

Zeitschrift: SPELL : Swiss papers in English language and literature
Herausgeber: Swiss Association of University Teachers of English
Band: 45 (2025)

Artikel: Looking beneath the surface : the Long-Briquets' contribution to material bibliography and Shakespeare studies
Autor: Depledge, Emma
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-1090378>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 16.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

EMMA DEPLEDGE
(UNIVERSITY OF NEUCHÂTEL)

Looking Beneath the Surface: The Long-Briquets' Contribution to Material Bibliography and Shakespeare Studies

This essay explores significant methodological breakthroughs a Swiss couple contributed to material bibliography and Shakespeare studies. It does so through consideration of publications attributed to a Genevan named Charles-Moïse Briquet, especially *Les Filigranes* (1907), and their influence on the resolution of famous bibliographical puzzles, such as the dating of the Shakespeare “Pavier Quartos,” the *Missale Speciale*, and a 2014 forgery of Galileo Galilei’s *Sidereus Nuncius*, or *Starry Messenger* (1610). *Les Filigranes* has long been used by scholars wishing to learn more about the paper used to make manuscripts and printed books, but Caroline Long’s role as Charles-Moïse’s collaborator, and the couple’s contribution to bibliographical research and Shakespeare’s print history has remained somewhat obscure. Building on recent studies seeking to reinscribe into the history of bibliographical studies the contributions of marginalised groups—including female scholars and those working beyond anglophone countries—I suggest that, in addition to historical biases within the field, failure to recognise the Long-Briquets’ methodological breakthroughs and links to major discoveries can be attributed to issues with reproduction, translation and typesetting.

Keywords: Watermarks; paper studies; Shakespeare; Galileo; Gutenberg

To say that Briquet is Switzerland’s most famous son might be an exaggeration, since William Tell and Roger Federer both stake strong claims to the title. On the other hand, instead of spoiling a perfectly good apple or beating hell out of innocuous tennis-balls, Briquet has given us something truly *aere perennius*. (Harris 61)

This essay considers paper and its value as bibliographical evidence, and reflects on the important contribution a Swiss couple, the Long-Briquets, made to paper and watermark studies, to our knowledge of medieval and

early modern publications, and to the history of Shakespeare publishing. The collections of watermarks recorded in *Les Filigranes* (1907) have long been used by scholars wishing to learn more about the paper used to make the manuscripts and printed books on which they work and, as noted by Neil Harris, “the physical importance of these four tomes for scholarship” is “well-known to rare-book librarians” (61). The significant impact the collection played in bibliographical discoveries and Shakespeare studies in particular has, however, been overshadowed. Further, Caroline Long’s (1841-1912) role as Charles-Moïse Briquet’s collaborator has until now remained somewhat obscure. Building on recent studies seeking to reinscribe into the history of bibliographical studies the contributions of marginalised groups—including female scholars and those working beyond anglophone countries—I intend to suggest that, in addition to historical biases within the field, failure to recognise the Long-Briquet’s link to major discoveries, like W. W. Greg’s observations about the publication dates of the (so-called) Shakespeare Pavier Quartos, can be attributed to issues with reproduction, translation and typesetting.

1. Laid Paper

Paper plays a subsidiary role in book production. It is the basic substance of which books are made, yet almost never impinges upon their communicative function. It serves as a mute vehicle of text, rarely noticed except when it fails of its purpose, when defects inherent in its manufacture impede the transmission and preservation of printed information (Bidwell 3).

Switzerland played an important role in the production of laid paper, which is the type of hand-made paper produced in Europe during the handpress period of printing until it began to be replaced by “wove paper” in the late eighteenth century.¹ There are records of Swiss paper mills dating back to the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century, and either Marly or Belfaux (both Fribourg) was likely the earliest,² with other important mills then appearing in and around places such as Geneva (Alle-

¹ As Sarah Werner notes, “wove paper was made from moulds of finely woven wires, rather than horizontal wires supported by vertical ribs” (29), as found in laid paper (discussed below).

² The 1394 civil register (*Bürgerbuch*) in the town archives “includes several paper makers” (Laurentius and Laurentius 12), and Briquet presented the case for Marly (1883-1884), but there has been subsequent debate as to whether Marly, Belfaux, or a mill in Hauterive (also Fribourg), linked to the Cistercian

mogne, France, circa 1426; Versoix, circa 1459), Basel (Kleinbasel, circa 1433), Bern (Ittigen, circa 1466) and Zurich (Werdsteg, circa 1470), with Bern and Basel going on to dominate the industry, the latter having “the largest concentration of mills in Switzerland” (Laurentius and Laurentius 12; Kälin; Tschudin). English stationers imported paper from central Europe, including Switzerland, as attested by several examples of British texts written on Swiss paper. The Basel cross, or crosier mark can, for example, be found in *Accounts of the Collectors of Customs* dating from the 1590s (Folger X.d.46 (1–52)), and a house watermark, alongside the Basel cross, appears in paper used to document *Moneys due by the Privy Council to Sir John Peyton, Lieutenant of the Tower of London* from 1598 to 1599 (Folger X.d.326). In recent years, it has also been claimed that the Gutenberg Bible, printed in Mainz in the 1450s, may have been printed on paper produced in Basel, and not in Piedmont, Italy, as was previously thought (Feder McCarthy).

Paper was made by teams of three, producing approximately 200 sheets an hour or 1500 a day (Michael). The vatman made sheets by dipping a rectangular mould—that resembles a sieve—and a deckle (the mould frame) into the stuff, a substance made up of boiled linen rags.³ The mould, which was made up of vertical chainlines and horizontal wire lines, was then collected by the coucher, who pressed the sheet out from the mould on to a piece of felt, before the layer removed the felt. To increase productivity, they always worked with two very similar hand-made “twin moulds” (Stevenson), meaning the vatman could be dipping the second mould as the coucher pressed the first out. The pulp settles around the mould so that traces of the chainlines, wirelines, and any watermarks and countermarks remain visible in the finished product when it is held up to the light or a light source is placed underneath.⁴

abbey, was the first to produce paper (Dubas; Kaelin; Gerardy). What is clear is that the first Swiss paper was produced in the vicinity of Fribourg. Swiss mills covered by Briquet included: Belfaux, Marly, La Glâne (Fribourg), Faverges, Crans, Arenton, Allemagne, Thiory, Dardagny, Divonne, St Loup. Versoix, La Bâtie and Geneva (in and around Geneva), Worblaufen, Thal, Warb, Bolligen, Bremgarten, Rheinfelden, Suhr, Clarens, Bière, St. Suplice, La Mothe (Bern), Baar, Cham, Herw, Kriens, Sursee, Perlen, Rotzloch (Basel, Zurich and Central Switzerland), Mümliswyl, Goesgen, Zuchwyl, St. Sulpice, Serrières (Solothun and Neuchâtel), Goldach, Kraetzeren, Kubel, Schaffouse (Western Switzerland), and Canobbio, Vouvry, Naters, St. Gingolph (Southern Switzerland).

³ On women’s role in the rag trade, see Heidi Craig.

⁴ Avi Michael provides a helpful video showing the process.

Moulds were handmade and thus unique, like fingerprints. They had a lifespan of around twelve months and watermarks, made from copper sewn onto the frame, of around six months (Gaskell 62–63). Watermarks and countermarks can offer indications of date, provenance, the name of the mill that produced the paper, or the size of the paper. As paper was expensive and perishable, publishers purchased it for specific projects, and used it up quickly. It is therefore possible to adduce that two publications printed on paper featuring the same mould measurements, watermark measurements and placement within the mould were almost certainly published within twelve months of one another, by the same publisher (Depledge 187; Hansen and Rasmussen 59–60).

We know these important facts about the value of paper as evidence thanks to various works attributed to Charles-Moïse Briquet, a Genevan filigranologist and businessman.⁵ Charles-Moïse came from seven generations of paper makers and paper merchants dating back to 1687; Protestant refugees, his parents moved from Châlons-sur-Marne, France, to Geneva around 1724 (Briquet 1923, 3). Charles-Moïse worked for his family business, as well as for a papermill near Versoix, and he and his family played significant roles in the civic and cultural life of Geneva. For example, a keen mountaineer, Charles-Moïse was influential in founding both the Geneva branch of the Swiss Alpine Club (SAC)—becoming its first secretary, under the honorary presidency of General Henri Dufour, in 1866, before taking on the roles of vice president and president in 1867 and 1868 respectively—and *L'Echo des Alpes*, the publication of franco-phone sections of the SAC (Briquet 1923, 8). From 1880, he was also member of the *Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Genève*, and in 1908 the University of Geneva bestowed on him the *docteur ès lettres honoris causa* (Briquet 1923, 13).

Charles-Moïse's vast publications on paper and watermarks include reflections on different paper mills across Europe (as well as Swiss mills listed in note 2), the materials used to make early paper, and the uses of paper for dating and working out the provenance of undated texts. With the help of a microscope, and his friend, Professor Jacques Brun, a diatomologist, he was able to demonstrate that “cotton paper” has never existed, meaning that, “when classifying documents, we should limit ourselves to speaking of papyrus, parchment, and paper, each of which

⁵ For a collected edition of his works beyond *Les Filigranes*, see Allan Stevenson's *Briquet's Opuscula. The Complete Works of Dr. C. M. Briquet without Les Filigranes*.

can be easily distinguished from the other" (Briquet 1884; 1886; 1923, 10–11). He further argued that "papier chiffé" (made from linen rags) is older than previously presumed, dating back to the tenth century, having first been used in the East, before making its way to Europe two or three centuries later.⁶ Further, he observed the use of watermarks to be European in origin and, because he found no evidence of the practice being adopted in the East, concluded that all marked paper originates in Europe (Briquet 1884; 1886; 1923, 10–11). His monograph on paper and watermarks from the Geneva archives helped form the basis of an article published the same year on "*l'utilité des filigranes du papier*" (1888), and the ideas from his various studies also found their way into the Introduction to *Les Filigranes*, a four-volume collection for which he is most famous today. First published in 1907, it contains sixteen thousand tracings of watermarks dating from 1282 to 1600, taken from circa forty-thousand tracings he made during visits to 235 archives, and organised by subject, type and date.⁷ It is by no means without fault, and numerous corrections have been made over the years, but it remains an incredible achievement and an invaluable resource nonetheless (compare with Stevenson's Introduction to Briquet 1968).

The watermark sketches in *Les Filigranes* were produced by hand, holding sheets of paper up to the light to locate marks and then tracing them by hand and adding chainlines. It was a herculean effort, especially when you note that on one occasion Charles-Moïse managed to produce as many as 275 manuscript tracings in only one week! (Harris 63–64). He sought to provide the earliest examples of all watermarks, but also recorded later examples of the same design, and examples of twin marks or moulds, even if the wording used has confused some scholars, and the label "twins" did not come into nomenclature until the publication of Stevenson's 1951/1952 article. Charles-Moïse's greatest achievement comes from the methodology he handed down to us. He predominantly worked on manuscripts, but also studied a large number of printed books (for a list, see Briquet 1968), and the implications are equally if not more helpful for scholars analysing printed books, where paper study is most reliable when combined with analysis of other material features, like printers' ornaments.

⁶ That the rags used to make paper come from linen and not linen and hemp was clarified by Julius Weisner's experiments, conducted contemporaneously.

⁷ More sketches of watermarks were collected than those included in *Les Filigranes*, and the rest are housed at the Geneva Public Library. Many are also reproduced in online repositories of watermarks.

In the “Avant-Propos” to the study, Charles-Moïse credits family members with helping him prepare the final manuscript for the press, but it is clear that he always had a collaborator, one who significantly helped him during each of his research trips. Family and friends assisted with final proofs for the volume, and he specifically thanks “Mr. Edouard Mercier and Miss Adeline Long” for having “autographed his traced drawings of watermarks and rendered them with fidelity and precision,” adding that “this attention to detail was all the more necessary because the gradual loss of [his] eyesight did not allow [him] to carry out this work personally, as [he] would have liked” (Briquet 1907, xi).⁸ Indeed, Charles-Moïse’s commitment to the study of watermarks, working in poorly lit environments, likely contributed to the loss of his eyesight. Due to progressive paralysis of the optic nerve, he was already suffering from significant visual impairment during many of his trips to archives, and his sight had deteriorated to an incapacitating level by the time *Les Filigranes* was published (Briquet 1923, 13). As his nephew, Dr John Isaac Briquet (1870-1931), Director of the City of Geneva Botanic Gardens, makes clear in a biography added to a reprint of *Les Filigranes* published in Leipzig in 1923, Charles-Moïse was “accompagné everywhere by his wife, who assisted him with absolute devotion, [as] he undertook long journeys through Italy, France, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Belgium, and the Netherlands” (Briquet 1923, 12).⁹ Their mobility is remarkable, and, in true Swiss style, they are said to have made good use of trains (Harris 61); the vast number of European archives the Long-Briquets visited meant that patterns and trends could be observed, and conclusions drawn. Charles-Moïse also explicitly recognised Caroline’s important role, and did not simply dedicate *Les Filigranes* to “his wife,” as is often stated, but

⁸ “M. Edouard Mercier et Mlle. Adeline Long ont autographié les dessins calqués de nos filigranes et les ont rendus avec fidélité et minutie. Ce soin était d'autant plus nécessaire que la perte graduelle de notre vue ne nous a pas permis de faire personnellement ce travail, comme nous l'eussions aimé,” translation mine.

⁹ “accompagné partout de sa femme, qui le secondait avec un dévouement absolu, il parcourut au cours de longs voyages l'Italie, la France, l'Allemagne, l'Autriche, Hongarie, la Belgique et les Pays-Bas,” translation mine. In Italy they visited Genoa, five cities in Sicily (1889-1890), Naples, Amalfi, Rome, Fabriano, Florence, Bologna and Venice, plus eleven more cities during a second trip to Italy (Papiers Briquet, n. 41). From 1895, they travelled through Eastern and Northern France, Germany, Austria, and what was then Czechoslovakia, plus Belgium and the Netherlands (Papiers Briquet, ns. 41, 44 and 45, cited in Harris 63).

instead wrote “A ma chère Caroline, ma bien aimée femme et fidèle collaboratrice.” In other words, he recognised her as his faithful collaborator, an acknowledgement that helps to explain how he managed to produce and record so many illustrations at such speed, even as his eyesight began to fail him.

Important recent studies have highlighted the significant but overlooked role female bibliographers, scholars, and editors of the nineteenth and early twentieth century played in the accumulation of knowledge (Adams, Bourne, Houghton, and Yarn), and Caroline Long’s name ought to be added to the list. Charles-Moïse and Caroline, the daughter of Italian Protestant immigrants, married in 1866. Caroline’s contribution is celebrated in a review of *Les Filigranes*, cited in the 1923 biography, which also speaks volumes about contemporary prejudices towards female scholarly labour: “with particular interest, I learned—and Briquet himself confirmed it to me—that his admirable wife was not only his travel companion but also his diligent collaborator. She is worthy of all respect!” (13).¹⁰ She is also said to have been presented with a large wreath of flowers at the moment when Charles-Moïse received his honorary doctorate from the University of Geneva, a poor consolation prize but a (probable) sign of recognition nonetheless. John Briquet speaks of Caroline as Charles-Moïse’s “much-loved wife [...] who, having been the joy and pride of his youth, became his *constant collaborator in his mature years* and, following his visual impairment, became his indispensable support” (14; my emphasis).¹¹ Details of Charles-Moïse’s collaborator were thus not hard to find in the 1907 edition. No mere “travel companion,” Caroline was also recognised and celebrated at the time of *Les Filigrane*’s publication, and the significant role she played, working alongside Charles-Moïse, is stressed in the biography added to the “Leipzig edition” of 1923.

¹⁰ “C’est avec un intérêt particulier que j’ai appris, et Briquet lui-même me l’a confirmé, que son admirable épouse a été non seulement son compagnon de voyage, mais sa zélée collaboratrice. Elle est digne de tous les respects!” The translation from the French is mine, but note that John Briquet has translated the German original. A handful of other early reviews preface the Bibliothèque de Genève’s digital copy, which can be accessed here: https://archives.bge-geneve.ch/data/files/bge.diffusion/pdf/imprimés_num/bge_ob_447_1.pdf

¹¹ “sa femme bien aimée [...] qui, après avoir été la joie et l’orgueil de sa jeunesse, était devenue sa collaboratrice de tous les instants dans l’âge mûr et qui, depuis que la terrible infirmité s’était abattue sur lui, était devenue son soutien indispensable.” Translation mine.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of the 1968 “Jubilee edition,” furnished with a new English Introduction by Allan Stevenson of Chicago University, which became the standard reference edition.¹² John Briquet’s additions to the “Leipzig edition”—a fourteen-page biography of his uncle and a list of obituaries and works published about Charles-Moïse after his death, as well as his life’s works—are situated within the original pages of the 1907 edition, meaning that the new title page is immediately followed by Charles-Moïse’s *dédicace* with its reference to Caroline as collaborator, and then the biography in which her role is further elaborated and celebrated. The Jubilee printing, by contrast, adds far more para-texts and, as a result, Charles-Moïse’s French *dédicace* is buried under 151 pages of English text. Positioned in such a way, it is hidden in plain sight. Further, although the Jubilee edition also includes a biography of Charles-Moïse, by Fritz Blaser, it is only a page and a half long. Disappointingly, when mentioned by name, Caroline’s contribution is merely discussed in terms of patriarchal roles assigned to women—“his marriage to Caroline-Marguerite Long (1841-1912) followed in 1866, and was to prove childless” (13). Blaser does write that Charles-Moïse was “assisted by his wife,” but no details are given, and the verb “to assist” implies far less agency than “collaborate,” in which one instead understands “joint labour” or “in conjunction” with someone (OED) / “travailler en commun” (Larousse). In this “edition,” the one most frequently consulted and cited, particularly by anglophone scholars, Caroline is all but written out of both the volume and the couple’s collaborative achievements.

2. Briquet, Galileo and Gutenberg

Sometimes recognized, sometimes not, important examples of the Long-Briquets’ methodology in action include cases related to Galileo and Gutenberg, as well as a field-shaping example from Shakespeare studies, discussed below. In 2005, a New York bookseller purchased what he believed to be a unique, proof copy of Galileo’s first major publication, *Sidereus Nuncius*, or *Starry Messenger*, of 1610, featuring watercolour

¹² I use inverted commas around the word edition as there was technically only one edition of *Les Filigranes*, that of 1907, the Leipzig and Jubilee editions are facsimile reprints of the 1907 edition that are prefaced by differing amounts of new prefatory material, even if the latter does add corrections and additions to the Long-Briquets’ text and also restructures the contents across the four volumes.

illustrations and supposedly signed by Galileo himself. These were lent validity by Horst Bredekamp's 2007 *Galilei der Künstler*, but a reviewer named Owen Gingerich suspected they were forgeries. Set to go on sale for around ten million dollars, the book then became the focus of an investigation by a team of leading Galileo scholars and experts in bibliography, their findings culminating in two monographs celebrating the value and authenticity of the book (Bredekamp et al.; Needham). Nick Wilding's 2012 *Renaissance Quarterly* review of the monographs subsequently raised further suspicions about the New York copy's authenticity, writing "Needham's conclusion nicely reminds us that many individuals were involved in the making of an early modern book: some of them may still be active" (218). His hunch was right.

The team of Galileo scholars were prompted to return to their investigations. When they tested the contents of the book's paper, the forgery was finally exposed. Thanks to Charles-Moïse's 1884 article, we know that early paper does not contain cotton fibres, it is made from linen rags. Cotton was not found in paper until the eighteenth century and it was not possible to produce refined cotton (linters) until the nineteenth: "the most damning evidence about the paper was the fibre identification and analysis," the team reported, as all the paper stocks in the copy "are made from cotton linters [...] much too recent an arrival in the paper fibre market to be in genuine *Sidereus Nuncius* [paper] stocks" (38).¹³ The book turned out to be a sophisticated forgery produced by a man named Marino Massimo De Caro, who used photo-polymer plates ("a sort of film negative that hardens into relief when exposed to ultraviolet light," as Schmidle writes), inked with specially modified nineteenth-century Indian ink, and handmade paper containing similar watermarks to those found in genuine copies. He even placed individual sheets of paper into an oven at 250 degrees Celsius with "a Pyrex dish with hydrochloric acid on the bottom rack" because, as De Caro stated in an interview he gave to Nicholas Schmidle for the *New Yorker* during his time of house arrest, "at that temperature [...] 'twenty minutes is like four hundred years'" (Schmidle). A skilled, twenty-first century forger was thus undone, in large part by something Charles-Moïse discovered back in the nineteenth century, and the team were forced to issue a third monograph, entitled Volume III *A Galileo Forgery: Unmasking the New York Sidereus Nuncius*.

Charles-Moïse's research into Swiss papermills, especially those of Basel, also provided invaluable guidance for Stevenson, who authored a

¹³ They do not cite Briquet or Julius Weisner.

study on one of the greatest bibliographical puzzles of all time, *The Problem of the Missale Speciale*, in the same year he was editing the jubilee edition of *Les Filigranes* (1967). Due to its early type and lack of date, a solitary Munich copy of the *Constance Missal* was by some thought to predate the Gutenberg Bible of 1455/1456, the earliest book printed using moveable type, and there was much debate as to who printed it and from when it might date (Stevenson 1967b). A second copy was found in Corinthia in 1900, followed by two copies in Switzerland—one at the Capuchin Monastery at Romont, Fribourg, in 1915 and one in Zurich central library in 1925—and a fourth in Ausberg in the 1960s, the same decade when the Romont copy was purchased by the Pierpoint Morgan Library in New York, meaning that Stevenson could now access a US-based copy and compare the paper in different copies (Stevenson 1967b; Harris 138). Stevenson went on to demonstrate that the book did not predate the Gutenberg Bible, nor was it printed by Gutenberg. Thanks in part to knowledge of Bull's head watermarks provided in *Les Filigranes*, and other Charles-Moïse publications, he was able to date it to 1473 and to identify Johannes Meister (Hans Koch, died 1487), a little-known journeyman in Basel, as the printer (Stevenson 1967b).

3. The Long-Briquets' Contributions to Shakespeare Studies

In a 1908 essay that has “marked Shakespeare studies ever since” (McKittrick 23), W. W. Greg examined the paper stocks in a distinct collection of plays published together despite the range of dates on their title pages. He examined the Capell copy of what is today known as the Pavier Quartos, or the Jaggard Quartos (see Lesser).¹⁴ Greg noted that the paper stocks used to print the plays all dated from the same period, 1619, thereby contradicting some of the title-page dates, proving them to be false, and confirming that all the quartos were published by Jaggard for Pavier in 1619. The discovery provided an illuminating marker of popularity: it confirmed that London printers tried to produce a collected edition of Shakespeare plays four years before the publication of the First Folio in 1623, and thereby undermined suggestions made by A.W. Pollard, whose examination of other copies led him to suspect that book-sellers were trying to remainder, that is to shift old stock that had not sold.

¹⁴ Held at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he was librarian.

Greg's observation further suggested that something had happened to alarm the publishers, prompting them to add false dates to the title pages of some of the editions to pass them off as left over copies of earlier editions.

The discovery was significant for the field at large, arguably marking the birth of what became known as New Bibliography. It was revolutionary in convincing the anglophone world of the value and authority of paper and watermark analysis as bibliographical evidence but, unfortunately, Greg's debt to the Long-Briquets' work in *Les Filigranes* has been overlooked. Later scholars have since built on Greg's work, most notably Carter Hailey, who (seemingly unknowingly) used the same Long-Briquet-inspired methodology to redate Q4 *Romeo and Juliet* and Q4 *Hamlet* ("The Dating Game"), both of which were published without title-page dates, and by Lara Hansen and Eric Rasmussen, who suggest that what they term a "fifth folio" printing was undertaken in 1700. I too used paper evidence to redate Q7 *Hamlet* in 2017, and am currently researching what watermarks and paper evidence reveal about the date of one of four undated *Julius Caesar* quartos and the publisher who produced it. Finally, in a very recent article in *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Mark C. Hulse used paper analysis to glean information about the elusive print runs of the 1623 first Shakespeare Folio. Thus, the methodology proposed in *Les Filigranes* continues to facilitate major discoveries within Shakespeare studies and it is high time the Long-Briquets received greater recognition for the role they have played in shaping the field.

Greg is rightly seen as a pioneering scholar in the field of paper and watermark studies but his debt to the Long-Briquets—like that of most of the scholars who followed him—appears to have been overlooked by some scholars, albeit through no fault on Greg's part.¹⁵ In what is now an infamous, oft-repeated quote, Greg in 1908 wrote of how "a *happy inspiration*" led him "to examine the paper on which the quartos are printed," reporting that he "at once noticed a circumstance which [...] puts beyond doubt the fact of their having all been printed within quite a short period of time" (120; my emphasis). This "happy inspiration" has been quoted out of context, in ways that suggest that Greg was divinely inspired. Indeed, Stevenson uses the quote as epigraph to his study, and Carter Hailey who, as mentioned above, built on Greg's work, writes:

¹⁵ It is recognized by David Mckitterick.

Greg casually states that ‘a happy inspiration led [him] to examine the paper upon which the quartos are printed:’ he eventually distinguished twenty-six different watermarks as well as some unmarked stock and found that in a number of instances paper bearing the same watermarks appeared in quartos with different title-page dates (“The Shakespeare Pavier Quartos Revisited”, 151).

But a return to Greg’s 1908 article makes clear that the happy inspiration and the guide helping him to draw and describe the marks was not God, but instead the Long-Briquets’ work, *Les Filigranes*. Greg continues:

The question is of rather a technical character, but I think that, with a little patience on the reader’s part, I shall be able to make it tolerably clear. There has recently appeared at Paris a great work by Monsieur C.M. Briquet, entitled *Les Filigranes* [...] *To the work itself, the reproduction of over 16,000 watermarks with analytical index, are prefixed some very valuable observations on the history of papermaking* (120–121; my emphasis).

Greg then proceeds to summarize some of the Long-Briquets’ calculations concerning the lifespan of paper moulds and watermarks and the maximum amount of time that might elapse between a stock of paper being manufactured and used, noting that “these calculations have a direct and important bearing upon the matter in hand” (122).

Greg mirrors the Long-Briquets’ observations, following the order in which they appear in *Les Filigranes*. It is evident that Greg’s “happy inspiration”—his decision to examine the paper used to print the Shakespeare quartos—stemmed from reading the Long-Briquets’ recently published work. *Les Filigranes*’ insights into using paper and watermarks as evidence for dating texts offered Greg a fresh perspective on the mystery of the quartos. Notably, two of the quartos contain continuous signatures, suggesting they were published together. After encountering the Long-Briquets’s ideas, Greg was inspired to apply this new approach himself, leading him to look beneath the surface and examine the watermarks within the paper.

The Long-Briquets’s role in inspiring Greg has in part been overlooked due to the common tendency to repeat the most recent scholarship and reference Greg without returning to his essay, but the credit due to *Les Filigranes* might also have been missed due to *The Library* typesetter’s inclusion of illustrations in a way that not only interrupts Greg’s citation of it, but even cuts the title in half. The article and first syllable (“*Les Fili*”) come at the bottom of a page of text that is followed by two pages

of illustrations. The second syllable of the title (“*granes*”) only appears after the pages of illustrations. Thus, Greg clearly cites his source and identifies his inspiration, even if he neglects to mention Caroline’s role in producing the guide, but readers are understandably distracted by the images. Greg’s paper evidence was combined with the observation that the same printers’ device appeared on all but one of the quartos; he produced images depicting both the watermarks, where he follows *Les Filigrane*’s example in including chainlines to show a mark’s position relative to the rest of the mould, and the printer’s device in question. The printers’ device is that of the arms of the city of Geneva, complete with the city’s motto *Post Tenebras Lux*. In a beautiful twist of fate, it therefore looks as if the significant role *Les Filigranes* played in inspiring Greg and shaping the field of New Bibliography that was to dominate British and American scholarship for decades to come, may have been obscured by an image showing the emblem of the Long-Briquets’ home town, Geneva.

Paper’s value as evidence is to my mind unparalleled. It is best combined with other forms of analytic bibliography—such as analysis of printers’ devices, or broken type—but, as shown in these examples, it is paper that tends to provide the smoking gun. I hope that this paper sparks curiosity and inspires others to delve deeper into the fascinating world of paper—to look beyond its surface and explore what it can reveal about the texts and documents we study. I also hope to have made a small contribution to ongoing efforts to reexamine the narratives of bibliography, challenging the Anglocentric and male-dominated perspectives that often shape the field. Finally, it is hoped that, *Post Tenebras*, the achievements of both Caroline and Charles-Moïse and their contribution to material bibliography and Shakespeare studies have been brought to light.

References

Adams, B. K. "Fair / Foul." *Shakespeare / Text, Arden Shakespeare Intersections*, edited by Claire M. L. Bourne. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2021, pp. 31–49.

Bidwell, John. *Paper and Type: Bibliographical Essays*. Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 2019.

Bourne, Claire M. L. "The Handmaids' Tale: Book History, Shakespeare, and Women's Textual Labour." *The Oxford Handbook of the History of the Book in Early Modern England*, edited by Adam Smyth. Oxford UP, 2023, pp. 20–46.

Bredekamp, Horst. *Galilei der Künstler: Der Mond. Die Sonne. Die Hand*. De Gruyter, 2007

---., et al. editors. *A Galileo Forgery: Unmasking the New York Sidereus Nuncius*. De Gruyter, 2014.

Briquet, Charles-Moïse. *Les Filigranes. Dictionnaire Historique des Marques de Papier (1282-1600)*. 4 vols. A. Julien, 1907.

---. *Les Filigranes. Dictionnaire Historique des Marques de Papier (1282-1600)*. 4 vols. Leipzig: K. W. Hiersemann, 1923.

---. *Les Filigranes. Dictionnaire Historique des Marques de Papier (1282-1600)*. The New Briquet-Jubilee Edition, edited by Allan Stevenson. 4 vols. Amsterdam, 1968.

---. "Notices sur les plus Anciennes Papeteries Suisses." *L'Union de la Papeterie* 8 & 12, 1883; 1–7, 9–10, 12, 1884; 2–7, 1885. Lausanne, 1883–85.

---. "La Légende Paléographique du Papier de Coton." *Journal de Genève*, 29 October, 1884.

---. "Recherches sur les Premiers Papiers Employés en Occident et en Orient du Xe au XIVe siècle." *Mémoires de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France*, vol. 46, 1886.

---. "De la Valeur des Filigranes de Papier comme moyen de Déterminer l'âge et la Provenance de Documents non Datés." *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire et Archéologie de Genève*, tome I, livre 2, 1892, pp. 192–202.

Craig, Heidi. "Rags, Ragpickers, and Early Modern Papermaking." *Literature Compass*, vol. 16, 2019, pp. 1–11.

Depledge, Emma. "False Dating: The Case of the '1676' *Hamlet* Quartos." *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, vol. 112, 2018, pp. 183–199.

Dubas, Jean. *Les Papeteries Établies dans les Environs de Fribourg au XVe siècle*. Fribourg, 1997.

Feder McCarthy, Isabel. “Ad Fontes: A New Look at the Watermarks on Paper Copies of the Gutenberg Bible.” *The Library*, vol. 17, 2016, pp. 115–137.

Gerardy, Theodor. *Das Papier der Seckelmeisterrechnungen von Freiburg i. Uechtland: 1402-1465*. Schinznach-Bad, Schweizer Papierhistoriker, 1980.

Greg, W. W. “On Certain False Dates in Shakespearian Quartos.” *The Library*, vol. 9, 1908, pp. 113–131, pp. 381–409.

Hailey, R. Carter. “The Shakespeare Pavier Quartos Revisited.” *Studies in Bibliography*, vol. 57, 2005–2006, pp. 151–195.

---. “The Dating Game: New Evidence for the Dates of Q4 *Romeo and Juliet* and Q4 *Hamlet*.” *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 58, 2007, pp. 367–387.

Hansen, Lara, and Eric Rasmussen. “Shakespeare Without Rules: The Fifth Shakespeare Folio and Market Demand in the Early 1700s.” *Canonising Shakespeare: Stationers and the Book Trade, 1640-1740*, edited by Emma Depledge and Peter Kirwan. Cambridge UP, 2017, pp. 38–54.

Harris, Neil. *Paper and Watermarks as Bibliographical Evidence*. Lyon, 2017.

Houghton, Eve. “Private Owners, Public Books: Henrietta Bartlett’s Feminist Bibliography.” *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, vol. 116, 2022, pp. 567–587.

Hulse, Mark C. “Watermarks and the Print Run of the Shakespeare First Folio.” *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 75, 2024, pp. 119–136.

Kälin, Hans. *Papier in Basel bis 1500*. Self-published, 1974.

---. “Heraldik in Schweizerischen Wasserzeichen.” *Schweizer Archiv für Heraldik*, vol. 102, 1988, pp. 3–26.

Lesser, Zachary. *Ghosts, Holes, Rips and Scratches: Shakespeare in 1619, Bibliography in the Long Durée*. Pennsylvania UP, 2021.

Laurentius, Frans, and Theo Laurentius. *Watermarks 1450-1850: A Concise History of Paper in Western Europe*. Brill, 2023.

Mckitterick, David. “W. W. Greg, the Scholar-Librarian.” *Textual Cultures*, vol. 4, 2009, pp. 21–30.

Michael, Avi. “Chancery Papermaking.” *University of Iowa Center for the History of the Book*, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e-Pmfd-V_cZU&t=72s

Schmidle, Nicholas. "A Very Rare Book. The Mystery Surrounding a Copy of Galileo's Pivotal Treatise." *The New Yorker*, December 16, 2013.

Stevenson, Allan H. "Watermarks are Twins." *Studies in Bibliography*, vol. 4, 1951/1952, pp. 57–91, p. 235.

---. *The Problem of the Missale Speciale*. The Bibliographical Society, 1967.

---, editor. *Briquet's Opuscula. The Complete Works of Dr. C. M. Briquet without Les Filigranes*. 4 vols. Paper Publications Society, 1955.

Tschudin, Peter F. *Handwerk, Handel, Humanismus. Zur Geschichte von Papier, Schrift und Druck in Basel*. Buchverlag Basler Zeitung, 1984.

Werner, Sarah. *Studying Early Printed Books 1450-1800: A Practical Guide*. John Wiley and Sons Ltd., 2019.

Weisner, Julius. "Die Mikroskopische Untersuchung des Papiers." *Mitteilungen aus der Sammlung Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer*, vols. 2–3, 1887, pp. 179–255.

Wilding, Nick. "Reviewed Work(s): *Galileo's Sidereus Nuncius: A Comparison of the Proof Copy (New York) with Other Paradigmatic Copies* by Brückle, Hahn and Bredekamp: *Galileo Makes a Book: The First Edition of Sidereus Nuncius, Venice 1610* by Needham and Bredekamp." *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol. 65, 2012, pp. 217–218.

Yarn, Molly. *Shakespeare's Lady Editors: A New History of the Shakespearean Text*. Cambridge UP, 2021.