

REVIEW ARTICLE

COLONIZING THE SPACE BELOW:
EXPANSIVE SCHOLARSHIP AND FORCEFUL NOTES

Elizabeth Hollis Berry
Grant MacEwan College

GRAFTON, ANTHONY. *The Footnote: A Curious History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1999. Pp. 256. US \$18.99 hardcover.

Whether celebrating the sublime, recording the ridiculous, or poised deftly somewhere in between, this elegant narrative chronicles the footnote's art and power over centuries of earnest enquiry, compulsive pedantry, and backstabbing skulduggery. Anthony Grafton's subtitle—delivered appropriately enough in the form of a footnote—tells the story in a suggestive aside: this is indeed a curious history, filled with fascinating rhizomatic twists and turns. Beginning with the footnote's heyday in the eighteenth century, when historical narratives were graced by notes offering high literary art, Grafton opens his first chapter with a statement about the epic scale and classic style that characterizes Edward Gibbon's *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. In what could be read as a moment of reflexivity, he effectively describes in Gibbon's style the kind of scholarly range and stylistic verve that distinguishes Grafton's own achievement in his witty analysis of the footnote's history. Gibbon's 1776 "Advertisement" to his first edition proclaimed a style "Susceptible of entertainment as well as information" (4), a characteristic emphasis on the Ciceronian conjunction of instruction and delight that tells the reader something about Gibbon's

Augustan allure, no less than it foregrounds Grafton's considerable skill. Indeed, Grafton, I would argue, achieves the impossible: he makes the history of the footnote an intriguing narrative of sometimes gripping intensity, punctuated by anticipatory highs and treacherous lows.

While Grafton refers to the "glamorous metaphors" used to transform dusty texts by one of the central figures in the footnote's history, his own deployment of suggestive metaphors and nuanced similes emerges as a notable feature of his style. This now familiar footnoting apparatus Grafton describes variously as analogous to the high whine of a dentist's drill, boring deeply but reassuringly "directed" for scientific and technological "benefit" (5), or, sometimes, when it degenerates into mere routine, the "offhand production and disposal of waste products" (6)—a necessary form or function of scholarly plumbing. According to Grafton's account, the production of footnotes can hold the fascination of forensic digging for pungent evidence of past practices, the exercise turning up "hidden cracks and forgotten conduits in both the modern practice and the millennial traditions of historical scholarship" (7). Grafton limns the details of diverse worlds taking shape in the footnote's history as he analyses a "staggering range of divergent practices under history's apparently stable surface" (7). He himself ranges through such Arcadian spaces as housed the antiquarian Varro and nostalgic historian Livy: from the "fragrant shades of scholarly autobiography" to the sober daylight of sourced accounts. He adroitly steers the reader through "archival waters" (7) where those who would go trawling might be lucky enough to "identify the catch in any given set of notes" (4). Taking on variously the "lead of official prose" and the "gold of Gibbon's classic oratory" (4), Grafton probes into the farthest reaches of scholarly debate where footnotes enter the fray, affording entertainment "normally in the form of daggers stuck in the backs of the author's colleagues" (8). Just as all roads were said to lead to Rome, this all leads to a point about the legitimising power of the footnote: "Like the shabby podium, carafe of water, and rambling inaccurate introduction which assert that a particular person deserves to be listened to when giving a public lecture, footnotes confer authority on a writer" (8).

Anyone who has tackled a scholarly text knows the power of the footnote to delay, perplex, inform, tax, and sometimes amuse, but who would have thought the footnote's history could lay claim to high drama? Yet Grafton tells the story with such panache that one is convinced the footnote could just as well be the locus of empire building and wicked subversions as of intellectual sniping, scientific compilation, or careful exegesis. Gibbon's classic opus is a case in point, since those particular footnotes' sometimes infamous religious and sexual irreverence, Grafton opines, "evinced the power to amuse friends and enrage enemies" (1). This power to satirize and undermine is indicated in the titles of other footnote studies from the 1990s—such as P.W. Cosgrove's "Undermining the Footnote"—cited instructively¹ in one of Grafton's early notes (2). Among several instances offered of Gibbon's "cheerfully sarcastic" notations, one example of the historian's wry artistry is hidden in a

footnote about the high price paid for chastity by early Christians such as Origen, who, as Gibbon intimates, "judged it the most prudent to disarm the tempter" (2). Beyond this mere suggestion, it is the historic footnote that explains precisely by what drastic means Origen avoided temptation—self-castration, no less—and reveals just how Gibbon viewed the operation: "As it was his general practice to allegorize scripture, it seems unfortunate that, in this instance only, he should have adopted the literal sense" (2). While such footnotes offered metahistorical commentary, they gave Gibbon the opportunity to wear various critical hats and attracted plaudits from nineteenth-century classical scholars (such as the Bernays² brothers) who praised their "instructive abundance" (4). Whether sporting the forms of the grave scholar or those of the amused polemicist, Gibbon's footnotes could stick like "burrs in orthodox memories" (2), yet while they subverted they also supported "the magnificent arch of his history" (3).

Citing Noel Coward's arch observation that "having to read a footnote resembles having to go downstairs to answer the door while in the midst of making love," Grafton explores nineteenth-century concerns about preserving a coherent (seamless) literary narrative along with documentary authenticity (70). He emphasizes the historian's struggle to avoid interrupting (with cumbersome references) an omniscient narrator's single story, since footnotes tend to detract from the illusory veracity and immediacy of narrative coherence. Grafton's chapters on the origins of nineteenth-century scientific history delve into the contributions to the craft of its first famous practitioner—Leopold von Ranke, star of the Prussian renaissance at the University of Berlin. Ranke had a nose for primary sources and took evident delight in "document-diving" (35), while his books, lectures and seminars won him a following of thousands, eager for intellectual order out of chaos. The means to this heroic end, Grafton points out, lay in the proper study of history set out by Ranke, whose cited letters evoke with peculiar conviction "one of the great discoveries of early nineteenth-century history: the pleasures of the archive" (37). Footnotes, it seems, were the underpinnings of stardom for this historical wunderkind, and his vaunted position came from no lesser place than the rhetorical appeal of his documentation. Yet, curiously enough, it was not so much through the science of history as through the romance of fiction that Ranke arrived at his magical method of documentary reassembly. He had been seduced by historical novels before tastefully transforming the "dusty thrift shop of the past into a modern museum," with an array of "glamorous" metaphors at the ready to apply deft touches in the organizational process of dating and labelling (39). For Ranke, after falling in love with Sir Walter Scott's novels, had then discovered the compulsion to fix troubling inaccuracies in those seductive medieval or renaissance fictional worlds and to do so by reconstructing the history in an orderly manner without losing the narrative flow of the literary. The results, it seems, were legendary. Ranke had set into motion an oddly modern-looking vehicle assembled from ancient components: he "created and dramatized a new practice, based on a new kind of research and made visible by a new form of

documentation. Each serious work of history must now travel on an impregnable armoured bottom, rather like a tank" (56). While Ranke's desire for the literary and the documentary forced the footnote upon him, the second component of his learned apparatus (appendices) gave the experience of reading him a "a symphonic density" and produced a "continual interplay between chronological narrative and systematic reflection"—the *son et lumière* of sophisticated footnotation also enjoyed by Gibbon's readers (72).

The complexity of this process seems also to be embodied in the personal rivalries that jostle beneath the footnote's stolid surface. Grafton's investigation effectively turns up suspicions that the father of the footnote was not quite the straightforward originator he claimed to be. For all Ranke's revelation (in his late dictations) that his critical textual apparatus came upon him "as a conversion experience," remembered with the shock of one who having fallen "through a weak spot in an apparently solid floor...suddenly saw that history must rest on thick pillars and joists which only criticism could fashion and put in place" (72), he was also well aware he was not entering uninhabited spaces. A number of his techniques were used during the Renaissance: a fact to which Ranke alluded without actually acknowledging the debt. Here Grafton describes one such Italian humanist who systematically applied practices such as source identification, comparison, and elimination (of non-con-temporaneous, derivative sources) to expose authoritative texts as forgeries. Lorenzo Valla's careful application of these practices achieved the demolition of a treasured papal construction in *The Donation of Constantine*—the story of a formerly leprous Constantine cured by the Pope and gratefully donating the entire western half of the Roman empire to the papacy. While the drama of the scholar's literary sleuthing unfolds, it takes on the cut and thrust of political insurrection, as Valla denounces the falseness of the text's rhetorical language, trounces the forgery, indicts the papacy and takes "no argumentative prisoners" (75): altogether searing stuff. Then again, the history of the footnote takes another turn in the sixteenth century when Jean Bodin and others were writing elaborate how-to manuals on reading for historical sources. In order to get the format right, insisted Francois Baudouin, a radical admission had to be made: while historical texts had been lost and some medieval chronicles were riddled with error, a critical study of tradition could produce a coherent history of the whole known past. A list of sources as wide-ranging as Cicero's letters, oral traditions mentioned by Charlemagne's biographer, Einhard, and by European observers of New-World societies, derivative histories, and original documents held in the French royal archives could all be used by modern scholars. Both Bodin and Baudouin insisted on critical scrutiny, seeing history as "a form of inquiry as well as a form of narrative" (76). The very fact that Ranke cited Bodin on how to read historical texts shows his debt to the historical hermeneutics of French theorists and others who had gone before, though Ranke later denied such influences. Despite the explosive impact" on Ranke's method of his own professor (Gottfried Hermann, the Hellenist) who taught the young student how to lay bare the ancient landscape

by demolishing the derivative constructions of earlier scribes, the younger scholar was determined to deny his teacher and seize the laurel crown as in some latter day mythic drama. Ranke never did acknowledge his debt to the professor of Greek, who, like Sir Walter Scott, had taught him "to prefer bare facts and historical sources to derivative later narratives, however well they read" (91).

From this discussion of Ranke's famously innovative combination of narrative with analytical history on the grand scale and dramatization of the critical process, Grafton follows the footnote back in time, away from nineteenth-century historicism, with its "hard-pressed teacher begging for books and travel grants," to the Enlightenment, where it takes shape in certain eighteenth-century gentlemen's well-stocked libraries (93). Here the footnote's genealogy meanders onto the pages of authors such as Gibbon, Hume, Swift, and Pope, but does so by way of continental writers. Although the trendsetting Voltaire dismissed technical scholarship as a kind of "vermin" and sent it packing with the *grande geste*—"Woe³ to details!"—other lesser known writers went in the other direction. While Gibbon inventively fused existing traditions—addressing himself to the "lurid lives of emperors," he did not neglect "dusty sources"—this eye for dry detail was predated by continental historians such as Justus Moser, for example, who, ten years earlier, published a spectacularly documented history of Osnabrück. If Moser was hardly a cutting-edge historical critic, he did set the pace of writing the footnoted "double story" followed by Gibbon and added the perspective that, as far as other European writers were concerned, Gibbon "appeared to be the master of an existing craft rather than the inventor of a new one" (102).

That Gibbon entered into the practice of footnoting with some powerful company is documented by David Hume's 1776 letter to William Strahan, publisher of the *Decline and Fall's* first volume and Hume's *History of England*. This letter, described by Grafton as "one of the most illustrious documents ever to concern itself with the humble problem of the footnote" (102), expresses esteem for Gibbon's learning, while also voicing complaints about such technical matters as the placement of the chapter numbers and the format of the notes. In this example of epistolary history in-the-making, it transpires that the system then used by Gibbon of appending notes after the body of text prompted Hume to grumble, "One is also plagued with his Notes," although Hume himself enjoyed writing copious notes, such as one detailing the works of Mons. Montgeron and other French authors on miracles, expatiated over several pages beneath the text of *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (900). His instructive complaint here, though, is not so much about the notes themselves as about their placement which required him to "turn to the End of the Volume," where "you often find nothing but the Reference to an Authority: all these Authorities ought only to be printed at the Margin or the Bottom of the Page" (Grafton 103). The capitalization of those last three substantives is suggestive and, as Grafton points out, this "text reveals much" (103), not only that Gibbon's footnotes started out as endnotes before Hume complained, but also that the "technical, documentary side of Gibbon's

footnoting" followed in the footsteps of Hume and others before him, revealing the footnoted citation of sources to be neither radical nor new, though Gibbon's particular mixture of satirical commentary and historical references "proved unique" (103). The burgeoning of this craft in the eighteenth century led to some famous fights, such as the war between Scriblerians, Alexander Pope and Jonathan Swift, and their meddlesome foe Richard Bentley (who gained notoriety as an audacious specialist in retrofitting vintage texts from ancient Manilius to mighty Milton). Appearing in parodic fury on the bottom of pages amongst "the most brilliant" to see the light in eighteenth-century letters, the Scriblerus Club's satirical sorties turned Bentley's shockingly "lordly approach" to the classics against him, with all the amiable vicious-ness the neoclassical wits could muster (112). From diverse weapons available in his arsenal during this battle between Ancients and Moderns represented in *The Battel of the Books*, Swift aimed his mockery at Bentley's folly, not only for being an uncritical proponent of the modern science featured absurdly in *Gulliver's Travels*, but also for the failings (symbolical gaps)⁴ in his philological career. It was from the vitriolic pen of Pope, however, that Bentley suffered the more acrid assault. Grafton describes Pope as variously "infuriated," "enraged," and "appalled" by Bentley's audacity in attempting to alter canonical texts, his baleful influence on modern editorial practices, and his sorry pretence at scholarly criticism—especially where Pope's own work was concerned. The footnote, of course, proved a memorable repository for such fury. Pope's great foray against the monstrous Dullness of the age, the *Variorum Dunciad*, allows for commentary on both his own superlative talent and the "immense, irremediable stupidity of his opponents" (114). Grafton concludes with one of his own illustrative metaphors:

He used the footnote throughout as the hockey-masked villain in an American horror film uses a chain saw: to dismember his opponents, leaving their gory limbs scattered across the landscape. (114)

Rich for his satirical purposes, Pope's favourite kind of footnote originated somewhere between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when classical scholars set up a "baroque" system of "exegesis and debate" (114). Grafton expands on this with a characteristic metaphorical flourish: "Polemics raged, glosses spread, a thick moss of modern, secondary literature grew over the broken columns of Greek and Roman literature" (115). The seventeenth-century proliferation of this trend towards variorum editions, "in all of which the voices of the arguing commentators threatened to drown the thin classic monotone of the original text," provided Pope with a model by which not only to impersonate but ultimately to demolish his opponents (115). This kind of heavy documentation is resplendently displayed in the *Dunciad*, for example, where Pope's enemies are invited to the satirical feast in footnotes citing their work, only to be roasted by ridiculing their idiotic scholarly pretensions or skewered by the sharp parodies of learning offered by Pope's friends who were invited to contribute to the sport. Friends such as Swift were breezily encouraged by Pope to "make a few" of

the attendant "Notes" and other critical apparatus "in any way you like best" in the shape of their solicited variorum-style⁵ contributions, which delighted in slashing and burning the dense, fertile undergrowth of the Moderns' chaotic preoccupations. All these cleverly familiar procedures of scholarly annotation were the means to the end of Pope's literary wargames, demonstrating the extent to which by 1729 the footnote was a trend throughout Europe: "when the first version of the Dunciad variorum appeared, the footnote had become a Europe-wide fashion, as likely to appeal to a wit in a London coffee-house as to a subrektor in a Wittenburg Gymnasium" (118).

At this juncture in the footnote's history, when Pope and the Scriblerus Club regulars were finding ripe opportunities to point up the pedantic flatulence of the London literary scene and the vogue for excessive antiquarian learning through technically adept parodies of scholarly annotation, their European neighbours were wallowing in the appealing billows of the footnote's expansive scholarly and satirical potential. From German readers' interest in footnotes that either echoed Pope's efforts to expose and satirize learned charlatany⁶ or proudly recycled endless research in self-parodying satires of the footnote,⁷ Grafton moves on to describe how the footnote's rapid spread in eighteenth-century historiography can be traced back "into the stately urban palaces of great Renaissance lawyers and collectors, and perhaps all the way to the ancient world itself" (121). Grafton's leading conclusion here is that, while the footnote is "distinctively modern in its final form," it has "as we shall see...some surprisingly ancient prototypes" (121). This draws the investigation back into the Renaissance historical writings produced by historians who were systematically analytical beyond the grand narrative tradition. Those who were "*urkundlich*" (Ranke's word for writers who used documentary evidence or eyewitness accounts) relied on public and private archives to produce variously coloured accounts of their heroes or even their employers, embodying elements of propaganda and ideology as willfully as had Caesar's *Commentaries*.

Depending on the context, humanist historians of the Renaissance used varying procedures, at times excising colourful local detail in the original chroniclers' accounts through the process of Latin reinscription, at other times anticipating an excessive faith in documents (faith of the sort evinced by nineteenth-century historians) and relying on such dubious archives as the confessions of torture victims.⁸ While some Renaissance historians made short work of corrupt or corruptible sources, others recognised the value of archival documents. Grafton comments on the dazzling ability of an influential historian such as Giannantonio Campano to break through Latinity's formal restraints in a "colourful account" of his hero, Fortebraccio Baglioni, drawn from Perugian public archives and the private archives of the Baglioni family. Campano's text registered disagreements amongst sources, while simultaneously demonstrating his belief that, beyond ideological propaganda, historians had a serious duty to report fully. With an aptly architectural trope, Grafton sums up the increasingly evident process towards history built on a solid critical foundation:

Under some of the smoothly classical texts of humanist history, with their gleaming marble facades of unfootnoted Latin and their elegantly arched niches in which medieval Italian and modern French orators incongruously spouted Ciceronian periods lav massive foundations carved from the historical granite of archival documentation and detailed, pertinacious interviewing. (127-28)

One of the Renaissance historians whose ingenuity found room for "special literary measures," offering commentary plus critique in the revolutionary form of endnotes, was the English Catholic Richard White of Basingstoke, who published his eleven books of *Historiarum libri...cum notis antiquitatum Britannicarum* between 1597 and 1607 (128). Arguing his country's history required special attention to sources White explained in a dedicatory letter to Archduke Albert of Austria how this could best be achieved: "as bees take honey from different flowers, so we must take materials from all sorts of different authors and, once they have been systematically collected store them away, as it were, in the proper combs" (129). White's stylistically florid tendencies combined with an "unconvincing narrative" failed to achieve the appropriate shoring up or consolidating of evidence in his honeycomb of endnotes many based on enticing-but forged-histories taken from the texts published in 1498 by a Dominican friar, Annius of Viterbo. This admittedly popular, albeit questionable source incorporated the fabricated genealogical connections between royal families of northern Europe and aristocratic Trojan ancestors exiled by the Greeks a story of material importance to scene painters, actors, playwrights and poets who catered to burgeoning English and French nationalism. Shaky and ultimately discredited though this history proved to be, White elsewhere proposed adopting a middle way ("*ego tamen mediam viamputo seligendam*") in order to incorporate all sources that were once regarded as standard or pure, until such time as other scholars sorted out the problem.⁹

The English (*plus fa change*) had only to look over the Channel to find the very scholars who were endeavouring to sort out modern footnotes from old stories in the production of a new sort of history: in a nutshell, this was the kind of history "they knew they should prefer to read" (132). For this novel approach towards assembling a comprehensive historical narrative, the exemplary genus of researcher takes shape in Jacques-Auguste de Thou, "the brilliant lawyer and Latinist who wrote what may be the longest historical narrative ever undertaken" (133).¹⁰ De Thou's project—the history of Europe from 1544 to 1607—was not only written in admirably pure Latin, but also founded upon weighty motives of impartiality in a attempt to portion out the blame for the Wars of Religion, thereby securing political and social peace between Catholic and Protestant factions that divided France. The theory was indeed solid (his Latin historical works later "received the exceptional compliment of a monumental entombment in seven volumes, each of them too heavy to lift"), but, perhaps predictably, the practice proved flawed in its ideal purpose, since France was not united by his book nor was tolerance created by his attempt at honest flexibility (134). In all his striving for impartiality and balance, de Thou's methods skated

alarmingly close to the thin ice of political compromise; yet, in the face of invective or even possible assassination, he managed to maintain his principles and, above all, he confidently upheld a belief in the authority of first-hand testimony. While some scholars attacked his perceived partiality towards Catholics or Protestants for their own denominational reasons, most praised his objectivity and the reason for this, according to Grafton, lies in the simple fact that although de Thou refused to annotate his history, he made his wide-ranging correspondence "into a running collaborative commentary on his text" (140).

The paradoxical problems that accompany the use of notes for purposes of both understanding and appropriating original sources were batted back and forth amongst de Thou's circle. While acknowledging the value of the archive and the need for commentary such as his letters provided, de Thou remained adamant in his refusal to encumber his eloquent prose with annotated comment and was furious when a pirated edition of the *Histories* was tricked out with glosses. For all his subsequent reputation in the history of historiography as the virtuoso of authenticity, celebrated by Wachler and Ranke in the nineteenth century because he provided a model for archive-rooted, self-critical narrative history, de Thou seems to have recognised the potential for plagiarism that lurks insidiously around footnote reading no less than it does around footnote writing. Accordingly, he avoided letting the reader look through his study window and dig in his files, as Grafton puts it, preferring to occupy a more contained space: "For all the critical effort that went into the foundations of de Thou's work, he wanted its superstructure to remain classical. He must have thought that footnotes would spoil its crisp Greco-Roman colonnades and roof-line" (141).

From this architectural trope suggestively outlining the palimpsest of ancient origins beneath modern practice, Grafton moves "Back to the Future" again, in a chapter that finds clues to connect the forms of exposition and argument "which took place in the text, with those that later took place underneath it" (148). In the realm of ecclesiastical historians and antiquaries, while church influence caused radical variations from period to period, it becomes increasingly evident that challenges to one system's ideology (such as the Reformation) brought about intellectual and financial investment in the discipline of ecclesiastical historiography. In order to shore up the Catholic church (or knock it down) and solve problems of liturgical practice (among other things), minute investigations of individual saints' lives joined forces with archeological research that configured the past as polemic. Appended to all manner of discourse, whether picture book or protest, footnotes were mobilised like so many Christian soldiers called up for service to the cause. Sometimes, as in the case of one Flacius Illyricus who amassed the "full-scale Protestant treatment," the resultant vast, learned compilations prompted the funding of a whole historical institute to collect material and check notes, a process that proved suspiciously costly when Flacius began pocketing the funds for himself after indulging in some very fishy note-taking methods, "cutting pages from manuscripts with the legend-

ary *culter flacianus* (the 'Flacian knife' became proverbial)" (162). For the purpose of supplying powerful politico-religious needs, Grafton concludes, "Church history, in other words, spawned the first grant-supported historical research institute—and the first charges that the grant money had been wasted" (162-63).

In a penultimate¹¹ chapter with the resounding title of "Clarity and Distinctness in the Abysses of Erudition: The Cartesian Origins of the Modern Footnote" Grafton locates the origin of the historical footnote somewhere between the Restoration and the eighteenth century, a generation or two before Hume wrote to Walpole to apologize for his "negligence" in not quoting his authorities. Hume's frank admission that it would have been "easy" to write the references "on the margin," followed by an allusion to the "more modern" practice of adding footnotes (recent beyond the time of his Renaissance high political models) provides what Grafton calls the most precise clue to be turned up so far. The story takes shape on (or maybe between) the sheets of Pierre Bayle's *Historical and Critical Dictionary*, an "unlikely best-seller," which seems to have been the quintessence of annotated texts, since it surpasses the garden variety of merely footnoted work by consisting largely of footnotes, with "even footnotes to footnotes" (191). Grafton ranges from here to Bayle's wicked passages and his defense of "the naughty bits" of the footnotes (198) for the simple reason that all subjects—from "Lais" to "Lucretia"—should be examined, since he was, in a word, a compiler,¹² a badge he wore with pride: "*C'est en un mot un Ouvrage de Compilation*" (198, n. 20).

Having woven into this historical tapestry the threads of Bayle's resolutely protestant¹³ contributions, Grafton ends his curious narrative at a place where he began—with an example from the footnote's flourishing past—an example of eighteenth-century brilliance in a passage from Gibbon's *Miscellaneous Works*. The quoted passage demonstrates (as Grafton suggests only Gibbon could) why footnotes were an art form, burning "most brightly" in the eighteenth century before they "lost the prominent role of the tragic chorus," and in the nineteenth century became, like so many Carmens, "reduced to labourers and confined to a vast, dirty factory" (229). It is to the earlier period and the singular prose of Gibbon that Grafton turns for a summary of his findings:

In a brilliant passage, Gibbon dissects the five volumes of the *Origines Guelficae*, the collection of documents which Leibnitz undertook for the Dukes of Hanover: "The hands of the several workmen are apparent; the bold and original spirit of Leibnitz, the crude erudition and hasty conjectures of Eccard, the useful annotations of Gruber, and the critical disquisitions of Scheid." One could say much the same—if one could write such sentences—of the footnote. A palimpsest, it reveals on examination research techniques framed in the Renaissance, critical rules first stated during the Scientific Revolution, the irony of Gibbon, the empathy of Ranke, and the savagery of Leo—as well as the slow growth of publishing conventions, educational institutions, and professional structures which reshaped historians' lives and work. (229)

When not engaged in taking the mickey or the cake, perverting, belittling, confirming or controverting, the footnote occupied some fascinating niches in the gothic vaults of history and no-one has sifted through the evidence to tell the tale more eloquently or amusingly than Grafton in this compelling narrative.

WORKS CITED

- Gibbon, Edward. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Eighteenth-Century English Literature*. Ed. Geoffrey Tillotson. New York: Harcourt, 1969. 1329-1375.
- Hume, David. *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding. Eighteenth-Century English Literature*. Ed. Geoffrey Tillotson. New York: Harcourt, 1969. 890-903.
- Root, R-K. Introduction. *The Dunciad Variorum, with the Prolegomena of Scriblerus. Reproduced in Facsimile from the First Issue of the Original Edition of 1729*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1929.
- Cosgrove, P.W. "Undermining the Footnote: Edward Gibbon, Alexander Pope and the Anti-Authenticating Footnote." *Annotation and Its Texts*. Ed. S. Barney. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991. 130-151.
- Swift, Jonathan. *The Battle of the Books. The Writings of Jonathan Swift*. Eds. Robert A. Greenberg and William B. Piper. New York: Norton, 1973. 376-396.
- _____. *Gulliver's Travels. The Writings of Jonathan Swift*. Eds. Robert A. Greenberg and William B. Piper. New York: Norton, 1973. 1-260.

ENDNOTES

1. Grafton's notes refer to a "remarkable" older study by M. Bernays—"Zur Lehre von den Citaten und Noten," *Schriften zur Kritik und Literaturgeschichte*, IV (Berlin, 1899)—then to Cosgrove's more recent study and F. Palmeri's "The Satiric Footnotes of Swift and Gibbon," *The Eighteenth Century*, 31 (1990). In covering substantially more territory with such historical range and discursive sprezzatura, Grafton advances footnote studies far beyond these useful works.
2. Grafton explains his translation of the phrase "lehrreiche Fiille" which the one brother (Michael Bernays) quoted approvingly from the other (Jacob Bernays), and manages to enlarge on the family tree by adding "So far as I know, the third brother, Freud's father-in-law Berman, did not venture an opinion on Gibbon's footnotes" (4, n. 14).
3. So, Grafton's footnote informs us, wrote Voltaire to Dubos in October, 1738 (95 n. 1).
4. While Swift, as Grafton indicates, is demonstrating his familiarity with philological technique through leaving gaps in his own text, the explanatory marginal notations referring to "hiatus in MS" are also suggestive in the context of Swift's footnote mocking the failings in Bentley's philological career (when "Guardian" of the Royal Library) for refusing Charles Boyle the loan of a manuscript,

a refusal "by the Library-Keeper," qua Swift's note "*pro solita Humanitate sua*" which surely demonstrated a gap in Bentley's humanity (*Battel* 379, n. 1).

5. R.K. Root's Introduction to *The Dunciad Variorum, with the Prolegomena of Scriblerus. Reproduced in Facsimile from the First Issue of the Original Edition of 1729* quotes Pope's letter to Swift on 28th June 1728, saying the poem "will be attended with *Proeme, Prolegomena, Testimonia Scriptorum, Index Authorum, and Notes Variorum*. As to the latter, I desire you to read over the text, and make a few in any way you like best" (116, n. 35,36).
6. Grafton refers to Johann Burckhard Mencke, whose pioneering Leipzig journal *Acta eruditorum* pursued "a lumbering, ultimately doomed breed of learned dinosaurs, the polyhistor," for their social ineptitude and scholarly credulousness" in his (so the footnote tells us) *De charlataneria eruditorum declamations duae* (Leipzig, 1715), *On the Charlatanry of the Learned* (119, n. 42).
7. Gottlieb Wilhelm Rabener, in 1743, went so far as to produce *Hinkmars von Repkow Noten ohne Text*—a dissertation, as the title declares, without a text, consisting entirely of notes. Rabener frankly confessed his goal of fame and fortune could best be achieved through jumping on the com mentary bandwagon, for people who are not fitted to be scholars make themselves "gross undfurcht- bar" in this way: "*und wodurch? Durch Noten!*" (120, n. 46). Grafton's footnote adds these remarks to Rabener's translated comments, enlarging on how Rabener saw the footnote as the "royal road to fame, even for those who did not deserve it" (120).
8. Grafton cites the case of Tristano Calco, "a Milanese historian who loved to explore archives" to such an extent that he "believed everything he found there, including such spurious sources as the confes sions extracted from the Templars by torture" (128).
9. In his footnote, Grafton quotes White at some length in Latin, explaining how White admitted that many scholars attacked Annii's texts as forgeries, but he chose instead to emphasize "the large number of Annii's defenders" and then "borrowed a half-hearted refutation of the critics from one of them" (n.18, 131).
10. Here Grafton refers to Joe Gould (whose story was also featured in a film of his life, starring Ian Holm as Gould), "a famous Harvard graduate and beggar" who "became something of a celebrity in the old Greenwich Village," in the 1930s when he "undertook a still longer *Oral History of the World*" which proved to be imaginary (n.20, 133).
11. As one might expect, however, the final chapter appears to be a footnote to the main body of the text and appears in the form of an epilogue entitled "Epilogue: Some Concluding Footnotes" (223).
12. In the *Eclaircissements* of 1720, Bayle defended his *Dictionaire* when it attracted, *qua* Grafton, "flak from orthodox batteries, Catholic and Calvinist" by claiming "*C'est un Dictionaire Historique commente*" where inclusivity is the name of the game, and "It is necessary to bring to bear proofs, to examine them, confirm them, and clarify them" (198, n. 20).
13. Grafton points out that Bayle described himself "wonderfully, as a real protestant—the sort who on principle protests against everything" (192).