in 2009. He is now a director of live and filmed media and has recently worked for English National Opera in London and The Wooster Group in New York. He continues to write on experimental theater in the early-modern period and the present day.