



## Historicizing the *Jupien* Effect: Paratextual Anxieties In Eighteenth-century Critical Discourse

Alex Watson  
University of York

### Introduction: 'Watch out for the paratext!'<sup>1</sup>

In *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (1997), Gérard Genette gives the label 'the *Jupien* effect' to situations in which 'the paratext [...] tends to go beyond its function and to turn itself into an impediment' (410). Here Genette's allusion to the young tailor Jupien in Marcel Proust's *À la recherche du temps perdu* (1913-27) accords the paratext a complex status. In one sense, with this tag, Genette supports his view that the paratext is always ancillary: 'only an antecedent, only an accessory of the text' (410). Jupien is Baron de Charlus' homosexual lover and the manager of his male brothel, described as the aristocrat's 'factotum' and 'a subordinate'.<sup>2</sup> In another, however, this label places the paratext in a more problematic position. Jupien acts as Proust's narrator's entry-point into the clandestine world of Parisian homosexuality, challenging his earlier belief in the near-universality of heterosexuality. When the narrator first witnesses a tryst between Jupien and Charlus he comments: 'faced by this initial revelation, I had greatly exaggerated the elective nature of so selective a conjunction [...] these exceptional beings [...] are legion'.<sup>3</sup> At the same time, Jupien is a socially mobile figure, who gradually achieves considerable power over the Baron, becoming Charlus' attendant after a heart attack.<sup>4</sup> Jupien is a minor character who nonetheless embodies some of the major changes in the narrator's social world and mental landscape. In like manner, Genette's term 'the *Jupien* effect' shows his tacit recognition of the potential of the paratext to undermine the hierarchy between text and paratext. Genette warns us to '*watch out for the paratext!*' (410).

In this article, I argue that Genette's warning reflects a subtle cultural anxiety about the potentially encroaching effects of paratexts. In order to give this discussion focus, I will concentrate on the paratext that has become the main target for such fears: the footnote. As I will show in the following section, the footnote is conventionally described in terms that suggest that it is not only beneath the text, but unworthy of critical discussion altogether. In contrast, as I demonstrate in the third section, sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writers frequently envisioned text and paratext in a symbiotic relationship. I argue that hostile attitudes towards annotation became only commonplace in the eighteenth century, emerging in new scientists' distrust of Renaissance humanist commentary, Anglican thinkers' wariness about Biblical commentary and the 'Ancients'' attacks on the 'Moderns' in the 'Battle of the Books' controversy. In the fourth section, I expose the discrepancy between many writers' proclaimed opinions about notes and actual annotative practice in the eighteenth century. In so doing, I seek to initiate the project of historicising the *Jupien* effect, arguing that Genette's model often reflects contemporary ways of talking about paratexts, rather than actual historical textual practices. Most importantly, I do not wish to invert the text/paratext binary – and, rather absurdly,

place the text on the periphery and the margins in the centre. But I would argue that Genette's insistence upon the secondary nature of the paratext has the potential to obscure as much as it can reveal.

### What we talk about when we talk about footnotes

Annotation often inspires odium and horror in critics and creative writers, described as 'a kind of cowardly corroboration',<sup>5</sup> 'a mask',<sup>6</sup> 'a viper's nest',<sup>7</sup> or 'a tomb'.<sup>8</sup> Most commonly, however, annotation is portrayed as an abnormality: 'an aberration',<sup>9</sup> an 'aesthetic evil',<sup>10</sup> 'a fetish' or 'a lump'.<sup>11</sup> For the poet John Kinsella, annotation introduces a nasty, lingering flavour to an otherwise pleasurable, sensuous experience:

A footnote  
is added  
like bad breath  
to a deep kiss  
in an impressionable  
place.<sup>12</sup>

Similarly, Noël Coward claimed reading a footnote is like having to go downstairs to answer the doorbell, while making love.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, as the example of George Eliot's Edward Casaubon shows – the dusty reverend who 'dreams footnotes' and lets them 'run away with his brain',<sup>14</sup> – footnotes have become a byword for scholarly folly. Such attitudes survive in the popular historian David Starkey's recent complaints against academic history:

A lot of books have become rarely animated footnotes. In fact, they should really be written upside down, with the footnotes at the top and a drip of text underneath. Footnotes aren't new, but what is new is our worship of them.<sup>15</sup>

Ironically however, as I will show, similar complaints have been made since at least the early eighteenth century.

In keeping with such remarks, some critics have argued that annotation is so banal that it should be excluded from scholarly consideration. G. W. Bowerstock for instance argues that 'the ordinary footnote [...] deserves no place in the annals of literature'.<sup>16</sup> Other writers have vastly underestimated the amount of annotation in literary texts. Sari Benstock claims that 'the use of footnotes in literary texts [...] occur[s] in fewer texts than can be counted on one hand'.<sup>17</sup> For Claire A. Simmons, 'annotations tend to diminish a text, by limiting the interpretative potential in favour of one reading, or at any rate a lesser range of possibilities than the plurality of the text might command'.<sup>18</sup>

Annotation is frequently represented as an annoying presence, interfering with linear progression through the text. In his recent memoir *Experience* (2001), Martin Amis quotes a passage reverentially from Vladimir Nabokov's *Lolita* (1955). He links a note to the end of the first quoted clause, which contextualises the excerpt. At the note's close, however, Amis requests: 'now please go back, if you would, and start the passage again'.<sup>19</sup> As this example suggests, 'the upstart footnote',<sup>20</sup> as Duncan Forbes calls it, exists in an implicit rivalry with the text, establishing a counter-text that challenges the text's supremacy. As Jerome Christensen argues, 'structural equivocation is [...] built into the annotative situation, for an apparently single voice is doubled by the addition of the note [...] the marginal comment always threatens to reduce the original text to a pretext for commentary'. Christensen stresses the dual

nature of this relationship, describing annotation as ‘both an enrichment and a deprivation of its host’.<sup>21</sup>

Arguably, the English term ‘footnote’ encourages its own subordination. The union of ‘foot’ and ‘note’ implies that the status of the words in a note is inseparable from their lowly circumstances at the bottom of the printed page - a situation compounded by the verb form (‘to footnote’) being the same as its noun counterpart (‘a footnote’). Interestingly, the OED reveals that the first recorded usage of the term ‘footnote’ was only in 1841. More surprising still, ‘endnote’ is an American term, used first as late as 1950. Even the term ‘marginalia’ was only coined by Samuel Taylor Coleridge in 1832. The absence of this lexicon shows us that writers in earlier periods operated in a subtly different print culture to our own. Many conventions we take for granted were still emerging and more fluid.

### **‘The mind is refrigerated by interruption’: Talking about annotation before and during the eighteenth century**

In his 1633 poem *The H. Scriptures*, George Herbert puts forward a view of annotation that contrasts with the hostile representations we have examined:

Such are thy secrets, which my life makes good,  
And comments on thee: for in ev'ry thing  
Thy words do finde me out, & parallels bring,  
And in another make me understood.<sup>22</sup>

In the first three clauses, Herbert compares the relationships between lover and loved one, and human beings and the deity, to that of commentary and text. The speaker realises the loved one in his own thoughts and actions, just as a commentary makes concrete a difficult text. Likewise, human beings must unpick and interpret the mystery of the universe, in the same way as a scholar untangles and explicates a tricky passage. In the clauses that follow the colon, Herbert switches the terms of these analogies. The speaker’s lover reflects an image of him back to himself, which enables him to better understand himself, in a manner comparable to the way a commentary explicates a passage of text. Similarly, God’s will - revealed in the Biblical text, and the signs God has implanted in the world – provides the means by which human beings make sense of themselves and find meaning in the world. Moreover, Herbert’s poem itself enacts this process. In the parallels he establishes between monogamy, humankind’s relationship with God and textual explication, each figure gains meaning and resonance by being compared to the other. And, in the simple act of reading the poem, the reader is implicated within this process, creating meaning actively through the agency of another text. In contrast with Genette and the descriptions we have examined, Herbert presents text and paratext in a symbiotic relationship, in which each constitutes and creates the other.

This – more sympathetic – depiction of annotation is common in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writing. For instance, in his treatise on rhetoric, *The Garden of Eloquence* (1577), the English curate Henry Peacham recommended annotation as an unproblematic way of clarifying confusions: ‘where the sentence may seeme darke or doubtfull, it [...] a short annotation [...] giue[s] light and to resolue[s] the doubt’ [sic].<sup>23</sup> In ‘To Dr. Plot’ (1692), the clergyman and philosopher John Norris celebrated scientists as annotators of God’s universe:

They *most* justly yet this Tribute pay  
 Who don't *Contemplate* only, but *display*,  
*Comment* on Nature's Text, and to the sense  
 Expose her latent excellence.<sup>24</sup>

In its interventionary nature, annotation provides Norris with a metaphor to praise scientific investigation - as a more active and effective tribute to the glory of the world than passive religious meditation. Importantly, even when writers of the period highlighted annotation's ability to obfuscate, they employed images of symbiosis. In his ode 'To A.D.', Thomas Carew compares the relationship between text and commentary to his addressee's relationship with her self-image, urging her to destroy her distrust of her own beauty: 'breake thy Glasse, it hath perplex't / With a darke Comment, beauties clearest Text'.<sup>25</sup> Here Carew likens unilluminating commentary to his recipient's false view of her own appearance. Yet his demand that she replace this with a more positive self-image carries with it the implication that effective annotation acts as a counterpart to the text - reflecting the text back to itself and helping navigate its relationship with a wider world.

However, by this time, this reciprocal model of the interaction between text and paratext had been challenged by new scientists like Francis Bacon and Galileo Galilei. Bacon and Galileo found 'commentary' to be a versatile trope with which they could express their disdain for Renaissance humanists such as Erasmus, Joseph Scaliger and Isaac Casaubon, who sought to renew Western culture by reviving classical literature and applying the tools of philology to ancient texts. Bacon tried to distance himself and the scientific project from them, exclaiming: 'down with antiquities, and citations or supporting testimonies from texts; down with debates and controversies and divergent opinions; down with everything philological'.<sup>26</sup> For scientists such as Bacon, annotation encapsulated the Humanists' desire to view everything at second-hand, explicating other men's texts rather than investigating the world directly. Scientists portrayed humanist commentators as intellectually short-sighted individuals, who would prefer to sift through the accumulated rubbish of the centuries than explore the new fresh world of intellectual endeavor that the scientists were uncovering. Galileo wrote of them contemptuously in a letter to Johannes Kepler:

This kind of man thinks that philosophy is a sort of book like the *Aeniad* and *Odyssey*, and that truth is to be found not in the world or in nature but in the collation of texts (I use their terminology). I wish I could spend a long time laughing with you.<sup>27</sup>

As I will demonstrate, such sentiments contributed towards the establishment of a series of binary oppositions - of world to book, creation to collation, and reason to authority - which were to be applied frequently to annotators and commentators in the eighteenth century.

Anglican hermeneutic theorists applied the same charge to the Roman Catholic tradition of Biblical commentary. According to Romanist thinking, the meaning of the scriptures was ambiguous and volatile, and required the Church to stabilise it. As Marcus Walsh puts it, they believed that 'the word of truth has been passed down in an unbroken series from Christ to his apostles and thence through the agency of the Church to the modern believer'.<sup>28</sup> The Protestant tradition defined itself against such arguments, asserting that, just as humankind should have a direct relationship with God, so readers required unmediated access to the scriptures. In the

view of Protestant thinkers, annotation placed an unnecessary barrier between reader and text. As the eponymous central figure in the philosopher Bishop George Berkeley's *Alciphron; or, the Minute Philosopher* (1732) declares: 'methinks if the supreme Being had spoke to man, he would have spoke clearly to him, and that the word of God should not need a *comment*'.<sup>29</sup>

At the same time, Anglican theologians were also wary of commentary as a potential source of heresy. They tried to guard against a completely independent approach to the scriptures, perceiving, in the Puritan preference of interpretation to private reason, the potential for the word of God to be subordinated to the misconceptions of mankind. In 1712, for instance, the theologian and philosopher Samuel Clarke warned gravely about Biblical commentary's latent capacity to consume and replace the primary authority of the text it purported to support. He saw this substitution as a blasphemous usurpation of Godly authority by human will, writing that: 'a Comment may in effect come into the place of the Text [...] till in process of Time, men [...] depart entirely from the Meaning of the Text, and Human authority swallows up that which is divine'.<sup>30</sup>

The issues surrounding Biblical exegesis crossed over into the secular editing of vernacular classics. In his 'Preface' to *The Works of Shakespeare* (1733), the editor Lewis Theobald uses his notes to defend himself against accusations of distorting Shakespeare's original text according to his own whims and fancies, maintaining that 'where-ever I have ventur'd at an Emendation a *Note* is constantly subjoin'd to justify and assert the Reason of it'. For Theobald, notes form a protective seal around the text, safeguarding it against corruption: 'a Note [...] hinders all possible Return to Depravity; and for ever secures them in a State of Purity and Integrity not to be lost or forfeited'.<sup>31</sup> Interestingly, in his use of the terms 'depravity', and 'purity', Theobald portrays his notes as the text's moral guardian. Such quasi-religious language reflects the large degree to which the editing of secular literary works remained implicated in discussions about religious exegesis.

Importantly, Theobald's statements form part of the conflict between the 'Ancients' and the 'Moderns' in the 'Battle of the Books' controversy at the beginning of the eighteenth century. This debate centred on whether contemporary learning had surpassed Ancient Greece and Rome. Put simply, moderns such as Theobald, the editor Richard Bentley and the critic William Wotton argued that the art and culture of the modern era of reason and scientific inquiry were greater than those of the superstitious classical world. On the other hand, ancients such as the politician Sir William Temple and the satirists Jonathan Swift and Alexander Pope adopted the position that Virgil, Cicero, Homer and Aristotle were superior to contemporary writers and thinkers. For them, earlier texts were examples of eternal eloquence, for poets to imitate and for future statesmen to read in order to learn how to live, rule virtuously and speak persuasively. The role of annotation was therefore to explicate those passages necessary to understanding, and to point the student towards the grace and power of the text in question. The Moderns, on the other hand, defined texts as cultural artefacts: intricate, difficult products of what was, to some extent, an irretrievable past. For them, annotation's purpose was to justify their editorial decisions and elucidate difficult, historically-specific passages in the text.

For the Ancients, however, the Moderns appeared to chip away at the exalted, timeless status of the Greek and Roman classics: notes had begun to supplant the text. Indeed, William Wotton had asserted provocatively the intellectual superiority of modern philologists over classical poets – the primacy of annotation over text – contending that 'he that discerns another Man's Thoughts is therein greater than he

who Thinks'.<sup>32</sup> The Ancients accused the Moderns of being more concerned with aggrandising themselves – with using texts as a springboard for annotation – than in deepening their reader's understanding of the art and wisdom of the ancient world. Jonathan Swift parodied the Moderns' scholarly practice in *A Tale of a Tub* (1704), making his mock-editor assert that 'a true critic [...] is a discoverer and collector of the writer's faults'.<sup>33</sup> Likewise, in *An Epistle to Arbuthnot* (1734), Alexander Pope compared the presence of Theobald's and Bentley's annotations in the works of Shakespeare and Milton to 'hairs, or straws, or dirt, or grubs, or worms' preserved in amber.<sup>34</sup> Such an image encapsulates Pope's fear and fascination with the miscellaneous, fragmentary nature of annotation, as well as his indignation that such writers of scholarly annotation achieved an unwarranted immortality by infiltrating great works of literature.

Indeed, in 1713, when Alexander Pope was beginning what was to be the seven-year project of translating *The Iliad*, he expressed his contempt for the earlier commentators on Homer and set out the different means by which he would explicate the poem. He asserted that:

There are indeed, a sort of underling auxiliars [sic.] to the difficulty of a work, call'd Commentators and Critics, who wou'd frighten many people by their number and bulk, and perplex our progress, under pretence of fortifying their author. They lie very low in the trenches and ditches they themselves have digg'd, encompass'd with the dirt of their own heaping up, but I think there may be found a method of coming at the main work by a more speedy and gallant way than mining under ground, that is, by using the Poetical Engines, Wings and flying over their heads.<sup>35</sup>

In this example, Pope puts forward his main charges against annotators, portraying them as impudent upstarts, who confuse under the pretence of aiding the understanding, intimidate by their sheer numbers, and demean themselves by subordinating their words to the text of another. He declares his intention to bypass the boring task of wading through their contributions, by bringing imaginative insight, rather than antiquities or philology, to his edition of the poems.

Famously, in the *Dunciad Variorum* (1728) Pope satirised what he saw as the excessively literal approach to literature exemplified by textual critics such as Richard Bentley and Lewis Theobald. In this surreptitious verse attack on the politics and culture of the Hanoverian regime, Pope created a series of pseudo-scholarly footnotes, in which he lampooned his literary enemies. Such notes crowd and overwhelm the page, acting as a visual demonstration of annotation's propensity to muddle and obfuscate. In an extensive note, for instance, Pope's caricature annotator, Martinus Scriblerus, ponders pedantically the spelling of the title:

It may well be disputed whether this be a right Reading. Ought not to be spelled *Dunceiad*, as the etymology evidently demands? *Dunce* with an e, therefore *Dunceiad* with an e.

In this passage, Pope makes oblique reference to Theobald's *Shakespeare Restored* (1726), a critical reply to Pope's own edition of *The Works of Shakespear* [sic.] (1725). Pope mocks Theobald for being obsessed with textual details that are inconsequential to the meaning of the text, claiming Theobald assumes himself to possess greater cultural authority than Shakespeare himself (implicit in Scriblerus' calling into question whether the poem's author provides a 'right Reading'). In Pope's view, Theobald's 'accuracy' and 'punctuality' betrays his unscrupulous

ambition and intellectual mediocrity. Scriblerus asserts: ‘nor is the neglect of a *Single Letter* so trivial as to some it may appear; the attention whereof in a learned language is an *Atchievement* (sic.) that brings honour to the Critick that advances it’.<sup>36</sup> Nonetheless, what such examples show is the Augustans’ schizophrenic attitude towards annotation. On the one hand the footnote embodies the excessive minuteness of scholars such as Bentley and Theobald. On the other, Pope and Swift are fascinated with the opportunities annotation affords for ironic juxtaposition and satirical play.

Interestingly, in his definitions in *Dictionary of the English Language* (1755) – itself a series of scholia – Johnson appears to maintain a position of studied neutrality towards annotation and annotators, defining the former as ‘explications or remarks written upon books; notes’, and the latter as ‘a writer of notes, or annotations; a scholiast or commentator’. Yet, the majority of the passages he selects to confirm his definitions portray the annotator in a negative light. In his definition of ‘annotators’ Johnson quotes the assertion of the early eighteenth-century educationalist, Henry Felton, that ‘I have not that respect for the annotators, which they generally meet with in the world’. Likewise, while defining ‘notes’, he prints Felton’s statement that: ‘the best writers have been perplexed with notes and obscured with illustrations’.<sup>37</sup> Johnson sets out his views on annotation in his 1755 ‘Preface to Shakespeare’, claiming that: ‘particular passages are cleared by notes; but the general effect of the work is weakened’. In his view, ‘the mind is refrigerated by interruption; the thoughts are diverted from the principal subject; the reader is weary, he suspects not why; and at last throws away the book, which he has too diligently studied’.<sup>38</sup> For Johnson, annotation forces the eye to perform a movement – from the centre to the foot of the page, or from a page to the back of the book – that weakens readers’ attention and cumulatively alienates them from a work of literature, leading to boredom, frustration and, ultimately, rejection.

In the same year as Johnson’s *Dictionary* and his ‘Preface’ was published, the printer John Smith devoted a section of his *Printer’s Grammar* (1755) to the subject of ‘references’, which he defines as ‘all such Marks and Signs as used in matter which has either side or bottom Notes’, using the term ‘bottom notes’ to refer to what we would now call footnotes. In his view, notes have a miscellaneous, explanatory function: ‘matter [...] is explained by Notes’. Smith suggests also that notes were used by certain readers to appraise a book before examining it in detail, referring to ‘gentlemen who chuse [sic.] to read copious Notes first, and then refer to the Text’. At the same time, Smith makes subtle jibes against pseudo-scholars attempting to appear more knowledgeable than they really are by pillaging notes from obscure sources, adding that ‘notes [...] are collected from foreign books, which [...] help to make the Author to be counted very learned’.<sup>39</sup> Such a comment suggests that the association between annotation and obfuscation had become a truism.

### **‘Make something out of a hundred pedants that is not pedantical’: Annotative practice in the eighteenth century**

We might well ask how such overt hostility towards annotation compared with actual annotative practice. As we have seen, Protestant denunciations of commentary consolidated a rhetoric about annotation – as a barrier between reader and text, threatening to usurp the text. Despite this, in many ways, William E. Slights is right to insist that ‘it is a myth, or at best a half truth, that Protestant theologians were wholly hostile to marginal annotation’.<sup>40</sup> As Marcus Walsh has argued, the Anglican interpretative tradition forged its own style of commentary, asserting that the Biblical

text contained a determinate meaning that the annotator could explicate through direct paraphrase.<sup>41</sup> Even the King James Bible – which was authorised on condition that it appeared without interpretative commentary – contained a gloss explaining Greek and Hebrew terms and internal cross-references.

One particularly interesting example of eighteenth-century Protestant annotation is John Brown's *The Self-Interpreting Bible* (1778). Brown's *Bible* was a bestseller: according to the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 'as familiar in Presbyterian households as John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* and Thomas Boston's *Human Nature in its Fourfold State*'.<sup>42</sup> In his address 'To the Reader' Brown claimed he used annotation to mediate the Bible to a different kind of audience: 'to exhibit their principal substances with all possible advantage, in a manner that might best comport with the ability and leisure of the poorer and labouring part of mankind; and especially to render the oracles of GOD their own interpreter and enable every serious reader to judge for himself what doctrines ought to be believed and what dictates practiced by the Christian'.<sup>43</sup> Accordingly, most of his notes elucidate scriptural passages through paraphrase.<sup>44</sup> However, these apparently-neutral translations in fact inflect the Biblical text with specific political meanings. 'Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth' in Matthew 5.5 is rendered as 'happy are they who, sensible of their own unworthiness, and of God's great goodness, readily submit to his will in all things without murmuring'.<sup>45</sup> While Brown's 'unworthiness' refers to spiritual baseness, his emphasis on submission promotes a passive acceptance of social inequality.

This divergence between the use and the representation of annotation in Biblical scholarship is also noticeable in Pope's work as a translator and editor. While Pope denigrated the annotator, he sifted through a large number of commentaries in order to buttress his edition of Homer's *Iliad* with a series of detailed and learned paratexts, describing this task resignedly as having 'to make something out of a hundred Pedants that is not Pedantical'.<sup>46</sup> Within his notes, he attempts to display the aesthetic and ethical qualities of the poem to the eighteenth-century reader, claiming, in the 1720 second edition, that his aim was simply 'to illustrate the Poetical Beauties of the Author'.<sup>47</sup> Interestingly, Samuel Johnson recommended Pope's notes, claiming that they brought a welcome amusement and variety to reading the poem: 'commentaries which attract the reader by the pleasure of perusal have not often appeared; the notes of others are read to clear difficulties, those of Pope to vary entertainment'.<sup>48</sup>

As well as being a commonplace and contentious presence in editions of the Bible and literary classics, annotation was often found in eighteenth-century grammar books. As Murray Cohen has argued in *Sensible Words*, writers of these works, such as John Jones, James Greenwood, Charles Gildon, Michael Maittaire, and Isaac Watts, used the split between text and note to accommodate a text to both the novice and the expert.<sup>49</sup> Grammatical rules were placed in the centred text, while the rational grounds underpinning such rules were printed at the bottom of the page. Through such a division, these writers endeavoured to adapt their subject matter to both a general and a specialist audience. Gildon wrote in his 'Preface' that this separation permits 'Children, Women and the Ignorant of both Sexes' to read across the top of the page while 'the Reasonable Teacher' may discover the 'Reason of Things' in the smaller type.<sup>50</sup> According to both Cohen and John Barrell, this disconnection enforced the divisions between the novice and the expert, sequestering knowledge in the hands of the few. Cohen describes this as the moment in which 'pedagogy shed its philosophical responsibilities',<sup>51</sup> while Barrell argues that the logic of the



typographic arrangement was such that ‘the unenfranchised are kept ignorant of the freedom theoretically attributed to them in the notes, and which is therefore (it must be assumed) a freedom particularly enjoyed by the “rational” and “enfranchised” only’.<sup>52</sup>

In other cases, annotation performed the opposite role, rendering difficult texts or forms of knowledge available and comprehensible to a lay readership. For instance, in the annotation for his idiosyncratic, quasi-scientific mock-epic *The Loves of the Plants* (1789), Erasmus Darwin juxtaposed sumptuous, highly visual verse with what he labeled ‘philosophical notes’.<sup>53</sup> In the verse, he presents the world of plants as a sparkling, Arcadian landscape in which statuesque ‘Beaux and Beauties [...] / [...] woo and win their vegetable loves’ (ll. 9-10). For each plant mentioned, Darwin creates a long quasi-scientific footnote, in which he details – highly systematically – its Linnaean binomial nomenclature, colloquial name(s) and the number of male sexual parts to female. He then goes on to describe its appearance, relate his own scientific observations and recount any diverting anecdotes about it. As Darwin articulates (through the mouth-piece of the Bookseller in the first of the ‘Interludes’ that intersperse the Cantos of *The Loves of the Plants*), the verses ‘consist of pure description’ but there is ‘sense in the notes’ (47). Darwin shows how the sensual, visual medium of verse can be combined with the conceptual mode of prose to create hybrid texts that ‘enlist Imagination under the banner of Science’ (1). Darwin’s friend, the poet Anna Seward, later praised his notes as ‘the vehicle of much useful instruction’ for those lacking scientific knowledge, asserting that ‘all poetic allusions to facts, or to branches of science not already known demand notes’.<sup>54</sup> Seward’s comment suggests that, rather than enforcing divisions between the novice and the expert, Darwin’s margins made specialist knowledge available to the general reader. Indeed, Darwin bragged later that the notes acted as an independent introduction to the subject, boasting ‘the philosophical part of botany may be agreeably learned from the notes to the second volume of *The Botanic Garden*, whether the poetry be read or not’.<sup>55</sup>

In further examples, annotation offered a site in which the more subversive or salacious aspects of a work could be printed. Perhaps the most celebrated example of this practice is Edward Gibbon’s ‘naughty footnotes’, as Winston Churchill described them,<sup>56</sup> for *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776-88), which are erudite and witty, occasionally lewd and frequently hilarious. In one note, Gibbon describes Origen’s drastic use of self-castration in order to safeguard his virtue, quipping breezily: ‘as it was his general practice to allegorize scripture; it seems unfortunate that, in this instance only, he should have adopted the literal sense’.<sup>57</sup> Likewise, in a further example he relates ‘the frank confession of a Benedictine abbot’ who claims ‘my vow of poverty has given me a hundred thousand crowns a year; my vow of obedience has raised me to the rank of a sovereign prince’. ‘I forget’, smirks Gibbon, ‘the consequences of his vow of chastity’ (II: 424).

On other occasions, Gibbon’s schoolboy sauciness spills over into salaciousness. In support of his debauched characterization of the sixth-century emperor Justinian’s wife Theodora – ‘whose strange elevation cannot be regarded as the triumph of female virtue’ (II: 563) – Gibbon quotes the following description of Theodora’s obscene antics on the Roman stage from the Byzantine historian Procopius’ scandalous *Secret History* (c. 550):

she would sink down to the stage floor and recline on her back. Slaves to whom the duty was entrusted would then scatter grains of barley from above over her

private parts, whence geese, trained for the purpose, would next pick the grains one by one with their bills and swallow them.(II:565)<sup>58</sup>

In a subtle act of self-censorship, Gibbon printed this passage in Procopius' original Attic Greek, hoping perhaps to restrict its circulation to classically-educated aristocratic gentlemen. One cannot help suspecting that, for once, prurient delight rather than historiographical rigour led Gibbon to quote so liberally from Procopius' notoriously bitter and vindictive account of Justinian's reign. Gibbon appears unable to resist the opportunity of using the anecdote to make a further dig at the Christian church, recounting, 'I have heard that a learned prelate, now deceased, was fond of quoting this passage in conversation' (II: 565).

Gibbon's notes earned him a reputation for ribaldry. In his 1778 *An Examination of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Chapters of Mr. Gibbon's History*, Gibbon's chief antagonist, the historian Henry Edward Davis described Gibbon's salacious, miscellaneous annotations as 'a body of notes, stuffed with a disgusting farrago of ancient learning'.<sup>59</sup> Davis observed more perceptively in his later *A Reply to Mr Gibbon's Vindication* (1779) that Gibbon's citations allowed him to absent himself from moral responsibility for the outrageous content of some of his assertions, claiming that 'whenever he was willing to throw out an insinuation against religion, which would appear more graceful when supported by some testimony, he quoted the author or the book at large'.<sup>60</sup>

Gibbon responded to Davis' earlier publication in his 1779 *Vindication*, insisting that his exhaustive annotation demonstrated his fidelity to the historical record:

the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Chapters of my History are illustrated by three hundred and eighty-three Notes; and the nakedness of a few Notes, which are not accompanied by any quotation, is amply compensated by a much greater number, which contain two, three, or perhaps four distinct references; so that upon the whole my stock of quotations which support and justify my facts cannot amount to less than eight hundred or a thousand.<sup>61</sup>

In his admission of the 'nakedness' of a small number of notes, Gibbon acknowledges that a few of his statements are unsupported by direct quotations and thus vulnerable to attack. At the same time, his word choice appears to carry with it an implicit recognition of the lechery and levity of the notes. Nevertheless, his noun 'stock' stresses their general robustness, suggesting that the notes provide a form of capital, attesting to the reliability of his account. Gibbon's assertions were supported by his fellow historian William Robertson, who claimed, 'I have traced Mr Gibbon in many of his quotations (for experience has taught me to suspect the accuracy of my brother penmen) and I find that he refers to no passage but what he has seen with his own eyes'.<sup>62</sup>

For other writers however, Gibbon's critical appraisal of his sources in his footnotes was simply baffling. Rather than supporting the centred text, the notes appeared to be at odds with it. John Whitaker argued that:

In every other author [...] The note indeed always plays the parasite to the text. But Mr. Gibbon repeatedly breaks in upon this parasitical humour, and destroys this loving fellowship. His notes are behaving like impudent valets to their masters.<sup>63</sup>

Interestingly, Whitaker's notion of the note as a 'parasite' is echoed in Genette's label 'paratext'. In a fascinating rhetorical move, Whitaker maps the textual hierarchy of

‘main’ text and notes onto a representation of the social hierarchy. For Whitaker, a note should act as a manservant to the text – alternating between a close companion or a subservient skivvy as the occasion demanded. Gibbon’s notes, however, replaced companionship with contention, assuming an importance beyond their station.

Whitaker insisted that, in their considerable size, the notes forced the eye to move uncomfortably quickly between text and paratext, narration and verification, sending the mind spinning like a ship in a storm: ‘his notes are so frequent [...] that the reader is perpetually drawn off from the subject of the text, and his mind is distracted in an endless variety; being tossed backwards and forwards, between historical narrative and critical observations, the deeds of the actors on the *stage* above, and the characters of the writers in the ‘cellarage’ below’.<sup>64</sup> The notion of notes as a ‘cellarage’ likens the notes to the hollow area beneath a Renaissance stage known in slang of the period as ‘hell’ and entered through a trapdoor called a ‘hell mouth’, suggesting that the margins constitute an infernal underworld, in which dead or condemned aspects of the text exist in wild discord. Whitaker’s final phrase consolidates his elision of the social and the textual pecking order, suggesting that the centred text preened and posed centre stage while the notes lurked underneath. However, what is particularly striking about this remark is that it suggests that Gibbon engages in a public performance in the centre and a more private, intimate dialogue with the reader in his margins. Indeed, the clergyman and man of letters, James Chelsum expressed similar sentiments, portraying the margins as the site in which Gibbon conversed more informally: ‘from these [the notes] perhaps the temper and design of our Historian may be collected, since in these we hear him speaking in his own person’.<sup>65</sup>

Gibbon’s notes form an important precedent for later annotative practice in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. Gibbon’s presentation of extensive Latin and Greek quotations for the delectation of polite gentlemen readers provide a precedent for the vast swarm of classical allusions found in Thomas James Mathias’ notes for *The Pursuits of Literature* (1794-7): a heavily annotated ultra-loyalist satire that was a huge commercial success at the time, described later by Thomas De Quincey as ‘by far the most popular book from 1797 to 1802’.<sup>66</sup> Certainly Mathias recognised parallels, and sought to associate himself with Gibbon’s scholarly prestige while distancing himself from the historian’s irreverent reputation, asserting smugly: ‘I shall never blush for any of my notes, though perhaps Mr. Gibbon has blushed for many of his; at least I sincerely hope so’.<sup>67</sup>

Lord Byron also honoured Gibbon as the ‘lord of irony’.<sup>68</sup> And Gibbon’s notes arguably provided a key precedent for the discordant richness of Lord Byron’s sardonic, scholarly notes for poems such as Cantos I and II of *Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage* (1812) and his Eastern tales. For instance, in his irreverent notes to *The Giaour* (1813), Byron pokes fun at established religion, claiming he omits the abbot’s attempts to console the Giaour for his grief over his dead love Leila because his sermon was ‘of a customary length [...] and was delivered in the usual tone of all orthodox preachers’ and thus ‘had so little effect upon the patient, that it could have no hopes from the reader’.<sup>69</sup> Byron’s witty notes recall Gibbon’s in their sardonic tone and their use of the margins as a space in which more hostile attitudes towards Christianity could be articulated.

Gibbon’s scholarly, playful and occasionally lewd notes took up approximately one quarter of *The Decline and Fall*, numbering close to eight thousand and provided an important precedent for the annotative practice of later writers. Nonetheless he depicted the spread of commentary as a symptom of the

intellectual stagnation that he identified as a principal cause of the degeneration of the Roman world: ‘a cloud [...] of commentators darkened the face of learning, and the decline of genius was soon followed by the corruption of taste’.<sup>70</sup> What this shows is how easily a talent and taste for creating extensive notes could co-exist with an expressed distaste for paratexts.

### **Conclusion: The raw meat painting and Romantic-period literature**

You just wait there,  
says a wife.  
Yes, says her husband,  
pauses, then shuffles a few steps towards  
the raw meat painting called Girlie Show  
and stands there, waiting.<sup>71</sup>

In the title of his poem ‘Footnote on the Edward Hopper Exhibition’, Adrian Mitchell makes an ingenious analogy between the episode described in the poem – a fleeting incident, aside from the main event – and the condition of annotation. Like annotation, the poem relies upon stark juxtaposition. Mitchell’s placing of the pornographic histrionics of the artwork against the couple’s mundane exchange is wryly discordant. The husband’s bored inattention (‘waiting’ not looking) acts as an unwitting riposte to the affected audacity of the artwork, which is a parody of modern art shock tactics – its visceral explicitness belying its conceptual conventionality. Mitchell presents both the corridor outside the gallery toilets and the margins of the page as sites for liminal encounters.

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, a number of interactions took place in the margins, which have frequently been overlooked. Annotation was a pervasive phenomenon: from William Wordsworth ‘Note’ to *The Thorn* (1800); to Samuel Taylor Coleridge’s marginal gloss to *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* (1816); Percy Shelley’s radical notes to *Queen Mab* (1811; published 1813); to Walter Scott’s notes to the *Waverley Novels* (1814-32). Notes appeared in bibles, editions of literary classics, dictionaries, grammar books, literary oddities, novels, parliamentary registers, parodies, poetic epics, satires, scientific literature, plays and works of antiquarian scholarship. The aforementioned satirist Thomas James Mathias used the margins of *The Pursuits* as a clandestine location, in which he could launch virulent attacks on the private lives of prominent intellectuals and intervene in contemporary controversies. In addition, the scholar-poet Robert Southey used annotation as a space to create collections, arranging an array of exotic extracts in the margins of his Oriental poetic epic *Thalaba the Destroyer* (1801). Moreover, in the creative partnerships of Samuel Henley and William Beckford, Samuel Taylor Coleridge and William Wordsworth and Lord Byron and John Cam Hobhouse, annotation provided a location in which literary collaborators negotiated their reciprocal roles and engaged in struggles for intellectual ownership. And in *Castle Rackrent* (1800) and *The Wild Irish Girl* (1806), Maria Edgeworth and Sydney Owenson respectively, use the margins in which they can negotiate their marginal identities as Irish women. Moreover, in his brilliant study of eighteenth-century editorial practice *Scholars and Gentleman*, Simon Jarvis points out that, by the Romantic period, the minute philological practices of scholars such as Bentley and Theobald had become indispensable elements of any scholarly edition: ‘the historicist approach to language and anti-eclectic approach to bibliographical evaluation, which at the beginning of the century had seemed to so many critics to be low and interested incursions upon a

public culture, had by the end of the century become the marks of scholarly respectability'.<sup>72</sup>

Nonetheless, the widespread use of annotation in imaginative literature continued to co-exist with a neo-Popean view of annotation as a parasitic presence. For William Hazlitt, commentary engulfed the text in a mire of petty details, inhibiting aesthetic appreciation. He claimed: 'a beautiful thought is sure to be lost in an endless commentary upon it'.<sup>73</sup> John Keats saw interpretative comments as an admission of aesthetic deficiency, arguing that poems should 'explain themselves' and 'should do without any comment'.<sup>74</sup>

Writing after the Romantic period, in his 1840 essay 'Style', Thomas de Quincey poses the question: 'how far the practice of footnotes [...] is reconcilable with the laws of just composition'? For De Quincey, footnotes show a text to be unfinished: 'a note argues that the sentence to which it is attached has not received the benefit or a full development for the conception involved'. De Quincey wonders 'whether, if thrown into the furnace again and re-melted, it [a text] might not be so recast as to absorb the redundancy which had previously flowed over into a note'. Here de Quincey imagines style as a mould into which words and ideas are poured and allowed to solidify. A text is like a piece of metalwork – something hard and fixed – which can nevertheless be dissolved and reshaped to smooth defects such as annotation. While de Quincey begins this passage by speculating to what extent footnotes can be considered an aspect of a good writing style, he ends by suggesting that they are better eliminated altogether. Despite his own frequent reliance upon footnotes (this very essay contains seven) he portrays them as a disfiguring outgrowth – an 'excrescence' and a 'redundancy'.<sup>75</sup> As I have shown, this dichotomy persists in the present, and underpins recent theoretical accounts of annotation by Gérard Genette.

For Genette, the paratext is always a parasite: it lives upon another organism and derives nourishment from it. In so doing, Genette conflates actual annotative practice with the discourse surrounding it, believing that *what writers and critics say they are doing* and *what they are actually doing* are one and the same. On the contrary, while the footnote was overwhelmingly represented by eighteenth-century writers in hostile terms, it also provided them with a means of creating a diverse range of new literary practices. Genette reiterates commonplace views about annotation without noting their divergence from actual annotative practice. Instead, as Mitchell's poem suggests, taking annotation seriously is an incongruous experience that places conventional views of textual structure and literary history at a new angle. In particular, it requires going beyond a concept of textuality that isolates the paratext, and moving towards a more inclusive definition. The 'para' of 'paratext' might then signify not just 'ancillary to' but 'beside', 'in transgression of', 'continuous with', 'in counterpoint to' and 'beyond'.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Gérard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans. by Jane E. Lewin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 410. All subsequent references given in parentheses.

<sup>2</sup> Marcel Proust, *Finding Time Again* (1927), trans. by Ian Patterson, ed. by Christopher Prendergast (London: Penguin 2003), p. 125.

<sup>3</sup> Marcel Proust, *Sodom and Gomorrah* (1921-2), trans. by John Sturrock, ed. by Christopher Prendergast (London: Penguin, 2002), p. 34.

<sup>4</sup> For instance, in the final book of *À la recherche du temps perdu* Proust's narrator contrasts the mobile Jupien with the incapacitated elderly Baron de Charlus. He describes Charlus as an 'old, decayed

prince' whose 'eyes had lost all their lustre', 'making the same sort of effort to sit upright as a child does when he has told to be good [...] [w]ith Jupien, who was endlessly attentive, at his side' (Proust, *Finding Time Again*, p. 167).

<sup>5</sup> Oscar Wilde, *Intentions* (London: Unicorn Press, 1945), p. 15.

<sup>6</sup> Hilaire Belloc, 'On Footnotes' in *On* (London: Methuen and Co., 1923), pp. 30-38 (p. 33).

<sup>7</sup> Richard Howard, 'Edmond and Jules de Goncourt', *Misgivings* (London: Atheneum Press, 1979), p. 45 l. 7.

<sup>8</sup> Thomas McGrath, 'Ode for the American Dead in Korea', *New and Selected Poems* (Ohio: Swallow Press, 1964), p. 78, l. 12.

<sup>9</sup> Sari Benstock, 'At the Margin of Discourse: Footnotes in the Fictional Text', *PMLA*, 98:2 (March 1983), 204-25 (p. 204).

<sup>10</sup> J. D. Salinger, *Franny and Zooey* (Boston, Toronto: Little, Brown and Co., 1961), p. 52.

<sup>11</sup> Belloc, *On*, p. 34.

<sup>12</sup> John Kinsella, 'The Phenomena that Surrounds a Sighting of Eclipse Island', *Poems: 1980-1994* (Newcastle-Upon-Tyne: Bloodaxe Books, 1998), pp. 18-23, section 5, ll. 18-23.

<sup>13</sup> Quoted in G. W. Bowerstock, 'The Art of the Footnote', *American Scholar*, 53 (1983) 54-62 (p. 54).

<sup>14</sup> George Eliot, *Middlemarch: A Study of Provincial Life* (Edinburgh and London: Blackwood, 1874), p. 50.

<sup>15</sup> Quoted in Jonathan Thompson, 'History ain't what it used to be: Simon Schama slams academic historians', *Independent*, February 22 (2004), p. 37.

<sup>16</sup> Bowerstock, 'Footnote', p. 54.

<sup>17</sup> Benstock, 'Margins', p. 204.

<sup>18</sup> Claire A. Simmons, 'Annotating a Text: Literary Theory and Electronic Hypertext', in *Electronic Text: Investigations in Method and Theory*, ed. by Kathryn Sutherland (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), pp. 47-67 (p. 50).

<sup>19</sup> Martin Amis, *Experience* (London: Vintage, 2000), p.120.

<sup>20</sup> Duncan Forbes, 'Memorandum for the Grand Panjandrum', in Duncan Forbes, *Taking Liberties* (London: Enitharom Press, 1996), p. 58, l. 6.

<sup>21</sup> Jerome C. Christensen, 'Coleridge's Marginal Method in the *Biographia Literaria*', *PMLA*, 92: 5 (October 1972), 928-40 (p. 933).

<sup>22</sup> George Herbert, *The Works of George Herbert*, ed. by Tim Cook (Ware: Wordsworth Editions, 1994), p. 52, ll. 9-12.

<sup>23</sup> Henry Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence* (London: H. Jackson, 1577) p. 199.

<sup>24</sup> John Norris, 'To Dr Plot on his Natural History of Stafford-shire', in *A Collection of Miscellanies*, 2nd edn (London, 1692), p. 127, ll 37-40.

<sup>25</sup> Thomas Carew, 'To A.D., unreasonable distrustfull of her owne beauty' in *Poems* (London: Thomas Walkley, 1640), p. 143, ll 1-2.

<sup>26</sup> Quoted in Anthony Grafton, *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450-1800* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991), p. 2.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>28</sup> Marcus Walsh, *Shakespeare, Milton, and eighteenth-century literary editing: The beginnings of interpretative scholarship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 33.

<sup>29</sup> My italics. Bishop George Berkeley, *Alciphron; or, the Minute Philosopher: The Sixth Dialogue* (London: J. Tonson, 1732), p. 232.

<sup>30</sup> Samuel Clarke, *The Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity*, (London: 1712), p. xvii.

<sup>31</sup> William Shakespeare, *The works of Shakespeare: in seven volumes. Collated with the oldest copies, and corrected; with notes, explanatory, and critical: by Mr. Theobald* (London: A. Bettesworth et al., 1733), p. xiv (p. xlv).

<sup>32</sup> William Wotton, *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* (London: 1694), p. 318.

<sup>33</sup> Jonathan Swift, *The Oxford Authors: Jonathan Swift*, ed. by Angus Ross and David Woolley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), p. 106.

<sup>34</sup> Alexander Pope, *Poems* ed. by John Butt, 12 vols (London: Methuen, 1954), IV, p. 118, l. 170.

<sup>35</sup> Letter addressed originally to John Caryll, but reissued for publication and addressed to Joseph Addison, 30 January 1713 in Alexander Pope, *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, ed. by George Sherburn, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), I, pp. 208-9.

<sup>36</sup> Alexander Pope, *The Dunciad*, ed. by James Sutherland (London: Methuen, 1963), p. 59.

<sup>37</sup> Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language* (1755; repr. Harlow: Longman, 1990). No page numbers given.

- <sup>38</sup> Samuel Johnson, 'Dr. Samuel Johnson's Preface', in William Shakespeare, *The Plays of William Shakespeare, from the text of Dr. S. Johnson* (Dublin: Thomas Ewing, 1771), pp. vii- lvi (p. liv).
- <sup>39</sup> John Smith, *The Printer's Grammar* (London: John Smith, 1755), pp. 76,78.
- <sup>40</sup> William W. E. Slights, *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001), p. 255.
- <sup>41</sup> See Walsh, *Shakespeare, Milton, and eighteenth-century literary editing*, pp. 30-53.
- <sup>42</sup> D. F. Wright, 'Brown, John (1722-1787)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3622>> [accessed 16 September 2004]
- <sup>43</sup> John Brown, *The Self-Interpreting Family Bible* (London: John G. Murdoch, c. 1850), p. 50.
- <sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1. For instance, Brown spells out the meaning of Genesis 1.1 – 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth' – explaining 'that is, in the beginning of time and things, three Divine Persons in one Godhead, made of nothing, the third heaven, or residence of the blessed, and the while matter out of which the air, and starry heaven, the sun and earth were afterwards framed'. Importantly, such a note does not simply explain scripture but frames it in terms of orthodox Protestant theology.
- <sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 808.
- <sup>46</sup> Alexander Pope, *The Poems of Alexander Pope: Volume VII: Translations of Homer*, ed. by Maynard Mack et al. (London: Methuen and Co., 1967), pp. 82-3.
- <sup>47</sup> Homer, *The Iliad of Homer. Translated by Mr. Pope*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn (London: W. Bowyer, 1720-21), p. 1.
- <sup>48</sup> Samuel Johnson, *The Works of the English Poets. With Prefaces, Biographical and Critical* (London: H. Hughs, 1779-81), pp. 310-1.
- <sup>49</sup> Cohen claims that, 'these writers separate the practical grammar from its rational grounds by giving each a different portion of the page. The implication [...] is that students can learn the language without acknowledging its rational justification'. Murray Cohen, *Sensible Words: Linguistic Practice in England, 1640-1785* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1977), p. 55.
- <sup>50</sup> Charles Gildon, *A Grammar of the English Tongue* (London: John Brightland, 1711) p. 4.
- <sup>51</sup> Cohen, *Sensible Words*, p. 69.
- <sup>52</sup> John Barrell, *English Literature in History: 1730-80: An Equal, Wide Survey* (London: Hutchison, 1983), p. 141.
- <sup>53</sup> Erasmus Darwin, *The Botanic Garden: Part II: The Loves of the Plants, a Poem, with Philosophical Notes* (1789) (Oxford and New York: Woodstock, 1991), title page. All subsequent references given in parentheses.
- <sup>54</sup> Anna Seward, *Letters of Anne Seward: Written between the years 1784 and 1807* (Edinburgh: George Ramsay, 1811) pp. 73, 74.
- <sup>55</sup> Erasmus Darwin, *A Plan for the conduct of female education, in boarding schools* (Derby: J Drewry, 1797), p. 41.
- <sup>56</sup> Winston S. Churchill, *My Early Life* (London: Thornton Butterworth, 1930), p. 75.
- <sup>57</sup> Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. by David Womersley, 3 vols (London: Penguin Press, 1994), I, p. 480. All subsequent references given in parentheses.
- <sup>58</sup> Translation is a paraphrase from Procopius, *Secret History*, trans. by Richard Atwater (Chicago: P. Covici, 1927; New York: Covici Friede, 1927; repr.. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1961), p. 48.
- <sup>59</sup> Henry Edwards Davis, *An Examination of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Chapters of Mr Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (London: J. Dodsley, 1778), p. i.
- <sup>60</sup> Henry Edward Davis, *A Reply to Mr Gibbon's Vindication* (London: J. Dodsley 1779), p. 13.
- <sup>61</sup> Edward Gibbon, *A Vindication of some passages in the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters of the History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (Dublin: W. and H. Whitestone, 1779), pp. 11-12
- <sup>62</sup> Quoted in Roy Porter, *Edward Gibbon: Making History* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1988), p. 73.
- <sup>63</sup> John Whitaker, *Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, in volumes IV, V and VI, Reviewed* (London: J. Murray, 1791), p. 253.
- <sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 254.
- <sup>65</sup> James Chelsum, *A Reply to Mr. Gibbon's Vindication* (Winchester: Robbins and Gilmour, 1785), p. 7.
- <sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>67</sup> Thomas James Mathias, *The Pursuits of Literature; or, What you will* (London: J. Owen, 1794), p. i.
- <sup>68</sup> Lord Byron, *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage: Canto the Third* (1816), in Byron, *The Complete Poetical Works*, ed. by Jerome McGann, 7 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1980), II, I. 999.
- <sup>69</sup> Lord Byron, *The Giaour* (1813), in Byron, *The Complete Poetical Works*, ed. by Jerome McGann, 7 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), III, pp. 420. 422.

<sup>70</sup> Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* ed. by David Womersley, 3 vols (London: Penguin, 1994), I, p. 84.

<sup>71</sup> Adrian Mitchell, 'Footnote on the Edward Hopper Exhibition', in *Blue Coffee: Poems 1985-1996* (Newcastle-Upon-Tyne: Bloodaxe, 1996), p. 45.

<sup>72</sup> Simon Jarvis, *Scholars and Gentlemen: Shakespearean Textual Criticism and Representations of Scholarly Labour, 1725-1765* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 182.

<sup>73</sup> William Hazlitt, *Characters of Shakespear's [sic.] Plays* (London: R. Hunter, 1817), p. 349.

<sup>74</sup> John Keats, 'To George and Georgiana Keats, Wednesday 16 December 1818' & 'To George and Georgiana Keats, Monday 4 June 1819', in *The Letters of John Keats: Third edition, with revisions and additional letters*, ed. by Maurice Buxton Forman (London: Oxford University Press, 1947), p. 262.

<sup>75</sup> Thomas de Quincey, 'Style: part one', in *The collected works of Thomas de Quincey: Volume X: Literary Theory and Criticism*, ed. by David Masson (Edinburgh: Black, 1990), pp. 166, 165, 166, 166-7.

## Works Cited

- Amis, Martin, *Experience* (London: Vintage, 2000)
- Barrell, John, *English Literature in History: 1730-80: An Equal, Wide Survey* (London: Hutchison, 1983)
- Belloc, Hilaire, *On* (London: Methuen and Co., 1923), 30-38
- Benstock, Sari, 'At the Margin of Discourse: Footnotes in the Fictional Text', *PMLA*, 98:2 (March 1983), 204-25
- Berkeley, Bishop George, *Alciphron; or, the Minute Philosopher: The Sixth Dialogue* (London: J. Tonson, 1732)
- Bowerstock, G. W., 'The Art of the Footnote', *American Scholar*, 53 (1983) 54-62
- Brown, John, *The Self-Interpreting Family Bible* (London: John G. Murdoch, c. 1850)
- Byron, Lord, *Byron, The Complete Poetical Works*, ed. by Jerome McGann, 7 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1980)
- Carew, Thomas, *Poems* (London: Thomas Walkley, 1640)
- Chelsum, James, *A Reply to Mr. Gibbon's Vindication* (Winchester: Robbins and Gilmour, 1785)
- Christensen, Jerome C., 'Coleridge's Marginal Method in the *Biographia Literaria*', *PMLA*, 92: 5 (October 1972) 928-40
- Churchill, Winston S., *My Early Life* (London: Thornton Butterworth, 1930)
- Clarke, Samuel, *The Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity*, (London: 1712)
- Cohen, Murray, *Sensible Words: Linguistic Practice in England, 1640-1785* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1977)
- Darwin, Erasmus, *A Plan for the conduct of female education, in boarding schools* (Derby: J Drewry, 1797)
- , *The Botanic Garden: Part II: The Loves of the Plants, a Poem, with Philosophical Notes* (1789) (Oxford and New York: Woodstock, 1991)
- Davis, Henry Edwards, *An Examination of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Chapters of Mr Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (London: J. Dodsley, 1778)



- 
- Davis, Henry Edward, *A Reply to Mr Gibbon's Vindication* (London: J. Dodsley 1779)
- Eliot, George, *Middlemarch: A Study of Provincial Life* (Edinburgh and London: Blackwood, 1874)
- Forbes, Duncan, *Taking Liberties* (London: Enitharom Press, 1996)
- Genette, Gerard, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans. by Jane E. Lewin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- Gibbon, Edward, *A Vindication of some passages in the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters of the History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (Dublin: W. and H. Whitestone, 1779)
- , *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. by David Womersley, 3 vols (London: Penguin Press, 1994)
- Gildon, Charles, *A Grammar of the English Tongue* (London: John Brightland, 1711)
- Grafton, Anthony, *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450-1800* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991)
- Hazlitt, William, *Characters of Shakespear's [sic.] Plays* (London: R. Hunter, 1817)
- Herbert, George, *The Works of George Herbert*, ed. by Tim Cook (Ware: Wordsworth Editions, 1994)
- Howard, Richard, *Misgivings* (London: Atheneum Press, 1979)
- Jarvis, Simon, *Scholars and Gentlemen: Shakespearean Textual Criticism and Representations of Scholarly Labour, 1725-1765* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)
- Johnson, Samuel, *A Dictionary of the English Language* (1755; repr. Harlow: Longman, 1990)
- , 'Dr. Samuel Johnson's Preface', in William Shakespeare, *The Plays of William Shakespeare, from the text of Dr. S. Johnson* (Dublin: Thomas Ewing, 1771), pp. vii-lvi
- Johnson, Samuel, *The Works of the English Poets. With Prefaces, Biographical and Critical* (London: H. Hughs, 1779-81)
- Keats, John, *The Letters of John Keats*, ed. by Maurice Buxton Forman, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. revised (London: Oxford University Press, 1947)
- Kinsella, John, *Poems: 1980-1994* (Newcastle-Upon-Tyne: Bloodaxe Books, 1998)
- Mathias, Thomas James, *The Pursuits of Literature; or, What you will* (London: J. Owen, 1794)
- McGrath, Thomas, *New and Selected Poems* (Ohio: Swallow Press, 1964)
- Mitchell, Adrian, *Blue Coffee: Poems 1985-1996* (Newcastle-Upon-Tyne: Bloodaxe, 1996)
- Norris, John, *A Collection of Miscellanies*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (London, 1692)
- Peacham, Henry, *The Garden of Eloquence* (London: H. Jackson, 1577)
- Pope, Alexander, *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, ed by George Sherburn, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958)

- 
- , *The Dunciad*, ed. by James Sutherland (London: Methuen, 1963)
- , ed., *The Iliad of Homer. Translated by Mr. Pope, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn.*, (London: W. Bowyer, 1720-21)
- , *Poems*, ed. by John Butt, 12 vols (London: Methuen, 1954)
- , *The Poems of Alexander Pope: Volume VII: Translations of Homer*, ed. by Maynard Mack et al. (London: Methuen and Co., 1967)
- Porter, Roy, *Edward Gibbon: Making History* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1988)
- Procopius, *Secret History*, trans. by Richard Atwater (Chicago: P. Covici, 1927; New York: Covici Friede, 1927; repr. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1961)
- Proust, Marcel, *Finding Time Again* (1927), trans. by Ian Patterson, ed. by Christopher Prendergast (London Penguin 2003)
- Proust, Marcel, *Sodom and Gomorrah* (1921-2), trans. by John Sturrock, ed. by Christopher Prendergast (London: Penguin, 2002)
- Quincey, Thomas de, *The collected works of Thomas de Quincey: Volume X: Literary Theory and Criticism*, ed. by David Masson (Edinburgh: Black, 1990)
- Salinger, J. D., *Franny and Zooey* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1961)
- Seward, Anna, *Letters of Anne Seward: Written between the years 1784 and 1807* (Edinburgh: George Ramsay, 1811)
- Shakespeare, William, *The works of Shakespeare: in seven volumes. Collated with the oldest copies, and corrected; with notes, explanatory, and critical: by Mr. Theobald* (London: A. Bettesworth et al., 1733)
- Simmons, Claire A., 'Annotating a Text: Literary Theory and Electronic Hypertext', in *Electronic Text: Investigations in Method and Theory*, ed. by Kathryn Sutherland (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)
- Slights, William W. E., *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2001)
- Smith, John, *The Printer's Grammar* (London: John Smith, 1755)
- Swift, Jonathan, *The Oxford Authors: Jonathan Swift*, ed. by Angus Ross and David Woolley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984)
- Thompson, Jonathan, 'History ain't what it used to be: Simon Schama slams academic historians', *Independent*, February 22 (2004), p. 37
- Walsh, Marcus, *Shakespeare, Milton, and eighteenth-century literary editing: The beginnings of interpretative scholarship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

- 
- Whitaker, John, *Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, in volumes IV, V and VI, Reviewed* (London: J. Murray, 1791)
- Wilde, Oscar, *Intentions* (London: Unicorn Press, 1945)
- Wotton, William, *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* (London: 1694)
- Wright, D. F., 'Brown, John (1722-1787)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)  
<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3622>> [accessed 16 September 2004]