
Many years ago, as an English department graduate student looking for part-time employment, I took on some copy editing for a local publishing house. I had received no directions, just as I had not received any directions for another job, tracking down all the bibliographical information missing from a famous European scholar’s monograph. It was just presumed I would have the requisite skills. Work in the library went well, but the copy editing proved more problematic. Dutifully I crossed out errors and wrote little notes in the margin to I didn’t quite know who — some imaginary editor or printer, perhaps, who would clean up the mess by following my directions. Needless to say, the person to whom I returned my marked-up sheets was annoyed. Why didn’t I use the to-her-familiar corrector’s marks?

The answer, of course, was that I had never heard of them, and by now I can’t remember who sat me down and taught me all the symbols used for deletions, insertions, changes of font, restoration of material, etc., a full and efficient communication system between a corrector reading a proof sheet for errors and the person called upon to make the required changes to the proofs, whether a sixteenth-century compositor rearranging lead types or someone today on a computer entering keystrokes.

But where did this system come from? It is this question that Jocelyn Hargrave attempts to answer in *The Evolution of Editorial Style in Early Modern England*. More specifically, Hargrave looks at the development of style guides used over the centuries by editors and printers and their contribution to what book historians following Robert Darnton call the “communications circuit”. The book is unfortunately mistitled, as it extends well beyond any normal understanding of “early modern”, tracing the guides from Hieronymus Hornschuch’s *Orthotypographia* of 1608 to Philip Luckombe’s *Concise History of the Origin and Progress of Printing* in 1770 and to later guides in nineteenth-century editing, including Caleb Stower’s *The Printer’s Grammar* in 1808. The final chapters analyze the editing of *Piers Plowman* in 1813 and of Coleridge’s *Poems* in 1796. The confusing title,
perhaps at some point required to fit the material into the “early modern” field, and a repetitive citation of sources, are among the indications that the book was originally a dissertation and is not quite sufficiently modified into a monograph.

Hargrave describes her focus thus: “to provide a historical study of the evolution of editorial style and its progress towards standardisation through an examination of early modern style guides; and to explore how multiple stakeholders — namely authors, editors, and printers — either directly implemented, or uniquely interpreted and adapted, the guidelines of contemporary style guides as part of their editorial practice” (2). Consequently the book is structured in successive units of two chapters, the first describing the content and contribution of a particular guide and the second analyzing the use made (or ignored) of that guide in a contemporary publication.

For early modernists the earlier sections of the book are the most interesting. Hargrave treats the field of style guides as international, discussing Joseph Moxon's early Dutch experience and describing what he derived from Hornschuch, whose 1608 handbook was published first in Latin and then in German. She provides considerable information about Moxon, the first tradesman elected to the Royal Society and a man positioned “between the professional and the philosophical worlds” (38). Hence Moxon's guide, Mechanick Exercises (1683), moves from the “typographical arts”, i.e. printing, cutting of letters, kerning, to “production processes”, the linguistic and editorial presentation of text. Moxon was the first writer to explain how compositors were to cast off copy and he also described the proofreading marks. He created a checklist that effectively standardized the editorial process of checking typeset pages, with an assistant reading copy aloud to the corrector. Moxon does not give directions for punctuation (a major topic in the later style guides) but comments that he expects a compositor to have learned this from schoolbooks. As D. F. McKenzie has shown, Moxon's late seventeenth-century guide codified processes already in use in the Elizabethan and Jacobean period, thus making it clear that it was normal for early modern authors like Shakespeare to expect punctuation and other formatting to be added to their texts in the printshop (McKenzie 1969, 46, 57). In general, according to Moxon, a compositor is “strictly to follow his Copy”, but due to “the carelessness of some good Authors, and the ignorance of other authors” it has become a “duty incumbent on the Compositor, viz. to discern and amend the bad Spelling and Pointing of his Copy” (Moxon 1896, 198). With this knowledge the three pages of “hand D” (now usually thought to be that of Shakespeare) in the manuscript of
Sir Thomas More (1600–1604), which include almost no punctuation, look less idiosyncratic (see Jowett 2011).

To demonstrate how Moxon’s publications embody the editorial practices delineated in his manual, Hargrave turns for her comparative study to his A Tutor to Astronomie and Geographie (1659). Moxon had an interest in architecture, and Hargrave shows how he develops the “architecture of the page”, both in the large — the structure of title pages, the three orders of letters used — and the small — various forms of kerning, spacing between letters, words and lines, etc.

For Hargrave, John Smith’s The Printer’s Grammar (1755) was the “pinnacle of editorial style in eighteenth-century England”. Smith further internationalized his instructions, featuring a variety of alphabets, describing the use of accents in the French, and including music notation. He was the first to instruct on the specifics of punctuation. In general his guide demonstrates the eighteenth-century progress towards “editorial standardisation”, participating in what Hargrave identifies as “three fundamental shifts”: from rhetorical to grammatical punctuation, from permissive to regulated spelling, and from the elaborate typography of the seventeenth century to something “more sober” (83). And Smith’s manual once again insists on the intellectual and editorial role of the compositor, reiterating that authors expect “the Printer to spell, point and digest their Copy, so it may be intelligible and significant to the Reader” (112).

In discussing later style guides, especially Luckombe’s A Concise History of the Origin and Progress of Printing (1770) and Stower’s The Printer’s Grammar (1808), Hargrave is forced to admit that these manuals appropriated earlier material “liberally” and added little that was new. Consequently she includes a discussion of plagiarism, arguing that this charge against Luckombe should be dismissed because he acknowledged borrowing from his predecessors and made some practical improvements to their directions, particularly in the use of quotation marks. She highlights Luckombe’s “Britanno-centric agenda”, which simply means that he omitted instructions on printing French and using accents, material reinstated half a century later by Stower. Stower himself continued the general movement towards standardization, in this case for hyphenation, not previously standardized, by following directions in Samuel Johnson’s Dictionary (1755).

The final chapters of the book, on “nineteenth-century editorial style at work” in Thomas Dunham Whitaker’s 1813 Piers Plowman and in the complex Ashley Manuscript 408 of Coleridge’s Poems, seem out of place in the monograph, though both chapters have points interesting for book
history. Whitaker's volume, despite being published only three years after Stower's guide, uses black letter and rubrication and hence participates in the period's movement toward romanticization of the medieval, here expressed through printing. The Coleridge volume, although catalogued in the Ashley collection as a manuscript, Hargrave identifies as a “palimpsest”. It contains the printed pages of the 1796 Poems with Coleridge's own corrections, including extensive marginalia and annotations and using the proofreading symbols, as well as corrected proofs of the second edition. Thus, Hargrave argues, it provides evidence of how the printer's manuals influenced an author's correction of typeset proofs. Nevertheless, her discussion of types of marginalia and of Coleridge's annotations in the “shared working space with his professional counterparts”, as well as analysis of his comments on his reading, knowledge of German, and marginal arguments with critics, seems rather a bypath for her book.

No doubt responding to contemporary pressure to give her monograph a theoretical frame, Hargrave adopts terminology from the sciences. She invokes Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldredge's modification of Darwinian gradual evolution theory, that is, “punctuated evolution” with periods of “active stasis”, and argues for a similarly “punctuated evolution of editorial style, not a gradual one, through a process of generational intertextual inheritance” that “plateaued” in the mid-nineteenth century (2, 11–12, 257–8). In its simplest terms, this means that the editorial style guides appeared at irregular intervals, depended on those that preceded them, and instituted differing quantities of improvements in the stylistic work of editors and printers. Hargrave has a graph charting the number of innovations offered by each style guide editor from Hornschuch in 1608 to C. H. Timperley in 1838; not surprisingly, Smith in 1755 made the most. The innovations of each guide are summarized in the concluding chapter.

Despite this attempt at a theoretical framework, Hargrave's monograph is primarily useful for the detailed information it provides. From it one can trace developments towards standardization in editorial work as well as in forms of mark-up and their implications for relations between printers and authors. As almost all textual scholars at some moment find themselves functioning as copy editors, it is interesting to learn the history of this element of the communications circuit. Nevertheless, the reader who is interested in the larger questions — what effect, if any, did the style guides have more generally on authors and how they created their texts, and conversely how if at all were the printers who created style guides influenced by the authors they printed — will find her information limited. This is especially
true because of its foregrounding of only one or two volumes in parallel with each guide as an indication of the way authors used the guides as part of their editorial practice.
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“A critical edition of Missionary Travels” by David Livingstone (1813–1873) “is long overdue”, Justin D. Livingstone observes in his wonderful introduction to the latest addition to Livingstone Online. The fully digitized 1100-page manuscript of this key 1857 work by the British missionary and explorer, as well as a handful of critical essays and illuminating associated images and texts, mark this MLA Approved Edition of Missionary Travels as a major accomplishment in scholarly editing. With its wealth of clearly structured, never before digitally-accessible material, this is a most welcome addition to Victorian scholarship in general and a valuable resource for those interested in Livingstone and his travels. It is a thrill to scan Livingstone’s handwriting and see such an influential work take shape before one’s eyes.

The Livingstone’s Missionary Travels Manuscript site allows users to trace the development of the popular bestseller as author and editors wrestle in the margins. The manuscript is a rare artifact — a mix of original manuscript, dictation transcript, and editor’s copy — and is not only fully transcribed but accompanied by high-resolution images, easily viewable online. The essays surrounding the manuscripts (especially the two-part “Composing & Publishing Missionary Travels”) are a model for thorough and engaging scholarly writing. The sheer wealth of data and context, as well