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While the idea of the speech is generally clear, one sentence is unsatisfying:
'now must my eldest son be a knave or nothing, he cannot lieue ypopt'h
foole, for he wil have no land to maintaine him'. The phrase 'lieue ypopt'h
foole' is especially puzzling. This phrase was virtually unchanged in the
second quarto of 1619 ('lieue ypopt'h foole'), but the next time the play was
reprinted, in the third Shakespearian folio of 1664, a lame attempt was made
to give the passage more meaning:

Now muat my eldest Son be a Knave or nothing, he cannot live but upoth'
fool, for he will have no Land to maintain him: (sig. Q2v)

The fourth folio of 1685 added another apostrophe thus making the phrase
in question 'lieue but upo' th' fool'. Early editors then followed the F4
reading until Edmond Malone returned to a modernized Q1 with the con-
traction expanded: 'he cannot live upon the fool'.1 Malone's version has
generally been followed by later editors without comment although a recent
editor has defined the puzzling phrase as 'live a life of riot'.

I suggest, however, that the Q1 'foole' is a misreading of 'foole', a spelling
used later in the same scene on sig. Btv. The confusion of long s and f is
common and the misreading was perhaps reinforced when the compositor's
eye went back to the word 'Foole', a line or so above. The emended sentence
then reads in modernized form, 'Now must my eldest son be a knave or
nothing; he cannot live upo' th' soil, for he will have no land to maintain
him'. The passage is now clear and foreshadows the husband's powerful
soliloquy spoken before he kills his eldest son:

What is there in three dice to make a man draw thrice three thousand acres into
the compass of a round little table, & with the gentlemen's palfy in the hand shake
out his posterity, thieues or beggars: tis done, I ha don't ye faith: terrible horrible
mifery. (sig. C2)
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TRISTRAM SHANDY: THE MARBLED LEAF

The marbled leaf in Tristram Shandy, which in the first edition printed for
R. and J. Dodsley in 1761 was tipped in between L4 and L5 of volume III,
appears to have caused problems for some of the printers of later editions.1

The printer of the edition of Tristram Shandy published as volume V of the
Novelists' magazine in 1781 adopted the simple expedient of tipping in
between N4 and O1 a sheet of marbled paper which, in the editions I have
seen, was clearly cut from a larger sheet. In the London edition of the novel

1 Supplement to the Edition of Shakespeare's Plays Published in 1778 by Samuel Johnson and
2 Keith Sturgess, ed., Three Elizabethan Domestic Tragedies, Baltimore: Penguin Books,
1969, p. 159.

1 Copies referred to in this note are held in the Bodleian Library, the Australian National
Library, and my own collection.
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printed in 1794 in three volumes for T. Cadell, pages 327 and 328 of volume I bear the note:

_The bookbinder is desired to cover both sides of this leaf with the best marbled paper, taking care to keep the folio lines clear, and to preserve the proper margins._

The same instructions are to be found in the edition of the _Works_ printed in London in 1795 for the Booksellers (8 vols., I, 265–6).

The edition printed in English for R. Samner of Vienna in 1798 (4 vols.) has two small pieces of marbled paper stuck in, one each on pages 119 and 120 of volume II. It is possible that these pieces of marbled paper, together with that found in Cooke’s edition (London, n.d.) stuck on page 12 of volume III, were later embellishments covering instructions similar to those set out above.

A number of printers evidently decided to ignore the problem, and some Dublin editions of the _Works,^2_ whilst retaining the reference in the text, omit the leaf itself. The Lynch edition, which is dated 1760–7 but which as Kenneth Monkman has pointed out cannot have been printed before 1769,^3_ seems to have been most at a loss. One finds on page 389 of volume I a reference to the leaf: ‘the next marbled page (modly emblem of my work!).’ The verso of this page is completely blank, lacking even the page number. Page 391 is numbered, and bears the signature Cc4; page 392 is numbered. The text continues normally on the following page.

A close examination of the marbled leaf in the first edition offers good reason for this variety of unsuccessful solutions. Each marbled leaf in the first edition of _Tristram Shandy_ was prepared individually. All the copies I have seen retain quite clearly the fold marks from the operation. Each leaf was folded along all four sides to ensure clean margins and was marbled only in the centre. A brief description of the process of marbling will possibly explain the reluctance or inability of some subsequent printers to reproduce the original idea.^4

The solution upon which marbling takes place is a mixture of gum tragacanth and flea-seed. The colours to be used in the design are knocked on to this mixture which is held in a marbling trough. All the marbled leaves I have seen in the first edition contain five colours: a base of white or gall, red, olive green, yellow, and white or gall again. The design corresponds fairly accurately to stage D of the preparation of Italian Four Veins as shown by Woolnough (plate 15). After folding and marbling each leaf would have had to have the superfluous colour washed off before being hung up to dry. After drying the leaf would be sized and dried again. The leaf was then folded back along the same margins to allow the other side to be marbled, washed, dried, sized, and dried similarly. The page numbers, 169 and 170, were then stamped on by hand.

---

^1_ As the preparator and star in the tr colours involved tragacanth.

^2_ Kenneth Monkman, _Tristram Shandy_ (1972), 1:1. The leaf is numbered 119

Bibliographical Notes

As there were approximately four thousand copies of the first edition the preparation of this one leaf involved eight thousand folding, marbling, sizing, and stamping operations. After each separate piece of marbling the surface in the trough would have had to be checked and if necessary skimmed. The colours would allow approximately eight-hundred marblings, so the run involved at least ten complete changes of colour. The base solution of gum tragacanth and flea-seed would have needed changing at least four times, assuming that the operation took place in one trough.

The length of time necessarily involved in the preparation of a single leaf no doubt explains the perfunctory attitude adopted by some later printers.\(^5\) Kenneth Monkman concluded his excellent description of the early editions of *Tristram Shandy* with the comment, ‘There is ample evidence that he [Sterne] took a meticulous interest in his words and how they were printed.’ From the evidence of the marbled leaf one may suggest that Sterne’s meticulousness extended beyond the words to the appearance of the work as a whole.
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TRISTRAM SHANDY: STERNE AND BISHOP HALL

Large parts of *Tristram Shandy* are verbatim or near verbatim borrowings. Occasionally Sterne acknowledges his source either in the text or in a footnote. At one point he makes what appears to be a most explicit reference to his source material:

The learned Bishop Hall, I mean the famous Dr. Joseph Hall, who was Bishop of Exeter in King James the First’s reign, tells us in one of his Decades, at the end of his divine art of meditation, imprinted at London, in the year 1610, by John Beal, dwelling in Aldersgate-street, ‘That it is an abominable thing for a man to commend himself;’—and I really think it is so. (i, 22, 159–60).

It was James Aiken Work in his edition of *Tristram Shandy* (New York, 1949, p. 72) who first observed that he was unable to find this particular sentence in any of Hall’s works. The sentence certainly does not appear in the Decades, and a reading of the collected works of Hall (London, 1647) supports Work’s suggestion that Hall did not write this.

\(^5\) Lest it be thought that the eighteenth-century printers were slapdash in this matter, a quick survey of twentieth-century editions may be salutary. Most are satisfied with a monochrome reproduction of the colourful original such that it lacks much of its point; the Shakespeare Head Press in 1926 followed the example of the *Novelists’ magazine* and tipped in a marbled leaf cut from a larger sheet; the Modern Library edition published in New York omits the leaf. The only modern edition to reproduce Sterne’s apparent intentions satisfactorily is the Japanese translation of Professor Natsuo Shumuta (Tokyo, 1968), in which there is a colour photograph of a marbled page tipped in between pages 248 and 249. The photograph was taken, Professor Shumuta tells me, from a copy of the fifth edition. Shandean may also be interested to note that in this splendidly produced edition, possibly as a result of the Japanese convention of numbering pages from right to left, the Hogarth illustration of Walter Shandy arriving at the christening, which is reproduced both on the slip case of the volume and facing page 320, has been reversed. The illustration of the sermon remains the same.