Open Research Online

"Small-scale copyrights"?: Quotation marks in theory and in practice

Journal Item

For guidance on citations see FAQs.

oro.open.ac.uk

"Small Scale Copyrights"?: Quotation Marks In Theory and In Practice[1]
Edmund King

Although there has been relatively little written about the development of quotation marks and "modern" forms of literary citation in England, what there has been has tended to date that emergence to the end of the seventeenth -- or beginning of the eighteenth -- century.[2] Recently, however, Margreta De Grazia has put forward another interpretation, which delays the emergence of modern usage to the end of the eighteenth century, and associates it with the formation of a Foucauldian "author-function" in the wake of the Enlightenment.[3]

De Grazia -- whose main focus is the editing of Shakespeare in the eighteenth century -- assumes that the uses to which quotation marks are put in various seventeenth and eighteenth-century Shakespearean editions provide a visual index of the development of the idea of literary property, and thus Shakespeare's eventual "discursive enclosure" within the authorial domain of editors, critics, and other writers. The printing practices found in these editions -- the lack of any typographical markers for indicating quotes in dialogue in the quartos and folios; Pope's use of double inverted commas to flag "shining

---

[2] McKerrow dates the transition in function of inverted commas from signalling emphasis to serving exclusively as notes of citation to the early eighteenth century: Ronald B. McKerrow, *An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927): 316–7. G. K. Hunter suggests that "gnomic pointing" -- the use of marks (usually inverted commas) to flag *sententiae* -- peaked in the early years of James I and had more or less ceased by 1660. Hunter characterizes gnomic pointing as a typographical display of indebtedness -- a demonstration of the moral scope and depth of reading behind a text -- most often associated with works that had been closely supervized at press by an author or editor: G. K. Hunter, "The Marking of *Sententiae* in Elizabethan Printed Plays, Poems, and Romances," *The Library* 5th ser. 6 (1951): 173–5. C. J. Mitchell concludes from an examination of eighteenth-century works in the British Library that "modern" usage had become the norm by the 1720s: C. J. Mitchell, "Quotation Marks, National Compositorial Habits, and False Imprints," *The Library* 6th ser. 5 (1983): 367.

[3] Margreta De Grazia, *Shakespeare Verbatim: The Reproduction of Authenticity and the 1790 Apparatus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 214–8; Margreta De Grazia, "Shakespeare in Quotation Marks," in *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: Post-Renaissance Reconstructions of the Works and the Myth*, ed. Jean I. Marsden (New York: St Martin's, 1991).

passages" in the edition of 1725 (a convention followed by Warburton and Hamner); and Malone's eventual imposition of "modern" practice onto the Shakespearean text in 1790 -- are assumed to be representative of textual practice generally at the time each edition appeared. De Grazia then uses this pattern as evidence for her chronological model: a long period of stasis followed by radical change in typographical practice under the influence of newly emergent Enlightenment subjectivities that are reflected in Malone's edition, but not those of his editorial predecessors.[4]

   De Grazia's theoretical model rests on rather flimsy evidential foundations. She assumes that the full range of quotation practices in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries can be extrapolated from the pattern she discerns in the Shakespeare editions -- it cannot, as I will show. Her contention that English grammar books make quotation marks "mandatory" for literary citation only at the end of the eighteenth century seems to derive solely from her observation that the grammar books in Mitchell's British Library sample that prescribe quotation marks date from the 1780s or later.[5] However, the conclusion she draws from this -- that they were the among the *first* such books to do so -- is incorrect, as an examination of earlier English grammatical texts reveals. Finally, her assertion that no typographical means existed for signalling where a citation ended before the introduction of the closing quote, and that therefore each occasion of quotation marks in a text produced before the end of the eighteenth century represents an example of "gnomic pointing," rather than citation, not only goes far beyond G. K. Hunter's findings that such usages are characteristic only of a small subset of academic texts and presentation fair copies in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, but it anachronistically conflates emphasis and quotation at a time when each was becoming distinct and ignores such means as differentiation types for separating quoted from nonquoted material.

---

[4] De Grazia, *Shakespeare Verbatim*, 214–7. De Grazia's chronology seems to stem from Foucault, who dates the emergence of systems for designating the ownership of texts -- in which context she places the quotation mark -- to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. See Michel Foucault, "What Is an Author?" translated by J. V. Harari, in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (London: Penguin, 1984), 108.

[5] De Grazia, *Shakespeare Verbatim*, 214 n. Two date from 1786, the others from 1794 and 1799, respectively.

In this paper, I want to contest De Grazia's thesis that a line of demarcation appears in the late eighteenth century that separates "modern" usage of the quotation mark from that of the earlier eighteenth century and before, and that any such change in convention would necessarily have been determined by developments in economics and subjectivity brought about by the Enlightenment. In doing so, I will address the following specific points: De Grazia's assertions that grammar books made quotation marks mandatory for literary citation only at the end of the eighteenth century,[6] and that beforehand quotation marks were used interchangeably with the pointing index finger (☞) and italic text to indicate "remarkable text" and/or *sententiae*;[7] that quotation marks were considered a form of punctuation rather than a cue to the reader only once they moved from the margin of the page into the text itself;[8] that the word "quotation" itself derives from quotation quads;[9] and that, until the development of the closing quotation mark, no means existed of accurately separating citations from the surrounding text, so that *verbatim* -- as opposed to paraphrastic -- quotes were impossible.[10]

---

[6] De Grazia, *Shakespeare Verbatim*, 214.

[7] De Grazia, "Shakespeare in Quotation Marks," 58; 69 n.

[8] Ibid., 60.

[9] Ibid., 58.

[10] In her book *Authorship and Appropriation: Writing for the Stage in England, 1660-1710* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), Paulina Kewes has already provided a partial qualification of De Grazia's analysis. After noting that "Margreta de Grazia has traced to the later eighteenth century the establishment of quotation marks as a grammatical convention for marking off the words of another", she goes on to add that the use of quotation marks in several early eighteenth-century dramatic adaptations, though "more rudimentary and erratic in scope", nevertheless "fulfilled the same function" (93).
Kewes describes, *inter alia*, the practices of Colley Cibber and George Granville who, when preparing their adaptations of Shakespeare's *Richard III* and *Merchant of Venice*, respectively, for publication, used quotation marks to separate original from interpolated text. Elsewhere, she considers the collected plays of Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, published in 1668, which deploy such typographical means as slip cancels to mark off lines she has written from the textual contributions of her husband (136–7).
Interestingly, despite providing examples of collaborators writing serially, so that their contributions might be theoretically separable, Kewes is hostile towards the efforts of twentieth-century investigators, such as Hoy, to distinguish authorial styles in plays of mixed authorship, at least with respect to the Renaissance: "…as Jeffrey Masten has shown, the very notion of individual shares is untenable, for [collaborative Renaissance] scripts resist modern notions of singular authority and literary property" (131).
Presumably, Kewes would maintain that, but for the Cavendishs' efforts to distinguish their lines typographically, their styles would be otherwise inextricable due to the general unreliability of authorship tests (132).

Quotation marks, grammar books, and *sententiae*

Although the quotation mark first appeared in print in 1516 and arrived in England no later than 1521,[11] prescriptions for its correct usage were to appear in English grammars only late in the next century. Indeed, grammar books lagged behind printing practice in their treatment of punctuation generally; innovations in pointing tended to come from the printing industry, and were to enter the conventions governing handwriting only later, by way of imitation.[12] The first grammar book to include a section on pointing appears to have been Charles Butler's *English Grammar* (first edition 1633); by 1800, the proportion of grammar books published in Britain since the sixteenth century to carry a section on punctuation had risen to around sixty percent.[13] Despite this delay in recognizing the printers' "occasional marks,"[14] it is nevertheless false to maintain -- as De Grazia does -- that grammatical primers made quotation marks mandatory only in the late eighteenth century. An examination of earlier grammar and spelling handbooks indicates that the same, or similar, rules were being prescribed throughout the eighteenth century and, in some cases, in the late seventeenth century also. There is some variation in the earliest examples -- Owen Price's *The Vocal Organ* (1665), and *English Orthographie* (1668) prescribe a lower case "c" set in the margin for indicating citations,[15] and Christopher Cooper's *The English Teacher* (1687), after glossing the

---

[11] Mitchell, 363–4.

[12] Ibid. 362; McKerrow, 250; M. B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1992); Antony Hammond, "The Noisy Comma: Searching for the Signal in Renaissance Dramatic Texts" in Randall McLeod ed. *Crisis in Editing: Texts of the English Renaissance* (New York: AMS Press, 1994), 212–3.

[13] Ian Michael, *English Grammatical Categories and the Tradition to 1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1970), 195.

[14] Butler's *Grammar* illustrates something of the disjunction between grammatical presciption and printing practice in this period. Its section on pointing has nothing to say about asterisks, section marks, obelisks, paragraphs, or pointing indices, even though its printer -- William Turner -- uses all of these marks at some point in the book's production. See Charles Butler, *The English Grammar* (Oxford: William Turner, 1634. Early English Books 1475–1640 microfilm series 1165:03.)

[15] Owen Price, *The Vocal Organ*, English Linguistics, 1500–1800, Facsimile Reprint Series, ed. R. C. Alston, no. 227 (1665; reprint, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1971), 37; Owen Price, *English Orthographie*, English Linguistics, 1500–1800, Facsimile Reprint Series, ed. R. C. Alston, no. 314 (1668; reprint,

quotation mark as showing "the Citation of an Author" adds that it can also indicate "something added to a former edition."[16] -- but, by at least the early eighteenth century, the rules set out for using and interpreting quotation marks begin to sound very similar.

The earliest book published in English that deals solely with punctuation is the anonymous *Treatise of Stops, Points, or Pauses*[17] that appeared in London in 1680. Apparently written by a schoolmaster, it prescribes orthographical rules and gives guidelines for construing pointing. Definitions for both the index and the quotation mark are given, and the writer clearly differentiates between them:

> 13. An Index made like a Hand, with One Finger longer than the rest, pointing at what is more than ordinarily remarkabl; thus [☞]. Exampls whereof you will find in som Books, whiçh you ought to take speçial notiçe of, where you see them; and of what they point unto.
>
> *Where the Fore finger of an Hand is made,*
> *It Points at what Remarkabl is said.*
>
> 14. A Note of Citation; thus ["]. This note is used in som Books, when any thing is quoted from another Author, as you will find by observation; and it is always plaçed in the Margin…
>
> *This Note is made, when Authors quoted are,*
> *And doth shew forth, what they to us declare.*[18]

A similar definition -- and distinction -- occurs in Joseph Aickin's *The English Grammar* (1693): "This mark (") sheweth an Author to be quoted…An *Index* pointeth forth something worthy to be remarked."[19]

Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1972), 42: "cc is a Note of Citation, when any thing is quoted from another Author, thus c.c.c." Presumably, this convention might be used in a print shop short of commas. (Unless otherwise noted, subsequent references to grammars, etc., are to microfilm copies in this series.)

[16] Christopher Cooper, *The English Teacher* (1687; reprint, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1969), 119.

[17] *A Treatise of Stops, Points, or Pauses, and Notes Which Are Used in Writing and in Print* (1680; reprint, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1968)

[18] Ibid. 17–18. Italics in original.

[19] Joseph Aickin, *The English Grammar* (1693; reprint, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1967), 70.

James Greenwood's *An Essay Towards a Practical English Grammar* (1711) contains another closely allied set of definitions, extending the range of symbols treated to the obelisk. Again, while the index and obelisk are said to be interchangeable, both are explicitly distinguished from the quotation mark:

> *Index* (☞) the Fore-finger Pointing, signifies that Passage to be very remarkable over-against which it is plac'd…Sometimes an obelisk (†) or Spit is used upon the like occasion as the foregoing Note…

> *Quotation* (") or a double *Comma* revers'd at the beginning of a Line, denotes that Passage to be quoted or transcrib'd from some Author in his own Words.[20]

Thomas Tuite's *Oxford Spelling Book* (1726) gives an almost identical list of glosses: "*Index*…signifies that passage to be very remarkable against which it is plac'd…*Quotation* (") or a double comma, is put at the beginnings of such lines as are taken out of other authors."[21]

The uniformity of the prescriptions listed here indicates that a consensus had emerged by at least the early eighteenth century that the quotation mark was to be used to signal the introduction of text from another author. All subsequent texts are similar in their language: even after the introduction of the closing quotation mark, the definitions remain almost identical. Indeed, the only occurrences found among the grammar and spelling primers reproduced in the Scolar Press facsimile reprint series of quotation marks being prescribed for "shining passages" appears in three late seventeenth-century books: George Fox and Ellis Hookes's *Introductions For Right Spelling* (1673) and Tobias Ellis's *The English School* (1680), where inverted commas are glossed as "[a] note for extraordinary passages";[22] and Thomas Jones's *The British Language in Its*

---

[20] James Greenwood, *An Essay Towards a Practical English Grammar* (1711; reprint, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1968), 258.

[21] Thomas Tuite, *The Oxford Spelling-Book* (1726; reprint, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1967), 125.

[22] George Fox and Ellis Hookes, *Introductions for Right Spelling* (1673; reprint, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1971), 98; Tobias Ellis, *The English School* (1680; reprint, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1969), 145.

Lustre (1688), a Welsh-English dictionary with orthographical definitions appended. Jones defines the quotation mark as follows:

> " This Note call'd twinn'd Commas, is placed in the Margin of a Book; and sometimes in the middle of a Line, or body of a Page: it is a Note of extraordinary passages, and wheresoever you find this Note in your reading, you are to take great notice of the annexed part of the Treatise; for this Note is a significator of a notable passage, or part worthy of great notice.[23]

Jones was a printer at Shrewsbury, so presumably an informed observer of printing-house practice in this period. While confirming that the tradition of marking "remarkable passages" with inverted commas continued in some printing shops into the late seventeenth century, his definition also seems to indicate that the quotation mark was already being set occasionally in the main body of a page as early as the 1680s.[24] There were no eighteenth-century examples found of quotation marks glossed as noting remarkable passages.[25]

Marginal versus in-body quotation marks as punctuation

De Grazia maintains that quotation marks "came to be considered a form of punctuation rather than a cue to the reader" only once they had "moved from the white border of the page into the text itself."[26] It is slightly unclear whether she means the movement of quotation marks from the margin, where they would be set after the body text had been composed, to a position as the outermost pieces of type in the body itself (a movement

---

[23] Thomas Jones, *The British Language in Its Lustre: Or a Copious Dictionary of Welsh and English* (1688; reprint, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1972), [X]1.

[24] Cf. Mitchell, 366.

[25] This does not, of course, indicate that the *practice* had disappeared completely. Both Mitchell (365) and McKerrow (316 n.) suggest that the use of inverted commas for emphasis continued -- at very low levels -- throughout the eighteenth century.

[26] De Grazia, "Shakespeare in Quotation Marks," 60.

which Mitchell dates to the late seventeenth century)[27] or their movement into the text to enclose a passage between opening and closing marks. I will assume that she means the latter, as it accords more easily with the chronological flow of her argument. Mitchell notes that the development of the closing quotation mark in Europe generally was haphazard, as there was no pressing need for it: context usually indicated where a passage ended. Even after the introduction of the closing quotation mark into printers' founts, they were often omitted if an obvious typographical cue, such as a paragraph break, coincided with the end of a citation. In Britain, however, closing quotation marks became mandatory. Based on the orthographical patterns found in his sample works, Mitchell dates the divergence of European and British practice to the first third of the eighteenth century: "of the twenty British works [in the sample] which omit closing quotation marks, only four were printed after 1721."[28]

One grammar book that reflects this change in orthographic practice is Ann Fisher's *A New Grammar*, published at Newcastle upon Tyne in 1750. Its prescriptions are very similar to those found in earlier handbooks, such as Tuite's. The new mark is assimilated into a preexisting system of meaning, rather than generating a new one:

> 14. *Quotation*, or double *Comma* turn'd, is put at the Begginings of such Words, or Lines, as are cited out of other Authors.
> 15. *End of the Quotation*, or double *Apostrophe* is put after the last Word, or Line, to show that the Passage cited is finished.[29]

Fisher's definitions are echoed in subsequent grammars, with the usage prescribed appearing completely "modern" in Joseph Robertson's *An Essay on Punctuation* (1785):

---

[27] Mitchell, 365. Ralph Johnson's *Scholars Guide* (1677), for instance, specifically locates quotation marks in the margin of the page: "A note of Quotation ["] used in the margin, when we quote a sentence out of an Author," Ralph Johnson, *The Scholars Guide from the Accidence to the University* (London: printed by A.C. for Henry Brome, 1677, Early English Books 1641–1700 microfilm series, 920:09), [A]4.

[28] Mitchell, 367. Two of the four exceptions are in verse, which may indicate that there was more discretion allowed to compositors when working with verse as opposed to prose.

[29] Ann Fisher, *A New Grammar* (1750; reprint, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1968), 43.

A Quotation " ". Two inverted commas are generally placed at the beginning of a phrase or a passage, which is quoted or transcribed from some author, in his own words; and two commas in their direct position, are placed at the conclusion: as,

An excellent poet says:
"The proper study of mankind is man."[30]

Although the usage here is clearly more precise than the use of marginal or side quotations, it is important to recognize that the earlier grammarians were also prescribing a set of conventions for indicating quotation. The language used to describe the use and purpose of the quotation mark remains similar whichever method is prescribed. Here, for instance, Robertson's words closely echo those of Greenwood. Although one could argue for some kind of distinction between the citing of a "private" author and an "Authority," such as the biblical examples quoted in the earlier *Treatise of Stops*, there is little evidence of a revolution in discourse or subjectivity separating the early eighteenth century grammars from the late. Writers were using quotation marks to cite other authors, as opposed to "Authorities," in the seventeenth century, as Langbaine does in *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets* (1691).[31] Indeed, as early as 1554 the author of *A Traictise Declaryng...That the Pretensed Marriage of Priestes...Is No Mariage*[32] uses marginal quotation marks to flag citations from Thomas Cranmer, the reformist Archbishop of Canterbury, whose arguments in favor of clerical marriage he vehemently rebuts in the *Traictise*.[33] The treatment extended to Cranmer, who is variously accused of

---

[30] Joseph Roberston, *An Essay on Punctuation* (1785; reprint, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1969), 147.

[31] Gerard Langbaine, *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets* (Oxford: printed for George West and Henry Clements, 1691).

[32] The book is attributed to Thomas Martin on the title-page, but the *Short Title Catalogue* (2nd ed.) suggests that it was actually written -- or at least its materials compiled -- by Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. See W. A. Jackson, F. S. Ferguson, and Katharine F. Pantzer (eds.) *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland & Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1976), 17517.

[33] Thomas Martin [Stephen Gardiner?], *A Traictise Declaryng...That the Pretensed Marriage of Priestes...Is No Mariage* (London: Robert Caly, 1554). Copy in Special Collections, Auckland City Libraries, RBR 1554.

being "unreasonable," "unpitthie," and, even, at one point, the product of a literary forger, is hardly that which one would expect to befall a *sententia*-dispensing Authority.[34]

"Quotation" and quotation quadrats

In the dictionary of "abstruse Words and Phrases that are used in Typography," appended to his *Mechanick Exercises on the Whole Art of Printing* (1683), Joseph Moxon defines "*Quotation Quadrats*" as being "*Cast* the heighth of a *Quotation*. They are *Cast* of different *Bodies*, that the *Compositor* may have the choice of them to *Justifie* his *Notes* or *Quotations* exactly against the designed *Line* of the *Page*."[35] His list of terms has no heading under "quotation," but Moxon does provide one for "note" -- it is clear from this definition that "note" and "quotation" were used interchangeably to refer to the *marginalia* that might be set either side of the main body: "*Quotations* down the side of *Page* are called *Notes*."[36] Ephraim Chambers provides a complementary description of the way in which quotation quadrats were to be used in the setting of marginal notes:

> For marginal notes, in the spaces reserved for them, between the two sliding-pieces of the composing-stick, are put little quadrated pieces of metal, called *quotations*; which are justified by other smaller pieces; a slip of scale board being placed from the top of the page to the bottom; to keep the note and text at a due distance.[37]

These marginal passages could be glosses on the text, summaries or headings, biblical references, or simply letters or numbers indicating subsections within an argument. Their purpose was to organize or classify the material that appeared in the body, or, by aligning parts of it with biblical citations, provide substantiation or precedent for arguments made there. The function of these marginal passages provides, for Moxon's editors, an

---

[34] Ibid. [F]ii

[35] Joseph Moxon, "Mechanick Exercises on the Whole Art of Printing," ed. Herbert Davis and Harry Carter (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1958), 349.

[36] Ibid. 322.

[37] Ephraim Chambers, *Cyclopædia: Or An Universal Dictionary of the Arts and Sciences*, 5th ed., vol. ii (London: 1743), [9O]2$^{\text{V}}$

explanation for the origin of the word "quotation," initially a French coinage: "the typical early sidenotes were numbers (Latin *quota*) classifying passages in the text or referring to classifications of other texts cited in it."[38] These sidenotes eventually developed into a regularized set of symbols, each with a precise classificatory meaning, to be deployed in the margin. One of these, the "note citation or quotation," had come by the seventeenth century to refer particularly to the act of literary citation.

The verb "côter" or "quoter" is glossed in several French–English dictionaries dating from between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. Claude Desainliens lists the following entry in his *Dictionary French and English* (1593): "[q]uoter…marquer l'article que on veult impugner, *to quote or mark in the margent*,"[39] and Abel Boyer's *Royal Dictionary Abridged* (1700) defines "côter" as "[t]o quote, alledge, or cite, → to endorse."[40] These entries indicate that the word was somewhat fluid in meaning, encompassing the act of writing notes in the margin as well as associated ideas of endorsing, corroborating, or providing specific literary reference. The latter meaning is most often expressed in modern French by "citer." "Côter" or "cotation" -- deriving from the noun "cote:" a "quota" or "share" -- tend to have application to specific instances of meaning, such as the quotation of a price or share value at the stock exchange, or the act of marking down references on a map.[41] However, the main meaning appears to be "to impose a contribution on", or "to classify, number, [or] letter" documents.[42] Émil Littré gives similar examples of the usages of "coter" and "cote:"

> cote: …Marque alphabétique au numérale servant á classer chaque piéce d'un procés au d'un dossier…

---

[38] Moxon, 41 n.

[39] Claude Desainliens, *A Dictionary French and English* (1593; reprint, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1970).

[40] Abel Boyer, *The Royal Dictionary Abridged* (1700; reprint, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1971).

[41] J. E. Mansion, *Harrap's Standard French and English Dictionary* (London: 1934), 200. Mansion gives a subsidiary meaning of "cote" as a typographical term referring to the "take" of an individual compositor.

[42] Ibid. 201.

coter: …Noter. Coter á la marge le numéro d'une cote alphabétique au numérique.[43]

Presumably, when "quote" and "quotation" came to England as part of the general inflow of printing terms, practices, *materiel*, and print workers from Europe, they carried similar meanings to those expressed by Desainliens and Boyer -- to mark up a page with notes that commented on, classified, or ennumerated the arguments found there. A particular kind of classification by marginal note was that which acknowledged the citation of another author. Eventually, this came to be the primary meaning of "quotation" in English, expressing the idea of literary quotation now represented in French by "citation."

A number of eighteenth-century English grammarians and dictionary makers commented upon the historical derivation of the word "quotation." James Greenwood provides a gloss in the catechism following his chapter on punctuation in *An Essay Towards a Practical English Grammar* (1711):

> *Q*. Whence comes the Word *Quotation*?
> A. From the *Old French* Word *Quoter*, to praise an Author, or to tell *quota sint*, what they are that are contained in such a Book or Chapter of an Author.'[44]

James Buchanan, after defining "quotation" as a "citation of a passage in a book, speech, etc.," notes further that it derives from French,[45] as does the anonymous *Vocabulary* (1797) after its definition: "[from *coter*, Fr.]."[46] Both the *Vocabulary* and Thomas Sheridan's *General Dictionary of the English Language* (1780) retain at least some of the

[43] Emil Littré, *Dictionaire De La Langue Francaise* (Paris: Editions Universitaires, 1958), 279–80.

[44] Greenwood, 260.

[45] James Buchanan, *Linguae Britannicae Vera Pronunciatio* (1757; reprint, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1967).

[46] *A Vocabulary of Such Words in the English Language as Are of Dubious of Unsettled Pronunciation* (1797; reprint, Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1967).

French pronunciation, specifying an initial "k" rather than "kw,"[47] a practice ridiculed by John Walker in his *Critical Pronouncing Dictionary* (1791).[48]

Clearly, "quotation" was generally understood to be a French borrowing, and by at least the early eighteenth century was used primarily to denote the act of literary citation. Quotations are, in contemporary printing practice, the cast or wooden blocks of spacing material used to generate white space on a page -- the descendants of quotation quadrats.[49] Considering the French origin of the English word "quotation," and the apparent derivation of the French "cotation" from "cote" (a portion or quota), reflected in both historical and modern French glosses of "cotation" as a form of classification, it seems likely that the quadrats obtained their name from the notes or "quotations" they were used to separate, rather than *vice versa* as De Grazia maintains.

"Differentiation types" and line breaks as means of demarcating quoted text

De Grazia does not discuss any of the typographical methods other than quotation marks employed in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries to indicate changes in authorial voice. The one apparent exception which she does mention -- the occasional use of italics in setting direct speech in the early Shakespearean quartos and folios, and eighteenth century editions after Theobald -- she attributes to gnomic pointing rather than quotation. Observing that many of the lines quoted by other speakers in Shakespeare are anyway *sententiae*, she asserts that these passages are "italicised…not to indicate their origin in another speaker or text, but to stress their importance." In the seventeenth century, "as now, italic print was a form of highlighting or emphasis."[50]

---

[47] Thomas Sheridan, *A General Dictionary of the English Language* (1780; Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1967), [F]ff.

[48] John Walker, *A Critical Pronouncing Dictionary* (1791; Menston, UK: Scolar Press, 1968).

[49] Moxon, 41 n.

[50] De Grazia, "Shakespeare in Quotation Marks," 69 n.

However, the quotation mark was only one of several typographical conventions used by printers before the eighteenth century to signal the introduction of quoted material. The employment of one or more "differentiation types," in combination with that used to set the main body of text, could be very effective in indicating quotations. Robert Caly -- Stephen Gardiner's printer -- uses three different typefaces in setting the *Traictise*: black letter for the main body; italic for Latin citations; and a Greek font for quotations in that language. Caly also uses punctuation -- usually a full stop, but occasionally a comma or a colon -- to mark off the main text just before the introduction of an in-body quotation. The effect is to delineate clearly the boundary between Gardiner's words and those of the authors he cites. Italic appears to have been the conventional differentiation type for introducing verse citations, as in Richard Puttenham's *The Art of English Poesie* (1589), while roman tended to be used for setting same-language quotes in black letter books.[51] Setting quotations in a differently sized typeface (within the same type family as that used for the main body) could serve the same purpose.[52]

Another kind of type differentiation employed the use of white space to set off quotations from the surrounding text. A compositor could, for example, use quads to indent quoted passages, either alone, or in combination with other methods. Indents *and* italics are used to differentiate Puttenham's Italian verse quotations from his explications of them on the page. An older printing technique -- noted by McKerrow -- is the use in some sixteenth-century books of parentheses to enclose short quotations.[53] Obviously, the choice of method in any particular instance would depend on a number of variables: in-house printing conventions; the typeface used for the body text; whether the quoted material was prose or verse; the number of typefaces in stock; and the availability of commas. It should also be noted that these printing house methods themselves drew upon -- or at least resembled -- conventions used in manuscripts, where quotes might be

---

[51] McKerrow, 251, 297–8; Mitchell, 362.

[52] Examples of this occur in the 1656 edition of James Harrington's *Commonwealth of Oceana.*

[53] McKerrow, 317–8.

written in an Italian hand, or underlining or a new ink might be used to off-set one writer's words from another.[54]

One of De Grazia's main objections to marginal quotation marks being identified with modern forms of citation is that they cannot precisely signal where a quote begins and ends. The authorial voices bleed into each other, so that, for instance, "no typographical boundary prevent[s] the end of the quote from running into the beginning of the text proper."[55] However, quotation marks were not used in isolation, and a seventeenth -- or early eighteenth -- century reader would have been used to looking for additional typographical cues that might indicate where a quote ended. A compositor could use marginal quotation marks in combination with indents, for instance, to mark the division between authorial and quoted voices. In addition, some of the alternative ways of marking citations listed above could also be *more* effective in separating quoted from ordinary text than unclosed, in-body quotation marks. The use of roman as a differentiation type for setting quotations in a black letter book, for instance, would provide precise lines of demarcation, and make possible the kind of *verbatim* quotation which De Grazia assumes could exist only once a passage was enclosed in opening and closing inverted commas. Since these means of representing quoted text were in use in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, De Grazia's thesis that *verbatim* quotation arose only in the later eighteenth century once "language ha[d] been demarcated as property and removed from the free flow of discourse" by quotation marks collapses.[56]

A consensus regarding the use of double inverted commas for literary citation seems to have been reached in the grammar books rather earlier than De Grazia maintains -- at the turn of the eighteenth century. This consensus reflected what had been common printing practice for several decades beforehand. While marginal quotation marks had indeed originally been employed as reference markers for sidenotes, and were later used to

---

[54] Ibid., 251; Mitchell, 362.

[55] De Grazia, *Shakespeare Verbatim*, 215.

[56] Ibid. 218.

indicate *sententiae* in certain texts, these usages had become more or less outmoded by the late seventeenth century. The failure of De Grazia's attempt to map the development of the quotation mark to the emergence of new Enlightenment subjectivities in the late eighteenth century illustrates the precariousness of a certain kind of theoretical study that traces relationships between socio-historical practice and ideal-typical generalizations such as "the rise of the individual," or "Enlightenment," while failing to acknowledge the extent to which the latter are historiographical artefacts, rather than actually occurring historical processes or events.