Bonds of Print and Chains of Paper: Rethinking Print Culture and Social Formation in Early Modern England, c.1550-c.1700.

Volume I of II

Frances Emily Maguire

PhD

University of York

History

August 2017

Abstract

This thesis examines the employment of print by institutions in early modern England c.1550-c1700, to challenge existing understandings of print culture. Where previous studies of print focus predominantly on the published, public and popular, my research demonstrates that institutions commissioned and distributed print for a variety of communicative and administrative purposes. By engaging critically with the adoption of print, I interrogate the role of documentary culture in the workings of governance. I argue that print increasingly navigated and negotiated a wide set of exchanges and was a critical component in the development and performance of social relations.

Examining institutional records and personal papers, this thesis identifies a previously overlooked corpus of print that was implicit to administration and record keeping. My research supplements existing print catalogues to remap the printed landscape of the period. Each section explores a particular institutional setting, looking in turn at the printed output of the Church, the state and London livery companies to reveal the function of print in administrative practice. To do this, it follows the course of printed sheets from printing house to archive. As a result, it charts a very different circulation and consumption of print. This thesis aims to transform ideas of what men and women read, as much as what institutions printed.

Scholars have largely ignored this print and the wider ramifications it has for understanding the paperchains that connected institutions and individuals. By taking a material approach to print, this thesis extends the parameters to discuss and study paperwork more broadly. My research contests the association usually drawn between the adoption of print and the emergence of standardisation and bureaucratic efficiency. I argue this has significant implications for conceptions of state formation, social relations and knowledge production in the early modern period.

Table of Contents

Volume I - Text

Volume II – Figures and Bibliography

List of Figures

List of Tables

Acknowledgments

This PhD could not have been completed with the help and support of many institutions and individuals. These few words cannot do justice to their assistance, but I hope it goes some way to acknowledging my debts to them.

I was fortunate enough to receive funding from the Arts and Humanities Research Council, as well as additional bursaries from the Centre of Renaissance and Early Modern Studies and the History department at the University of York, to undertake this project.

I am grateful to the staff at various archives and libraries for letting me look at their collections and very often going out of their way to hunt down scraps of print. In particular, Chris Webb at the Borthwick Institute for Archives who gave me access to the document store. It was a cold but extremely profitable few weeks.

My supervisor, Dr Mark Jenner has been an unwavering source of guidance, wisdom and encouragement throughout. I am eternally grateful for his time, patience and intellectual generosity. His tireless interest in all things papery has been a constant source of inspiration and without it I would not have made it quite this far.

I would also like to express my profound thanks to the members of my thesis advisory panel, Natasha Glaisyer and Helen Smith for asking hard questions, providing invaluable advice and inspiring me at every stage. A number of other scholars, including Michael Scott, Kenneth Fincham, Laura Gowing and Mark Hailwood have been extremely generous in offering their expertise and sharing their research and ideas.

I need to extend my gratitude to the population of the Humanities Research Centre. Although, technically colleagues I am privileged enough to call many of them friends. In particular, George Brown, Jennie England, Claire Canavan, Hannah Hogan, Sarah Goldsmith, Andrew Stead, Emily Moore and Emma Martin. All have provided a steady supply of help, humour and at various points, beer. I must also mention Charlie for her technological wizardry, but more importantly her friendship throughout.

Finally, I must thank my family, my sister Anna and most of all, Malcolm and Sue, my parents for their unstinting love and support. They have kept me smiling and, at critical stages, kept me going, I cannot thank them enough.

Author's Declaration

This thesis is entirely my own work and I am the sole author. This work has not previously been presented for an award at this, or any other, university. Some aspects of this work have been presented as conferences papers but these have not been published. All sources are acknowledged as references.

Introduction

When examining documents in The National Archives, I discovered the scrappy bit of print in Figure 1. It is a summons to appear before the Sheriff's Court in London. There is no year written on it, nor does it give its recipient. It is crumpled and a bit torn. It was and is unfamiliar. It does not appear on the English Short Title Catalogue (ESTC). It is 'rare'; no historian has discussed it. However, it epitomizes a form of print which was widely distributed and experienced in the seventeenth century. This insubstantial sheet disrupts several historical categories. The contradictions are evident. It is print in an archive. It is print that is written all over (and not neatly in the blank spaces provided), giving ready evidence of people doing things with it. It belongs to the story of print that began at Johannes Gutenberg's press, but does not feature in existing discussions of print.

As I will show in the remainder of this thesis, overlooking print like this has impoverished not only our understanding of print culture, but also of important facets of the early modern world. Thinking about this anomalous phenomenon can lead us to rewrite histories of the period, simultaneously exposing significant cracks in existing scholarship and, quite literally, papering them over. In the following chapters, I focus on the paperwork of several institutions in England c.1550-c.1700, to unearth a very different corpus, and different kinds of circulation and consumption of print, from those with which we are familiar. This PhD substantially rethinks the place of print in early modern England and the part it played in the development and performance of social relations.

Historiography

One key development of the early modern period was the advent and spread of the printing press in Europe. Scholars like Elizabeth Eisenstein and Lucien Febvre were effusive in their analysis of the impact of moveable type.[1] Subsequent revisions

[1] Elizabeth Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: communications and cultural transformation in early modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979); Lucien Febvre and Henri Jean Martin, *The Coming of the Book: the impact of printing, 1450-1800* (London: N.L.B., 1976).

by scholars, including Adrian Johns and Andrew Pettegree, remain emphatic about the effect the printing press had on the early modern world. It wrought seismic shifts on the communication of politics, religion, scientific knowledge and much more besides.[2] Eisenstein's articulation of a 'printing revolution' centred on the standardization printing brought to the production of texts.[3] Johns, of course, subsequently challenged this by contending that fixity is 'transitive' rather than 'inherent', it was constructed, rather than woven into print production, and printers were 'manufacturers of credit.'[4] Despite numerous critiques and revisions of Eisenstein's original proposal, the place of the printing press in driving a shift from oral to literate society remains. This has led not just to a concern with books and libraries, but also to a wider interest in print culture.

Print Culture

The volume of twentieth and twenty-first century literature on print culture almost matches the outpouring of print it describes. Online bibliographies, including the ESTC and Early English Books Online (EEBO), cataloguing print give a picture of the exponential rise of print culture. Scholars have used catalogues like this extensively to reconstruct the printed environment of early modern England. Amongst other things, scholars have used the catalogues to graph print production. These graphs unfailingly show an upward curve of printed output across the period, based on the increasing number of publications and book titles year on year.[5] From bawdy ballads to political tracts and proclamations, the early modern landscape was

---

2 Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998); Andrew Pettegree, *The Book in the Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).

3 Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: communications and cultural transformation in early modern Europe*, 80-88.

4 Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*, 19 and 33; the nature of a print revolution was also debated by Johns and Eisenstein in the American Historical Review, see Elizabeth Eisenstein, 'An unacknowledged revolution revisited', *American Historical Review*, 107:1 (2002): 87-105; Adrian Johns, 'How to acknowledge a revolution', *American Historical Review*, 107:1 (2002): 106-125.

5 See for example, Peter Blayney, *The Stationers' Company and The Printers of London, 1501-1557, Vol. 2* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 834 and 836-837; John Barnard and Donald F. McKenzie and Maureen Bell, *The History of the Book in Britain, Vol IV, 1557-1695* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 785.

one bedecked in print, stuck, pinned and pasted onto every imaginable surface.[6] To judge from modern studies, men and women encountered print at every turn, as it festooned the walls of alehouses, decorated households, passed between customers of coffeehouses and hung in marketplaces. Amongst a sea of print publications, social historians are particularly interested in cheap print, and especially single sheet productions, hawked by peddlers and booksellers for a few pence.[7] Cheap print was popular print.[8] It was available to a wider section of the populace. Scholars attribute the spread of print like this to a burgeoning news culture, the ferment of religious attitudes and a revolution in reading.[9] Recent work points out that cheap print could also be official print, examining the reception and circulation of items, including bills of mortality in relation to 'popular print culture.'[10] It communicated information, new ideas and vital statistics to an ever-increasing audience. By the end of the period, with the profusion of tickets, trade cards and billheads, print shaped, negotiated and was embedded into myriad social interactions. [11]

Print culture is regularly associated with the emergence of a public sphere. Scholars have not only revised Jürgen Habermas' original proposal of the birth of a public sphere in the eighteenth century, arguing that it developed in the seventeenth

---

6 Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Angela McShane, *Political Broadside Ballads of Seventeenth-Century England: a critical bibliography* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2011); Patricia Fumerton, Anita Guerrini and Kris McAbee ed., *Ballads and Broadsides in Britain, 1500-1800* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010); Tiffany Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); For a European perspective see Rosa Salzberg, *Ephemeral City: Cheap Print and Urban Culture in Renaissance Venice* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014).

7 Tessa Watt*, Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Margaret Spufford, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories* (London: Methuen, 1981).

8 Joad Raymond ed., *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture*, *Volume 1, Cheap Print in Britain and Ireland to 1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

9 Andrew Pettegree, *The Invention of News: how the world came to know itself* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014); Richard Cust, 'News and Politics in early seventeenth-century England', in *Reformation to Revolution: politics and religion in early modern England*, ed. Margo Todd (London: Routledge, 1995): 232-51; Joad Raymond, *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain* (London: F. Cass, 1999); Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Revolution: the politics of reading in early modern England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000).

10 Mark S. R. Jenner, 'London', in *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture*, *Volume 1 Cheap Print in Britain and Ireland to 1660*, ed. Joad Raymond (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011): 294-307; Will Slauter, 'Write Up Your Dead: The Bills of Mortality and the London Plague of 1665', *Media History*, 17:1 (2011): 1-15.

11 Sarah Lloyd, "Ticketing the British Eighteenth Century': A thing… never heard before', *Journal of Social History*, 46:4 (2013): 843-871; James Raven, *Publishing Business in Eighteenth-Century England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2014); Maxine Berg and Helen Clifford, 'Selling Consumption in the Eighteenth Century Advertising and the Trade Card in Britain and France', *Cultural & Social History*, 4:2 (2007): 154-170.

century, but also stressed the need to study its 'modes of communication'.[12] The mode of choice is print. Even in recent revisions that emphasise public spheres, plural, and multiple forms of association, the 'agency of print' remains central.[13] If print is the mode of choice, pamphlets are the medium. Much attention focuses on pamphleteering.[14] Single sheets and pamphlets were a means to debate, declare and denounce everything from republicanism to the perils of excessive coffee consumption. Print, it is argued, became central to politics and politicking.[15] Chris Kyle asserts that, by the 1620s, 'Parliament was displayed, perused and sold as printed matter' and that print played a performative role within the 'theatre of state.'[16] In his study of the Civil War period, Jason Peacey argues pamphlets and newsbooks spread information and this print increased political participation.[17] He observes that 'official literature represented the most commonly and systematically available genre of print', but he lavishes far more attention on newsbooks and pamphlets.[18] However, the notion that print culture and the public sphere were made by the book trade and items sold by booksellers and peddlers gives a truncated view of the types of print in circulation and focuses on an imagined community of readers, rather than on the users of print.

This thesis argues that we need to move beyond crude formulations of print propaganda and news to examine other forms of print culture. It concentrates on

---

12 Jürgen Habermas, *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989); Peter Lake and Steve Pincus, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England', *Journal of British Studies*, 45:2 (2006), 287; see also idem, *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

13 Bronwen Wilson and Paul Yachnin, 'Introduction', in *Making Publics in Early Modern Europe: People, Things, Forms of Knowledge*, ed. Bronwen Wilson and Paul Yachnin (London: Routledge, 2010), 13.

14 Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain;* Jason Peacey, *Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004)*;* Alexandra Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Anna Bayman, *Thomas Dekker and the Culture of Pamphleteering in Early Modern London* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2014).

15 David Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

16 Chris Kyle, *Theatre of State: Parliament and Political Culture in Early Stuart England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012), 2.

17 Jason Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); see also idem, 'New Pamphlets and Public Opinion', in *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution*, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); idem, 'Print and Public Politics in Seventeenth-Century England, *History Compass* 5:1 (2007): 85-111; idem, 'Print Culture and Political Lobbying during the English Civil Wars', *Parliamentary History* 26:1 (2007): 30-48.

18 Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution,* 81.

print not usually produced for retail to readers. This kind of print is often not included in bibliographies such as the ESTC, or, if it is, irregularly so. As we will see, early modern institutions commissioned and distributed print for a variety of communicative and administrative purposes that went beyond proclamations and print propaganda.[19] This print was often, although not always, single sheets that became part of the paperchains of institutional business. By engaging with the myriad applications to which print was set by offices and with its use in broader exchanges between institutions and individuals, this thesis overhauls the parameters by which to discuss and study print. It challenges existing notions of 'print culture' and uncovers a much wider set of papery transactions taking place in early modern England. Print negotiated and navigated a much wider set of exchanges than is currently acknowledged. As I will show, institutions commissioned thousands upon thousands of pieces of print and this type of print became increasingly common over the seventeenth century. However, existing studies of print have not incorporated or examined this material in any detail. Locating and investigating this print will allow us to re-examine and rethink print culture, the social life of print and the social work of print.

Jobbing Print

Although relatively unstudied, this material has been touched on in several scholarly literatures. Scholars of ephemera have compiled catalogues and collections of this type of material.[20] However, these are rather dismissive of what print like this did, focusing instead on amassing what survives and placing it alongside everything from theatre tickets to cigarette cards. Moreover, they concentrate predominantly on the print collected by antiquarians, usually in the twentieth century, rather than institutional repositories. Recent work by James Raven and Lisa Gitelman offers a more expansive account of the production and propagation of what is often described

---

[19] On proclamations see Kevin Sharpe*, Selling the Tudor Monarchy: authority and image in sixteenth century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 83; Lloyd Bowen, 'Royalism, Print and the Clergy in Britain, 1639-40 and 1642', *The Historical Journa*l, 56:2 (2013): 297-319; Chris Kyle, 'Monarch and Marketplace: Proclamations as News in Early Modern England', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 78:4 (2015): 771-787.

[20] See for example, Michael Twyman, 'Printed Ephemera' in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol 5 1695-1830,* ed. Michael Twyman and Michael Turner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009): 61-80; Maurice Rickards and Michael Twyman, *The Encyclopaedia of Ephemera: a guide to the fragmentary documents of everyday life for the collector, curator and historian* (London: British Library, 2000).

as 'jobbing print.' Nonetheless, their arguments are decidedly one-sided and predicated on material produced from the eighteenth century onwards. In her study of print in nineteenth-century America, Gitelman challenges notions of print culture by underlining the 'neglected importance of the jobbing press.'[21] Besides her troubling chronology, which ignores the production of such print much earlier, simply charting the proliferation of jobbing print does not provide a critical analysis of the circulation and consumption of this material. Similarly, Raven's study of print in eighteenth-century England flags up the extensive use of printed forms in everyday business and its importance to many aspects of trade and finance. He stresses 'the breadth of the contribution of print to the operation, practice and perception of trade' in this period, asserting that studies of early modern print 'focus on indulgences and religious and ballad-type production rather than civic and business jobbing.'[22] Again, Raven emphasises that this print was practically everywhere in the 1700s and printers made good money from it. However, simply espousing the increasing range and volume of print does little to explicate the work print did. Again, his frame of analysis overlooks the critical formulation of much of this material before the eighteenth century.

Peter Stallybrass's discussion of jobbing print underpins much of this work. He argues that jobbing print, often no more than a sheet and quick to produce, provided ready cash for printers in between producing larger publications (usually books) that took longer to yield a return.[23] In effect, jobbing kept many printers afloat and, crucially, institutions ordered and bought it. This supposed chain of supply and demand underwrites his claim that to understand the print trade 'sheets are what matter.'[24] A steady stream of forms, tickets and other items flowed from printing houses to offices. He suggests, 'every branch of central and local government, every town, every diocese, and institutions such as the universities and the Inns of Court

---

[21] Lisa Gitelman, *Paper Knowledge: toward a media history of documents* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014), 12.
[22] Raven, *Publishing Business in Eighteenth-Century England*, 14 and 47.
[23] Peter Stallybrass, "Little Jobs': Broadsides and the Printing Revolutions' in *Agent of Change: print culture studies after Elizabeth L. Eisenstein*, ed. Sabrina Alcorn Baron, Eric N. Linquist and Eleanore F. Shevlin (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007): 315-341.
[24] Ibid, 340.

required an endless series of small jobs.'[25] By highlighting the importance of jobbing print, Stallybrass shows a different dynamic at work in the print trade and brings attention to different types of print. However, his assertion that jobbing work was pivotal to the print trade is a huge claim made with little evidence. There is a complete lack of empirical analysis to support Stallybrass's argument about the importance of jobbing.

Stallybrass cites letters patent issued to individual printers and the ESTC to support these assertions about the print trade, rather than any rigorous examination of printing accounts. He reels off a list of items Richard Pynson, the King's Printers, produced for various institutions, as well as monopolies established by other printers. He makes much of the contested letters patent held by Thomas Symcocke and Roger Wood in the 1620s for all items 'printed upon one side only of a sheete or sheetes of paper.'[26] From the prolonged disputes with members of the Stationers' Company over this patent, he asserts jobbing was central to the print business. However, supply and demand cannot be determined from letters patent. Certainly, the list of documents in the letters patent shows the array of texts printed and the various offices using them. There is everything from bills of lading to indentures for apprentices.[27] However, the actual output of this material is far less carefully examined by Stallybrass. There is no way of knowing from lists in letters patent how this translated into chargeable print days. Were the presses always busy printing this stuff? Letters Patent and the accounts of the King's printer, who by virtue of the position had command of more presses than other printing houses, do not fully elucidate the amount of print institutions commissioned, and what this meant to the print trade. Nor do they reveal what it looked like, where it went and what was done with it. Crucially, there has been no examination of how the production of this type of print changed over the period. Was the output of the presses in the 1580s the same as in the 1620s or 1690s? This thesis first examines the production of this material across the period, challenging Stallybrass's claims for its ubiquity and profitability. It

---

25 Ibid, 331.
26 Ibid, 327.
27 For transcripts of Wood and Symcocke's Letters Patents see Walter Greg ed., *A Companion to Arber: Being A Calendar of Documents in Edward Arber's Transcript of the Registers of the company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon press, 1967), 165-167 and 172-173.

also goes further, looking at the life of institutional print once outside the printing house.

Print and Institutions

Our historiography draws an implicit and explicit link between print, state formation and standardization. Scholars herald the early modern period as an era of institutional development and increase in governance.[28] The apex of this was the emergence of the 'fiscal military state' at the end of the seventeenth century. John Brewer emphasises the army of clerical personnel, especially those in the expanding Excise office, responsible for increasing taxation revenue that swelled the coffers of the treasury, with the inimitable phrase, 'clerks won wars.'[29] Print is regularly linked to state growth and bureaucracy, and often to the Civil War or Restoration. Paul Slack cites the use of print in the collection of hearth tax in the Restoration as evidence of the expanding capacity of the state to gather information and enforce governance. Again, he does so without quantification or clarification, asserting that print speeded things up and streamlined procedure,

> Print too, it scarcely needs saying, not only assisted data collection, once there were printed forms and instructions for such things as the hearth tax, but added immensely to what Adrian Johns terms the 'new politics of circulation.[30]

This is typical of the way historians shoehorn print into discussions of state formation. It has become a *de facto* marker of increasing efficiency and developing bureaucracy. As an apparatus of the burgeoning information state, print was a way to monitor its subjects, demarcating the deserving poor and legitimising claims to relief and settlement.[31] These studies do not analyse print. They invoke it, uncritically, as evidence of state development at both centre and periphery.

---

[28] Anne Goldgar and Robert Frost, 'Introduction', *Institutional Culture in Early Modern Society*, ed. Anne Goldgar and Robert Frost (Leiden: Brill, 2004): xi-xxii; Michael Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England, c.1550-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

[29] John Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989), xvi.

[30] Paul Slack, 'Government and Information in Seventeenth Century England', *Past and Present*, 184 (2004), 60; see also Edward Higgs, *The Information State In England since 1500* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

[31] Steve Hindle, 'Technologies of Identification under the Old Poor Law', *The Local Historian*, 36:4 (2006): 220-236; Valentin Groebner, *Who Are You? Identification, Deception and Surveillance in Early Modern Europe*, trans. Mark Kyburz and John Peck (New York: Zone Books, 2007); discussions of print,

The role of print and paperwork is emphasised in particularly illuminating ways by post-colonial scholarship. Colonial studies readily correlate the advance of governance with the paper output of the bureau. Bernard Cohn's discussion of 'investigative modalities' considers the production of 'usable knowledge' by the creation of reports, statistics and other texts and the part they played in 'officializing procedures' of the colonial regime.[32] In these accounts, document generation was pivotal to the construction and maintenance of power. Miles Ogborn's recent examination of the East India Company during the period credits the production of script and print in establishing the legitimacy of the Company at home and abroad.[33] This is alongside recognition that colonial rule overlapped with, and was significantly informed by, pre-existing governing structures.[34] Departing explicitly from Cohn, Bhavani Raman seeks to give 'more attention to the complex articulation of records' in early colonial Madras.[35] These studies take a less presumptive approach to state formation, although the speed and profusion of print is still assumed. In the following analysis, I will examine this assumption in various ways by looking at print and the state and by looking at print and various other institutions, including the Church, livery companies and local government.

This thesis recovers a more complex chronology of the uptake of print to disrupt the association between print and institutional development. This draws on Michael Clanchy's seminal work on the proliferation of bureaucratic documents after the conquest of England in 1066 to show elements of continuity in the writing of the state.[36] Clanchy foregrounded a text- and document-based approach to governance

---

settlement and state formation will be developed further in Naomi Tadmor, 'The settlement of the poor and the rise of the form c.1662-1780', article forthcoming in *Past and Present*.

32 Bernard Cohn, *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 3-5.

33 Miles Ogborn, *Indian Ink: Script and Print in the Making of the English East India Company* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2007).

34 Christopher Bayly, *Empire and Information: Intelligence Gathering and Social Communication in India 1780-1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Rosalind O'Hanlon, 'Performance in a World of Paper: Puranic Histories and Social Communication in Early Modern India', *Past and Present*, 219 (2013): 87-128.

35 Bhavani Raman, 'The Duplicity of Paper: Counterfeit, Discretion and Bureaucratic Authority in Early Colonial Madras', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 54:2 (2012), 230.

36 Michael Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993); see also Jack Goody, *The Logic of Writing and the Organisation of Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), chapter, 'The state, the bureau and the file'.

that shaped successive studies of administration. Accounts of the administrative revolution of Tudor government in the 1530s may have piled acclaim on to one man, Thomas Cromwell, but the emphasis of this scholarship was also on structural change in state management that transformed the operation of government.[37] Peter Burke goes as far as to say the early modern state was a 'paper state', whereby people were enfolded into state structures via writing.[38] Paper was a technology of the state, a critical component for governance. It is imperative to integrate print more critically into such models, which recognise the interaction between writing and print. The persistence, and, in many cases, the proliferation of manuscript in the age of print is widely recognised.[39] Furthermore, scholars now emphasise the 'reciprocity between different media' in the early modern world and, certainly, much of the print I discuss demanded written and oral responses.[40] Nonetheless, the presence of print did not automatically equate to bureaucratic efficiency.[41] As Gerald Aylmer argued, early modern 'bureaucracy was more circular than linear.'[42] It is imperative that modern notions of improvement do not determine our understanding of print in early modern administration. I draw on this scholarship and other literature on paper and governance to show the more complex and performative role of print. By looking at print in the administration of taxation and in the workings of local government, I redraw standard histories of state and print. Uptake of print was in many instances patchy to the point of being idiosyncratic, and, in each case, there was no explicit *turn* to print.

---

37 Geoffrey Elton, *The Tudor Revolution in Government: administrative changes in the reign of Henry VIII* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1953).

38 Peter Burke, *A Social History of Knowledge: From Gutenberg to Diderot* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 119.

39 Harold Love, *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth Century England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993); see also David McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1459-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Noah Millstone, *Manuscript Circulation and the Invention of Politics in Early Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016); Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham ed., *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Peter Beal, *In Praise of Scribes: manuscripts and makers in seventeenth-century England* (Oxford Clarendon Press, 1998); Joshua Eckhardt and Daniel Starza-Smith ed., *Manuscript Miscellanies in Early Modern England* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014).

40 Adam Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture, 1500-1700* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 6; see also Jonathan Barry, 'Communicating with authority the uses of script, print and speech in Bristol, 1640-1714', in *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700*, ed. Julia Crick and Alexandra Walsham, 208; Fillipo de Vivo, *Information and Communication in Venice: rethinking early modern Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 16.

41 Paul Du Gay, *In Praise of Bureaucracy: Weber, organization, ethics* (London: SAGE, 2000).

42 Gerald Aylmer, *The Crown's Servants: Government and Civil Service under Charles II, 1660-1685* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 270-272.

My thesis takes a broader view of governance to develop this understanding of print. Instead of focusing solely on the state, it analyses the printed output of different institutions in a way not done before. This multifaceted approach demonstrates the different ways print worked in governance. The first piece of print to come off William Caxton's press in England was an ecclesiastical indulgence. However, discussions of religious print focus heavily on the production and dissemination of the Book of Common Prayer, the King James Bible and other contentious religious texts and the impact they had on devotional practice.[43] There is comparatively little work on the administrative print of the Church. This is surprising given the significant role of the Church in the registration and record-keeping of society. Parish registers, installed in 1538 to record christenings and burials in all English parishes, have received attention.[44] It is necessary to extend this with an examination of visitation and church courts, which were junctures of interaction between institution and populace and a point of document production and exchange. Despite discussion of visitation articles as texts of the Church, there is no discussion of them as a body of print.[45] While the work of Natalie Mears and others highlights the compulsory purchase of special prayers, the use of the printing press at all levels of the church requires further consideration.[46] In addition to the pillars of the Church and state, I also look at London livery companies to explore governance in another guise. Examining these institutions highlights points of overlap and divergence in different administrative systems. It offers a less clean chronology of more print over time, incorporating instances of unrest, discord and institutional decline.

---

43 Brian Cummings ed., *The Books of Common Prayer: The Texts of 1549, 1559 and 1662* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Kevin Killeen, Helen Smith and Rachel Willie ed., *The Oxford Handbook of the bible in Early Modern England, 1530-1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

44 Simon Szreter, 'Registration of Identities in Early Modern English Parishes and amongst the English Overseas', in *Registration and Recognition: Documenting the Person in World History, Proceedings of the British Academy*, ed. Keith Breckinridge and Simon Szreter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012): 67-92; Adam Smyth, *Autobiography in Early Modern Autobiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), Chapter 4, 'Entries and Exits: finding life in parish registries'.

45 Keith Fincham ed., *Visitation Articles and injunctions of the Early Stuart Church*, Vol 1, Church of England Record Society, 1 (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1994); idem, *Visitation Articles and injunctions of the Early Stuart Church*, Vol 2, Church of England Record Society, 5 (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1998).

46 Natalie Mears, 'Public Worship and Political Participation in Elizabethan England', *Journal of British Studies*, 51:1 (2012): 4-25; Natalie Mears et al, ed., *National Prayers: special worship since the Reformation*, Church of England Record Society, 20 (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013).

Whilst it is not new to warn against linear ideas of growth and development, in this thesis it provides intriguing contexts to consider the employment of print. Certainly, infrastructure expanded, but this was also a period of flux. Civil War, fire, plague and other incidents besides brought turbulence and points of crisis. Church courts and visitations ceased altogether during the Interregnum, causing a process of re-establishment in the Restoration, as well as significant changes in personnel. Of course, the Civil War was a watershed moment in governance, implementing new methods of taxation and financial burden on the populace in addition to seismic regime change. Despite recent revision to traditional assumptions of livery company decline in the seventeenth century, companies still faced crippling financial circumstances, political turbulence, and the decimation and subsequent rebuilding of company halls after the Great Fire. This is not to suggest either development or decline, but to situate a consideration of print within a more intricate institutional milieu.

This requires drawing out the varied employment of print for institutional use. The complex dissemination and consumption of print will be constantly apparent throughout this thesis, although some broad categories are distinguishable. Firstly, print circulated within an institution for purposes of administration and record-making was a form of 'intra-communal' print. This included visitation articles distributed, primarily, to parish officers from archbishops, bishops and archdeacons, instructions to tax collectors or summonses to livery company members. There was also print disseminated outwards to sections of the populace, such as tax receipts, or printed orders issued by quarter sessions that enveloped those that read and received them into particular forms of association. Finally, print that passed from institution to individual for the addition of names and signatures and then returned most obviously different types of bonds and recognizances kept in duplicate in institutional repositories. This corresponds with much of the print in church court records. Although none of this print fits neatly into one category, it is crucial to unpack the different ways print worked and the active role it played in shaping and adapting relationships.

Identifying these varied forms of print prompts a number of key questions that will frame this thesis. How quickly did various institutions start using print for administrative and routine activities? How did these pieces of print work in institutional relations? How did print work on the page? How did print work in human transactions? How does this change understandings of these transactions and how does it change understandings of print? To engage with these questions and begin formulating answers to them requires expanding the frameworks to analyse print.

Methodology

In this section, I will outline the various scholarly fields I have drawn upon to develop my analysis. I examine the printed output of institutions using what has become known as the material turn. By taking a material approach, my thesis reinvigorates studies of print culture and, in turn, redraws accounts of social relations. The material turn influenced a number of scholarly literatures and, as I will discuss, these, equally, shape and inform my analysis. Developments in book history have critically extended the social life of texts and this must be applied to single sheet print. I also show how the emphasis placed on document production in the history of science to understand the construction of knowledge and scientific fact is pertinent to this study. Recent explorations of governmentality and paperwork have incorporated these considerations to give new perspectives on the material infrastructure of state power. Moreover, I demonstrate how combining this with literary analysis of texts and a history of reading sheds new light on what was done with print by both institutions and individuals. It foregrounds the physicality of documents as things cut up, pasted and kept. Indeed, the recent archival turn has recast the place of documents inside repositories and in wider schemas of institutional development that will be drawn upon in the ensuing chapters. By examining these fields in turn, I show how they provide valuable resources to rethink the place of print and demonstrate the complex consumption of this material in early modern England.

Through employing and extending these frameworks, this thesis gives a very different picture of print culture. As discussed in the next section, institutional

records are well studied, but not, typically, as a source for print. I am developing an Actor Network Theory (ANT) account of paperwork. Crucially, in the chapters that follow, this opens up varying ideas about what print did and the sets of relations it produced, from parishioners and clergymen to tenants and landlords. Taking a material approach does not give the same story each time. Instead, it shows very different things. It reveals a more complex dispersal of power between institutions and individuals and the intricacy of social relations. Surveying the flow of this print into household accounts, as much as into institutional archives, reconfigures our understanding of official paperwork. Too often, the work of officers is one story, with paperwork considered separately, and I demonstrate that it was far messier than this. There was an essential entanglement of people and paperwork that must be explored.

In outlining my methodology, it is necessary to detail how the nature of my research shaped my approach. As with any research project, its parameters and scope shifted in line with the material found and the changes in direction this required. What started as a project purely concerned with the printed output of institutions quickly became a more wide-ranging exploration of the function of print in paperchains inside and outside the office. This was the consequence of two factors. Firstly, institutional records were not as fruitful as I had hoped, as few accounts detailing the purchase of print have survived. The nature of the material set certain limitations. The paucity of accounts for church courts and quarter sessions made it hard to quantify the exact amount of print purchased and used. Secondly, and more importantly, I found administrative print in different places that opened up very different ways of thinking about its operation and purpose. The presence of print that institutions commissioned in personal papers demands a broader exploration of what it did. Examining systems of archiving and record-keeping by institutions, as well as by individuals, underlines a more dynamic engagement with print by early modern men and women than previously recognised.

The decision to look at print in a number of institutional settings was at the expense of alternative ways of exploring this material. By looking at Church, state and livery companies, I compare administrative practice and the different junctures at which people experienced print. Each of the institutions surveyed could warrant an

entire thesis to itself and, indeed, I also highlight the need for further research on each of them. The time constraints of the thesis imposed restrictions on the research undertaken. It was not possible to survey all institutional records from repositories across England. Consequently, I undertook case studies of particular collections and sampled sets of records. The York registry records held at the Borthwick Institute form the basis of the chapter on church courts, whilst a sample of accounts from livery companies held at the London Guildhall forms the basis of another. My study of the state focuses on certain levies in order to explore fiscal print and on procedures of licensing to gauge the uptake of print at a local level. Combining this with an examination of receipt books and personal papers shows the flow of print from institutions to individuals. Undoubtedly, looking at more records like this would uncover a greater volume and range of types of print. My study does not, therefore, give or attempt a comprehensive account of all the print produced by institutions. Instead, it offers a way of re-framing our historical approach to them, and incorporating a different analytical framework to do so.

Underpinning this approach is the material turn. Early modern studies embrace this approach, but, strangely, neglect the materiality of documents. There is a wealth of publications on all manner of early modern stuff, from spoons to bedheads.[47] Charting everything from elite consumption to the worldly possessions of the poor, the material turn often emphasised objects rather than written records.[48] The influence of theorist Michel de Certeau, in particular, placed emphasis on 'everyday objects' as a part of a broader concern to integrate the quotidian into historical practice.[49] In an appraisal of the field, Frank Trentmann argues material

---

47 For instance, Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson, *Everyday Objects: medieval and early modern culture and its meanings* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010) Sara Pennell, "Material Culture in Seventeenth Century Britain': The Matter of Domestic Consumption', in *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Consumption*, ed. Frank Trentmann (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012): 64-84; Lena Cowan Orlin, *Material London ca. 1600* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000); Lisa Jardine, *Worldly Goods* (*London: Macmillan, 1996*).

48 For instance, Linda Levy Peck, *Consuming Splendor: Society and Culture in Seventeenth-century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Peter King, 'Pauper Inventories and the Material Life of the Poor in Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century', in *Chronicling Poverty: The Voices and Strategies of the English Poor, 1640-1840*, ed. Peter King, Tim Hitchcock and Pamela Sharpe (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997): 155-191.

49 Michael de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988); For an overview of the field see Frank Trentmann, 'The Politics of Everyday Life' in *The Oxford*

studies must look outside the domestic sphere, proposing 'a more user- and practice-orientated approach might enrich our understanding of material politics.'[50] Trentmann's subsequent focus on the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries reflects the fact that a more rigorous application of theories of materiality has developed in studies of post-1700 society. However, his desire to break down the rigid distinctions between private and public spheres by taking a practice-oriented approach to the material world is valid for study of the early modern period. He invokes Bruno Latour's Actor Network Theory to consider the effects objects had and situates this within an examination of 'habits, routines, rhythms.'[51]

I argue that returning to documents, albeit in a different way, offers substantial insight here. Following paperchains between institution and individual reveals the interplay between people and things. For Latour, the social 'is seen to be performed by material things just as much as humans' and this thesis demonstrates that not only is ANT applicable to early modern records, but it is fruitful.[52] At times, I follow pieces of paper like followers of ANT from office into household.[53] It is not just that the flow of documents muddies the distinction between public and private spheres, but the page itself was a space where these negotiations took place. Form-filling melded human hand and printed object as manuscript additions and signatures *activated* material forms.[54] Mundane paperwork has much to tell us about the power of things in networks of social relationships.

Although my thesis does not look exclusively at pre-printed 'blanks', they do evidence the different types of exchanges mediated by print. Examples of 'bureaucratic literacy' were most suitable for mechanical reproduction by the

---

Handbook of the History of Consumption, ed. Frank Trentmann: 521-547; Karen Harvey, *History and Material Culture* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2009).

50 Frank Trentmann, 'Materiality in the future of history: things, practices and politics', *Journal of British Studies*, 48:2 (2009), 303.

51 Ibid, 290 and 286.

52 Patrick Joyce and Tony Bennett, 'Material Powers: introduction', in *Material Powers: Cultural Studies History and the Material Turn*, ed. Patrick Joyce and Tony Bennett (London: Routledge, 2010), 4.

53 See Latour's ethnographic study of paper in French law courts in Bruno Latour, *The Making of Law: an ethnography of the Conseil d'Etat* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010).

54 ANT developed with Michel Callon and John Law, see Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social: An introduction to actor-network-theory* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005).

printing press because of their generic content.[55] Numerous copies could be run off with blank spaces left for names and dates to be entered by hand. This technique was suited to a range of paperwork, from tax receipts to inquisition forms on the continent.[56] Indeed, Stallybrass declared that pro forma prompted its own 'manuscript revolution'. Rather than print succeeding manuscript, as previously supposed, pre-printed forms instigated a scribal culture of form filling. On the page, print represented the past, whereas scribal entry was the future.[57] Yet, many examinations of form filling are reductive, assuming 'the restrictive nature of pre-printed stuff' in contrast to the flexibility of handwritten and verbal agreements.[58] I show how this is a facile approach to the history of form filling. To be sure, blank space required filling, whether with names and dates or death tolls from plague.[59] They harvested information and data, but has form filling ever been neat and tidy? The summons in Figure 1 certainly is not. Scholarship on nineteenth-century forms does not show the dutiful form filler. Doctors left spaces for diagnosis in asylum admission blank, filling them in retrospectively after examination of the patient.[60] Blank space was negotiable. Form fillers were time-lords, as well as doodlers and graffiti artists. Census forms evidence the irreverent, bizarre and comical outcomes of

---

55 Michael Clanchy, 'Looking Back from the Invention of Printing', in *Literacy in Historical Perspective*, ed. D. P. Resnick (Washington: Library of Congress, 1983), 11.

56 Examples of printed inquisition forms from Spain dating from 1569 and 1704 can be found on the University of Notre Dame Special Collections site: https://inquisition.library.nd.edu/collections/RBSC-INQ:COLLECTION/genre/RBSC-INQ:Familiars_and_officials ; for a discussion of these in use see, Markus Freidrich, 'Government and Information-Management in Early Modern Europe: The Case of the Society of Jesus (1540-1773), *Journal of Early Modern History*, 12:6 (2008): 538-563.

57 Peter Stallybrass, 'Printing and the Manuscript Revolution', in *Explorations in Communications and History*, ed. Barbie Zelizer (London: Routledge, 2008), 117; see also *Michèle Barrett* and Peter Stallybrass, 'Printing, Writing and a Family Archive: Recording the First World War', *History Workshop Journal*, 75:1 (2013): 1-32.

58 Margaret Hunt, *The Middling Sort: commerce, gender and family in England, 1680-1780* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 183.

59 Mark. S. R. Jenner, 'Plague on a Page: Lord Have Mercy Upon Us in Early Modern London', *Seventeenth Century*, 27:3 (2012): 255-286.

60 Akihito Suzuki, 'Framing Psychiatric Subjectivity: Doctor, patient and record-keeping at Bethlem in the nineteenth century', in *Insanity, Institution and Society, 1800-1914*, ed. Joseph Melling and Bill Forsythe (London: Routledge, 1999), 124.

leaving the dotted line at the mercy of the public.[61] The fact that blanks were variously missfilled, overfilled or simply not filled at all counters the assumption that print brought uniformity. This thesis grapples with the false starts of paperwork as much as with its development.

Applying critical theory normally used to discuss books to single sheets is crucial here. Studies of certain types of printed forms have made various claims about what print did, obviating the need for a more cohesive study of them. Particular studies of seamen and apprentices examine the capacity of pro forma to enshrine the rights and entitlements of individuals.[62] Laura Gowing demonstrates the various negotiations the apprenticeship indenture arbitrated from the beginning to the end of service.[63] Gowing does important work in taking analysis of administrative print beyond the printing house, highlighting the fruitful application of book history to other types of print. Emphasising a consideration of the 'life of the form', she stresses 'printing was just the beginning of a journey of engagement between people, writing and print.'[64] This is resonant of Donald McKenzie's proposal to study the social life of texts but extends it specifically to pro forma rather than bound books.[65] My thesis develops this by looking at blanks in various institutional contexts to show the different ways print functioned as a transactional device. The variation in what printed forms *did* requires exploration as much as their capacity to standardize practice. My work thus develops the proposition of book historians that 'form makes

---

61 Paul Dobraszczyk, ''Give in your account': Using and Abusing Victorian Census Forms', *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 1:14 (2009): 1-25; Paul Dobraszczyk, Mike Esteber and Paul Stiff, 'Designing and Gathering Information: perspectives on nineteenth century forms', in *Information History and the Modern World*, ed. Toni Weller (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010): 57-88.

62 Margaret Hunt, 'The Sailor's Wife, War Finance, and Coverture in Late Seventeenth-Century London,' in *Married Women and the Law: Coverture in England and the Common Law World*, ed. Tim Stretton and K. J. Kesselring (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2013): 139-162; and eadem, "Women and the Fiscal-Imperial State in the Late Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries', in *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity and Modernity in Britain and the Empire, 1660–1840*, ed. Katherine Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 29-47.

63 Laura Gowing, 'Girls on Forms: Apprenticing Young Women in Seventeenth-Century London', *Journal of British Studies*, 55:3 (2016): 447-473.

64 Ibid, 467 and 456.

65 Donald McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); see also, William Sherman, 'The Social Life of Books', in *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture*, ed. Joad Raymond: 163-170.

meaning', showing that forms also make meaning.[66] This framework determines some key questions addressed throughout. What were the distinct properties of single sheets? How did these inform their reception as texts and objects? How did their circulation and consumption differ from books? What are the implications of this for thinking about print in networks of communication? Recent scholarship has examined the 'geographies' of books and the physical circulation of texts has also been used as a way to think about 'knowledge in transit.'[67] Both of these works develop the ways to think about texts in motion. I make extensive use of mapping and distribution diagrams in the following chapters to show how examining the flow of printed sheets transforms our understanding of their consumption and knowledge production more broadly.

The history of science has been instrumental in demonstrating the centrality of texts to knowledge production. This provides a frame for my analysis of print. Scientific discovery rested upon the ability to communicate ideas effectively. Steve Shapin and Simon Schaffer's exploration of Robert Boyle and Thomas Hobbes stresses the necessity to write and publish ideas.[68] This was 'publish or perish' seventeenth-century style. The establishment of 'truth' largely rested on wider social currencies of credit and trust as proclaiming scientific fact was exclusively a gentleman's game.[69] We must return to Latour here. This concern with writing things down influenced his discussion of inscription, which refers to,

> ...all the types of transformations through which an entity becomes materialized into a sign, an archive, a document, a piece of paper, a trace. Usually but not always inscriptions are two-dimensional, superimposible, and combinable...[70]

---

66 Roger Chartier, *Forms and Meanings: Texts, Performances, and Audiences from Codex to Computer* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995); Donald McKenzie, *Making Meaning: "Printers of the Mind and other essays*, ed. Peter McDonald and Michael Suarez (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002).

67 Miles Ogborn and Charles W. J. Withers, *Geographies of the Book* (Farnham, Ashgate, 2010); James Secord, 'Knowledge in Transit', *Isis*, 95:4 (2004): 654-672.

68 Steven Shapin and Simon Schaffer, *Leviathan and the air-pump: Hobbes, Boyle and the experimental life, including a translation of Thomas Hobbes, Dialogus physicus de natura aeris by Simon Schaffer* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985).

69 Steven Shapin, *A Social History of Truth: civility and science in the seventeenth century* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1994).

70 Bruno Latour, *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the reality of science studies* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1999), 306-307.

Getting it down on paper or on any other surface made something knowable. Within the history of science, an emphasis on locating the wider trails of paper implicit to the construction and communication of scientific understanding has extended to consideration of notebooks, journals and lists.[71] This interest in paperwork has translated to studies of early modern accounting, scholasticism and information management. The burgeoning mercantile trade witnessed a similar outpouring of ledgers, pocketbooks and manuals.[72] In scholarly spheres, an excess of information stimulated the production of texts to control it. Ann Blair identifies methods deployed in encyclopaedias, dictionaries and other texts to manage the 'information overload' of the early modern period.[73] Meanwhile, Jacob Soll's study of the fastidious information collection of Louis XIV's minister, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, has taken an analysis of note-taking and knowledge production into the sphere of governance but it remains concentrated around the particular quirks of one man.[74] My thesis builds upon this consideration of paper trails in knowledge production to consider exchanges between institutions and individuals and, critically, shows this was not a simple flow of paper from institutions outwards.

Crucially, historical studies that incorporate developments in both the history of science and material theory offer fresh perspectives on governmentality. It is necessary to return to Ogborn here. He incorporates and extends Latour's ideas of inscription by proposing reinscription, emphasising that the constant rewriting and reprinting of East India Company paperwork established and maintained institutional authority.[75] His significant claims that print within networks of communication

---

[71] Richard Yeo, *Notebooks: English virtuosi and early modern science* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2014); Elizabeth Yale, *Sociable Knowledge: Natural History and the Nation in Early Modern Britain* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016); Valentina Pugliano, 'Specimen Lists: Artisanal Writing or Natural Historical Paperwork?', *Isis*, 103:4 (2012): 716-726.

[72] Mary Poovey, *A History of the Modern Fact: Problems of Knowledge in the Sciences of Wealth and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), Chapter 2.

[73] Ann Blair, *Too Much to Know: managing scholarly information before the modern age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).

[74] Jacob Soll, *The Information Master: Jean-Baptiste Colbert's secret state intelligence system* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2009); Idem, 'From Note-Taking to Data Banks: Personal and Institutional Information Management in Early Modern Europe', *Intellectual History Review*, 20:3 (2010): 355-75; see also Chandra Mukerji, 'The Unintended State' in *Material Powers: Cultural Studies, history and the material turn*, ed. Tony Bennett and Patrick Joyce.

[75] Miles Ogborn, *Indian Ink: Script and Print in the Making of the English East India Company*, 70-71.

enabled 'competing and contradictory relationships to come into view' will be scrutinized in critical ways in this thesis.[76] Similarly, Patrick Joyce's discussion of the materiality of filing systems in nineteenth-century colonial India stresses the overlap of object and human in the 'production of the institution through paperwork.'[77] Within existing scholarship on states he asserts, 'the central questions of how flow and disposals are coordinated and connections are made and stabilised over space and time still remain somewhat opaque.'[78] He places paperwork alongside road building and photography as an infrastructure of the state. While this builds on Foucauldian concepts of 'governmentality', I suggest approaches to state paperwork also need to build in episodes of 'breakdown' and 'trouble' in the performance of government.[79] Indeed, I present examples of fraudulently printed documents that challenge straightforward models of governance through paperwork. This gives a more complex account that, importantly, leaves room for episodes of paperwork failure.

This thesis also engages with a growing amount of literature on paperwork and its currency in discussions of power. Thinking about 'geographies' and 'centres of calculation' has imparted a sense of movement to paperwork and its role in the formulation of institutions.[80] This includes looking at collections of documents in particular information networks, as well as thinking more individually about paper as a 'mobile'.[81] A review of the field emphasises the growing fervour to expound the 'materiality of communication', including pens, paper and other 'raw materials of power.'[82] Meanwhile, Gitelman's discussion of nineteenth century jobbing spoke of blanks that 'made bureaucracy, directing and delimiting fill-in entries that form the

---

[76] Ibid, 3.
[77] Patrick Joyce, 'Filing the Raj: Political Technologies of the Imperial British State' in *Material Powers: Cultural Studies, history and the material turn*, ed. Tony Bennett and Patrick Joyce, 107.
[78] Ibid, 104.
[79] Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France, 1977-1978*, trans. M. Senellart (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), Chapter 5; see Trentmann's critique in, 'Materiality in the future of history: things, practices and politics', 300.
[80] For discussion of 'centres of calculation' see Bruno Latour, *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1999), 304.
[81] Anke Heesen, 'The Notebook: A Paper Technology', in *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy*, ed. Bruno Latour and Peter Weibel (Cambridge Mass, The MIT Press, 2005), 584.
[82] Ben Kafka, 'Paperwork: The state of the discipline', *Book History*, 12 (2009), 341**;** Idem, *The Demon of Writing: Powers and Failures of Paperwork* (New York: Zone Books, 2012); see also Helen Smith, "A unique instance of art': the proliferating surfaces of early modern paper', *Journal of the Northern Renaissance*, 9 (Forthcoming, 2017).

incremental expressions of the modern bureaucratic self.'[83] Ethnographic and anthropological studies construct files and other paperwork as the material flow inherent to notions of bureaucracy.[84] This sort of approach has dramatically revamped ideas of 'writing the state' to include considerations of the 'part that official records have in the emergence of the notion of truth, concepts of state.'[85] This incorporates the destruction, absence and loss of paper as much as its presence. Early modern studies of the office must incorporate these critical considerations of paperwork, particularly at the point at which the printing press becomes an available technology. Thinking about print adds another dimension to the writing of institutions. However, I caution against some of the claims made about the capacities of a paperwork approach to institutions, as there remain the same gaps and inconsistencies in records there always were. What this new scholarly work does provide is an alternative perspective on the material that we do have and its function in a spectrum of social interactions.

Looking at documents in this way supplements and extends the emphasis on social complexity in early modern social history. Locating and analysing this wider corpus of print and its various functions not only challenges existing categorisations of 'print culture', but also places print as a dynamic actant in a much broader range of interactions. Institutional print penetrated and shaped myriad social relations. There is a rich body of work on the intricacies of early modern society, thanks to the new social history prevalent since the 1960s and 1970s.[86] This focus on the social provided new perspectives on the state and manifestations of power, often by looking at relations at a local level. Keith Wrightson and others have concentrated on the complex networks of human relationships to depict a period of polarization. The expanding gulf between rich and poor intensified relations in rural and urban communities. This period of rapid political, social, economic and cultural change left

---

83 Gitelman, *Paper Knowledge,* 30.

84 Cornelia Vismann, *Files: law and media technology*, trans. George Winthrop-Young, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008); Matthew Hull, 'Documents and Bureaucracy', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 41 (2012): 251-267.

85 Vismann, *Files: law and media technology*, xii.

86 Keith Wrightson, *English Society, 1580-1680* (London: Hutchinson, 1982); Peter Clark and Paul Slack ed., *Crisis and Order in English Towns, 1500-1700: Essays in urban history* (London: Routledge, 1972); Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox and Steve Hindle ed., *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996).

its mark on the populace. Scholars have taken particular interest in the effects of these changes and the 'impact upon social structures, social relations and social identities.'[87] There were fundamental shifts in the ways people inhabited their world and performed their social role within it. In her recent work, Alexandra Shepard brings together material studies and social relationships more comprehensively, arguing that people became readily able to appraise material goods as part of a larger schema, whereby 'processes of social estimation were significantly realigned'.[88] This thesis identifies print and paperwork as material components that shaped and negotiated social interactions.

This has significant implications for the way we approach texts. I have already touched upon the need for book history to extend to single sheets. The same point can be made about wider literary analysis. It is well established that the construction of texts was about more than the neat prose inside. Significant here are studies of the paratexts. These include indexes, title pages and other features that shaped the reading of a text and imposed meaning. Beyond Gerard Genette's original study, Helen Smith and Louise Wilson's edited collection, *Renaissance Paratexts*, has expanded the field by focusing on contemporary printing techniques used in texts to structure reading and understanding.[89] In her contribution about printed flowers, Juliet Fleming asserts that with the investigation of paratexts, 'we can begin to imagine the book as a mould into which words are poured in order to give expression to its structure as a device for reading.'[90] It is surprising that the rhetoric of this has not been extended to the analysis of the broader array of early modern print and less literary signs of power, such as stamps, seals and coats of arms. I contend that single sheets require such an analysis. Arguably, single sheets were in themselves paratexts - navigating and encoding exchanges -, but the surface of this print is also a rich source for paratextual discussion. The page was a performative space where

---

87 Keith Wrightson, 'Introduction: Framing Early Modern England', in *A Social History of England, 1500-1750*, ed. Keith Wrightson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 10.

88 Alexandra Shepard, *Accounting for Oneself: Worth, Status and the Social Order in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 1.

89 Gérard Genette, *Paratexts: thresholds of interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Helen Smith and Louise Wilson, ed., *Renaissance Paratexts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

90 Juliet Fleming, 'Changed opinion as to flowers', in *Renaissance Paratexts,* Helen Smith and Louise Wilson, ed., 57.

paratextual features underwrote the function of paperwork and its comprehension by readers. This extended to choices of surface and typeface. Some of the print I look at was on parchment and used civilité type that mimicked the written hand. Whilst it is easy to suppose this was so that official documents looked and felt right, what about the forms not printed on parchment and in civilité? In drawing out such distinctions, my analysis of print goes much further than that of Peacey and Kyle. Employing frameworks from literary studies provides a more active conception of what reading was. Stallybrass concludes his discussion of these little jobs suggesting, 'Our obsession with literacy rates has tended to obscure the extent to which many printed sheets fulfil their function without being read.'[91] While agreeing with this, I argue that our histories must also incorporate a more expansive understanding of reading as practice.

Embrace of the material turn within the history of reading accords a greater dynamism to texts and readers.[92] It has stimulated an approach to reading that considers the physicality of texts and the varied practices of the reader in configuring meaning.[93] Scholarship has engaged not just with books, but also with letter writing, sermons and all manner of avenues in which people were confronted with, and consumed texts.[94] Accordingly, our understanding of reading material has expanded to incorporate graffiti and tattoos as much as the bound book.[95] Reading was not exclusively silent and passive- it was, in turn, aloud and physical.[96] Annotation and other visible marks are now analysed as evidence of reading. What was done to texts was of equal importance to what they contained. Recognition of this has installed a much more fluid understanding of texts and their mutable state. Almanacs

---

91 Stallybrass, 'Little Jobs…', 340.

92 Heidi Brayman Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England: print, gender and literacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Jennifer Andersen and Elizabeth Sauer, *Books and Readers in Early Modern England; material studies* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002).

93 For an overview of the field see Frances Maguire and Helen Smith, 'Material Texts' in *The Routledge Handbook of Material Culture in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Catherine Richardson, Tara Hamling and David Gaimster (London: Routledge, 2016): 206-215.

94 James Daybell and Peter Hinds, *Material Readings of Early Modern Culture: texts and social practices, 1580-1730* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

95 Juliet Fleming, *Graffiti and the Writing Arts of Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).

96 On reading aloud see, Andrew Cambers, *Godly Reading: print, manuscript and Puritanism in England, 1580-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011) Chapter 3.

incorporated blank pages for the owner's written delectation.[97] Marginal annotations, crossings out and manicules are traces of reading and the evolving form of a text, underlining once more the overlap between script and print.[98] Destruction was as much a part of reading as binding and preserving. The cutting of bibles at Little Gidding was an exercise in configuring new meaning and a demonstration of piety.[99] Signs of cutting and pasting are indicative of textual assemblage; 'compiling was production.'[100] A special edition of the *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* on collage, along with this other work, assumes cutting and pasting to be about the re-use of texts - it was production, but out of existing sheets. However, most of the material I discuss went into service when cut up or torn out. The activation of blank forms began when cut out from a larger sheet. Printers might print sheets in the manner Stallybrass describes, but the administrator chops them up. Variations between forms were a result of the steady and unsteady hands of administrators. Four identical blanks on a single sheet, once cut out and filled in, became four different documents. Cutting was everywhere in administrative practice. The wiggly cutting of pairs of apprenticeship indentures or bonds for verification may be more obvious, but scissors were as much a part of paperwork as inkpots and quills. Engaging critically with administrative practice provides vital detail on the things done to paper and this extends to its storage in offices and registries.

Fully documenting the life of print requires an analysis that goes from house to archive (and in many cases back out again). Jacques Derrida's conception of the archive correlated a feverish drive to preserve documents with the manifestation of

---

97 Adam Smyth, 'Almanacs, Annotators and Life-Writing in Early Modern England', *English Literary Renaissance*, 38:2 (2008): 200-244; Idem, 'Textual Transmission, Reception and the Editing of Early Modern Texts', *Literature Compass*, 1:1 (2003): 1-9.

98 William Sherman, *Used Books: marking readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008); Jason Scott-Warren, 'Reading Graffiti in the Early Modern Book', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 73 (2010): 363-81; William Sherman and Heather Wolfe, 'The Department of Hybrid Books: Thomas Mills between Manuscript and Print', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 45:3 (2015): 457-485; see also other articles in, Juliet Fleming, William Sherman and Adam Smyth ed., 'The Renaissance Collage: Toward a New History of Reading', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 45:3 (2015):443-641.

99 Adam Smyth, "Little Clippings: Cutting and Pasting Bibles in the 1630s', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 45:3 (2015): 595-613; idem, "Shreds of holinesse": George Herbert, Little Gidding and Cutting up Texts in Early Modern England', *English Literary Renaissance*, 42:3 (2012): 452-481.

100 Jeffrey Todd Knight, *Bound to Read: compilations, collections, and the making of Renaissance literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 8.

state power.[101] Accumulation within the archive was a source and demonstration of power, metaphorical and literal. It reverses the idea of filing away and forgetting as the physical possession of documents entrenched dominance and control. This despotic model of document capture is now qualified with a more fluid conception of the archive than Derrida imagined. In her critique, Carolyn Steadman stresses, 'the archive is made from selected and consciously chosen documentation and also from the mad fragmentation that no one intended to preserve and just ended up there.'[102] Exposing that there was both method and mania in processes of acquisition opens up a much broader dialogue about repositories and the flow of material into and out of them. This thesis exposes the position and function of print in such systems.

The 'archival turn' recast the place of storage in statecraft, challenging Derrida's assumption of the archive as a bastion of state power. Ann Laura Stoler's study of colonial archives reverses the idea of a 'static' archive recasting 'archiving-as-process rather than archives as things', and argues for the need to think about the 'documents lost and destroyed along the way.'[103] Essential to this approach is looking 'along the archival grain' to see how repositories were constructed, rather than against it to see those traditionally excluded from institutional records.[104] Early modern studies are starting to engage with the possibilities offered by this trend and mapping it to the upsurge in institutional and personal record-keeping already recognised in the period. Special issues of *Archival Science*, *European History Quarterly* and *Isis* feature studies of early modern repositories from across Europe.[105] A recent *Past and Present* supplement harnesses the archival turn in various early modern contexts to present new ways to think of state formation and governance.[106]

---

[101] Jacques Derrida, *Archive Fever: a Freudian impression* (London: University of Chicago Press, 1996).
[102] Carolyn Steedman, *Dust* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 68.
[103] Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: epistemic anxieties and colonial common sense* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 20; see also Francis X. Blouin and William G. Rosenburg ed., *Archives*, *Documentation and Institution of Social Memory: Essays from the Sawyer Seminar* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006).
[104] Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain,* 53.
[105] Randolph Head ed. 'Archival Knowledge Culture in Europe, 1400-1900', *Archival Science*, 10:3 (2010): 195-2000; Filippo de Vivo, 'Early Modern Archiving', *European History Quarterly*, 46:3 (2016): 421-589; Elizabeth Yale ed. 'Isis Focus: The History of Archives and the History of Science' *Isis* 107:1 (2016): 74-120.
[106] Liesbeth Corens, Kate Peters, Alexandra Walsham ed. 'The Social History of the Archive: Record-Keeping in Early Modern Europe', *Past and Present*, Supplement 11 (2016): 9-359; Michael Hunter ed., *Archives of the Scientific Revolution: the formation and exchange of ideas in seventeenth-century Europe* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1998).

These studies are indebted to the material turn and, in doing so, extend the social life of documents considerably. Methods of record keeping shaped the nature and capacity of knowledge as access to records controlled understandings of people and things. The potential gains of combining analysis of the scientific archive with the state repository are also flagged, 'reorienting the field toward the study of making and organizing knowledge across an expanded array of epistemological sphere.'[107] My thesis incorporates a consideration of archiving and, critically, one that recognises the flow of paper in and out of the archive that complements the mobility of paperwork already discussed.[108] The survey of church courts presents a range of pro forma issued to, and signed by individuals, that then returned to the registry. However, rather than the inevitable return of this material to a central repository in a Derridean manner, I demonstrate the far more complex flow and storage of paper sheets. Looking at the consumption of print as a whole requires looking outside the institutional archive, coordinating these archival practices with individual record-keeping to show the flow of paperchains from one to the other.

By locating administrative print in archives and individual records, I challenge existing assumptions about the commerce of print. I have already established that this print was not published and sold in the traditional sense. The exchange and storage of the print I analyse also imbued it with a value that was not straightforwardly commercial. Print variously held significance because of the rights it bestowed, the proof it gave and other less tangible values. Arjun Appadurai's 'social life of things' helps us to think about the changing worth of commodities and 'the conditions under which economic objects circulate in different regimes of value in space and time.'[109] His emphasis that one should study things in motion to understand their associated values in particular contexts does account for the changing status and associated values of objects. However, the print I am surveying was not an explicitly economic object and was experienced in various ways. As I will

[107] Nicholas Popper, 'Archives and the Boundaries of Early Modern Science', *Isis*, 107:1 (2016), 87.
[108] On the flow of documents in and out of archives see Eric Ketelaar, 'Records out and archives in: early modern cities as creators of records and as communities of archives', *Archival Science*, 10:3 (2010), 201-210.
[109] Arjun Appadurai, 'Introduction: commodities and the politics of value', in *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in cultural perspective*, ed. Arjun Appadurai (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 4.

show, the issuing of meeting tickets or marriage bonds to early modern men and women were examples of vicarious consumption and, in turn, 'involuntary consumers.'[110] Although initially coined to refer to lodgers' experience of rented furniture and servants issued with their masters' choice of clothes, these terms present a helpful model for examining the other ways people experienced print without explicitly buying it and provide a salient counterpoint to assumptions of choice and agency in consumption. Men and women received much print as part of another exchange. Equally, people put their names and signatures to forms that they never saw again. This was consumption through participation: people encountered print but never owned it and, in other cases, it was the material by-product of another transaction, such as receipts for paying taxes. As well as thinking about print in a world of goods, it needs to be located in networks of exchange that were not strictly commercial.

I detail a much more complex model of commerce and exchange for this print as it circulated within institutions and between individuals. My analysis of livery companies demonstrates that, while companies could order meeting tickets from any printer, the regulated production of apprenticeship indentures via letters patent prohibited companies commissioning these contractual documents. In exchanges between institutions and individuals, did institutional supply or individual demand prompt the use of print? I suggest we need to account more fully for both. In his 'culture of credit', Craig Muldrew depicts the changing nature of financial transactions from exchanges between people who knew each other to an expanding market of indirect exchange that initially brought with it increasing debt litigation.[111] My thesis presents a significant material component to this model. Besides the proliferation of the bonds and, eventually, paper money he describes, the spread of printed receipts demonstrates paper proof standing in for trust. By showing the increasing amount of paperwork in interactions between institutions and individuals, this thesis rebuffs the

[110] John Styles, 'Lodging at the Old Bailey: lodgings and their furnishing in eighteenth century London', in *Gender, Taste and Material in Britain and North America, 1700-1830*, ed. John Styles and Amanda Vickery (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 62; see also idem, 'Involuntary consumers? Servants and their clothes in eighteenth century England', *Textile History*, 33:1 (2002): 9-21.
[111] Craig Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation: The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1998), 7.

suggestion that, 'institutions shape patterns of interaction.'[112] It was not just institutions with an element of archive fever. People read and saved printed slips and kept hold of licenses to sell ale, pass through the parish and so on. In addition to mediating exchanges between people and institutions, print became a component of individual account keeping and creditworthiness. There was demand. By colliding institutional supply of print with where it went and what happened to it, this thesis outlines a less prescriptive idea of print and paperwork as an inscription device. It aims to transform ideas of what men and women read, as much as what institutions printed.

Pointing up the function of this print as a transactional device recasts associations of single sheet print as a form of everyday material culture. As a means of proof and record of exchange, this print held very different sets of values. Outlining the points at which people encountered such print qualifies the perception of it as diurnal. These sheets were not quotidian in the sense that Peacey uses the word, or part of the everyday that has typified approaches to consumption since de Certeau. I interrogate the intervals and junctures at which people came into contact with this print. It was not everywhere; it was print experienced through particular exchanges. Its form and associated practice may have been familiar, but this does not make it quotidian or everyday as a consequence. Some was calendrical, received at regular and routine points in the year, such as livery company tickets for meetings, whilst others were periodic or (perhaps, hopefully) one-offs, including, marriage bonds and penance certificates. The various months written on tax receipts evidences the sporadic appearance of tax collectors in the parish. We need to think more about the rhythms of print, but detach this from the notion of the everyday and, instead, think about how it demarcated the rhythms of life, of marriage, death and taxes.

As a result, my thesis explores the semiotic value of institutional print, correlating its reception to its use and situated meaning. Administrative in function, it is resonant of the materials Michael Billig discusses in his account of 'banal nationalism'. Rather than explicit pronouncements of political affiliation, this print

[112] Keith Wrightson, 'Afterword' in *Institution Culture in Early Modern Society*, ed. Anne Goldgar and Robert Frost, 354.

was the mundane material encountered, habitually rather than sensationally, unremarkable but representative of an affiliation to state, Church or company. As Billig remarks, 'The metonymic image of banal nationalism is not a flag which is being consciously waved with fervent passion; it is the flag hanging unnoticed on the public building.'[113] Instead of proclamations, which were hung in marketplaces and read by the local crier, printed forms were mute flaggings of inclusiveness, participation and association, overlooked because of their 'unimaginative repetition.'[114] This is not to understate the importance of this material, but to reinforce the different ways it worked. Administrative print was far more prevalent than currently assumed. However, this should not lead to a prosaic notion of its everyday consumption. Rather, we must employ more complex models of consumption and reading to fully explore print in both institutional archive and household repository.

Sources

The source base for this thesis is necessarily wide-ranging. It departs from previous studies of print by looking at institutional repositories. Scholars usually engage with tax records, livery company accounts and other institutional records, as a way of gauging the wealth, density and other demographic information about the population. They read behind court papers and other contractual records to try to understand the agenda of the constable or the clerk. Their work is about understanding what the content of these records reveal about social relations and the workings of institutions. They rarely write about the documents themselves. Instead, my analysis demonstrates these records offer a valuable site to find print and in doing so think critically about its function in administrative processes.[115] Whilst these records are usually the preserve of political, economic, social and cultural histories, they provide substantial material to rethink conceptions of print culture. Looking at a range of bureaucratic records, I uncovered a world of print, which was intrinsic to paperwork and record making. This gives new perspectives on print and institutions in turn.

---

[113] Michael Billig, *Banal Nationalism* (SAGE: London, 1995), 8.
[114] Ibid, 10.
[115] Peacey discusses the potential of such records for finding print in, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*, 41-45.

I analysed different types of records to develop this investigation of print. This included accounts from both printing houses and offices. The former are scattered but valuable. Unlike the comprehensive accounts of the Bowyer ledgers of the eighteenth century, earlier accounts from printing houses are scarce.[116] There are some accounts of the King's printers and the printers to the City of London, and Kyle and Peacey identified further printing accounts for government.[117] I have used these to calculate and compare the cost of print. Crucially, I combined an analysis of these accounts with financial records of institutions. Examining the accounts of several livery companies revealed not only the frequency and scale with which they ordered print, but also the working relationships established between institutions and printers. Institutional accounts, where available, give new perspectives on the print trade and qualify Stallybrass's assumption about the profitability and pervasiveness of jobbing print. Of course, there are gaps. Accounts can be cursory and not all of them survive. For example, although a large amount of print came out of the Hearth Tax Office, we have no accounts. Nonetheless, there is much more to extract from existing accounts.

I extended this analysis of orders and payments for print with archival research into print in both institutional records and personal papers. Starting with institutional records, I surveyed particular classes of documents. This included going through the records of the York church courts held at the Borthwick Institute box by box, identifying the range of pro forma used and the multifaceted work of paper. This was also the case for local government print. I surveyed licences and recognizances at The National Archives to ascertain the employment of print. This gave a geographical and chronological perspective to the adoption of print by both central and local offices. My analysis demonstrates the amount of print in archives, not only in terms of

---

[116] Keith Maslen and Herbert Davis, *An Early London Printing House at Work: studies in the Bowyer ledgers: with a supplement to the Bowyer ornament stock (1973), an appendix on the Bowyer-Emonson partnership, and Bowyer's Paper stock ledger, by Herbert Davis* (New York: Bibliographical Society of America, 1993).

[117] On the King's printer see Graham Rees and Maria Wakely, *Publishing, Politics and Culture: the King's printers in the reign of James I and IV* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); on the London City printers see Jenner, 'London'; see also Raven, *Publishing Business in Eighteenth Century England*, 86-93; Kyle, 'Monarch and Marketplace: Proclamations as News in Early Modern England', 776; The accounts he cites are in British Library (BL), Add MS 5756, Bills of the King's Printer; Peacey discusses the accounts of the Scottish printer Evan Tyler printing during the Civil War, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*, 244; The accounts he cites are in National Archives of Scotland, PA 15/2 Evan Tyler Accounts.

volume, but also in the range of documents printed. This underlines the fact print is not just the preserve of libraries and reinforces the need to look for it in repositories previously overlooked.

This archival research also encompassed personal papers. Finding print in these records demonstrated the circulation of print between institutions and individuals. Much like institutional repositories, personal papers are considered to be manuscript entities. To view any personal papers in the British Library requires a trip to the 'Manuscript Reading Room'. Accordingly, they are usually discussed as manuscript collections entirely made up of handwritten letters, notes and any other correspondence that flesh out the lives of individuals. The introduction to a recent collection of essays on early modern correspondence acknowledged that 'authoritative forms' such as warrants, passports and bonds constituted forms of early modern correspondence, although it still peddles an idea of inter-personal communication firmly rooted in epistolary forms and manuscript.[118] Indeed, all the contributions concentrate on pen and paper, entrenching the idea that letters maketh the man. Handwritten records may seem more authentic in showing the outpourings of individuals via letters, diaries and other established categories of ego-document. However, the print they received also said important things about who they were. Receipts, licenses and bonds demarcated individuals as taxpayers and law-abiding parishioners that was critical to wider articulations of their social standing.

Combining archival research with bibliographic analysis enabled quantitative analysis of certain kinds of sources. For example, I conducted an extensive bibliographical study of ecclesiastical visitation articles using the ESTC, examining new ways, both graphically and geographically to map the distribution of print. Bibliographical aides including the ESTC, Short Title Catalogue (STC) and Wing Short Title Catalogue offer a good starting point for studies of print. However, they have limitations. The STC covers printed output from 1475 to 1640, the Wing catalogue covers 1641 to 1700 and the online ESTC combines both, as well as additional

[118] James Daybell and Andrew Gordon, 'The Early Modern Letter Opener', in *Cultures of Correspondence in Early Modern Britain*, ed. James Daybell and Andrew Gordon (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2016), 8.

content.[119] Given the exacting rubric that determined the compilation of these catalogues, their limitations come as no surprise. The focus of these cataloguing projects was on print in libraries not archives and, indeed, all those involved were librarians. As a result, they systematically overlooked the printed output of institutions. The introduction to the second edition of the STC makes it clear why this was so. Written by Katharine Pantzer, who took up the project to catalogue print after the original members passed away, it explains that, whilst she had catalogued some blanks when they had presented themselves,

> Many more of these blank forms undoubtedly exist in archives and record repositories, but Jackson considered that actively seeking them out was an inefficient use of time, and I have followed him in this policy[120]

The canon of the STC never set out to be complete and, finding the need to have some kind of end, the project had to limit its search somehow. Moreover, the blanks catalogued are not all grouped together, despite Pantzer's inclusion of 'England - Public Documents: Miscellaneous.' This thesis wrestles with the gaps in these catalogues and the print not captured in them. Key word searches for 'blank' or 'printed form' in the ESTC gave further examples, but the catalogue does not provide this level of description for all relevant material. Nor do the items I am concerned with have titles like standard publications. Instead, the title given is typically the first line of text, making them harder to find. In addition, the quantity of printed forms that comprised a sheet or part of a sheet do not always neatly fit into cataloguing systems.[121] It was, therefore, necessary to supplement analysis of these catalogues with my own archival research to provide a more accurate account of print and its distribution. There was a much broader corpus of institutional print in circulation than these catalogues record.

---

[119] A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave ed., *A short-title catalogue of books printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of English books printed abroad: 1475-1640*, 3 Vols (2nd ed.,rev. + enlgd, began by W.A Jackson and F. S. Ferguson, completed by K. F Pantzer: London: The Bibliographical Society, 1976-91); D. G Wing; Yale University Library; T. J. Crist and J. J Morrison, *Short-title catalogue of books printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales and British America, and of English books printed in other countries, 1641-1700* (2nd ed., New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1972-88).
[120] Pollard and Redgrave ed., *A short-title catalogue of books printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of English books printed abroad: 1475-1640 Vol 1*, xxv.
[121] Raven, 35.

The limited interface between electronic catalogues such as the ESTC and archival catalogues with their own description labels also hindered this search for print. Online archive catalogues such as The National Archive's *Discovery* and *State Papers Online* do not consistently describe the form of documents as either manuscript or printed (this is another consequence of the focus traditionally being on the content of documents rather than their physical properties). Nonetheless, digitisation is changing the landscape of print. It is possible to see original documents on *State Papers Online*. This enables us to get behind the calendars originally compiled in the nineteenth century that are their own 'genre of historical writing' which transformed the debris of government into ordered catalogue thanks to the tireless and uncelebrated efforts of Mary Anne Everett Green and others.[122] The volume of material on *State Papers Online* made it impractical to comb the entire collection to check for print, although the tremendous amount of print here warrants further study. The digitisation of other manuscript collections has brought different types of print to the fore, often revealing the diverse places in which it resides. Digitisation projects at the Bodleian Library, Folger Library and John Rylands Library tend to focus on major works, but have uncovered examples of more banal print. A salient example of this is a printed advertisement by William Caxton for *Sarum Pie* (Ordinale Ad Usum Sarum) c.1476-1477 in figure 2.[123] This perfectly illustrates a sheet that has not caught the attention of scholars like indulgences, but demonstrates the other slips Caxton printed, passed around and pasted up from an early date, captured in digitisation. This reinforces the need to combine archival research with bibliographical analysis to locate print scattered in various repositories.

Caxton's advert also foregrounds the problems of reconstructing the effect of print from isolated examples. Individual examples of print may well suggest shifts in the type of print produced and its circulation. However, the singularity in which they

---

[122] C. L. Krueger, 'Why She Lived at the PRO: Mary Anne Everett and the Profession of History', *Journal of British Studies*, 42:1 (2003), 67.

[123] John Rylands Library, Incunable Collection, 23122, this was accessed from the Ryland's Luna database http://enriqueta.man.ac.uk/luna/servlet/detail/Man4MedievalVC~4~4~706634~128081:Ordinale-ad-usum-Sarum ; there is another copy of this advert at the Bodleian Library (Bod. Lib.), Bod. Inc. Cat, C-155, Arch. G. e.37 accessed from http://bodley30.bodley.ox.ac.uk:8180/luna/servlet/detail/ODLodl~14~14~82954~136822:The-Caxton-advertisement--This-post

survive makes it hard to ascertain whether this was an anomaly or was representative of print encountered on a broad scale. There is no way to get a complete account of everything produced and used, due to the destruction and loss of much of this print. Previous estimates put the survival rates of single sheet print at one in ten thousand sheets.[124] One of the surviving indulgences at the John Rylands Library was binder's waste.[125] This demonstrates the precarious survival of print and the diverse places official sheets ended up. The value of print as waste paper could subsequently outstrip its function as an official document. Beyond its immediate use, much of this material became surplus to requirements and was thrown away or burnt. Receipts initially kept for yearly reckoning, or tickets retained to gain entry to a future event, were consequently liable to being discarded. To an extent, we are reliant upon the hoarding tendencies of certain individuals or collections of personal papers that tend to be those of the wealthy, landed and notable. It is harder to establish what everyone encountered. Nonetheless, these collections confirm that much of the print people received was single sheets from institutions. This happened more widely than currently recognised and demands further consideration.

Accordingly, it is important to look at how people used this material, as well as at where it survived. This requires an alternative approach to the source material, accounting for its function as both text and document. Adrian Wilson's discussion of sources as 'effects' is instructive for thinking about this material. He outlines a hermeneutic stance that focuses not on the content of sources, but, instead, on the generation of documents as reflective of the society in which they were produced.[126] While this is pertinent in examining the adoption of print, my research demonstrates the need to look beyond the generation of documents. I place Wilson's model in dialogue with annotation, filing and all the other things inflicted on paper discussed earlier to give a more rigorous account of effects. This throws up problems of categorisation. As Raven notes, filled out forms are frequently parts of other

---

[124] Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety 1550-1640*, 11 and 141.
[125] John Rylands Library, Incunable Collection, 17250.1, this was accessed from the Ryland's Luna database, http://luna.manchester.ac.uk/luna/servlet/detail/Manchester~91~1~260390~117487
[126] Adrian Wilson, 'Foundations of an integrated historiography', in *Rethinking Social History: English Society 1570-1920 and its Interpretation*, ed. Adrian Wilson (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), 302 and 315.

records.[127] We need to critique how this print has been categorised previously and develop the questions we ask accordingly. Where does this print fit into the paperchains of office and broader interaction with institutions? In what ways did it mediate and record exchanges? How did this material perform the institution inside homes and alehouses etc.? Unfilled blanks hold a different place in paperchains to the completed form. Whereas the sheets bearing names, dates and signatures, had an obvious place in institutional records, empty blanks are the residual effects of administrative practice: the spares. Combining a study of institutional records, personal papers and print catalogues, I have located this print in its various states. Together, they shed light on print previously overlooked and show paperchains in action. In doing so, this complicates existing ideas of 'print culture' and has wider implications for the study of documents. This material infused very different sets of exchanges, redrawing understandings of print, power and reading.

Chapter Overview

This thesis comprises three sections, each with two chapters. The sections focus in turn on ecclesiastical administration, taxation, and local governance, looking at print and paperchains in a particular context. It demonstrates the employment of print for various functions in each. The opening section looks at the Church. Chapter One analyses visitation articles sent out to parishes in preparation for the visit of church personnel. Surveying the spread of printed articles, this chapter nuances ideas of jobbing print and establishes geographies of print within the networks of communication between various levels of the church, from parish to archbishop. Looking at the articles themselves provides ready evidence of the practices of annotation, copying and collecting that administrative print was subjected to. Articles were both working documents and reference texts. Visitation was a juncture of record production, material exchange and administrative performance, connecting parish life to the higher levels of the Church. This embedded visitation articles in a much broader set of inscription practices. In outlining this, Chapter One argues that the production of this print was bound in the performance of the Church as an institution,

[127] Raven, 62.

an idea that is developed in Chapter Two, which examines record procedure and document production in church courts.

Chapter Two reveals the uneven adoption of printed pro forma between different church courts. The York church courts are the focus here, with examples drawn from other courts to demonstrate that the adoption of print was office based and that manuscript continued to proliferate over print. Matters of godly governance increasingly became a form-filling exercise, but this did not entail a wholesale turn to print. This chapter details the types of documents printed and then situates them in court practice. Concentrating on the purpose of these documents in the function of the courts posits the flow of paper into and out of archives. Addressing this flow of paper revises how church courts worked and demonstrates how the discard and capture of paper shaped the formation of records and the production of knowledge. This enables comparisons with secular governance to be made to underscore the dynamic interplay between institutions and their use of print.

The second section looks at fiscal print, examining firstly print in the paperchains of state offices and then its wider circulation to the populace. Concentrating on tax collection, Chapter Three examines print in the paperwork of governance and the collectivities established via these pro forma. This challenges the associations made between print, standardization and state formation. It establishes that the method of collection, rather than any notion of increasing state efficiency, determined the use of print. It also demonstrates that innovations in the employment of print equally took place away from Westminster, when the crown sold off parts of government revenue to fee farmers. The operation of the extra-state involved an increasing use of print. In turn, the chapter reveals how the money raising required during the Civil War prompted an outpouring of print. Finally, I use a case study of hearth tax, introduced in the Restoration, to map print in the revenue and record making procedures of a single levy. This advances a very different way to think about writing the state. Moreover, it establishes the need to look at the print that flowed out of state offices, which the following chapter develops.

Chapter Four charts state material going the other way by following the path of printed receipts. It argues that, as well as shaping social relations, these slips informed everyday practices of commonplacing and accounting. Forms of association were established and performed through the paperwork received when paying taxes and other levies. Moving away from the institutional record to personal papers reveals a very different consumption of print that, in turn, expands the idea of the state record. Receipts helped form individual creditworthiness and a notion of the reputable 'taxpayer'. This recasts interactions between institutions and individuals, by pointing up an intrinsic material component. Finding print here transforms understandings of the print men and women encountered and opens up a very different set of reading practices at work in households. Printed receipts demonstrate the full extent of institutional print and its circulation, substantially redrawing conceptions of early modern print culture.

The final section concentrates on local government and livery companies to examine print and paperwork in particular areas. Chapter Five looks at print in the context of local government, evidencing not only the circulation of print from centre to locality, but, equally, the local purchase and commission of print for communication, administration and record keeping. This builds on critiques of standardization and bureaucracy of state practice raised in Chapter Three by examining print in the provinces. It extends recent scholarship by demonstrating the messy reality of paperwork systems and the overlaps and gaps between periphery and centre. Tracing the commission and flow of print within local 'paper regimes' nuances existing discussion of state structures.[128] An important consequence of this is expanding our understanding of where people encountered official print. By concentrating on licensing, official print is found in alehouses as much as in quarter sessions. The discussion then moves on to an analysis of fakes and forgeries. It demonstrates that counterfeit documents reveal contemporary understandings of print as both a semiotic and a transactive device.

[128] Paul Griffiths, 'Local Arithmetic: Information Cultures in Early Modern England' in *Remaking English Society: Social Relations and Social Change in Early Modern England*, ed. Steve Hindle, Alexandra Shepard and John Walter (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013), 116; see also idem, 'Surveying the People' in *A Social History of England, 1500-1750*, ed. Keith Wrightson: 39-59.

The final chapter charts print commissioned by livery companies and, in doing so, alters notions of metropolitan print culture. Livery companies are an untapped source for exploring print within administrative practice. Indeed, this chapter argues that scholars overstate the printedness of livery companies in important ways. Printing pamphlets to lobby Westminster politicos did not automatically translate to a wider use of print by companies. This challenges key ideas about print and the public sphere. Ritual aspects of company life gradually incorporated print, inscribing the performance of the institution via oaths and orders. The printed output of livery companies changes current conceptions of print in the metropolis and thus the experience of print by its inhabitants. I argue that the use of print to cement intra-group solidarity revises the idea that print was always about communication.

While the road from Gutenberg's indulgence to the outpourings of Grub Street may be well trodden, this thesis demonstrates it is not complete. I identify a body of material that has been routinely overlooked, but contributes substantially to our understanding of what print did in the early modern world. In its pursuit, this thesis debunks many of the assumptions made about the material lives of men and women. It also re-negotiates the interplay between people, paperwork and power. This is not to suggest I have the topic wrapped up. Rather, it presents an alternative approach to the early modern period that can reinvigorate studies of print, institutions and social relations alike.

Chapter One A Visitation of Print: Visitation Articles and Ecclesiastical Administration

Religion and the book, and the relationship between print and the spread of Protestantism, have been key themes for historians for decades.[1] The advent of movable type enabled the dissemination of new religious ideas throughout society. Nowhere was this more apparent than in the production and propagation of the Protestant Bible. Heralded by scholars as 'the most important book in early modern England', printed bibles brought the word of God into the homes of men and women, sparking new practices of reading and religious devotion.[2] In recent years, this interest in religious print has extended to other texts, including prayer books and psalms.[3] In particular, Natalie Mears' work on printed prayers and fast day orders has highlighted the role of official and routine print in communicating religious and political policy to parishes.[4] However, there is much less work on the print culture of church administration, such as visitation.

Although this reflects the rather narrow definition of print culture used by most early modern scholars, it is surprising for a number of reasons. Firstly, visitation by deans, archdeacons, bishops and archbishops was a central part of ecclesiastical government that generated a lot of business. Visitations were routine inspections of

---

1 A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, 2nd ed. (London: B. T. Batsford, 1989), 153-156; Geoffrey Elton, *Reform and Reformation, England 1509-1558* (London: Edward Arnold Ltd, 1977), 163-164; Ian Green, *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

2 Kevin Killeen and Helen Smith, "All other books….are but notes upon this': The Early Modern Bible' in *Oxford Handbook of the Bible in England, 1520-1700*, ed. Kevin Killeen, Helen Smith and Rachel Willie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 1; see also Andrew Cambers, *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript and Puritanism in England, 1680-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Naomi Tadmor, *The Social Universe of the English Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Lori Ann Ferrell, *The Bible and The People* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008); on the printing of bibles see Graham Rees, 'The King's Printer's Bible monopoly in the reign of James 1', in *Negotiating the Jacobean Printed Book*, ed. Pete Langman (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2011): 15-28.

3 Brian Cummings, 'Print, popularity and the Book of Common Prayer', in *The Elizabethan Top Ten: defining print popularity in Early Modern England*, ed. Andy Kesson and Emma Smith (Burlington: Ashgate, 2013): 135-144; Linda Phyliss Austern, Kari Boyd McBride and David L. Orvis ed. *Psalms in the Early Modern World* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011); Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety*.

4 Natalie Mears, 'Brought to Book: special book purchases in English parishes, 1558-1640', *Negotiating the Jacobean Printed Book*, ed. Langham: 29-44; eadem, ''Public Worship and Political Participation in Elizabethan England', *Journal of British Studies*, 51:1 (2012): 4-25; eadem, 'Special Nationwide Worship and the Book of Common Prayer in England, Wales and Ireland, 1533-1642', in *Worship and the Parish Church in Early Modern Britain*, ed. Natalie Mears and Alec Ryrie (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013): 31-72.

an ecclesiastical jurisdiction that brought clergy and parishioners to account. Upon taking office, these clerics, or their representatives, had to conduct a visitation of their jurisdiction. In the case of dioceses, it could take months to work through the parishes, and metropolitical visitations could span years. Thereafter, the frequency of visitation differed. Archbishops would usually only visit individual dioceses, rather than the entire province. Diocesan visitation was ordinarily every three years, although in York it was every four years and in Norwich every seven years. Archdeaconries were visited annually or biannually.[5] Visitations of cathedrals and ecclesiastical peculiars also took place, at different intervals. By the beginning of the fourteenth century, most dioceses operated a system of visitation, and their 'records take on the formulaic trappings of canonical procedure…written proofs and procedural documentation.'[6] From a visitation of Norwich in 1499, 120 folios of records survive.[7] These events did, then, produce a prodigious amount of paperwork.

Secondly, visitations were crucial to implementing religious reform during the early modern period. It was an established part of ecclesiastical administration that expanded in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Given the function of visitation in the enforcement of religious and moral discipline, it has been described 'as the linchpin of effective ecclesiastical government.'[8] Religious historians have mined visitation articles – the sets of questions put to groups of churchwardens - to trace the changing concerns of bishops and ecclesiastical authorities about doctrine, discipline and the condition of the parish church. Eamon Duffy cites the returns to Archdeacon Nicholas Harpsfield's visitation of Kent in 1557 to demonstrate the immediate impact of Marian religious reform in the parishes.[9] Julian Davies uses the scope of enquiry in visitation articles produced during the 1630s to illustrate the influence of Archbishop Laud's religious programme and its implementation at a parish level.[10] Most recently,

---

5 Kenneth Fincham ed., *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church*, Vol 1, Church of England Record Society, 1 (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1994), xiv.

6 Ian Forrest, 'The Transformation of Visitation in Thirteenth-Century England', *Past and Present*, 221 (2013), 23.

7 Christopher Harper-Bill, 'A Late Medieval Visitation: The Diocese of Norwich in 1499', *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology*, 34 (1977). 35.

8 Fincham, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church*, Vol 1, xiv.

9 Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c.1400-c.1580* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 555.

10 Julian Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism, 1625-1641* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 121 and 141-145.

Lori Anne Ferrell uses articles and injunctions to evidence 'an unmistakable narrative of change over time as the Church's stated attitude towards the English Bible moved from promotion to increasing suspicion to select disavowal.'[11] These examples typify how scholars have used visitation articles, focusing on the intricacies of religious policies played out within the text. However, concentrating on articles as *texts* overlooks their function as *documents* that had a distinct format and materiality, which shaped how readers interacted with them and constructed returns and presentments in response. These documents played a key part in the performance of the Church as an institution.

Important edited collections have transcribed pre-1640 sets of visitation articles with care and accuracy. The compilation made by Walter Frere and William Kennedy at the beginning of the twentieth century remains a pivotal source, not only of articles, but also for tracing the imposition of Royal authority during the Reformation.[12] More recently, Kenneth Fincham's authoritative two-volume collection of early Stuart articles and injunctions transcribes a large number of these texts and draws similarities between particular sets.[13] Such works have brought the breadth of visitation material into the wider purview of historical scholarship. Record societies have supplemented this, publishing editions of further sets of articles and of the returns sent back from parishes in response to the questions asked.[14] There has been very little examination of the fact that, as we shall see, increasing numbers of sets of articles were printed. Flagged by Jeremy Gregory and Jeffrey Chamberlain as a 'relatively untapped' source that can give 'an unrivalled knowledge of the operation of the Church in the localities', visitation articles remain an entirely unused source for studies of print. [15]

---

[11] Lorri Ann Ferrell, 'The Church of England and the English Bible, 1559-1640', in *Oxford Handbook of the Bible in England, 1520-1700*, ed. Kevin Killeen, Helen Smith and Rachel Willie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015): 261-271.

[12] Walter Howard Frere and William Paul Kennedy, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation* (London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1910).

[13] Fincham *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church*, Vol 1; idem, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church*, Vol 2, Church of England Record Society, 5 (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1998).

[14] A comprehensive listing of such publications is given in Jeremy Gregory and Jeffrey Chamberlain, 'National and local perspectives on the Church of England in the long eighteenth century' in *The National Church in Local Perspective; The Church of England and the Regions, 1660-1800* eds. Jeremy Gregory and Jeffrey Chamberlain (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2003), 9.

[15] Ibid, 9-10.

Examining the production of articles, this chapter establishes the process, chronology and adoption of print in this area of church administration from 1550 to the late seventeenth century. In doing so, it challenges assumptions that print brought about greater efficiency and bureaucratisation, and it shows that the Church used print earlier than previously thought. It has been argued that the adoption of printed questionnaires in 1706, by William Wake, Bishop of Lincoln, - a practice continued by his successor Bishop Gibson- marked the 'advance' of print for godly governance. Sent to clergy rather than to churchwardens, these were pages of printed questions with spaces left underneath for handwritten answers. Scholars have equated these forms with 'the growth of the statistical habit of mind' and wider advances in record collection.[16] It has been argued that in this way the Church obtained information systematically, enabling a quantitative survey of ecclesiastical performance via printed forms. Adam Fox lauds this 'development of printed visitation articles,' linking it with the burgeoning research methods of antiquarian societies and leaders of the scientific revolution, who, in adopting questionnaires revolutionised data collection and facilitated its wider application.[17] These questionnaires were not, however, visitation articles. As William J. Sheils points out, such printed forms were enquiries sent in addition to, rather than instead of, visitation articles.[18] Furthermore, they continued a tradition of information collection initiated by various members of the Church before the eighteenth century, the Compton census of 1676 being a notable example.[19] Fox's oversight and Sheils' insight reveal the need for more work on visitation articles. By looking at articles in conjunction with a range of documentation produced by the Church, this chapter shows that articles offer a diverse body of print to explore ideas of standardisation in relation to institutional practice.

---

16 W. R. Ward, *Parson and Parish in Eighteenth-Century Surrey: Replies to Bishops' visitations*, Surrey Record Society, 34 (Guildford: Surrey Record Society, 1994), ix.

17 Adam Fox, 'Printed Questionnaires, Research Networks, and the Discovery of the British Isles, 1650-1800', *The Historical Journal*, 53:3 (2010), 605.

18 William Sheils, 'Bishops and their dioceses: reform of visitation in the Anglican church, c.1680-c.1760', *Clergy of the Church of England database Online Journal 1* (2007), 4. Accessed from http://www.theclergydatabase.org.uk/cce_a1/,

19 For records of Compton census see Anne Whiteman ed. *The Compton Census of 1676*, Records of Social and Economic History, 10 (London: British Academy, Oxford University Press, 1986); for the use of printed forms on the continent see Markus Friedrich, 'Government and Information-Management in Early Modern Europe. The Case of the Society of Jesus (1540-1773)', *Journal of Early Modern History*, 12:6 (2008): 538-563.

Through a systematic analysis of visitation articles, this chapter challenges Stallybrass' assertion that every diocese required an endless supply of small jobs.[20] Mapping the distribution of articles reveals that both the location of a diocese or archdeaconry and the number of parishes within it determined the use of print. It charts the chronology and geography of the adoption of printing for visitation articles, and thereby revises assumptions of the general spread of print. Visitation articles were booklets, typically quarto in size, but varied in length from just a few to over forty pages.[21] The questions they contained usually came from the Canons, enquiring about the state of religious practice in the parish and the moral wellbeing of clergy and parishioners. Clergy in charge of particular visitations also added their own questions. In a newsletter to Edward Viscount Conway, Edmund Rossingham described how a general book of articles was in production for visitation, with each bishop allowed to add further questions, 'for it is apprehended that some visitation articles are more proper for one diocese than for another.' He detailed that there 'is another article to inquire who keep on their hats during divine service and in sermon time, for the keeping off of hats has been much urged.'[22] There was, therefore, room for manoeuvre in the construction of articles with questions added, as well as removed, in response to the latest concerns of churchmen. This chapter will examine how this variation affected the structure and format of these printed booklets and reveal the complexity of articles as a body of print.

The second half of this chapter will then follow the path of visitation articles from printing house to parish and back to the bishops' registry. It will show how the form of the articles structured and contributed to the working of visitation. Churchwardens drew up the responses or 'returns' to these questions, and were also charged with presenting parishioners and clergy in breach of the articles. The subsequent court sessions conducted during visitation held these individuals to account. The Essex clergyman Ralph Josselin detailed numerous summonses to the visitation court after 1660. On one occasion, he was suspended for not administering the sacrament, whilst at another court he 'receivd admonicon to use all the prayers

[20] Stallybrass, 'Little Jobs', 331.
[21] Ferrell, 'The Church of England and the English Bible, 1559-1640', 263.
[22] SP 16/456/44. News letter from Edmund Rossingham to Edward Viscount Conway, June 8th, 1640.

always.'[23] Furthermore, at the visitation of the Bishop of London in 1664, Josselin reported 'no rubs, but my path clear so that I hope I may serve my Master with freedom.'[24] Visitations brought people and paperwork to account and church personnel recorded the proceedings.[25] It was a recognised occasion within the Church calendar that involved more than simply court proceedings, and articles were embedded in a mass of paper and parchment. Visitation initiated document generation, production and collection, in which print played an increasing (but uneven) role that has been overlooked by scholars.

Mapping the Production and Consumption of Visitation Articles

Unlike the printed summons that opened the Introduction of this thesis, visitation articles were books, not single sheets. Also, in contrast to psalms, sermons and other items of religious print, they generally did not jostle for space on booksellers' stalls: they passed directly from church officials to churchwardens, usually for a small sum.[26] However, they also differ from most of the print discussed in this thesis because the ESTC records visitation articles, and this enables a systematic analysis of them.

Searching 'visitation articles' in the ESTC produced 727 results dated between 1547 and 1750. This includes the visitation articles Tudor monarchs commissioned, as well as those of archbishops, bishops and archdeacons. In my analysis I have included all surviving editions of articles listed in the ESTC. This does mean that my data could overstate some numbers, because there are double or triple entries. However, my data could also understate the amount of printed visitation articles, as many have not survived. Indeed, the complexities of this source material must be

---

[23] Ralph Josselin, *The Diary of Ralph Josselin, 1616-1683*, ed. Alan Macfarlane (London: Oxford University Press, 1976), 498, 509.
[24] Ibid, 512.
[25] Some of these records, often called speculums, are also edited see for instance, Bishop John Wake, *Bishop Wake's Summary of Visitation Returns From the Diocese of Lincoln 1706-1715: Part 1 Lincolnshire*, ed. John Broad, Records of Social and Economic History, New Series 49 (Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 2012), x; Thomas Secker, *The Speculum of Archbishop Thomas Secker*, ed. Jeremy Gregory, Church of England Record Society, 2 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1995).
[26] See for example the inventory of bookseller John Foster in, John Barnard and Maureen Bell, *The Early Seventeenth-Century Book Trade and John Foster's Inventory of 1616* (Leeds: The Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society Ltd, 1994), Appendix 2.

stated. Fincham estimates a survival rate of forty per cent for printed bishops' articles and an even lower rate for archdeacons'.[27] Visitations took place at different intervals, depending on the province and type of visitation, and new sets of articles are continually coming to light. Furthermore, bishops did not always print new sets of articles for each visitation and, instead, ordered their reuse. Therefore, there was not necessarily a new set of articles produced for every visitation. Elsewhere, articles remained manuscript productions run up by clerks and scriveners. There are also problems with the ESTC as a catalogue for finding print.[28] It is not comprehensive and there may be variant titles that did not come up in the search terms used. Although the ESTC can never provide any definitive answers about the numbers and frequency of printed articles, it is reliable enough to conduct a detailed analysis of this print, and to reveal general trends in the printing of visitation articles.

Figure 3 shows the chronology of the printing of different types of visitation articles printed from 1547 to 1700. To facilitate analysis, the data is broken down into 25 year periods, starting from the first printed articles in 1547. To take this analysis to 1700, I extended the last period to 28 years. This includes only printed editions on the ESTC, and not manuscript editions surviving elsewhere. From the graph it is clear that the production of all types of visitation articles increased in the first half of the seventeenth century. Articles for dioceses dominate in each period, although particular chronological trends are apparent. From the graph, it is also clear that print production did not continuously increase throughout the seventeenth century and this is significant. There was a spike in production in the 1630s, marking the Laudian reforms, which indicates an upsurge in visitation and print in response to religious upheaval. However, the numbers subsequently fall. This is because visitations ceased during the Civil War and Interregnum. With no visitations taking place, the production of articles stopped. What is less perceptible from the graph is the large number of printed articles produced at the beginning of the 1660s, when visitation began again with gusto. There were episodes of heightened printing activity in the 1630s and 1660s, in addition to the emergence of printed articles in the second half of the sixteenth century. Instead of a simplistic notion of there being more print

[27] Fincham, Vol 1, xv.
[28] Raven, *Publishing Business in Eighteenth-century England*, 35; C. J. Mitchell, 'Provincial Printing in Eighteenth-Century Britain', *Publishing History*, 21 (1987), 6.

over time, fluctuations on the graph highlight that print production reflected the religious and political vicissitudes of the period.

The different types of articles plotted on the graph correspond to the different types of visitations carried out. The nationwide articles were for Royal visitations. Following this were metropolitical visitations that archbishops carried out. There are relatively low numbers of this type of article on the graph because archbishops usually commissioned individual sets of articles for each diocese they visited. Certainly, the dioceses visited by Archbishop Laud during his metropolitical visitation between 1633 and 1635 received their own set of articles. Diocesan articles therefore include sets of articles commissioned by bishops and archbishops. The next level down from this was archdeaconries, followed by deans and peculiars. 'Blanks' were articles with spaces left on the front page to enter the jurisdiction in which they were going to be used. Discussed in more detail later, it is obvious that the production of blanks could belie a much greater adoption of printed articles across all jurisdictions.

Once one looks more closely, one can see that different forms of article came to be printed at different times. The first set of printed articles dated from 1547. They were for the nationwide visitation carried out under Edward VI and printed by the King's printer, Richard Grafton.[29] Royal visitation started with Henry VIII in 1535, after the break with Rome, where 'Henry's Visitors were armed with a book of doctrinal articles and the first set of Royal Injunctions.'[30] Therefore, Church procedure provided the model for royal visitation, but it was royal visitation that began the printing of articles, and churchmen subsequently adopted the practice.

Printed articles for royal visitation were part of the wider use of the printing press by the Crown to impose religious uniformity. Elton asserts that the printed Injunctions Cromwell commissioned encapsulated the 'programme of spiritual reform', and notes that further injunctions and orders were printed and distributed by bishops.[31] Along with The Book of Homilies, printed in 1547, and the issuing of

---

[29] Four editions survive, *Articles to be enquyred of, in the kynges maiesties visitacion*...(London: Richardus Grafton regis impressor excudebat, 1547) S108706; S108733; S108732; S112543.
[30] Frere and Kennedy, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*, 125.
[31] Geoffrey R. Elton, *Policy and Police: the enforcement of the Reformation in the age of Thomas*

royal prayers to every parish in 1549, visitation articles built 'the structure of a state Church turning it into a powerful tool of royal propaganda.'[32] Throughout Elizabeth I's reign, the printing and reprinting of articles for royal visitation re-inscribed her authority as monarch, as did printed prayers.[33] This graph shows that the Stuarts did not continue producing nationwide articles in the same vein. However, the use of print for ecclesiastical visitation continued and succeeded these at a pace.

Archdiocesan visitations started to commission printed articles just after royal visitations instituted the use of print. Clearly there was an economy of scale here as visitations covering the largest areas adopted print first. As already stated, archbishops often ordered articles for each diocese visited. This explains the consistently high number of diocesan articles from an early point. Nonetheless, bishops also embraced print for their visitation of dioceses, which contributed to the large number of diocesan articles in each 25-year period. With over 1000 parishes in the largest dioceses, there was a lot of ground to cover for both archbishops and bishops, which compelled the adoption of print. Archdeaconries started to get articles printed at the start of the seventeenth century, although this subsided over the course of the period. Apart from this, only a handful of printed articles survive for peculiars. If printed, there was far less chance of survival, as the numbers produced would have been much smaller than those of a diocese. By the eighteenth century, there is a noticeable decline in the numbers of all kinds of printed articles catalogued on the ESTC. Visitation did not cease, but the production or publication of articles seems to have changed. Detailing the distribution of articles also shows distinct patterns in the employment of print.

One way of refining this is to see which dioceses adopted printed visitation

---

Cromwell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 247-254, quoted, 249.

[32] John Cooper, 'O Lorde save the kyng: Tudor Royal Propaganda and the Power of Prayer' in, *Authority and Consent in Tudor England, Essays presented to C.S.L Davies*, ed. George W. Bernard and Steve J. Gunn (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 193.

[33] *Articles to be enquyred in the visitation...* (Imprinted at London : In Poules Churcheyarde by Richard Iugge, and Iohn Cavvood, printers to the Quenes Maiestie, 1559), S101583 (1561), S4662 (1564), S2085 (1566), S120585 (1568), S2086 (1572), S2087 (1570), S120517 (1573), S115538 (1574), S2088 (1576), S125377 (1577), S112404 (1568), S2089 (1583), S101584 (1583), S125661 (1589), S117957 (1591), S111793 (1595), S101620 (1597), S121457 (1600), S121267; on national prayers see Natalie Mears et al eds. *National Prayers: special worship since the Reformation*, Church of England Record Society, 20 (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013).

articles first. Once print is mapped, its geographical spread becomes apparent. As we shall see, the location, as well as the size, of the jurisdiction prompted the adoption of print. Figure 4 shows the spread of printed articles across dioceses over time. It illustrates the coverage of print at different stages and for different areas. To construct it, the date of the earliest articles for each diocese in the ESTC was taken and put on to a map of England and Wales. This suggests general patterns of print distribution. Miles Ogborn and Charles Withers argue 'how deeply geography is involved in the production, distribution and consumption of books', and stress the need to explore the local networks of printed objects.[34] Figure 4 shows the validity of exploring the geographies of print institutions commissioned. It demonstrates that the printing of articles spread outwards to the west and far north from dioceses in and surrounding London. Given that London was the print centre of the country, this is not surprising. Jurisdictions closest to the printing press got print first. However, other factors also decided the implementation of print.

Distances from major roads, as well as from the capital, also determined the use of print. The spread of printed articles closely followed the path of the Great North Road, the main route linking north to south. Dioceses lying beyond it were the last to start commissioning printed articles. As late as 1689, William Lloyd, Bishop of St. Asaph in Wales, admonished the King's Printers because he could not get hold of printed orders,

> The fault is in ye King's printers, yt are careless in distributing ys things out they print. Whatsoever they are to send unto N[orth] Wales they send it to anyone of ye Chester Cariers without giving advice to ye B[isho]ps as they ought to do in a line or 2 by ye Post. And so of bundles ly at Chester in ye Cariers ware-house, till perhaps it is too late to distribute them.[35]

Situated beyond the main road system, the bishop struggled to get hold of print sent via Chester. The remoteness of places like St. Asaph not only hindered their adoption of print, but also prevented print produced centrally from reaching them. By the time it arrived, it was out-dated.

---

[34] Miles Ogborn and Charles. W. J. Withers. 'Introduction: Book Geography, Book History' in *Geographies of the Book*, ed. Miles Ogborn and Charles W.J. Withers (Farnham, Ashgate, 2010), 5.
[35] Bod. Lib., MS Tanner, Vol. 34, f.292.

The size of the diocese also affected how rapidly it employed print. Bigger dioceses got articles printed first because they had more parishes to distribute them to, whilst smaller ones lagged behind. This may explain why Rochester, relatively close to London, but small in size, commissioned printed articles later than larger surrounding dioceses farther afield. St. Asaph was not only remote but also small. It contained only 128 parishes. Bangor, with only 127, was the other diocese with the latest set of printed articles. In contrast, dioceses with over 1,000 parishes (York, Lincoln and Norwich), as well as those closest to London ordered printed articles first.[36] The difference in scale of print jobs between these dioceses becomes evident when we look at accounts of the King's Printer and the number of printed prayers, declarations and common prayer books they distributed to these dioceses. In December 1680, the King's Printer printed and stitched 12,950 forms of prayer for a public fast at a cost of £341:19:08. St Asaph received 100 and Bangor, 150, whilst York, Lincoln and Norwich got 750, 1600 and 1400 respectively. If we take these figures as the approximate number of visitation articles that individual dioceses required, it is apparent why larger dioceses commissioned print first. They needed considerably more copies of articles to disseminate to churchwardens in parishes. These figures do not exactly equate to one copy per parish, but, in addition to other accounts by the printer, suggest a direct connection between the size of diocese, number of parishes and amount of print.[37]

Mapping the spread of printed articles for archdeaconries, a much smaller unit, strongly suggests that location facilitated the uptake of print. The maps in Figure 5 show the articles produced for archdeaconries, again between 1547 and 1647, in 25-yearly intervals. It is clear from these maps that at this lower administrative level, jurisdictions closest to London adopted print first. Indeed, the first set of articles was for the Archdeaconry of London in 1572, earlier than all but seven dioceses.[38] Middlesex followed in 1582 and then Berkshire in 1595.[39] The fact that visitations of

---

36 Clergy of the Church of England Database: http://db.theclergydatabase.org.uk/jsp/search/index.jsp

37 Bod. Lib., MS Tanner, Vol. 33, f.28 seqq.; there is another account for printing common prayer books in MS Tanner, Vol 39, f. 21.

38 *[Twenty-nine articles]* (Imprinted at London: by William Seres, 1572?), S2640.

39 *Articles to be enquired of, by the Church Wardens and Swornemen within the Archdeaconrie of Middlesex* (London: Imprinted by Iohn Wolfe, dwelling at the signe of the Fox in Old Fishstreate neere

archdeaconries were more frequent than those of dioceses may have contributed to the employment of print, but, again, the maps show a definite clustering around London. Indeed, the description given in the STC suggests that two archdeaconries within the London diocese, Essex and Middlesex, shared the printing expenses for articles.[40] In contrast, no printed articles exist for any Welsh archdeaconry. Together, these maps of dioceses and archdeaconries reveal that the production and circulation of ecclesiastical print followed a very definite pattern.

This redraws previous assertions made about the dissemination of printed visitation articles. Whereas Fincham claims that, from 1603, articles were 'generally printed', thorough analysis of surviving articles reveals a much more complicated picture in which geography and size of jurisdiction were decisive factors in the adoption of print.[41] This exercise in mapping has drawn much greater distinctions about visitation articles as a body of print. Articles printed both before and after this date illustrate the geographical shift of print from centre to periphery. Separate sets of articles for Gloucester and Bristol succeeded a set jointly produced for the two dioceses in 1585.[42] There was also a separate set of articles produced for the archdeaconry of Wells in 1700, where previously Wells has been incorporated in sets of articles for Bath.[43] There were further distinctions made between jurisdictions over time, which resulted in the commissioning of separate sets of articles. This shows another way in which the forms of printed visitation articles changed over the period and why looking at these articles more closely reveals a much more complex story of print. It was not the bureaucratic level of the Church, whether diocese or archdeaconry, that determined the commissioning of print - it was its size and its

---

the signe of the Swanne, 1582), S111858; *Articles to be enquired of, within the county and archdeaconry of Berkes*.(Imprinted at Oxford: by Ioseph Barnes, printer to the university,1595), S92278.

[40] *Articles to be enquired of, within the Archdeaconry of Midlesex*…(London: Printed by Edw. Allde 1615), S2098; *Articles to be enquired of, within the archdeaconry of Essexx...*(London: Printed by Edw. Allde 1615), S860; Pollard and Redgrave ed. *A Short Title Catalogue of Books*, Vol 1, 457.

[41] Fincham, *Visitation Articles and injunctions of the Early Stuart Church*, Vol 1, xiv.

[42] *Articles to bee enquired of within the dioces of Glouces. and Bristoll...* (London: [G. Robinson] for Nicholas Ling, 1585), S92343; *Articles to be ministred and to be enquired of, and answered in the first generall visitation of the reverend father in God, John, by Gods permission, Bishop of Bristoll*. (Oxford: printed by Ioseph Barnes printer to the vniversitie, 1603) S92282; *Articles ...* (London: W. [Jag]gard for C. Knight, 1607), S96041.

[43] *Articles of visitation and inquiry concerning matters ecclesiastical. Exhibted [sic] to the ministers, church-wardens, and side-men, of every parish within the arch-deaconry of Wells…* (London: Printed, and sold by A. Baldwin in Warwick-lane, 1700), R223925.

proximity to printing presses.

Visitation Articles as a Print Job

Having examined the adoption and deployment of printed articles, it is necessary to turn attention to their production. Where were they produced and by whom? What can we learn about the ways in which printers acquired this kind of employment and how might this contract have benefited them? Are visitation articles a good example of the kind of jobbing print that Stallybrass saw as so important to the print trade?

Until the lapse of the Licensing Act in 1695, with the exception of a single set printed in Canterbury in 1556, all printed articles were produced in London, Oxford, Cambridge and York.[44] Of course, the vast majority were printed in London and there were a number of sets from Oxford and Cambridge. The first printed set produced in York dates from 1662, the same year that printed forms survive from the York church courts, discussed in the next chapter.[45] After that, printers based in York also printed articles for the neighbouring diocese of Durham, as well as for archdeaconries within York diocese.[46] Following the lapse of the Licensing Act and the subsequent rise in provincial printing, presses in Newcastle, Exeter, Norwich and other towns produced articles, although London continued to dominate.[47]

Close examination of the Oxford and Cambridge printers of visitation articles uncovers the geographical networks they established. Studies of printing in both

---

[44] *Articles to be enquyred of in thordinary visitation of the most reuerende father in God, the Lord Cardinall Pooles grace Archbyshop of Cannterbury wythin hys Dioces of Cantorbury. In the yeare of our Lorde God. m.d.c.lv*i (Prynted at Cantorbury: By Ihon Michel], 1556), S111795.

[45] *Articles of visitation and enquiry concerning matters ecclesiasticall: exhibited to the ministers, church-wardens, and side-men of every parish, within the diocesse and province of Yorke…* (Yorke: printed by Alice Broade, 1662), R225632.

[46] *Articles of visitation and enquiry, concerning matters ecclesiastical; exhibited to the ministers, church-wardens, and side-men of every parish within the dioces of Durham. In the ordinary visitation of the Right Rverend Father in God, Nathanael by divine providence Lord Bishop of Durham. Anno Domini. 1683* (York: printed by John Bulkley, 1683), R173873; *Articles of visitation and enquiry . . . Durham* (York: printed by John Bulkley 1684), R171332.

[47] *Articles of enquiry…* (Newcastle upon Tine: Printed by John White, 1710?), T63427; *Articles of enquiry concerning matters ecclesiastical…* (Exeter: printed by Jo.Bliss for Phil. Bishop, 1708), T225385; *Articles of visitation and enquiry*… (Exon: printed by Sam Farley for Philip Bishop, 1709), N16254; *Articles to be enquired of and answered…* (Norwich: printed by Henry Cross-grove, 1709), N16314.

places recognise the supply of public notices and other 'ephemeral' items to the university and the town.[48] In addition to this work, we can note that, in Cambridge, university printers Cantrell Legge (1613), John Field (1668), and John Hayes (1671, 1674, 1682, 1686) printed visitation articles for nearby bishops of Ely, while in Oxford, Joseph Barnes (1604), John Lichfield (1619, 1628, 1629, 1632), Leonard Lichfield (1635, 1638), and William Hall (1662, 1666, 1670) did work for the bishops of Oxford.[49] However, as revealed in Figures 6 and 7, which map the work of Cambridge and Oxford printers respectively, they printed articles for other jurisdictions as well. The maps show that the university printing houses rarely printed for the same places, but both printed for a number of other ecclesiastical jurisdictions. Articles from the Cambridge press were for the east, apart from a set for Bath and Wells, whilst those from Oxford went to the west of England, apart from a set for Peterborough. This mapping reveals local networks and that the spread of print was not simply a spread from London.

In addition to geographical considerations, political, personal and religious affiliations, as well as the constant presence of the Stationers' Company, all determined who printed articles. Oxford printers produced all recorded sets of articles for the Archdeaconry of Berkshire, as well as several sets for Worcester, Gloucester and other jurisdictions. A set of articles printed in Oxford by Joseph Barnes in 1586 for the diocese of Hereford antedates any recorded set of articles for the Oxford diocese.[50] Similarly, presses at Cambridge produced all recorded sets of articles for the archdeaconry of Sudbury and multiple sets for Peterborough, Norfolk and Lincoln. Printing for Lincoln appears to have come about via personal connections. William Chaderton, Bishop of Lincoln, for whom printer John Legate produced the first of a series of articles in 1598, had formerly been Regius Professor

---

[48] Martyn Ould, 'Ephemera and Frequently Reprinted Works' in *The History of Oxford University Press, Vol. 1*, ed. Ian Gadd (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013): 193-242; David McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press: Volume 1, Printing and the Book Trade in Cambridge 1534-1698* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), xiv.

[49] Cambridge (1613), S92330 (1668), R173874 (1671), R27270 (1674), R229602 (1682), R173875 (1686), R231419; Oxford (1604), S92413 (1619), S125655 (1628), S92414 (1629), S92415 (1632), S92416 (1635), S92417 (1638), S92418 (1662), R14476 (1666), R41875 (1670), R175791.

[50] *Articles ecclesiasticall to be inquired of by the churchwardens and the sworne-men within the dioces of Hereford in the first visitation of the reverend father in God, Harbart Bishop* (Imprinted at Oxford: By Ioseph Barnes printer to the vniuersitie, 1586), S120530.

of Divinity and President of Queen's College at the University.[51] Working relationships formed in Cambridge, it seems, continued to bring in business from farther afield. Furthermore, David McKitterick notes an occasion when the Bishop of Norwich chose the press in Cambridge in preference to those in the capital. Dissatisfied with the articles produced for him in London, the Bishop turned to printers at Cambridge and explained on the title page, 'This Book of Articles being extremely negligently printed at London, (which impression I disavow) I was forced to review and have it printed again at Cambridge.'[52] The presses outside London were, then, a competent as well as convenient alternative for printing visitation articles.

Moving away from university presses, the working relationship between printer Richard Badger and Archbishop Laud gives a clear example of commercial gain overlapping with ideological interests, and the printing network established in the process. Badger printed a whole series of articles for Laud, including those for his metropolitical visitation of the southern province between 1633 and 1635. This collaboration, as Peter McCullough shows, centred on Badger's support for Laud's religious policies that, in turn, secured his elevation to master printer.[53] Laud himself was involved in the print trade. As Bishop of London in 1628, he had the job of suppressing seditious print and was instrumental in founding a press at Oxford University, where he was Chancellor. The working relationship established between Badger and Laud was profitable for both sides. Badger's position as beadle in the Stationers' Company helped Laud gain information about the print trade, whilst, for Badger, printing articles provided income and opportunities for self-promotion. His printer's motif of a phoenix was on the front page of articles, making them recognizable across a range of print stock he produced. The motif also incorporated the coat of arms of the Stationers' Company to show his company credentials. Title pages of articles displayed Badger's association to both the established Church and to the Stationers' Company. Helen Smith's discussion of the religious and patrilineal relationships between churchmen and printers mentions a number of people who

51 McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press, Vol. I,* 124.
52 Ibid, 248.
53 Peter McCullough, 'Print, Publication and Religious Politics in Caroline England', *The Historical Journal*, 52:2 (2008), 296.

also printed articles.[54] For instance, John Beale, Simon Stafford and the Eliot's Court Press appear on the imprints of sets of articles in the early decades of the seventeenth century. Religious and political manoeuvring brought in business for some, although there is no apparent link between particular jurisdictions and printers elsewhere.

There is little evidence of dioceses or archdeaconries consistently employing the same printer. It is rare to find one printer favoured for more than a few years, aside from the dioceses and archdeaconries that used the university presses. Well-known printers, including Reginald Wolfe, Ralph Blower, William Jaggard and, of course, Richard Badger printed articles for the Archbishops of Canterbury. In his analysis of visitation articles, Fincham identifies 'master' sets of articles, which he groups with other sets that essentially copied them. However, there is no clear link between the chains of textual influences, which Fincham found between sets of articles and the printers employed to produce them. Felix Kingston printed both Bishop Thomas Morton's articles for Coventry and Lichfield diocese in 1620 and his articles for Durham diocese in 1637.[55] Meanwhile, John Bill printed Bishop Samuel Harsnett's articles for Norwich in 1627, as well as those of Bishop Francis White for the same diocese in 1629.[56] These few instances fail to provide any striking evidence of close working relationships between printers and churchmen in connection with the groups Fincham identifies because of their similarity. The imprints of articles reveal that the big players in the print trade dominated the production of articles.

Many of the printers that produced articles printed other 'official' material, which is demonstrative of their established position in the print trade. As mentioned earlier, the King's printer, Richard Grafton, produced visitation articles in the early sixteenth century, as did successive royal printers in the seventeenth century.[57] In the middle of the sixteenth century, William Seres secured royal favour via his service to

---

[54] Helen Smith, *'Grossly Material Things': Women and Book Production in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 90-91.

[55] *Articles to be enquired of within the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield* (London: By Felix Kingston,1620) S113668; *Articles to be enquired of, within the dioces of Durham* (London: imprinted by Felix Kingston, 1637), S92325.

[56] *Articles to be enquired of in the Diocesses of Norwich* (London: by Iohn Bill, 1627), S125380; *Articles to be enquired of in the diocesse of Norwich* (London: by Iohn Bill, 1627), S125656.

[57] Royal printers were printing articles in the 1620s, see Graham Rees and Maria Wakely, *Publishing, Politics, And Culture: The King's Printers in the Reign of James I and VI* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 136.

William Cecil, which brought him the contract to print psalters and primers.[58] This entrenched his position as a reputable printer and helped bring other work his way. He printed at least five sets of articles, including those for the bigger dioceses of Lincoln and York in 1571 and for Canterbury and London in 1577.[59] In the seventeenth century, the influence of the Stationers' Company became more perceptible. William Jaggard, official printer to the City of London, printed articles for the metropolitical visitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury between 1613 and 1615.[60] It was often printers with several presses and established positions in the Company who produced visitation articles.

Later in the seventeenth century, the prominent names in the 1668 survey of London print houses featured heavily on the imprints of articles.[61] Miles Flesher and John Streater were joint second in the survey, with five presses each. Flesher's partnership with printers Robert Young and John Haviland ensured that these men 'were the largest capitalists in the trade for many years' and the names of all were on the imprints of various sets of visitation articles.[62] On his own, Flesher's name

---

58 Elizabeth Evenden, 'Seres, William (*d.* 1578x80)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/25094].

59 *Articles to be enquired of in the visitation of the Dioces of London, by the reverende father in God, Edwyn Bishop of London* (Imprinted at London: By [H. Denham for?] William Seres, 1571), S116787; *Articles to be enquired of, within the prouince of Yorke, in the Metropoliticall visitation of the most reuerent father in God, Edmonde Archbishop of Yorke…* (Imprinted at London: By [H. Denham for?] William Seres, 1571), S111863; *Articles to be enquired of within the dioces of London…*(Imprinted at London: By William Seres, Anno. 1577), S111847; *Articles to be enquired of, within the prouince of Canterburie…*(Imprinted at London: By Willyam Seres, 1577), S857.

60 *Articles to be inquired of, in the [f]irst metropoliticall visitation, of the most reuerend visitation, of the most reuerend father, George, by Gods pro[v]idence, Arch-bishopof Canterbury, and primate of all England in, and for the dioces of Peterbury* (London: Printed by VVilliam Iaggar, 1613), S2101; *Articles to be inquired of, in the first metropolitical visitation, of the most Reverend Father, George, by God's porividence, Archbishop of Canterbury, and primate of all England; in and for the Diocese of Lincoln* (London: printed by William Jaggard, 1613), S92367; *Articles to be inquired of, in the first metropoliticall visitation, of the most reuerendfather, George, by Gods providence Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, and primate of all England; in and for the dioces of Norwich* (London: printed by VVilliam Iaggard, 1613), S92492; *Articles to be inquired of, in the first metropoliticall visitation, of the most reuerend father, George, by Gods providnce, Arch-bishop of Canterbury, and primate in all of England in and for the dioces of [blank], in the yeare of our Lord God [blank]* (London: Printed by VVilliam Iaggard, 1615?), S2091; *Articles to be inquired of, in the first metropoliticall visitation, of the Most Reuerend Father, George, by Gods providence, Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, and primate of all England; in and for the dioces of Canterbury* (London: printed by VVilliam Iaggard, 1615?), S92991.

61 'Appendix 2: Survey of printing presses 1668' in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol 4, 1557-1695*, ed. John Barnard, Donald F. McKenzie and Maureen Bell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 794-796.

62 Henry Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667* (Oxford: Bibliographical Society, 1907), 76.

appeared on seven surviving sets of articles, three of which were from 1626.[63] Richard Royston followed in the survey with four presses. He published six sets of articles printed by someone else.[64] Again, he had impressive connections: Royston was patronised by the Crown in 1660 and served as stationer to the court of Charles II.[65] He was also warden of the Stationers' Company in 1666. Holding authoritative positions within the Stationers' Company offered recognition as a printer that brought in work. Print begot print.

Many studies of the print trade have shown there was an increase in printer publishers across the seventeenth century, and visitation articles reflected this shift. Table 1 gives a decade-by-decade breakdown of the articles recorded on the ESTC as 'printed by *X*', those 'printed by *X* for *Y*' and those which give no printing details, from 1547 to 1746. There is a noticeable decline in the proportion of imprints attributed solely to printers, particularly during the Restoration. The increase in the number of articles 'printed by *X* for *Y*' demonstrates that visitation articles were a type of print stock progressively dominated by printer publishers - a pattern that echoed changes in the print trade more widely. These publishers were usually fellow printers, but

---

63 *Articles to be enquired of, by the church-vvardens, and sworne-men, in the visitation of the right worshipfull, the Archdeacon of Surrey* (Printed at London: By Miles Flesher, 1626), S2651; *Articles to be enquired of in the visitation of the Archdeacon of Buckingham, anno. Dom. 1626* (London: Miles Flesher, 1626), S854; *Articles to be enquired of by the churchwardens and sworn men within the diocese of Worcester* (London: printed [by Miles Flesher] for Iohn Grismand, 1626), S92463; *Articles to be enquired of within the dioces of London* (London: printed by Miles Flesher for Nathanial Butter, 1627), S92379; Articles to be enquired of, throughout the whole Diocesse of Chichester (London: Printed by M. Flasher, 1634), S92308; *Articles to be enquired of, in the second trienniall visitation, of the Right Reverend Father in God, VVilliam, Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells.* (London: Miles Flesher 1636), S851; *Articles to be enquired of, throughout the whole diocese of Chichester* (London: Miles Flesher, 1637), S92309.

64 *Articles of visitation and enquiry concerning matters ecclesiasticall according to the laws and canons of the Church of England, exhibited to the ministers, church-wardens, and side-men of every parish within the diocese of Worcester* (London: Printed by J.G for Richard Royston, 1662), R38740; *Articles of visitation and inquiry concerning matters ecclesiasticall, according to the laws and canons of the Church of England, exhibited to the ministers, church-wardes, and side-men of every parish within te diocese of Rochester* (London: printed by J[ohn] G[rismond] for Richard Royston, bookseller to His most Sacred Majesty, 1662), R225607; *Articles to be enquired of in the metropoltical visitation of the most Reverend Father, William, by God's Providence, Lord Arch-Bishop of Canterbury* (London: printed for Richard Royston, book-seller to His most Sacred Majesty, 1663), R173861*; Articles to be inquired of within the archdeaconry of Northampton,* (London: printed by J.G for Richard Royston, bookseller to His most Sacred Majesty, 1662), R2542; *Articles to be enquired of in the metropolitical visitation of the Most Reverend Father, William, by God's providence, Lord Arch-Bisop of Canterbury* (London: Printed for Richard Royston…,1663), R40813; *Articles to be enquired of vvithin the Archdeaconrie of Middlesex* (London: printed for Richard Royston, book-seller to his most sacred Majesty, 166[9]), R215134.

65 H. R. Tedder, 'Royston, Richard (1601–1686)', rev. William Proctor Williams, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/24240].

also, increasingly, booksellers. This perceptible shift corresponds with changing power relationships in the Stationers' Company, where booksellers succeeded the early dominance of printers.[66] Trade printing became common, so that printers relied upon work that booksellers and publishers gave them, and visitation articles fell into this category. Articles were then a type of print job tied up with the inner working of the Stationers' Company, which usually favoured those with the largest number of presses or capital.

Years	Printed by 'X'	Printed by 'X' (%)	Printed for 'X'	Printed for 'X' (%)	No Name	No Name (%)	No. of Articles
1547-56	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	8
1557-66	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	11
1567-76	20	83%	4	17%	0	0%	24
1577-86	19	76%	6	24%	0	0%	25
1587-96	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	15
1597-06	28	85%	5	15%	0	0%	33
1607-16	34	77%	7	16%	3	7%	44
1617-26	46	75%	9	15%	6	10%	61
1627-36	85	80%	15	14%	6	6%	106
1637-46	54	78%	14	20%	1	1%	69
1657-66	15	21%	52	71%	6	8%	73
1667-76	29	57%	19	37%	3	6%	51
1677-86	13	28%	21	46%	12	26%	46
1687-96	8	20%	14	35%	18	45%	40
1697-06	17	57%	6	20%	7	23%	30
1707-16	9	26%	2	6%	24	69%	35
1717-26	7	33%	1	5%	13	62%	21
1727-36	1	7%	1	7%	12	86%	14
1737-46	3	38%	0	0%	5	63%	8

Table 1 Types of imprint given in visitation articles 1547-1647

By far the most prolific publisher of visitation articles in this evolving market was the bookseller and sometime printer Timothy Garthwait in the 1660s. This was a consequence of circumstance as much as his printing model. The sudden increase in

[66] Cyprian Blagden, *The Stationers' Company: a history, 1403-1959* (London: Allen and Unwin 1960), 74.

the number of visitation articles 'Printed for X' in Table 1 between 1657 and 1666 was a result of thirty sets of articles printed for Garthwait. Sixteen of these were in 1662, for The Act of Uniformity, which saw seismic changes in church personnel, brought a spate of visitations.[67] Garthwait seized this opportunity, printing articles and a large number of sermons.[68] Working on numerous occasions with the printers Roger Norton and Anne Maxwell, he had established a printing network for his enterprise. Garthwait was a 'go to' man for producing religious texts, with a regular team of printers working for him. The imprints on visitation articles, therefore, reveal their place within the volatile and constantly evolving print market of the period and sets them apart from the small jobs that Stallybrass asserts were the mainstay of the print institutions commissioned.

So, what type of print job were visitation articles? Laud's orders of articles made up 'a significant portion of Badger's publications.'[69] This was not necessarily the case for other printers. With large print runs purchased by the Church, articles were less risky than printing ventures on the open market. However, estimating how much profit they gave the printer is difficult because of a lack of surviving accounts. Moreover, running in length anywhere from four to forty pages and distributed to a varying number of parishes meant there was no typical print run of visitation articles.

A rare scrap in the York diocesan records listing charges for 'printing the Offic's business' enables some costings to be estimated that contest Stallybrass' assumption about the profitability of institutional print. Although undated, the handwritten sheet addressed to Thomas Epsom, proctor in the Chancery Court from 1684 to 1703, was from John White, a printer in York between 1680 and 1716. It gave a list of items printed and the cost per item. It is unclear whether this is a receipt or the projected costing of work.[70] As well as bonds and other printed forms, it listed 'books of Ar[tic]les in the ArchB[isho]ps vit[stat]ions 00:00: 2 ½' and books of articles

---

67 John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991).

68 Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667*, 80; Matthew Jenkinson, 'Preaching at the Court of Charles II: Court Sermons and the Restoration Chapel Royal' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, ed. Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington and Emma Rhatigan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 444.

69 McCullough, 'Print, Publication and religious Politics in Caroline England', 301.

70 Borthwick Institute (BI), DR/ACC1/1/8.

by the Archdeacon were charged at '00:00:2.' The articles White printed for the Archbishop's visitation of York of 1698 were quarto booklets of eighteen pages.[71] This would have amounted to two sheets and, therefore, when read alongside the scrap in the diocesan records suggests a cost of one pence per sheet, which is comparable to what the King's printers charged in the early and late seventeenth century. The declarations, forms of prayers and common prayer books the King's printer ran up in the 1670s cost three pence, six pence and eight pence respectively, equivalent to one penny per sheet.[72] Accounts for printing Acts of Parliament and proclamations show they cost roughly the same. In a bill for printing for the Privy Council dated April 30th 1673, seven proclamations concerning soldiers at two sheets per copy cost one shilling and two pence, although these were only printed on one side.[73] Normally visitation articles were two sided, requiring double the impressions. However, we can use the figures from the diocesan records and the King's Printer's accounts to estimate what type of print job these articles were.

If two pence was the 'average cost', and if the King's Printer's accounts for books of Common Prayer provide a rough total of the number of visitation articles which each diocese would have needed, we can estimate the cost of each print run of visitation articles. Although there were over a thousand parishes in York, the King's Printer consistently sent 750 copies of the items he printed. 750 copies of the articles at two pence per copy would have cost £6:05:00, before stitching costs. This was a healthy sum and certainly more than the Corporation in York spent on print, although it was not enough to keep printing presses going for any length of time.[74] Donald McKenzie suggests that, at full stretch, pressmen could produce between 2500 and 3000 impressions in a twelve-hour day, although print houses rarely worked to this capacity.[75] This number of impressions would have equated to 1250-1500 sheets a

---

71 *Articles to be inquired of in the diocesan visitation of the most reverend father in God, John by Divine providence Lord Arch-Bishop of York. Held anno Dom 1698* (York: John White, 1698), R171340.
72 Bod. Lib., MS Tanner, Vol. 33, f.28 seqq.; MS Tanner, Vol. 39, f. 21.
73 BL, Add MS 5756, f.151; Peacey gives comparable costs from Evan Tyler's accounts in *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*, 244.
74 I found no orders for print in the York City Chamber Accounts, York City Archives (YCA), Y/FIN/1/2/25 (1653-1665) and Y/FIN/1/2/26 (1666-1679); see also Jenner, 'London', 303 n.61 and D. M. Palliser, *Tudor York* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929), 169-170.
75 Donald McKenzie, 'Printers of the Mind: Some Noted on Bibliographical Theories and Printing House Practices' in Donald McKenzie, *Making Meaning: Printers of the Mind and other Essays*, ed. Peter McDonald and Michael Suarez (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 19.

day.[76] Accounting for the time needed for typesetting and stitching, 750 copies of articles for York, consisting of two sheets, would have therefore taken printers at least two days. This compares with the print run of a short pamphlet estimated by Raymond.[77] Undoubtedly, visitation articles were a welcome commission for printers, but these figures are not overwhelming. Moreover, York was one of the largest dioceses in England; the print runs for articles commissioned by other jurisdictions would have been smaller and, thus, less profitable than this.

Once one examines the production of visitation articles, it is evident that it was not jobbing print as categorised by Stallybrass. Whilst jobbing is associated with the institutional demand for small, often single sheet, items, such as receipts, tickets and licences, visitation articles do not quite fit this model.[78] Firstly, in terms of format, they usually ran to several pages, which made them closer in form to pamphlets, and demanded extra effort in typesetting and stitching. Articles were a more substantial item of print, and, when ran up for a large jurisdiction, potentially lucrative. However, the costings I have estimated, when combined with a frequency of visitation of every few years, fail to give convincing proof that this output kept printing houses afloat. This does not take away from the fact they were sought-after commissions. In particular, those for nationwide and metropolitical visitation were akin to the Book of Common Prayer, proclamations, and other items printed in large quantities for institutions. What it demonstrates is that articles fall uneasily into existing categories of the print trade. They were not jobbing material, but neither were they a straightforwardly 'published' print available on booksellers' stalls. Instead, articles show the varied printed output of institutions and the need to situate it within a more complex model of the early modern print trade. To complement this more intricate understanding of visitation articles as print work, the next section will focus on the circulation and consumption of this print.

---

[76] Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern England*, 80.
[77] Ibid; Raven suggests this could have been higher in the eighteenth century, 48-50.
[78] Stallybrass gives an extensive list of such items in, 'Little Jobs…', 334; For discussion of jobbing and the print house see Andrew Pettegree, *The Book in the Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 243-244.

From Press to Parish

Once outside the printing house, the path of visitation articles is less clear. This section shows that although printing was evidently a significant expenditure, the mechanics of distribution warrant further examination. We need to explore the dissemination of these texts and their material histories. As already established, visitation articles were not generally bookshop stock. Commissioners for the visitation would carry sets of articles with them. This resembles the distribution of special prayers, where, as Natalie Mears shows, the administrative infrastructure of the Church provided the distribution network for print.[79] However, the dissemination of articles varied throughout the period. There are examples of articles being compulsorily purchased, freely distributed and also reused and collected. The circulation of articles was more complicated than the title pages would suggest.

Different churchmen set out different conditions for purchase and use, which led to the varied consumption of articles as printed texts. In reaction to overcharging for visitation articles in his province in 1629, Archbishop of York Samuel Harsnett ordered that, henceforth 'They are to be charged at sixpence.'[80] He capped the price to stop profiteering. In 1641, it was reported that Bishop John Williams' 'book of … visitation articles … are not to be sold.'[81] The decision not to sell may reflect the political manoeuvrings of Williams - keen to re-establish himself after a stint in the Tower of London - or, indeed, the declining of influence of bishops in this period.[82] There are other examples of articles being freely distributed. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, in correspondence with Thomas Jubb, registrar of York, a church official in Hexham Peculiar lamented that there had once been a time when 'the Churchwardens of every parish had such book given them by every court.'[83] This could have been artful remembering, but it does point up the ways in which the

---

79 Mears, 'Brought to book: special book purchases in English parishes, 1558-1640', 35.

80 'Archbishop Samuel Harsnett's orders for York Diocese, 1629', part 2, section 2, document 165, in *English Historical Documents, Vol. V (B), 1602-1660,* ed. Barry Coward and Peter Gaunt (London: Routledge, 2010).

81 *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury*, Vol. 22: 1612-1668, ed. G.D Owen (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1971), 364.

82 Brian Quintrell, 'Williams, John (1582–1650)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29515,].

83 BI, Hexham Papers, Hex.2.

distribution of articles fluctuated.

Elsewhere, churchmen saw an opportunity to make money. In 1671, Bishop John Cosin received a letter instructing him that

> the Articles of Visitation new printed in a little box or bagg together, by the Richmond carryer upon Monday next. The profitt that may be made by the Booke of Articles (if you pay the printer 30s and the carriage) I freely give to you.[84]

After paying the printer, Cosin was free to sell on the articles and keep the profit. This contrasts markedly with Harsnett's orders that tried to stop profiteering and, as such, reinforces the varied commerce of this kind of print. Although they may have been freely distributed at certain points, it appears that common practice was to charge a small fee for articles. Whilst scholars have used articles to track religious change, they have paid little attention to exactly which parishes were able to afford them. However, it is likely this had an impact on the state of religious practice on the ground.

Churchwarden accounts reveal the mixed provision of articles at a parish level. Some record regular outgoings for books of articles, others give no indication of any such purchases. Even if printed in significant numbers, we cannot presume that parishes obtained visitation articles as a matter of course. As with special forms of prayer, which were supposedly compulsory texts, parishes did not necessarily buy them and this resulted in the uneven dissemination of ecclesiastical instruction at a local level.[85] The late-seventeenth century accounts of St. Christopher Le Stocks, a wealthy parish in the City of London, have no entries for articles, whereas Lambeth Churchwardens' accounts of the sixteenth and seventeenth century detail regular purchases of diocesan and archdeaconry visitation articles.[86] These variations may

---

84 John Cosin, *The Correspondence of John Cosin, D. D, Lord Bishop of Durham, Part II*, ed. G. Ornsby, Surtees Society, 55 (London: Andrews & Co. 1872), 283.

85 Mears, 'Brought to Book: Purchases of Special Forms of Prayers in English Parishes, 1558-1640', 38.

86 Edwin Freshfield ed., *The Account Book of the Parish of St. Christopher le Stocks in the City of London 1662-1685* (London: Rixon and Arnold, 1895); Charles Drew ed., *Lambeth Churchwardens' Accounts 1504-1645 and Vestry Book 1610* (London: Surrey Record Society and Lambeth Borough Council, 1941), 133, 144, 143, 147, 150, 154, 156, 159, 162, 168, 179, 180, 186, 190, 197, 204, 205, 209, 217, 221, 225, 228, 234, 238, 242, 244, 247, 260, 266, 276, 286.

reflect the different accounting procedures of different parishes. Andrew Foster emphasises that such accounts document 'only a fragment of the real financial arrangements which underpinned parish life', and are not, in any sense, complete.[87] However, as Foster also stresses, some parishes were wealthier than others and it is these account books that are more likely to have survived.[88] The purchase of articles was often part of the broader expenditure of visitation. Churchwardens in Lambeth recorded,

Item for our dinner the last visitation	xijs
Item for the articles the same tyme	vjd

They also paid sixpence, as Harsnett had stipulated. Buying articles at 'the same tyme' indicates that the purchase of articles took place when the visitation was already underway.[89] An outlay for dinners and other items, such as wine, was common during visitation. It was an occasion for feasting and 'commensality among parish elite.'[90] The visitation party to St. Botolph Aldgate, in London, held a dinner at the local tavern, where the archdeacons inspected the churchwardens' presentments.[91] Other accounts detailed costs of travelling to local centres to purchase articles. Churchwardens from Prescott in Lancashire made trips to Wigan and Childwall to make presentments and get articles.[92] In addition to showing the purchase of articles at varied points, churchwardens' accounts suggest that the provision of print and, thus godly governance fluctuated from parish to parish.

In addition to cost, issues of supply could also have been a factor here. In further correspondence with Thomas Jubb, the church official in Hexham Peculiar complained that he had to use a set of articles Stephen Bulkley printed, in York, in

---

87 Andrew Foster, 'Churchwardens' accounts of early modern England and Wales: some problems to note, but much to be gained', in *The Parish in English Life, 1400-1600*, ed. Katherine, L. French, Gary G. Gibbs and Beat Kümin (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 85.

88 Ibid, 83.

89 Drew, *Lambeth Churchwardens' Accounts 1504-1645 and Vestry Book 1610*, 143; for the purchasing of wine and sugar for bishops' officers see William Day ed., *Oswestry Parish Church. The Churchwardens' Accounts for 1579-1613* (s.n.1970), 37.

90 Michael Berlin, 'Reordering rituals: ceremony and the parish, 1520-1640', in *Londinopolis: Essay in the cultural and social history of early modern London*, ed. Paul Griffiths and Mark S. R. Jenner (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 56.

91 Ibid.

92 Thomas Steel ed., *Prescot Churchwardens' Accounts, 1635-1663*, Lancashire and Cheshire Record Society, 137 (Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 2002).

1679, 'which I conceive not very proper since the revolution.'[93] The content of the articles had become outdated given the political and religious upheavals in the interim. The official was forced to continue using them as no further articles had arrived. Despite the fact visitation articles had been printed for York after this, none had found their way to Hexham. This example illustrates that a single set of articles may have served for any number of visitations in a single parish. The books, as used, were much more multifaceted than an ESTC entry details.

The reuse and recycling of articles challenges Fincham's supposition that 'articles were freshly printed, rather than recycled for each visitation.'[94] In the absence of articles for the diocese of York, the official in Hexham also resorted to using articles from Durham, claiming that he 'had no other but two I found amongst my Brothers papers printed since for ye Diocese of Durham.'[95] The official recycled articles from another diocese. This gives another example of articles being re-used and it also reveals the circulation of articles beyond the jurisdiction for which they were printed. As well as capping the price of articles, Archbishop Harsnett also stated that they were 'to be used for seven years.'[96] Articles distributed under Harsnett were for use in several visitations. These few examples alone demonstrate the vast differences in production and consumption of visitation articles that Fincham fails to account for. Moreover, it exemplifies the need to square the frequency with which articles were printed with their mixed consumption at a parish level.

Beyond visitation, articles had afterlives as reference material and held ongoing significance as documents for religious policy. Ferrell suggests that articles were 'some of the most heavily hand-annotated of any early modern printed pages', reflective of the fact that annotation was part and parcel of early modern reading practices.[97] Annotations show how articles were used as both working documents during visitations and afterwards as reference texts. William Sterne, rector of Glooston in Leicestershire, made annotations to a printed set of Canons in scholarly

---

93 BI, Hexham Papers, Hex.2.
94 Fincham, Vol. 1, xiv.
95 BI, Hexham Papers, Hex.2.
96 'Archbishop Samuel Harsnett's orders for York Diocese, 1629'.
97 Ferrell, 'The Church of England and the English Bible', 261; Sherman, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008).

pursuit rather than administrative practice.[98] As Andrew Cambers argues, Sterne's annotations were an expression of his religious conformity to Laud's policies. Annotations were not just a performance of piety, but show the ways administrative documents functioned as the material tools of religious governance. Tracing the textual sources of the annotations made by Sterne, Cambers notes his extensive use of visitation articles,

> from Lincoln in 1588 and 1591 (Wickham), from 1604 (Chaderton), from 1630, 1631 and 1635 (Williams) and 1638 (Laud). He had Laud's metropolitical articles from 1634, Wren's for Norwich from 1636 and William Warr's articles for the Archdeaconry of Leicester from 1636.[99]

The list shows his ownership of articles from different churchmen and places. His collection of articles was not for use in constructing returns during visitation; it informed his own religious practice and wider correspondence. Aside from re-use for multiple visitations, articles were also documents collected, referred to and argued with.

Visitation Articles as Material Texts

Given the range of uses and readerships, as well as the number of people who encountered visitation articles, it is important to consider how the format of articles shaped their use. Interrogating visitation articles as material texts can begin to illuminate the way readers navigated and used them. To date, there has been no extensive discussion on the format of visitation articles as printed documents. Judith Jago's examination of Archbishop Drummond's series of articles in the mid-eighteenth century notes the influence of previous editions. However, her claim that Drummond improved the format of his articles by 'spacing out his own name – R O B E R T - in capitals and placing it centrally' on the title page, ignores many previous articles that used this *mise-en-page*.[100] The features that Jago describes were in no way novel to eighteenth-century visitation articles. Employing analytical frameworks

---

98 Andrew Cambers, 'Pastoral Laudianism? Religious Politics in the 1630s: A Leicestershire Rector's Annotations', *Midland History*, 27 (2002): 38-51.
99 Ibid, 42.
100 Judith Jago, *Aspects of the Georgian church: visitation studies of the Diocese of York, 1761-1776* (London: Associated University Presses, 1997), 58.

from book history, the materiality of these documents and its effects become evident. Paratextual features shaped how articles functioned as administrative documents. Previous scholarship on paratexts has focused solely on literary texts.[101] I will now show how such an approach can advance our understanding of administrative texts and paperwork.

As quarto booklets, articles were comparable in size to the printed pamphlets that flooded the market with news, scandal and wonder. This similarity in form qualifies Raymond's claim that 'size influenced status.'[102] He associates folio-sized works with official commissions. However, visitation articles had the same physical properties as any number of seditious and libellous pamphlets and had an official function. It was from the turn of the seventeenth century that the format of articles solidified. Articles started to look more like books, incorporating separate title pages where, previously, articles had begun directly beneath the title. The emergence of distinct title pages included borders and printers' ornaments, visually separating it from the rest of the text. This and other prefatory material guided the reader into the articles.

The general features of the later seventeenth century visitation articles are well captured in one volume containing twenty-eight sets. This volume is held at York Minster Library and consists of articles for various dioceses and archdeaconries from 1662, produced by several printers and publishers.[103] They were collected by James Raine, the nineteenth-century clergyman, antiquarian and founder of the Surtees Society. Having a collection like this enables a comparison of the format of different sets of articles. These articles were for the first visitations to take place in the Restoration. An examination of their composition displays the array of techniques printers deployed to structure the reading of articles as well as the format of written returns made in response to them.

Title pages introduced articles to readers, giving vital details of place and the

---

[101] *Gérard Genette*, *Paratexts: thresholds of interpretation*; *Renaissance Paratexts*, ed. Helen Smith and Louise Wilson.
[102] Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*, 5.
[103] York Minster Library (YML), Special Collections, XXXVII.F.6.

governing authority conducting the visitation. As mentioned, they also carried the printer's mark, if there was one. Beyond this, there was very little ornamentation on title pages. Three of the articles in this collection have images of bishops' mitres and the coats of arms for the diocese or archdeaconry.[104] These images announced the ecclesiastical origin of the publication and authenticated its contents. After the title pages, other prefatory material readied the reader for entry into the main body of the text. This included instructions to the churchwardens on the inside pages about drawing up and delivering the returns and presentments, as well as oaths that these men had to take promising their accounts would be truthful and accurate. The oath printed in the articles for Peterborough was typical in charging churchwardens to 'make true Answer unto every Article in this Book now given you in charge.'[105] Here, oaths ensured the full and proper reading of the articles and are comparable to other pledges clergymen and parish officers took upon taking office.[106] The articles then started on another page, physically apart from the introductory notes. As Figure 8 shows, different typefaces also marked the separation of these two sections of the articles. Blackletter distinguished the articles as an authoritative text, separate from the information that preceded them.[107] Typeface was more than simply a stylistic feature. Visual and marginal cues navigated the reader through the text and thus the process of visitation, underpinning the role of articles in the performance of ecclesiastical governance.

The division of the main body of text into separate sections helped structure the handwritten responses made by churchwardens. Paratexts, in this instance, were tools of information management. The articles for the diocese of Exeter had seven

---

[104] YML, XXXVII.F.6, 15: *Articles of inquiry, concerning matters ecclesiastical, exhibited to the ministers, church-wardens, and side-men of every parish within the Diocess of Durham...*(London: printed by T. Garthwait, 1662), R4706; 21: *Articles to be ministred, enquired of and answered concerning matters ecclesiastical...* (London: printed for H. Brome,1662), R2365; 25: *Articles of enquiry, (with some directions intermingled) for the diocese of Ely...* (London: printed for Timothy Garthwait at the Kings-head in St. Pauls Church-yard, 1662), R14447.

[105] YML, XXXVII.F.6, 22: *Articles of visitation and enquiry concerning matters ecclesiastical: exhibited to the ministers, church-wardens, and side-men of every parish within the diocess of Peterborough…* (London: printed for A. Seile,1662), R14477.

[106] There is an admission book for the diocese of Ely made up of printed forms of oaths taken by clergymen between 1668 and 1683 in Bod. Lib. MS Rawl. D. Vol.340 f.60; on these oaths see William Gibson, 'The Limits of the Confessional State: electoral religion in the reign of Charles II', *Historical Journal*, 51:1 (2008): 27-47; The performance of oath taking from texts is discussed in greater detail in Chapter Six.

[107] Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern England*, 74.

sections.[108] These concerned: churches and chapels; churchyards, houses, glebes and tithes; ministers; parishioners, parish clerks and sextons; hospitals, schools, schoolmasters, physicians, surgeons and midwives; and churchwardens and sidemen. The spacing of the text, subheadings and, in this case, horizontal lines visually indicated these sections on the page. Paratexts corresponded to, and reinforced, the different topics dealt with in the articles. Horizontal lines and printed flowers formed the 'internal architecture' of articles.[109] In addition to guiding the reader through the text, these features also structured the written responses churchwardens composed. Every section of the articles was further broken down into numbered points for attention in the returns and presentments made in response to them. This demonstrates how print moulded the order and content of manuscript production. The first set of printed forms distributed to churchwardens to make returns on date from Archbishop Herring's visitation of 1743.[110] Before this, churchwardens handwrote all returns. Paratexts organised the performance of visitation articles as administrative documents and also shaped the format of further document generation.

Further devices navigated the ministers', churchwardens' and side-men's passage through and out of the text and placed the articles in a wider corpus of religious texts. Fincham notes 'manicules' pointing to particular sections of some sets of articles, which was a device used in many other early modern books.[111] Two sets of articles, for the diocese of St Asaph and the archdeaconry of Middlesex, had printed marginal annotation.[112] In the St Asaph text, marginalia glossed the main points in

---

[108] YML, XXXVII.F.6, 8: *Articles of visitation & enquiry concerning matters ecclesiastical: exhibited to the ministers, church-wardens, and side-men of every parish within the diocese of Exeter...* (London: printed for T. Garthwait, at the Kings-Head in S. Pauls Church-yard, 1662), R14448.
[109] Fleming, 'Changed opinion as to flowers' in *Renaissance Paratexts*, ed. Smith and Wilson, 49.
[110] Gregory and Chamberlain, 'National and local perspectives on the Church of England in the long eighteenth century', 9.
[111] Fincham, Vol. 2, xvii; see Sherman, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England,* chapter 2.
[112] YML, XXXVII.F.6, 26:*Articles of visitation & enquiry concerning matters ecclesiastical: exhibited to the ministers, church-wardens, and side-men of every parish within the diocese of Saint Asaph...*(London: printed for T. Garthwait, at the Kings-Head in S. Pauls Church-yard,1662), R14558; 27: *Articles to be enquired of within the archdeaconry of Middlesex, in the visitation of the Right Worshipful Dr. Robert Pory, Archdeacon of the said archdeaconry of Middlesex...*(London: printed for T. Garthwait, at the Kings-Head in S. Pauls Church-yard, 1662), R13755.

each section, as in printed statutes and other legal texts.[113] Articles can thus be added to the range of early modern printed texts with an inbuilt 'information retrieval system.'[114] Marginalia in the Middlesex articles provided the doctrinal precedence for each question asked. Generally, this was the 1604 ecclesiastical canons, with occasional reference to the Common Prayer Book and Royal Injunctions. These references placed articles in dialogue with a broader network of texts. It could be speculated that the need for doctrinal precedence was felt to be particularly important in the diocese of London, with high numbers of dissenters. Marginal annotations rooted visitation articles to works of religious authority, that legitimised their content.

The presence of these devices highlights that embodied knowledge and textual apparatus shaped the reading of both administrative and literary works in the early modern period. This was also evident at the end of articles. Most often, a single horizontal line across the page and the phrase 'Finis' (or in one example, 'The End) marked the ending of the articles.[115] The last lines of Alice Broad's articles for the Archbishop of York's metropolitical visitation visually tapered off,

> Let the Church-Wardens and Side-men enquire dili-
> gently what they will, and can, give to all
> these particulars, upon Oath, setting the
> fear of God and the good of his
> Church before their
> Eyes.[116]

---

[113] For a discussion of marginal annotation in statutes see, John H. Baker, 'English Law Books and Legal Publishing', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Vol IV*, ed. John Barnard, David McKitterick and Maureen Bell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002): 499.
[114] William Slights, *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001), 8.
[115] YML, XXXVII.F.6 14: *Articles of visitation and enquiry concerning matters ecclesiasticall according to the laws and canons of the Church of England, exhibited to the ministers, church-wardens, and side-men of every parish within the diocese of Worcester…* (London: Printed by J.G. for Richard Royston, 1662), R28740; This use of 'The End' contradicts claims that this term was not used before the nineteenth century William Sherman, 'The beginning of 'The End': terminal paratext and the birth of print culture' in *Renaissance Paratexts*, ed. Smith and Wilson, 68.
[116] YML, XXXVII.F.6, 1: *Articles of visitation and enquiry concerning matters ecclesiasticall: exhibited to the ministers, church-wardens, and side-men of every parish, within the diocesse and province of Yorke...* (Yorke: printed by Alice Broade, 1662), R225632; Another example of this triangulated closing can be found in a set of articles for Salisbury, *Articles to be enquired of, within the Diocese of Salisbury, in the first visitation of the Right Reverend Father, Robert by the providence of God, Lord Bishop of Sarum* (London: printed by Iohn Legatt, 1616), S92432.

The page runs out of words, reinforcing the guidelines and oaths issued at the beginning. These articles were bookended by reading instructions. Other articles ended with the name of the bishop or archdeacon, much like signing off at the end of a letter. The tapering of text, Bill Sherman notes, 'appears to be a genuinely new feature of mise-en-page in the new culture of print' in the seventeenth century.[117] This and the other paratextual devices underline the place of visitation articles in broader print culture. Not only is the print that institutions commissioned fertile ground for finding such devices, but, crucially, articles show how paratexts worked in particular ways in administrative texts to structure information collection.

Significantly, paratextual features also reveal the batch printing of visitation articles which provides crucial detail about their production. In 1613 and 1633 respectively, William Jaggard and Richard Badger produced numerous sets of articles for dioceses as part of the Archbishop of Canterbury's metropolitical visitation. Many articles were similar in content, particularly after the Canons of 1604.[118] However, the typographical similarity between different sets of articles Jaggard and Badger produced suggests they printed them as one print job and simply changed the wording on the title pages as required. The articles Jaggard produced for Peterborough and Lincoln for the metropolitical visitation in 1613 are the same in all aspects, with the same number of pages and questions on each.[119] The only difference between these sets of articles was the place specified on the title page. This was also the case for a blank set of articles and a set for Bath and Wells produced by Badger for the metropolitical visitation of Laud in 1633.[120] The print run for a single set of articles was, then, much larger than the changes in title pages would suggest. Each was technically a separate publication for an individual diocese or archdeaconry that has an individual catalogue entry in the ESTC. Yet, the similarities in the texts suggest

---

[117] Sherman, 'The beginning of 'The End'', 73.
[118] Fincham, Vol. 1, xxi.
[119] *Articles to be inquired of, in the [f]irst metropoliticall visitation, of the most reuerend father, George, by Gods pro[v]idence, Arch- bishop of Canterbury..diocese of Peterburgh…*(London: Printed by VVilliam Iaggard,1613), S2101; *Articles to be inquired of, in the first metropolitical visitation, of the most Reverend Father, George, by God's providence, Archbishop of Canterbury...in diocese of Lincolne…*(London: printed by William Jaggard,1613), S92367.
[120] *Articles to be enquired of in the metropoliticall visitation of the Most Reverend Father, VVilliam, by Gods providence, Lord Arch-bishop of Canterbury...in Bath and Wells…*(Printed at London: by Richard Badger, 163[3?]), S2090; *Articles to be enquired of in the metropoliticall visitation of the Most Reverend Father, VVilliam, by Gods providence, Lord Arch-bishop of Canterbury...*(Printed at London: Richard Badger, 1633), S2092.

that the printer ran them all up together. This indicates the reuse of standing type by printers for each edition. The Stationers' Company outlawed such a practice, but it remained common enough in the print trade, where margins of cost and profit were often slim.[121] Moreover, for the production of visitation articles, the re-use of standing type also made most sense when running up essentially the same articles but for different places.

Looking closely at the many sets of articles that Garthwait produced for visitations in 1662 reveals similar production methods, suggesting this was a common practice throughout the period. Of the twenty-eight sets of articles in the York Minster collection, Timothy Garthwait is on the imprints of fourteen. Of these, five sets are identical, down to a mistake in the page numbering.[122] Title pages gave specific place names and the corresponding names of bishops or archdeacons; however, the main body of the text was the same. One print run, therefore, produced numerous print 'jobs'. Other sets of articles printed for Garthwait use the same printer's ornamentation, including decorated initials, borders and headers, implying that the same printer did them, although they vary in length and content. Bibliographical analysis makes evident the significant overlap between different 'editions' of print and its production. It is apparent that many jurisdictions subscribed to 'off the shelf' sets of articles for the proceedings of their visitation and simply bought a standard set of articles that printers ran up *en masse*.

---

[121] For details of these Stationers' Company statutes see Jeremy Smith, *Thomas East and Music Publishing in Renaissance England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 25-26; see also Raven, 48.

[122] YML, XXXVII.F.6, 3: *Articles to be inquired of within the commissariship of Essex and Hertford…*(London: printed for Timothy Garthwait at the Kings Head in St. Pauls Church-yard, 1662), R173876; 4: *Articles to be enquired of by the ministers, church-wardens and side-men of every parish within the Arch-deaconry of Colchester...*(London: printed for Timothy Garthwait at the Kings Head in S. Pauls Church-yard, 1662), R40402; 11:*Articles to be enquired of by the ministers, church-wardens and side-men of every parish within the arch-deaconry of Lincolne...* (London: Printed for Timothy Garthwait ..., 1662), R41980; 12: *Articles to be enquired of within the archdeaconry of Saint Albans, in the visitation of Mark Franck D.D. Arch-Deacon of St. Albans...*(London : printed for Timothy Garthwait at the Kings Head in S. Pauls Church-yard, 1662); R14518, 13: *Articles to be enquired of within the commissariship of Westminster* (London: printed for Timothy Garthwait at the KingsHead in S. Pauls Church-yard, 1662), R14560.

Elsewhere churchmen commissioned their own sets of articles for each visitation, which enabled them to keep parishes up to date with the latest church business. In this context articles worked as a form of print publicity. Three sets of articles for the archdeaconry of Cleveland produced in consecutive years from 1686 to 1688 demonstrate this. At the end of the articles for 1686, there was a single line request that 'The Church-wardens are desired to bring in all Briefs Collected.'[123] This referred to the money for charitable causes that churchwardens collected in parishes and delivered at the visitation. As a point of contact between the parish and central administration, visitation was also a collection point for other ecclesiastical business and the back pages of articles were the most convenient place to communicate information about it. This may also explain why the Archdeacon of Cleveland, John Burton, got his articles re-printed so regularly. Each new edition gave fresh details for the next visitation. In subsequent articles, this extra-visitation business appeared on a separate page under the subheading 'advertisements.' This parallels the placement of 'advertisements' and book lists in the *London Gazette* and other newspapers, and highlights the proliferation of these forms across different types of Restoration print. The advertisements of the 1687 articles took up the entire last page. In reference to brief collections, it asked for 'particularly the Briefes and collections for His Majesties Subjects in Turkish-Slavery' as well as 'the relief of the French Protestants.' A further paragraph referred to the payment of Synodalls and other fees due variously to the Archbishop of York, the Dean and Chapter of York and the Archdeacon of Cleveland.[124] Increasingly, administrative business occupied the back pages of articles as they incorporated other kinds of instruction. The adverts in 1688 urged 'that the Brief for the relief of the distressed French Protestants herewith delivered be speedily read, and the Money gathered so suddenly, that it may be payd in at the Visitation.'[125] Issuing the brief alongside the articles ensured that collection took place in time for visitation. Printed and circulated each year, this series of articles was a vehicle for wider ecclesiastical business to be communicated and managed, underlining the broader administrative functions of these documents in the second

[123] *Articles to be enquire of in the visitation of the reverend John Burton… Archdeacon of Cleveland* (York: John Bulkley, 1686), R173866.
[124] *Articles to be enquire of in the visitation of the reverend John Burton… Archdeacon of Cleveland* (York: John Bulkley, 1687), R173867.
[125] *Articles to be enquire of in the visitation of the reverend John Burton… Archdeacon of Cleveland* (York: John Bulkley, 1688), R173868.

half of the seventeenth century.

Blank sets of visitation articles must be considered at this point. These bypassed particularities of place and personnel altogether, which precluded providing any details about charitable collections, but blanks contribute to the different types of visitation articles produced and how this shaped administrative practice as a result. Their occurrence emphasises the variability of visitation articles as a printed form. As is evident from Figure 3, there were blank articles produced throughout the period. There are twenty examples on the ESTC, including one by Badger, who produced a blank set of articles for the metropolitical visitation in 1633.[126] One set of articles David Maxwell printed in 1662 left blank spaces to fill in the name of church official, place and year of visitation manually.[127] Blanks gave flexibility of use for any ecclesiastical jurisdiction and at any time. The potential circulation of this print expanded as a result. Places did not need to commission their own articles to get print, as they could buy blanks instead. Equally, blanks could have supplemented areas in which demand outstripped supply. An example of a filled in blank set, produced in 1692 by the York printer John White, read,

> Articles to be Enquired of in the Visitation of the [Rt. Worshipfull Dean & Chapter of York to be held in the parish church of Stillinton on Wednesday the twenty fifth of Aprill 1694 betwixt the houres of nine & twelve aforenoon].[128]

Further handwritten notes extended beyond the borders of the title page (Figure 9). This set of articles was in use at least eighteen months after the date of printing as the handwritten entry specified the visitation took place in April 1694 and White printed the articles in 1692. Blanks had an extended shelf life. Dean and Chapters were particularly small jurisdictions, making a print run of articles negligible. In this instance, blanks facilitated the adoption of print at all administrative levels.

---

126 *Articles to be enquired of in the metropoliticall visitation of the Most Reverend Father, VVilliam, by Gods providence, Lord Arch-bishop of Canterbury, primate of all England; and metropolitan: in and for the dioces of [blank] in the yeere of our Lord God 163[blank]...*(Printed at London: by Richard Badger, 1633), S2092.

127 YML, XXXVII.F.6, 7, *Articles given by [...] and delivered to the church-wardens, to be considered and answered in his visitation holden in the year of our Lord God [...]...*(London: printed by Da. Maxwell, neer Baynards Castle in Thames-street, 1662), R14201.

128 YML, Special Collections, XI.M.28 *Articles to be enquired of in the visitation of the [blank],* (York: printed by John White, their Majesties printer for the city of York, and the five Northern Counties, 1692), R171330.

Moreover, the production of blank visitation articles shows the extent of form filling on print that institutions commissioned. The manuscript revolution prompted by print that Stallybrass outlines thus extended to a far broader corpus of print than he recognises.[129] He concentrates wholly on single sheet pro forma to highlight the volume of writing print stimulated. However, the inclusion of blank spaces on visitation articles shows blank space was appropriated in different ways. Filling in date, person and place on the title page by hand designated the body of articles that were inside to a specific location. It shaped the application and use of the articles, but the rest of the text was fully printed. Another set that John White printed in 1698 for the Archdeaconry of York, left a blank space on the back page for the addition of extra information. It instructed,

> All Ministers, School Masters, Parish-Clarks, Churchwardens, Chyrurgions and Mid-Wives are to appear at the Visitation to be holden [at St Micheals of Belfrey in York on Wednesday the Fifteenth day of June 1698].[130]

Filling this blank space by hand gave specific details about the time and location of visitation courts where people had to appear to renew their licences. This broader application of form filling has implications for ideas of fixity and print raised by Johns. The written hand, not printers' imprints, negotiated the fixity of these printed books to a particular time and place.

Visitation Articles and the Documents of the Diocese

Having looked at the complex ways visitation articles were adapted and disseminated, it is crucial to place them within the wider written record of ecclesiastical jurisdictions. Doing so supplements and extends work on the social negotiation of visitation. Adrian Wilson and Martin Ingram both emphasis that visitation was a socially sensitive interaction between Church officials and laymen.[131]

---

[129] Peter Stallybrass, 'Printings and the Manuscript Revolution' *Explorations in Communications and History*, ed. Barbie Zelizer et al. (London: Routledge, 2008), 115 and 111.
[130] YML, Sermons 1686-1698, *Articles to be inquired of in the diocesan visitation of the most reverend father in God, John by divine providence lord Arch-Bishop of York* (York: printed by John White, his Majesties printer for the city of York, and the five northern counties, 1698), R171340.
[131] Adrian Wilson, *Ritual and Conflict: The Social Relations of Childbirth in early Modern England*

Two-word returns from parishes of 'Omni Bene' suggested lax administration and a disregard for the command of senior churchmen. Equally, the presentment of wrongdoers at visitation gave the opportunity to dob people in and exact revenge on persistent offenders. Therefore, we have great work on visitation as an encounter and an arena in which social relations played out. But the documentary processes and performances of visitation need further discussion to elucidate the paperwork intrinsic to this social encounter.

The production of articles was intrinsic to the planning of a visitation. The correspondence of Bishop Cosin reveals the checking and sending of articles before printing. In relation to the visitation of the East Riding archdeaconry in 1625, Mr Claphamson wrote,

> I have sent you a booke of Articles such as the Archdeacons have used to minister in their visitations within this diocese. You may add, or diminish from them what you please, but that we have tyme to get prynted after you emendation. [132]

The demands of the printing press constrained and shaped the process of planning visitation as Actor Network Theory might suggest. Preparing a visitation was thus a negotiation involving both people and press. Indeed, preparing articles was just one part of the process. Before his visitation of Lincoln, in 1706, Bishop Wake recorded,

> April 4. I settled the places of my Visitation and fixed upon preachers. My Visitation Articles were returned to me by the Archdeacon of Huntington, April 5th; and sent to be printed April 9th.[133]

Visitation was a point of document production, inspection and collection that coincided with a wider performance of ecclesiastical governance. Indeed, in his discussion of communication in early modern Bristol, Jonathan Barry places visitation

---

(Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), 22-4; Martin Ingram, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1570-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 44-46 and 273-274.

[132] John Cosin, *The Correspondence of John Cosin, D. D, Lord Bishop of Durham, Part I*, Surtees Society, 52 (London: Andrews & Co, 1869), 81.

[133] Quoted in Norman Sykes, 'Bishop William Wake's primary visitation of the diocese of Lincoln, 1706', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 2:2 (1951), 191.

articles in a broader network of writing and governance in the town.[134] Articles formed part of a complex mingling of people and paper, and printing was just one stage of a documentary process.

Paperwork produced for visitation was the material trace of this administrative system at work. The presentments and returns churchwardens drew up attest to the volume of manuscript created in response to articles. Examinations of these documents have focused on the types of accusations made against people and the evidence this provides about contemporary perceptions of moral and spiritual wellbeing.[135] Passing from parish to registry, presentments were another way to keep broader ecclesiastical business up to date. At the close of articles for the London dioceses in 1605, Bishop Vaughn ordered, 'in the saide bill to set downe the names of all such as have beene buried at any time sine the seaventh of August.'[136] As well as presenting wrongdoers, churchwardens relayed details of burials recorded in parish registers. This demonstrates that visitation was a general point of information collection about the parish and reflects the wider function of the parish registers in recording early modern society.

Indeed, the record keeping capacity of the parish was a key subject covered in both visitation articles and returns made. The return from Saint Sampson's parish, York, to Archbishop Grindal's visitation in 1575 reported,

> Theye lacke the Book of Common Praier with the new Kalender, two psalters, two tomes of the Homilies, the Paraphrases of Erasmus, a coffer with two lockes and keyes for kepinge the regester booke and a boxe for the pore.[137]

---

[134] Barry, 'Communicating with Authority: the uses of script, print and speech in Bristol, 1640-1714', 199.
[135] Ingram, *Church Courts,* 44-46.
[136] *Articles to be enquired of within the dioces of London…* (London: s.n, 1605), quoted in Fincham, Vol 1, 38.
[137] Archbishop Edmund Grindal, *Archbishop Grindal's Visitation, 1575, Compert et Detecta Book*, ed. William Sheils, Borthwick Texts and Calendars: record of the Northern Provinces, 4 (York: Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, 1977), 3.

The Book of Common Prayer may have been one of the 'best-selling books' of the period and keeping documents in parish chests testament to the 'symbolic power as objects' in administrative procedures, but the returns made in response to visitation articles show that these were not guaranteed features of parish life.[138] Questions assessing the capacity of each parish to uphold the function of the Church as collector and recorder of information in society continued throughout the period.[139] Archbishop Richard Bancroft's articles for his metropolitical visitation of 1605 asked, 'Whether is there in your church or chappell one parchment register booke, provided for christenings, mariages and burials.'[140] This referred to keeping parish registers, required since the Injunction of Cromwell in 1538 and Elizabeth I's subsequent ruling in 1598.[141] A question in Bishop Lancelot's articles for Winchester in 1619 asked whether the parish clerk could 'reade, write and sing', highlighting the need for literacy to keep records updated.[142] Nonetheless, articles issued in Bristol in 1673 ordered the reading out of articles to churchwardens who might be illiterate.[143] All too often, the basics for church administration and worship were found wanting.

In addition to these surveys, visitation was a point of document validation as much as production. Clerics, schoolmasters, surgeons and midwives were all required to present their licences for review. The suspension of normal church courts during visitation meant all business passed to the visitation court.[144] Those wanting a licence, and those who wanted to keep hold of it, had to attend the visitation courts. Individuals acquired licences through testimonials and swearing oaths, as well as

---

[138] Cummings, 'Print, popularity and the Book of Common Prayer', 135; Michael Braddick, 'Administrative performance: the representation of political authority in early modern England', in *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland*, ed. Michael Braddick and John Walter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 178; For a broader account of parish administration see also, William Tate, *The Parish Chest: A Study of the Records of Parochial Administration in England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 35-42.
[139] Joanna Innes, *Inferior Politics: Social Problems and Social Policies in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 122.
[140] *Articles to be inquired of, in the first metropoliticall visitation of the most reverend father: Richarde by Gods providence, Archbishop of Canterbury…* (London: s.n, 1605) quoted in Fincham, Vol. 1, 9-10.
[141] Simon Szreter, 'Registration of Identities in Early Modern Parishes and amongst the English Overseas' in *Registration and Recognition: Documenting the Person in World History, Proceedings of the British Academy*, ed. Keith Breckinridge and Simon Szreter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 67-69.
[142] *Articles to be inquired …within the diocese of Winchester* (London: s.n, 1619) quoted in Fincham, Vol 1, 182.
[143] Barry, 200.
[144] Frere and Kennedy, 59.

paying a sizeable fee.[145] Renewal of licenses also required appearing before the court and getting another set of signatures. Although enforcement varied from place to place, this highlights the role of visitation in the wider proof and validation of texts. Churchwardens compiled and presented a set of glebe terriers for the metropolitical visitation of Berkshire in 1634.[146] Visitation was an inspection of the state of the parish and the records and paperwork circulating in it. Alongside the costs of producing presentments and purchasing articles, churchwardens' accounts from Lambeth detailed costs for having their parish register checked, as well as 'coppinge out the register book.'[147] Broader church procedure required the return of transcripts of registers to the diocesan registry. Added to this was the cost of 'presenting ye Regester booke at visitation.'[148] This is emblematic of the wider reckoning of people and paperwork at visitation. The upper echelons of church administration checked, proved and authenticated documents and accounts. Visitation was a point of material exchange.

This increased demand for information stimulated print production. Visitation articles worked alongside injunctions, as well as other printed texts, to reinforce ecclesiastical instruction.[149] The STC rather unhelpfully states that 'orders, directions, receipts and other items issued by bishops or their agents have been variously entered.'[150] There is a pre-printed collector's receipt for 13 ½ d. from the Rector of Caster, a parish in Northamptonshire, for the Archbishop's visitation in 1635 in Northampton record office.[151] However, this is the only example I have found of a visitation receipt from before the Civil War. It is not until the second half of the seventeenth century that other types of print became more apparent, most obviously, circular letters. From the Restoration onwards, bishops increasingly printed letters to

---

[145] David Harley, 'Provincial midwives in England: Lancashire and Cheshire, 1660-1760', in *The Art of Midwifery: Early Modern Midwives in Europe*, ed. Hilary Marland (London: Routlege, 1993), 30; Adrian Wilson, *The Making of Man-Midwifery: Childbirth in England 1660-1770* (London: University College London Press, 1995), 32.
[146] Ian Mortimer ed., *Berkshire Glebe Terriers, 1634*, Berkshire Record Society, 2 (Reading: Berkshire Record Society, 1995).
[147] Drew ed., *Lambeth Churchwardens' Accounts 1504-1645 and Vestry Book 1610*, 143.
[148] Ibid, 146.
[149] Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism, 1625-1641*, 77; Fincham, Vol. 1, xxiv.
[150] Pollard and Redgrave ed. *A Short Title Catalogue of Books*, Vol 1 457.
[151] Northampton Record Office (NRO), FH/G/L/0968.

communicate news and information to their clergy.[152] These reinforced the reading of briefs and other church business. One printed letter the Bishop of London commissioned in 1684 instructed,

> ...I pray Read this to your Congregation at Morning and Evening Service; that it may not be pretended, that timely Notice was not given, to prevent an Easter Presentment. [153]

Whereas articles were issued for visitation that took place every few years, circular letters could be disseminated whenever the need arose to reinforce and relay changes to Church procedure.

By the end of the period bishops produced other printed forms in response to the findings of visitation. Visitation records held at the York diocesan registry include a printed monition from 1694. Monitions were orders from the bishop that supported the findings of visitation. The text of the monition referred to presentments made at the previous metropolitical visitation, which had suggested that many church buildings were 'much Dilapidated, Ruinous and in Decay.' This printed form left spaces to outline repairs needed. It ordered that 'Wee do think fir to Admonish, Warne Will and Require, You the said [ ] aforesaid, that with all convenient speed you to Repaire and Amend…'[154] The threat of a court summons backed up the order. All administrative levels of Church made more use of the printing press and this is significant for discussions of ecclesiastical governance. The way the Church communicated orders, changes in religious policy and even announcements for the arrival of officials for visitation was increasingly via print, positioning articles in a network of both script and print.

In some ways, sermons contributed to this. They were an important part of the routine of visitation and a further source of work for printers. Sermons have been

[152] Bod. Lib., MS Tanner, Vol. 30, f.197 contains a costing for various items of print from Thomas Newcombe to William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury for circular letters and receipts in 1687.
[153] Bod. Lib., MS Tanner, Vol. 32, f.245.
[154] BI, Monition 1694, Visitation Papers York, V 1693/4.

widely discussed as a category of print with a distinct format and function.[155] There was, of course, a difference between published sermons and those delivered from the pulpit. Printing sermons enabled the reproduction of texts in their full, unabridged version.[156] Indeed, printed visitation sermons had a reach and remit that extended far beyond visitation. Another entry in Bishop Wake's visitation diary from 1706 noted that, on May 27th, he ordered the sermon of Mr Brown to be printed and, on September 2nd, 'Mr Wootton preached, and at the request of the clergy, I desired him to print his sermon.'[157] During his visitation, Wake ordered the printing of certain sermons. There is no information about the distribution of these, although the account book of Sussex clergyman Giles Moore recorded the purchase of 'Dr Reynolds Visitation Sermon at Ipswich' alongside other items of religious print, demonstrating that booksellers sold them.[158] Visitation sermons are discussed in broader literature on sermons, but they were sometimes part of a more united printed culture of the visitation. When printed alongside visitation articles, they shared the same printed devices. Alice Broad printed an accompanying sermon to the articles produced in 1662 for the metropolitical visitation of the Archbishop of York.[159] The surviving printed sermon was printed the year after the visitation sermon in 1663 and referred to the visitation citing 'the Canons whereof are now in force among us & according to which his day we are to be visited.'[160] Using the same printer for articles and sermons brought visual continuity between these two texts because of the printer's ornaments. There was a print culture to visitation that incorporated a number of texts.

---

[155] For example, Paul McCullough, Hugh Adlington and Emma Rhatigan ed., *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); William Gibson and Keith Francis ed., *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon, 1689-1901* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Mary Ann Lund, 'Early Modern Sermon Paratexts and the Religious Politics of Reading', in *Material Readings of Early Modern Culture, 1580-1700*, ed. Daybell and Hinds: 143-162.

[156] William Gibson, ''This Itching Ear'd Age': Visitation Sermons and Charges in the Eighteenth-century' in *The Oxford Handbook of the British Sermon, 1689-1901*, ed. William Gibson and Keith Francis, 290.

[157] Sykes, 'Bishop William Wake's primary visitation of the diocese of Lincoln, 1706', 194 and 204.

[158] Giles Moore, *The Journal of Giles Moore*, ed. Ruth Bird, Sussex Record Society, 68 (Lewes: 1971), 185.

[159] *At the Metropoliticall Visitation of The Most Reverand Father in God Accepted by Divine Providence Lord Arch-Bishop of York his Grace...* (York: Alice Broad, 1663); YML, XXXVII.F.6, 1: *Articles of visitation and enquiry concerning matters ecclesiasticall: exhibited to the ministers, church-wardens, and side-men of every parish, within the diocesse and province of Yorke...* (Yorke: printed by Alice Broade, 1662), R225632.

[160] *At the Metropoliticall Visitation*, 18.

Having surveyed the documents produced around visitation, we must turn to what happened to all this paperwork. Documents produced in response to articles became the record of visitation. Returned to bishops' registries for filing and archiving, they took on a new function in ecclesiastical administration. The presentments made in response to Archbishop Grindal's visitation of 1575 were bound into a *Comperta et Detecta*, 'in preparation for the acts of court.'[161] This brings us to the next stage of record production out of visitation; the compilation of sheets into bound volumes. Disparate paper slips became single textual tomes. The construction of bound volumes is a consistent feature of visitation records from the period. Lengths of returns varied though and even with the adoption of printed questionnaires that left a set amount of blank space on the page, replies veered from the minimal 'omni bene' to those that went on to numerous separate sheets.[162] Trying to impose a format on the returns was not just about controlling the length of answer, but also an attempt to shape the physicality of documents received by bishops or their clerical staff who had the task of compiling returns into volumes. In his printed inquiry of 1725, Bishop Willis instructed that replies should be written on folio sheets of paper 'and that you would leave the margin of each sheet of the leaf so large that it may be conveniently bound up with the rest, to be ready for the use of myself and successors.'[163] After use in the visitation, these sheets were absorbed into larger volumes of the ecclesiastical archive and instructions for the construction of returns had this in mind.

Compiling returns was another way of collecting and storing information. Jeffrey Todd Knight has styled the binding of separate literary texts into a single volume a form of textual production.[164] He stresses that assemblage imparted new meanings. Once compiled, texts read differently. The arrangement of visitation material into these volumes can thus be seen to have fostered another reading and understanding of them. The presentments bound in Grindal's *Comperta et Detecta* were arranged by parish and deanery. This dictated the way court personnel

---

[161] Grindal, *Archbishop Grindal's Visitation, 1575, Compert et Detecta Book*, i.; for discussion of another *comperta* book see, Shorrocks, *Bishop Still's Visitation 1594 and the 'Smale Booke' of the Clerk of the Peace for Somerset 1593-5,* 2-3.
[162] Sheils, 'Bishops and their dioceses: reform of visitation in the Anglican church, c.1680-c.1760', 7.
[163] Ward, *Parson and Parish in Eighteenth-Century Surrey: Replies to Bishops' Visitations*, 1.
[164] Todd Knight, *Bound to Read: Compilations, Collections and the Making of Renaissance Literature*, 5.

consulted them. Assemblage, in this instance, shaped the use of the document as an administrative text. Similarly, the alphabetical arrangement of returns by parish from incumbents of parishes in Middlesex and Essex to queries in 1727 imposed a new order on the individual responses.[165] The printed enquiries of the early eighteenth century brought about specific practices of textual production. Rather than just binding paperwork into a file, they copied information from returns into new volumes, a demonstration of 'knowledge transfer.'[166] Speculums bishops compiled combined information from returns with broader archival research into the dioceses.[167] Bishop Wake divided the pages of his speculum into two columns, with summaries for parishes and deaneries in the left hand column and extra information added later in the right hand column.[168] This practice of record collation continued with his successor, Edmund Gibson, and other bishops, most notably Thomas Secker.[169] Placing parishes side by side in alphabetical order created an artificial 'mental mapping' of the diocese on the page, like the mental mapping of London bills of mortality.[170] Speculums, however, were for private consultation rather than for publication and sale. Although an eighteenth century phenomenon, they are a salient example of how paper transferred and transformed inside a bound volume. This exercise in organising information was for institutional use only. It condensed the governance of the diocese into a single textual unit, a navigable material format in sharp contrast to the sprawling geography of a diocese that could take weeks to tour on horseback.

Conclusion

This chapter has redrawn approaches to visitation articles as a source for studies of print and the material text. It has demonstrated the efficacy of mapping for bibliographical analysis and for thinking more broadly about the geography of print outside the book. Pairing a study of visitation articles as a corpus of print with a

---

[165] London Metropolitan Archives (LMA) DL/B/C/004/MS25751.
[166] Secord, 'Knowledge in Transit', 666.
[167] Sheils, 'Bishops and their dioceses: reform of visitation in the Anglican church, c.1680-c.1760', 13.
[168] Wake, *Bishop Wake's Summary of Visitation Returns From the Diocese of Lincoln 1706-1715: Part 1 Lincolnshire*, x.
[169] Secker, *The Speculum of Archbishop Thomas Secker*.
[170] J. C. Robertson, 'Reckoning with London: interpreting the Bills of Mortality before John Graunt', *Urban History*, 23:3 (1996), 340.

material text approach to the individual documents, it offers new perspectives on the effect of print for standardisation and bureaucratisation. As much as this chapter details an increasing use of print and, with it, elaborate methods of information collection, there are examples everywhere of its absence. Whilst there is a lot here about the production of print, there is less about its commission at bureaucratic level inside the Church, and this is an area which certainly requires further research.

Critically, this chapter has highlighted the performative aspects of administrative documents. They were texts that commanded written responses, the swearing of oaths and the presentation of people. Recognising the practices these texts instigated demonstrates how they were performative of the Church as an institution. As well as a prompt to record production and information collection, these documents detail the material culture involved in such an enterprise. They were the nuts and bolts of checks and balances: parchment registers, wooden chests, locks, keys and other instruction manuals. Foregrounding the intertextuality of visitation articles is not new. However, thinking about the circulation of articles and their entanglement with other texts extends understanding of contemporary engagement with them. This material reading of articles reaffirms their operation as objects, not only within the process of visitation itself, but in the wider business of the church.

This directly links articles to the next chapter on church courts. Articles commonly asked questions regarding the operation of paperwork in accordance with court procedure. Were marriages licences issued accordingly? Were Certificates of Excommunication enforced? Did churches have white sheets and wands necessary for the performance of penance? Were Tables of Fees displayed for all to see? Church registries contain the paperwork that visitations were monitoring and assessing. They are the material component of Church archives. Therefore, visitation and church courts' records irrevocably intertwine, even though the material demands of the records means they make up two chapters in this thesis. This was paperwork issued and circulated as part of a broader network of ecclesiastical administration.

Chapter Two Form Filling and Godly Governance: The Paperwork of Church Courts

The previous chapter showed that visitation articles – key documents in the implementation of church discipline and doctrine - entered print culture in abundance by the middle of the seventeenth century. But did print penetrate the day-to-day business of ecclesiastical courts at the same time? Did print change administrative practices? How and, to what extent, did it impinge on the experiences of seventeenth-century people and their encounters with the workings of ecclesiastical courts? Did print come to shape their lives in this context, in the same way that printed forms affected the culture of freedom in London?[1] These are not minor questions. They have significant implications for our understanding of print culture and documentary culture in seventeenth-century England. This chapter focuses on the records of the church courts in York to examine these questions.

Church courts dealt with two distinct areas of business.[2] The first was testamentary business and licensing. This included the licensing of midwives, schoolteachers and preachers, which was a key source of revenue for the courts.[3] Testamentary business involved the administration of probate. Church courts processed any estate valued above five pounds, recording and keeping all wills, inventories and bonds.[4] This also amounted to a lot of business. The Exchequer court in York, that dealt with testamentary business, processed on average 970 probates and 675 administrations each year between 1612 and 1619.[5] Like visitation, church courts ceased operation during the Civil War and Interregnum and resumed in the Restoration. As we shall see the fortunes of church courts from the Restoration

---

1 For discussion of printed apprenticeship indentures see Gowing, 'Girls on Forms: Apprenticing Young Women in Seventeenth-Century London' and Chapter Six of this thesis.

2 For an overview of court business see R. B. Outhwaite, *The Rise and Fall of the English Ecclesiastical Courts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

3 Adrian Wilson notes that midwife licensing increased at the end of the seventeenth century as church officials attempted to raise more money see, Wilson, *Ritual and Conflict: The Social Relations of Childbirth in Early Modern England*, 23-24.

4 For an explanation of testamentary business see, Tom Arkell, 'The Probate Process' in *When Death Do Us Part: Understanding and Interpreting the Probate Records of Early Modern England*, ed. Tom Arkell, Nesta Evans and Nigel Goose (Oxford: Leopard's Head Press, 2000): 3-13.

5 Ronald Marchant, *The Church Under the Law: Justice, Administration and Discipline in the Diocese of York 1560-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 88.

onwards was mixed, although their function in administering probate continued into the nineteenth century.

The second area of business the courts oversaw was discipline and dispute. This included cases of defamation, which individuals brought to court and people summoned to courts by church officials for moral misconduct.[6] Ronald Marchant detailed the increasing number of cases conducted in the York courts up to 1640. Cases in the Consistory court peaked in 1611-12, with 379 causes entered, of which 164 concerned defamation, and this pattern was replicated in courts throughout England.[7] After the re-establishment of the church courts in the Restoration, business, in York at least, got off to a prodigious start. In the Consistory court, 100 cases were brought in the first term in 1661.[8] Growth continued into the 1690s; however, the litigious and disciplinary function of the courts steadily declined in the eighteenth century, and again this was a trend replicated elsewhere.[9] In Winchester, 'the numbers of people appearing before the court by the 1670s amounted to barely a quarter of those of the 1620s and, with it, the power of excommunication waned and the numbers seeking absolution withered.'[10] Whilst the administrative function of church courts continued for some time, their disciplinary capacity in English society diminished.

Given the wide-ranging function of courts, there was a developed administrative system. In York, the bulk of work was carried out by eight proctors, the 'lynchpins of the whole system', and the clerks they each employed.[11] Barry Till

---

6 Laura Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1998); Martin Ingram, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriages in England, 1570-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

7 Marchant, *The Church Under the Law*, 62; For a comparison with other courts see Outhwaite, *The Rise and Fall of the English Ecclesiastical Courts*, 15-22; Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words and Sex in Early Modern London*, 33.

8 Barry Till, 'The Administrative System of the Ecclesiastical Courts in the Diocese and Province of York, Part III 1660-1883. A Study in Decline' (unpublished. Ts. Report at Borthwick Institute, 1963), 60-62.

9 Robert Shoemaker, 'The Decline of Public Insult in London, 1660-1800', *Past and Present*, 169 (2000): 97-131; Tim Meldrum 'A Women's Court in London: Defamation at the Bishop of London's Consistory Court, 1700-1745', *The London Journal*, 19:1 (1994) 1:20.

10 Andrew Thomson, 'Church Discipline: The Operation of the Winchester Consistory Court in the Seventeenth Century', *History*, 91:303 (2006), 340.

11 Till, 'The Administrative System of the Ecclesiastical Courts in the Diocese and Province of York, Part III 1660-1883. A Study in Decline', 35.

estimates that 'the administrative and proctorial staff of the York courts…numbered some 30 or 40 men in the years following the Restoration.'[12] This is typical of scholarship on the church courts in concentrating on the work of particular individuals. Rosemary O'Day argues that the registrar had an increasing influence on the decisions of the courts. Describing the registrar as 'the hub of bureaucratic machinery' and 'as the origin of all formal documentation', she employs Weberian models of bureaucracy to suggest the power held by this officer.[13] However, by examining the adoption of print in court procedure and taking a material approach to registry records, I will show these notions of bureaucratic efficiency do not fit with early modern administrative practices.

The four sections of this chapter demonstrate the complex flow of print and paper in court business and the different types of interactions this material mediated. First, it establishes when print arrived, what types of document were printed and in which courts. It paints a picture of patchy uptake and mixed adoption of print. Not only did print do different things, but also, importantly, it took different forms. The second section examines the varied aesthetic, materiality and surface of printed forms used for church court business. The third section then analyses form filling in practice. This develops Adrian Wilson's call for historians to examine document generation to shed new light on institutional practice. He stresses,

> The key to such a reading is to shift attention from the surface 'plane' (the content of documents) to the underlying 'volume' (the processes which generated those documents and their content).[14]

The production of documents revealed social practices. This chapter demonstrates that such an analysis must extend beyond the creation of documents. Detailing the use and abuse of documents, to give a full account of the material life of paperwork, shows that printed sheets and the things done to them offers new perspectives on the performance of social relationships. This approach continues in the final section,

---

12 Ibid, 38.

13 Rosemary O'Day, 'The role of the Registrar in Diocesan Administration', *Continuity and Change: Personnel and Administration of the Church in England, 1500-1642*, ed. Rosemary O'Day and Felicity Heal (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1976), 89.

14 Wilson, 'Foundations of an Integrated Historiography'. 319.

which tracks print into the archive. Single sheets were distributed, presented, filled in, signed, returned and stored. These paper trails underpinned administrative procedure. Examining the York registry using methods of the 'archival turn' reveals that, once filed, single printed sheets became part of institutional records that underwrote the function of the courts. This redraws our image of the church registry. No longer should we view it as a dusty repository. Rather, we can see it as a place where print and paper circulated in the performance of ecclesiastical governance.

The Adoption of Printed Forms

Ironically, the extensive use of church courts records for social and gender analysis has led to neglect of what these records reveal about institutional processes. There has been much instructive work on the production of wills and inventories, as well as depositions to deepen understanding of early modern life.[15] Much attention has been paid to their language. Laura Gowing's seminal work on early modern women has, at its centre, court depositions,

> At the church courts, ordinary women and men fought over sexual words and marital conduct and left behind them testimonies of great length and detail about everyday events and critical life stages.[16]

Court cases give the background material of life - how people got on, why they did not - and attest to the huge amounts of paperwork produced as a result.[17] In a similar vein, testamentary records archived in ecclesiastical registries have been mined for what they reveal about the stuff of everyday life. Wills and inventories have provided a wealth of information about people's belongings, how much they had, what it was worth and to whom they gave it. Tom Arkell and Amy Erickson, amongst others, have used wills and inventories to consider property transfer, wealth distribution and kin

---

15 Lena Cowen Orlin, 'Fictions of the Early Modern English Probate Inventory', in *The Culture of Capital*, ed. Henry S. Turner (New York: Routledge, 2002); Margaret Spufford, 'Religious Preambles and the scribes of villagers' wills in Cambridgeshire, 1570-1700', in *When Death Do Us Part: Understanding and Interpreting the Probate Records of Early Modern England*, ed. Tom Arkell, Nesta Evans and Nigel Goose: 144-157.

16 Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words and Sex in Early Modern London*, 8.

17 For extensive use of court records see also Martin Ingram, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England 1570-1640*; James Sharpe, *Crime in Early Modern England, 1550-1750* (London: Longman, 1984).

networks.[18] All of these studies built on and, in many ways, critically departed from administrative histories of courts produced in the 1950s and 1960s.[19] It is partly due to this interest that the cause papers for York are now fully digitised and searchable from the fourteenth to the nineteenth century.[20] This focus on depositions and wills means that the other paperwork of court business has been studied much less. Scholars do not typically look in these records for print; however, once one starts to examine such legal records one gains a fresh perspective on print and its employment in administrative settings that complements and extends the previous chapter.

From scattered references in the ESTC and elsewhere, it is evident that some print was used in ecclesiastical administration before 1640. A printed brief for collection for John Stow was issued by James I and sent to all parishes in London to remind them of their duty to raise money. It was a small printed slip with civilité typeface, which explained that,

> our sayd Patents (being but one in them selves) cannot be shewed forth in diverse places or parishes, at once...We have therefore thought expedient in his unusuall manner, to recommen his cause unto you

A handwritten note on the back confirmed the brief had been read aloud before parishioners, and seven shillings and ten pence collected.[21] This is similar to the administration of briefs discussed in the last chapter, demonstrating the different types of print produced to assist charitable collection. In 1625, there was an order for William Stansby to print penance certificates for Bishop Bridgeman in Cheshire.[22] Stansby owned one of the largest printing houses in London and was a relative of

---

18 Tom Arkell, Nesta Evans and Nigel Goose ed. *When Death Do Us Part: Understanding and Interpreting the Probate Records of Early Modern England*; Amy Erickson, *Women and Property in Early Modern England* (London Routledge, 1993).

19 Dorothy Owen, *The Records of the Established Church in England* (London; British Record Association, 1970); Rev. John S. Purvis, *An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Records* (London: St. Anthony's Press, 1953); Idem, 'The Archives of the York Diocesan Registry: Their Provenance and History', *Borthwick Papers*, No. 2 (London: St. Anthony's Press, 1952); Ronald Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York, 1560-1642* (London: Longmans, 1960); Carson Ritchie, *The Ecclesiastical Courts of York* (Arbroath: The Herald Press, 1956).

20 Cause Papers of the Diocesan Courts of the Archbishopric of York, 1300-1858, https://www.hrionline.ac.uk/causepapers/

21 BL, Harley MS 367 f.10.

22 Cheshire Record Office, EDA3/1f.197r Bishop Bridgeman's register. (I am grateful to Professor Kenneth Fincham for this reference).

Bridgeman, suggesting personal relationships prompted the employment of print. The Huntington Library holds a printed marriage bond issued by William Juxon, Bishop of London, dating from the 1630s.[23] The online catalogue of Canterbury Cathedral archives lists a rental of the Deanery of Canterbury wrapped in a printed blank form for the appointment of a minister dated 1649.[24] Slightly later, Giles Moore, rector of Horsted Keynes in West Sussex, purchased printed blanks and bonds from stationers in London, alongside books, papers and other miscellaneous items. His account book on May 16th 1656 noted 'For a small paper booke with claspes of two Quire a dozen pens & blank bills 2s.'[25] Along with baptizing new-borns, collecting tithes and the other duties required of his office, Moore filled out forms. However, these examples are sparse, suggesting that, overall, not much print was used, and added to this the lack of diocesan accounts makes finding payments for print difficult.

In order to compensate for this lack of accounts, I conducted an extensive survey of surviving records from the York church courts and supplemented it by sampling records in London and elsewhere. As the 'seat of an Archbishop and the administrative centre of the largest English diocese', a large set of records survive for York, although many pre-1640 records were lost during the Civil War, when the courts were defunct.[26] I went through the York registry records at the Borthwick Institute, box by box, to gauge how much and what was printed. These boxes did not all start at the same date and varied widely in volume. This inevitably shapes our perception of print. Indeed, most of the records dated from the Restoration onwards, when the court was re-established, making comparison with pre-Civil War records impossible. Although little of this material pre-dated 1640, what remained gave clear evidence that the courts adopted print in the 1660s and the 1670s. This was significantly later than visitation articles discussed in the first chapter. Print was thus adopted at different points for different administrative levels.

---

[23] Huntington Library, shelf mark, 165150, (my thanks to Hannah Jeans for providing me with a copy of this); [*Marriage license in Latin*] (London: s.n., between 1632 and 1661), S123436.

[24] Canterbury Cathedral Archives, CCa-DCc-Survey/8; there is another example of court papers wrapped in a printed citation dated 1734. This information was gained from http://archives.canterbury-cathedral.org/CalmView/Default.aspx

[25] Giles Moore, *The Journal of Giles Moore*, ed. Ruth Bird, The Sussex Record Society, 68 (Lewes: The Sussex Record Society, 1971), 180, there was another purchase of blanks in 1662, 184.

[26] Stacey Gee, 'At the Sygne of the Cardinalles Hat': The Book Trade and the Market for Books in Yorkshire, c.1450-1550' (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of York, 1999), 24.

The types of print uncovered reveal that print was used for several aspects of church court business. I found seven types of printed document with an amount of variation within each category. These were 1) tables of fees, 2) seamen's wills, 3) administration bonds, 4) marriage bonds, 5) penance certificates, 6) excommunication certificates, and 7) citations.

The first two, tables of fees and seamen's wills, should be thought of as outliers. Tables of fees were not pro forma, but hung up in courts to set out prices of business and the two surviving examples of printed tables in the diocesan archives were undated.[27] Secondly, seamen's wills were not strictly ecclesiastical documents. The Navy issued these and they were sent to Church registries along with the rest of the probate documents of an individual.[28] The other examples mark the adoption of print for documents with generic content and used in volume for ecclesiastical administration. Two of these were bonds (marriage and administration) and the rest were certificates and summonses. Items issued on a routine basis were suited to the bulk production of pre-printed forms. In contrast, items produced on a case-specific basis, most obviously depositions and wills, cost too much to print individually. As Peacey observed in his discussion of parliamentary documents, scribal production could be expensive, but, for items of limited circulation, the cost of going to the printing press was too great.[29] In turn, the copying of pre-existing documents, such as 'standardized and straightforward bonds and recognizances', could be cheap, but only if they were needed in small numbers.[30] Cost-effectiveness went hand in hand with habitual administrative practice and conditioned the use of print at York.

Crucially, the uptake of print was gradual rather than definitive, and never conclusive. Table 2 details the printed documents found and the earliest surviving example in each case. As evident from the table, the earliest printed items found were

---

27 BI, DR/ACC2/22/1; DR/ACC2/25/2.

28 BI, Exchequer Wills, John Gibson of Borrowby, March 1696/7 (Cleveland), Peter Shaw of Scarborough, November 1719 (Dickering), Johnathan Mayburn of Redcar, January 1746 (Cleveland), Peter Wilson of Hull, December 1769 (Holderness).

29 Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*, 238.

30 Ibid, 242-243.

marriage bonds from 1660, followed by penance certificates from 1662.[31] It is not until 1677 that the first printed administration bonds appeared, over a decade later.[32] Meanwhile, the first printed citations date from 1666 and excommunications from 1669. The adoption of print varied from form to form. While the church courts began using printed forms in the Restoration period, there was no definite turning point. Moreover, print circulated in a mass of manuscript. The reams of wills, inventories and cause papers, not to mention act books and registers, outweighed print. Certainly, the numbers of clerks the courts employed attest to the fundamental role manuscript production continued to play in documenting the early modern world.[33] Notably, some documents, such as licences for preachers and schoolteachers, were never printed, despite their generic content.[34] The uptake of print must be placed in the day-to-day administrative practice of the courts, which remained overwhelmingly scribal.

Type of Document	**Year of First Printed Example in York Church Courts**
Administration Bond	1677
Seamen's Will	1696/7
Marriage Bond	1660
Penance Certificate	1662
Excommunication Certificate	1669
Citation	1666

Table 2 Years of first printed documents found in York Church Courts

An examination of administration bonds exemplifies the gradual adoption of print. To ensure that the executors of an estate settled the affairs of the deceased within a specified period, they had to enter into administration bonds. When this involved the provision for children, executors entered into tuition bonds in place of, or in addition to, administration bonds. I counted the probate files of five church courts in the diocese of York between the years 1675 and 1689 to ascertain the

31 BI, MB. Marriage Bonds 1618-1660; Y. V/Pen. Penances 1600-1701.
32 BI, Chancery Wills 1677-8, Henry Carvile of Catton, bond dated 27th October 1677.
33 For an illuminating account of a scrivener in an early modern Newcastle see Keith Wrightson, *Ralph Tailor's Summer: A scrivener, his city and the plague* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011).
34 There are printed licences for Presbyterian and Congregational worship dating from 1672, SP 29/321/3495; SP 29/321/1791; SP 29/321/[1791].

uptake of print. From 1675, clerks started to use printed bonds. Figure 10 gives the total number of probate bonds for each year and then breaks down how many were manuscript and printed. The courts chosen were the Dean and Chapter, and Deanery, both held in York, and the provincial courts of Weighton Prebendal Peculiar, the Precentorship with Driffield and East Riding, (Driffield and East Riding have no records in certain years). The graphs from each court in Figure 10 reveal the mixed uptake of print. Weighton Prebendal Peculiar, although closer in distance to York than Driffield, was much later to use printed bonds. This suggests that personnel, rather than geography, determined the use of print. Court clerks used printed bonds in increasing numbers in the period between 1670 and 1680, although there was no point at which print replaced manuscript completely. Pre-written and pre-printed bonds were used interchangeably throughout this period. Indeed, in the East Riding all the bonds in the last three years surveyed were manuscript. Alongside handwritten wills and inventories, probate, therefore, remained a chiefly scribal process. Even towards the end of the 1680s, when printed forms had become the norm, manuscript bonds continued to crop up. Whilst the printing press enabled the mass reproduction of forms, and would seem to have potentially increased bureaucratic efficiency, the uptake of print was not comprehensive.

The previous chapter showed that the employment of printed visitation articles varied considerably by diocese. Was this also true of pre-printed administration bonds? Given the different patterns of archival survival, it will be hard to be sure, even if one could go through every ecclesiastical archive. Nonetheless, a survey of bonds and certificates from London Consistory and Commissary courts revealed clusters of printed bonds. A fragment of a printed administration bond from 1665 shows an earlier uptake of print than York.[35] However, examining administration bonds covering the same period as those surveyed in the York courts uncovers a less comprehensive uptake of print. For example, the printed fragment from 1665 was the only piece of print out of a file of 136 bonds for that year. The next printed examples date from 1675 and, again, appeared sporadically. Bonds from the first half of the year were all manuscript. Of the 127 bonds entered between July and

[35] LMA, DL/C/B/014/MS09173/001B, Administration Bonds 1664-5/6.

December, 27 were printed.[36] Many files of bonds from subsequent years were entirely manuscript.[37] In addition, other documents, such as penances, citations and excommunications printed in York, were manuscript in London courts.[38] The amount of print varied considerably between different church courts.

Further evidence from other church courts confirms this uneven adoption of pre-printed forms. A pre-printed form that Henry Prescott, deputy registrar of Chester diocese, filled in transferring the possessions of a man who died intestate in 1689, suggests that Chester, like York, started using print in the later seventeenth century.[39] Meanwhile, courts records in Durham include a printed administration bond from 1691.[40] While other courts issued printed marriage bonds, this was much later than in York. For instance, the first printed marriage bonds held in the Leicester Archdeaconry records date from 1682, whilst in the records of Peterborough Diocese the earliest is from 1693, both at least twenty years later than York. Different dioceses took up a variety of pre-printed forms at different times and the established procedure of church courts, with in-house clerks and scribes, in many cases ensured the persistence of manuscript. There was a far more mixed uptake of printed forms than Stallybrass' discussion of small jobs would have us believe.

Looking at the printed documents, it is clear that, rather than buying general pro-forma, individual jurisdictions commissioned print for themselves. Aside from the seamen's wills that came from London and match examples elsewhere,[41] all printed pro forma in York referred to the diocese in the printed text, as did the

---

36 LMA, DL/C/B/014/MS09173/004, Administration Bonds, 1675.

37 LMA, DL/C/B/014/MS09173/006, Administration Bonds, 1676, these are a mixture of manuscript and print; DL/C/B/014/MS09173/009, Administration Bonds, 1680, these are all manuscript.

38 LMA, DL/C/A/007/MS09847, Citations 1679; DL/C/A/008/MS11168, Penances; DL/B/E/005/MS09583F, Excommunications, 1683, 1734.

39 Samual Gedge, *A List of Books, Manuscripts and Ephemera for the London International Antiquarian Book Fair*, Olympia 13-15 June, 2013 (Hanworth: Samuel Gedge and Ernesta Campane, 2013), 58; see also Henry Prescott, *The diary of Henry Prescott, LL.B, deputy registrar of Chester Diocese*, ed. John Addy, Lancashire and Cheshire Record Society Publications, 127 (Chester: Lancashire and Cheshire Record Society Publications, 1987), 132-133.

40 Durham Cathedral Archives, DPRI/6/B/1691/RI, printed administration bond dated 1691 (I am grateful to Francis Gotto for this reference).

41 Other printed seamen's wills survive in Durham Cathedral Archives, DPR1/1/1848/M6; Essex Record Office, D/ABW 75/104, D/ABW 74/177, D/AEW 29/147, D/ACW 21/116, this information was accessed from the online catalogues Essex Archives Online, http://seax.essexcc.gov.uk; for examples from the Navy Office see 'Wills of Royal Navy and Royal Marines personnel 1786-1882', The Nation Archives www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/records/seamens-wills.html

administration bonds in London. Citations and excommunications had York's Latinate name, 'Eborum'. In administration bonds, exact wording differed, but variations instructed that these sheets were, 'Exhibited into the Registry of the [ ] Court in York', or 'exhibite into the [ ] Office at York', as well as the more general instruction for the sheet 'to be exhibited into the Registry of the Court in York…' Therefore, all the variations specify that the bond was to be returned to York. Moreover, the slight alterations in wording also reveal that there must have been numerous print runs of administration bonds. Written in the blank space was the specific court (usually the Exchequer) that issued the bond. One run of bonds carried the spelling mistake 'Segistry' that the form filler often corrected to 'Registry', as we see in Figure 11. The printed text of these forms prescribed their use within a particular diocese.

Local idiosyncrasy was not the only factor that determined the adoption of print. The emergence of printed administration bonds in the 1670s, some time after marriage bonds and penance certificates, may well have been in response to national legislation. The 1670 Act for 'the better settling of intestates estates' set out a model bond with blank space for names, times and places.[42] The fact that printed administration bonds appeared from this point onwards suggests printing was in response to central administration, rather than in line with other documents printed earlier. Indeed, although these forms carried the names of particular courts, the main body of text followed the template set down in statute. Legislation specified standard forms for paperwork: print provided the means to achieve this, even if there was no wholesale adoption of it.

This was not, however, a simple story of print standardisation. In Durham, administrators used administration bonds printed for the York courts. This gives another example of printed forms that were changed by hand. However, instead of correcting a spelling mistake, the form filler scribbled over the printed 'York' and wrote 'Durham' so the form could be used there.[43] As with visitation articles in the previous chapter, the distribution and consumption of print was more complex than

[42] This Act is transcribed in Arkell, Evans and Goose ed. *When Death Do Us Part*, 350-352.
[43] Durham Cathedral Archives, DPRI/6/B/1691/RI.

the printed text would have us believe. In all probability, the presence of York bonds in Durham was due to the crossover in personnel between the two courts. Through commissioning print, York courts established local networks of print in the administration of ecclesiastical business that did not circulate neatly inside the diocese. Accordingly, pre-printed forms were changed by hand and used in other courts. The types of business that passed through all church courts gave this print a wider circulation and application, but it also raises the question of where exactly this print came from.

It is likely that the presses which were re-established in York at the Restoration, those of Stephen Broad, Anne Broad and later John White, produced these pro forma. The city had, of course, been a place of early printing and these presses had produced indulgences for religious confraternities, although the London Stationers' Company put an end to printing in the city in 1557.[44] Aside from the brief presence of a printing press during the Civil War, it was not until the Restoration that printing returned to York. Anne Broad printed in York from 1660 to 1667, and Stephen Bulkey from 1662 to 1680.[45] This was the same period in which the courts began using printed forms, which suggests they came from one of these presses and, as we saw in the previous chapter, both printers produced visitation articles for the diocese. In the 1680s, John White established a press and official contracts. Correspondence in State Papers referred to the licence White received on May 27th 1689 to be the King's printer in the York,

> to be our sole printer in our city of York' and to have the sole use of a printing press there, and the sole power of printing all papers usually printed related to our revenue and courts of justice the five northern counties.[46]

White started printing in York in 1680 and had a press in the city until 1716. This licence shows he held the contract to print for the secular courts and the printing

---

[44] Gee, 'At the Sygne of the Cardinalles Hat': The Book Trade and the Market for Books in Yorkshire, c.1450-1550', 107; Robert N. Swanson, 'Indulgences in the Pre-Reformation Diocese of York', *Borthwick Papers*, 119 (York: Borthwick Institute, 2011), 19; David Palliser, *Tudor York* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 170.

[45] For the location and published output of these printers see Robert Davies, *A Memoir of the York Press* (York: Ken Spelman Booksellers 1988), 89-104.

[46] SP 44/338/878.

account in the diocesan accounts discussed in the previous chapter reveals he printed for the church courts too. In addition to running up visitation articles, the costing for 'printing the Offic's business' by Thomas Epsom, proctor in the Chancery Court from 1684 to 1703, included '24 Sequestrations' at nine shillings, as well as '24 probate bonds' (most probably administration bonds) at the same price.[47] Furthermore, in correspondence with the registrar Thomas Jubb about marriage bonds, the Hexham officer complained 'Mr White…charges too high for printing.'[48] This gives further proof that White printed for York courts. Together, these accounts and the surviving pro forma indicate it was down to individual courts to commission print and the York courts used local presses.

The Form of Forms

Writing about these pro-forma as part of the spread of print suggests they were all the same. This section conducts a closer analysis of pro forma to show they were not. It examines the variations in and between pro forma. Once one looks closely at print in the York church courts it becomes apparent that it was not all in the same typeface and not all on the same material. Early administration used civilité typefaces, which were printed on parchment. However, the rest of the pro forma in these courts used a mix of roman and italic type and were on paper. Exploring the particularities of printed sheets unfurls the different ways print worked.

Figure 12 shows an early administration bond that used civilité typeface and was printed on parchment. These aesthetic and material choices structured the meaning of the page. Materially, parchment is typically associated with conferring legality and durability, and printing on parchment is indicative of the fact that

[47] BI, DR/ACC1/1/8.
[48] BI, Hexham Papers, Hex.2.

'surface' was critical in the comprehension of these objects.[49] The 'inky blots and parchment bonds' of Shakespeare's *Richard II*, that symbolised the morass of administration which beset medieval England, neatly captures the precedence of parchment as an essential ingredient of official documentation.[50] Parchment gave weight to the document, imbuing substance, durability and value. This was apt for administration bonds that had to be kept to make sure executors settled the affairs of the deceased. Robert Swanson argues that 'printing on parchment was technologically more demanding and took longer but was still not particularly time consuming.'[51] Noting the presence of parchment and civilité, might then be seen as bibliographical antiquarianism. Certainly, civilité has been largely catalogued by bibliographers rather than interpreted as a stylistic device.[52] Yet, when considered within the documentary culture of the church courts, and society more broadly, it becomes apparent these features had cultural currency.

The employment of civilité typeface placed these administration bonds, aesthetically, within the manuscript tradition of church court procedure. When we compare the early printed administration bond in Figure 12 with the handwritten example in Figure 13, the similarity is evident. The printed documents in the church courts replicated not only the size and format of their manuscript counterparts, but also the written aesthetic of manuscript. There was an attempt to maintain the aura of script, reflecting how manuscript culture conferred legitimacy. Figure 13 also shows that blanks were not an innovation of the printing era. Manuscript blanks formed 'a normal part of the procedure for the collection of loans under Henry VI, and Henry VIII's government attempted to limit the use of blank 'Quorum Nomina'

---

49 For discussion of parchment and durability for legal contracts see Gowing, 'Girls on Forms: Apprenticing Young Women in Seventeenth-Century London', 457; on surface meaning see Glenn Adamson and Victoria Kelley, 'Introduction' in *Surface Tensions: Surface, Finish and the Meaning of Objects*, ed. Glenn Adamson and Victoria Kelley (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), 2; for discussion of page surface in relation to early modern bibles see, Joshua Calhorn, 'The Word Made Flax: Cheap Bibles, Textual Corruption and the Poetics of Paper', *PMLA*, 126:2 (2011): 327-344.

50 William Shakespeare, *King Richard II*, ed. Andrew Gurr (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 2.1.64.

51 Robert N. Swanson, 'Printing for Purgatory: Indulgences and Related Documents in England, 1476 to 1536', *Journal of the Early Book Society for the Study of Manuscripts and Printing History*, 14 (2011), 126.

52 Harry Carter and H.D.L. Vervliet, *Civilité Types* (Oxford: Oxford Bibliographical Society, by the Oxford University Press, 1966), 17; A. F. Johnson, *Type Designs: Their History and Development*, (London: Graftin and Co, 1934); Hilary Jenkinson, 'English Current Writing and Early Printing', *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, 13 (1913): 273-296.

citations by Church apparitors.[53] The contrast in ink colour and clerical hand of the text in the administration bond in Figure 13 confirms this was a pre-written bond. Moreover, pre-written and pre-printed bonds appear interchangeably in probate records. Print did not succeed manuscript. Court clerks and scribes continued to produce pre-written bonds and this was a practice that pre-dated the adoption of print. That printed bonds copied these written versions so closely was undoubtedly to do with legitimacy. There was a received understanding of what bonds should look like and, as legally binding contracts, it was important that they looked the same each time. As printed bonds circulated alongside written versions this need for continuity was necessary. These examples demonstrate that not only did print replicate manuscript, but pre-printed blanks copied pre-written blanks.

The use of civilité in early printed administration bonds is demonstrative of the use of this typeface for legal and financial documents. Indeed, of the printed pro forma in the church courts, administration bonds were purely financial, as they dealt with the estates of the deceased. In their catalogue of printed works with civilité, Carter and Vervliet note, 'Law printers used it for personal bonds and powers of attorney.'[54] Identifying civilité in central government records, Hilary Jenkinson argued there was a 'reciprocal relationship between English printing and English administrative documents.'[55] A keyword search of civilité in the ESTC returns twenty

[53] J. G. Dickinson, "Blanks and Blank Charters' in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries', *The English Historical Review*, 66:260 (1951), 377; Robert Rodes Jr, *Lay Authority and Reformation in the English Church* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2012), 84.
[54] Carter and Vervliet, *Civilité Types*, 39.
[55] Jenkinson, 'English Current Writing and Early Printing', 273.

results, the vast majority of which were contractual documents.[56] Not only did this typeface look like handwriting, it also included constructions of words particular to handwriting. Heather Wolfe notes 'the font was neither practical nor economical since it contained far more sorts than roman and italic fonts' in its efforts to reproduce the abbreviations and shorthand words usually found in handwriting.[57] This would seem to explain its use for legal contracts. Including the particular word constructions that clerks and scribes traditionally used would have added another layer of legitimacy to these printed forms. However, the range of documents in York qualifies this strict association between typeface and legitimacy.

It is significant that the surface of different types of pre-printed documents varied. The rest of the pro forma in the church courts did not use civilité and were on paper. Most notably, this was the case for the other types of bond in the records: marriage bonds. As shown in Figure 14, York marriage bonds occupied one side of a sheet of paper, rather than either side of a piece of parchment, and did not use civilité. The first section of the marriage bond, written in Latin, which was the bond setting out the financial penalty due if broken, was in italic, whereas the second section, that gave the condition, was in roman. Different typefaces denoted distinct parts of the contract. Added to this, penance certificates, excommunications and citations were all on paper, with a combination of roman and italic typefaces. While parchment prompted ideas of longevity and durability for records and civilité offered the

---

56 The colophon of J. God, *Crueltie of a widowe toward a gentlemen* (London: By Henrie Binneman, 1570), S105738; *[Sir Walter Raliegh] This indenture triparte…* (London: s.n., 1583) S92130; London Carpenters' *Abuse vsed concerning the heawing, sawing and measuring of timber…* (London: s.n., 1593), S94013; *[Blank] Debet supercomum…* (London: s.n., 1601?), S92125; D. de Saxo-Bosco, *The rare virtue of a most excellent pil* (Antwerp?: s.n., 1603), S96174; *By the King. Trustie and wellbeloved wee greete you well…* (London: Robert Barker?, 1604), S122980; *James, by the grace of God…* (London: R. Barker, 1604?), S91982; *[Indenture for an unidentified company…*(London: s.n., c.1605), S94012; *By the King. Trustie and wellbeloued wee greete you well…* (London: R. Barker?, 1611), S120203; *This indenture witnesseth that [blank]…* (London: s.n., 1611), S96105; *By the king. Right trust &c. wee greet you well…* (London: R. Barker, 1613), S92128; Stationers' Company, *A brief of the bill concerning printers, booksellers, and bookebinders* (London: s.n., 1614), S94023; *By the King. Right and trustie, et Wee greete you well…* (London: Bonham Norton and Iohn Bill?, 1627?), S122721; [Marriage license in Latin] (London: s.n., 1632-33), S123436; N*overint universi per presents me…* (London: s.n., 1640), S91134; *[ ] admissus fuit in libertatem…* (London: s.n., 1636?), S121616; New River Company, *[Indenture for a lease of supply of water]* (London: s.n., 1640) S96132; *Shipped by the grace of God in good order* (London: Printed for Nicholas Bourn, c.1650), R184111; *Shipped by the grace of God in good order* (London: s.n., 1684), R505238; *Shipped by the grace of God in good order* (London: s.n., 1686), R504695.

57 Heather Wolfe, 'Print or manuscript? Civilité type in early modern England', *The Collation*, Folger Shakespeare Library, July 22nd 2014, http://collation.folger.edu/2014/07/print-or-manuscript-civilite-type-in-early-modern-england/

authority of the written hand, the majority of legally binding documents in the registry were on paper and did not use civilité. Documents looked very different, yet were still legally binding.

The use of civilité for printed pro-forma declined in the church courts. Marriage bonds issued by Bishop Juxon in the 1630s were on parchment and had civilité typeface, although all those that survive from the Restoration onwards in York and other church court records were a mixture of roman and italic. This also happened with administration bonds. By the end of the seventeenth century many administration bonds were on paper and had a combination of roman and italic. For example, the bond in Figure 11 that had 'registry' spelt incorrectly was still on parchment, but used roman type. It is apparent that typeface mattered, although not in as regimented a manner as some have presumed.

Paratextual features of pro forma are significant here too in thinking about the page as a performative space. Excommunication certificates for York had the emblem of the cross keys of the Minster in place of the decorated initial to declare their origin (see Figure 15). Along with the signature at the bottom, this authenticated the document and its order of excommunication. This printer's decoration, which printers would have had to source or make them themselves, was used to brand church court documents. Due to the paucity of survival, it is impossible to know if this was the case with excommunication certificates in other courts. Furthermore, it should be noted that administration bonds, marriage bonds and penance certificates did not carry such insignia. However, this use of insignia bore comparison to the title pages of visitation articles, with bishops' mitres, and, as we shall see, the printed paperwork of London livery companies. Similarly, a Royal coat of arms, a picture of the monarch and an anchor motif with the phrase 'Pray God preserve the fleet' adorned the pages of seamen's wills (Figure 16). This demonstrates the other ways in which the authenticity and authority of sheets was inscribed.

Significantly, print did not simply produce generic, depersonalised forms of authority. The succession of names on East Riding excommunication certificates reveals the numerous print runs of these documents produced to keep up with the

changes in court personnel. The name of York registrar Philip Broome, in Latin, opened the text of an excommunication for East Riding from 1669 (Figure 17). Subsequent excommunications carried the names of different personnel, including Robert Hitch, who served as the Dean of York, as well as the Archdeacon of the East Riding, and William Bleary, who was Archdeacon of the East Riding from 1675 to 1702. Each change of personnel, prompted a new batch of printed excommunications. Aside from print practice, this reveals a personalisation of authority on the printed page to impose excommunication – or, at least, an attempt to do this. Enforcing excommunication was a widespread issue as the authority of the church courts declined, as shown by the high percentage of people excommunicated at any one time.[58] Printed forms could not alter the indifference of their recipients. Citations that summoned people to court also imprinted the names of court officials. As with the excommunications, the text opened with the name of the official making the order, Thomas Burwell, the Chancellor overseeing the diocesan courts. The pre-written and pre-printed forms in Figures 18 and 19 again demonstrate the replication of manuscript in print, this time with italic typeface. The mark of a wax seal, once attached to the document, also remained. Whilst these sheets carried the name of Burwell, his frequent absence from York suggests someone else completed the paperwork. Acting as Chancellor for Durham, as well as MP for Ripon, Till notes that Burwell's business in York 'would be largely in the hands of surrogates.'[59] Court documents commonly imprinted the names of officials or their insignia to underwrite the authority of the sheet, but this authority was usually wielded by surrogates who were given the monotonous task of form filling, which became an increasing part of court administration.

Each of these printed documents was a material record of an administrative transaction and a financial transaction: this was a fee-based system. Church court employees made their money by charging for the production of documents like these. The Canons of 1604 attempted to regulate fees charged in the church courts. They incorporated fees decreed by John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1597 and

[58] Ingram, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England,* 343; Thomson, 'Church Discipline: The Operation of the Winchester Consistory Court in the Seventeenth Century', 358-359.
[59] Till, 19.

they also stipulated the display of fee tables in diocesan registries.[60] In addition to capping the prices of visitation articles in York diocese in 1629, Archbishop Samuel Harsnett ordered his registrar to carry tables of fees with him, 'and to affix in a public space that all men may see and read them a table containing the several ancient and accustomed fees.'[61] This points to a wide display of fee tables in church courts and, perhaps, in visitation courts for consultation by officers and the public alike. A broader genre of fee tables was drawn up by professional scribes and this was a practice with medieval antecedents.[62] Ordered for display in church courts since 1311, tables had a similar aesthetic to painted tables of the Ten Commandments hung in churches.[63] Moreover, by the late seventeenth century and early eighteenth century, these tables were printed. The tables demonstrate that, in addition to producing documents, getting them signed, sealed and delivered was chargeable. Paper and parchment held a material value as well as a value attached to it by the wax and signatures applied by a succession of court personnel.

One of the printed tables in the diocesan records was 'from the Original, which lately hang'd in the Said Bishop's Consistory in the Cathedral Church of Litchfield' (Figure 20).[64] The replication in print of a table of fees hung in Litchfield that found its way to York points to the broad dissemination of printed fee tables for church courts. The structure of these tables altered to reflect the changing dynamics of courts over the period. After his visitation in 1703, Archbishop Sharp ordered an additional column on fee tables for the consistory and chancery courts, which gave costs owed to the clerk. Previous tables had three columns of fees due to the apparitor, registrar and judge. This extra column was a result of the deputy registrar (a position that had come about because of absenteeism of registrars) hiring clerks for the 'donkeywork' of drawing up the Act books and other documents for the court.[65] This presumably also included filling out the printed citations with Burwell's name on and the other

---

60 Till, 158; for a comparison between Whitgift's fees and those charged in Salisbury church courts see Ingram, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England,* 56.
61 'Archbishop Samuel Harsnett's orders for York Diocese, 1629', in *English Historical Documents, Vol. V (B), 1602-1660,* ed. Barry Coward and Peter Gaunt.
62 On fee tables for scribes see Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*, 239.
63 Marchant, *The Church Under the Law,* 111; for a discussion of tables of the ten commandments see Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety,* 246-248.
64 BI, DR/ACC2/22/1.
65 Till, 31.

pro forma discussed. The format of tables changed to incorporate the increasing role of clerks in court business. The second printed table in the diocesan records varied in format, giving a list of officeholders, the services they undertook and the price.[66] This second table of fees was also in Latin, which limited the number of people who could read it. Together, these tables portrayed the institution as a body offering a range of administrative services that usually involved documentation. Having established the format and issuing of forms in court business, it is necessary to consider how forms worked in practice.

Form Filling in Practice

Printed penance certificates provide a pertinent example of how the York church courts fought friskiness with form filling. Whilst there has been commentary on penance as a social process, we can see here the performance of printed forms in punishment.[67] The earliest certificate of penance in the York records dates from 1662. Although the records for York go back no further, there are much earlier examples of manuscript penance certificates that survive in other repositories.[68] Certificates of penance elicited a very specific set of practices from their recipients. It was usually the registrar's office or his court that issued penance certificates, and they were also issued during visitation. Examining the certificate issued to John Cravon from Ilkley in 1700 reveals the process of penance on the printed sheet, and, in turn, the material agency of the printed sheet in the process of penance (Figure 21).[69] The folio sized paper sheet opened with the statement 'Penance enjoyned to be done by', followed by a space with John Cravon's name written. Manuscript entry made the generic certificate an order of penance for an individual. The use of the future tense also declared that the penance was yet to take place. The opening paragraph outlined

66 BI, DR/ACC2/25/2.

67 Ingram, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England,* 53-54 and 336-337; idem, 'Shame, Punishment and Charivari in Early Modern England' in *Shame Between Punishment and Penance: The Social Usages of Shame in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times*, ed. Benedict Sere and Jorg Wettlaufer (Firenze: Edizioni de Galuzzo, 2013); Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words and Sex in Early Modern London*, 40-1; David Postles, 'Penance and the Market Place: a Reformation Dialogue with the Medieval Church (c.1250-c.1600)', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 54:3 (2003): 441-468.

68 Purvis, *An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Records*, 48.

69 BI, Y. V/Pen. Penances 1600-1701.

what penance was to entail, with spaces left blank for the entry of the specific Sunday and time when John should present himself. John was to appear before,

> the whole congregation then assembled, being bare-head, bare-feet and bare-leg'd, having a white sheet wraped around h[im] from the shoulders to the feet, and a white wand in h[is] hand.' This was to be immediately after the reading of the gospel and 'before the Pulpit or place where the Ministers read prayers…

The spaces left blank for the appropriate pronoun to be entered show these forms were issued to both men and women. Crucially, the certificate textualised the enactment of ritual punishment, detailing time, place and practice. Using anthropological models to examine repentance in the Scottish Kirk, Margo Todd describes a 'staged and choreographed' process, where 'public visibility' reinforced the meaning of punishment.[70] Importantly, this printed sheet codified the shaming element of this ritual punishment, specifying that the recipient wore a white sheet and carried a wand that the congregation was familiar with. This printed script even extended to John's confession.

Print gave punishment a formulaic quality. The second paragraph was the confession read aloud by John. The sheet transcribed the oral as well as the physical performance of penance. It declared his 'detestable sin of fornication' and left a space where they added the name of Jane Thompson, his accomplice, for good measure. This drew a second individual into the punishment and onto the document, providing another name for the congregation to identify and admonish. Pre-printed documents thus contributed to the 'soundscape' of the early modern parish church. As Bruce Smith's discussion of printed ballads demonstrates, print interacted 'in highly volatile ways with the physical body, with soundscapes, with speech communities, with political authority, with the singer's sense of self.'[71] Significantly, penance was a religious punishment. This was a speech act deemed necessary for acceptance back into the congregation; solemn words performed at a particular point in the Sunday

---

[70] Margo Todd, *The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 148 and 129.

[71] Bruce Smith, *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-factor* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1999), 173; see also Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English preachers and their audiences, 1590-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

service. Print ensured each penitent said the same words, which became recognisable to the congregation. The only noticeable difference was the names of the fornicators. Rather than the words of the minister or the repetition of the Lord's Prayer by the congregation as a whole, it was an auditory and visual display by an individual. The printed sheet outlined a spectacle that sought to humiliate and deter. The last part of the sheet was the declaration that officers signed confirming the conclusion of penance and the certificate. Ingram has overlooked the agency of these sheets in the social negotiation of penance. He argues that penance became less elaborate in the seventeenth century, owing to the 'standardization of law and legal practices.'[72] These sheets demonstrate another way in which punishment became more uniform, via printed forms that gave step by step instruction.

Penance was, then, a paperwork system as much as a punishment. These certificates give an example of the importance of document generation in an institutional setting in the manner Adrian Wilson outlines, and in addition to this, the ongoing function of these documents past the point of production. The certificate functioned successively as an order of penance, an instruction manual and script for its performance, as confirmation of its completion and then as an archival record. Plotting the journey of this sheet shows the progression from blank form to documentary record and the number of different hands through which these sheets passed. It mediated different sets of exchanges as it moved from parish to registry. This form apparently travelled to Ilkley (as it specifies that John was to perform the punishment in the Church there) and then back to York. Whether the minster in Ilkley had his own supply of certificates and then sent it to the church courts, or it was issued as the result of a visitation of the parish, is unclear. There is no way of knowing whether John could read the form either. In 1700 illiteracy rates remained high and the fact John was unable to buy his way out of penance suggests he was lower down the social order and, thus, less likely to be able to read.[73] Yet, the transcript of a confession given on the sheets implies that recipients were supposed to read from them, or at least memorise them from someone. More and more people bought themselves out of penance from the end of the seventeenth century onwards. For

[72] Ingram, 'Shame, Punishment and Charivari in Early Modern England', 291.
[73] David Cressy, *Literacy and The Social Order: reading and writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres, 1980).

those who could not, it became a form-filling exercise. People performed penance to get the certificate signed off.

The different types of penance certificates printed shows what the Church was worried about and the print people encountered as a result. People served penance for all types of offence, from swearing and fighting in church to falsely obtaining a marriage licence. However, there were just three kinds of printed penance certificates and they all concerned sexual impropriety. As well as fornication, other pre-printed certificates were for 'adultery' and 'fornication before our marriage.'[74] Print production reflected the anxieties of the Church, with the types of certificate available determining the classification of the sexual indiscretions of individuals. Any other types of misbehaviour occasioned handwritten certificates. Therefore, print reveals the preoccupation of this institution with the sexual exploits of its flock and its attempt to regulate this behaviour via pro forma. It should also be noted that this drive to print took place at the same time the authority of the church courts to enforce such punishments was in terminal decline.[75]

Instances in which the performance of these documents broke down reveal the limitations of blanks and paperwork more widely. Marriage bonds offer a pertinent example of how the function of print varied in theory and practice. The Canons of 1604 prescribed licences, although the first printed bonds in the York registry date from the Restoration. Issued alongside marriage licences, these pieces of paperwork enabled couples to marry without the reading of the banns. The introduction of licences was an attempt to curb clandestine marriage, as well as to turn over a profit from selling them.[76] However, in response to complaints made about flaws in the licensing system, the authorities imposed 'bonds and affidavits on licence seekers to ensure that the requirements of canon law were fulfilled.'[77] In exchange for a licence,

---

[74] BI, Y. V/Pen. Penances 1600-1701; ER. V/Pen. Penances 1692-1731; D/C. V/ Pen. Dean and Chapter Penances 1666-1718; Rodes, *Lay Authority and Reformation in the English Church*, 181.
[75] Outhwaite, *Rise and fall of English ecclesiastical courts*, 80-84.
[76] R. B. Outhwaite, *Clandestine Marriage in England, 1500-1850* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1995), 31; for a quantitative analysis of the issuing of licences see Jeremy Boulton, "Itching After Private Marryings? Marriage Customs in Seventeenth Century London', *The London Journal*, 16:1 (1991): 15-34; see also Steve Hindle, 'The Problem of Pauper Marriage in Seventeenth-Century England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 8 (1998): 71-89.
[77] Outhwaite, *Clandestine Marriage in England, 1500-1850,* 31.

couples entered bonds that the courts kept. Despite this, clandestine marriage continued, as did the problem of clergy performing marriage ceremonies incorrectly, and the existence of no questions asked 'fleet marriages'. During the Protectorate, licensing moved to JP's, albeit unsuccessfully.[78] The resulting confusion in the Restoration led Charles II, in 1661, to legitimise all marriages performed since 1642.[79] The volume of bonds in the registry attests to the Church's bid to regulate marriage via bureaucratic means once the courts were up and running again. Court officials signed and wax sealed the sheets, which declared the named couple, 'now Licensed to be Marryed together be neither of Consanguinity nor Affinity the one to the other' (Figure 14). Printed bonds were a material consequence of the prevailing need to record and document and, in this instance, an attempt to counter unholy matrimony. Having a lawful marriage required the correct documentation, and the appropriate signatures of court officials.

Yet correspondence with officials in Hexham again points to the fact that a lack of print often compromised administrative practice in the parishes. The officer there struggled to get the volume of printed marriage bonds he needed. Printing documents in York did not ensure their use throughout the diocese. The frequent correspondence between Hexham and York detailed the delays and frustrations in delivering the appropriate paperwork to this remote region.[80] A surprisingly large number of weddings caused the curate to marry 'four couples only taking the partys bound and sworn for want of Blank Licences, which I filled up asoon as I got them'.[81] With no forms to hand, the officer in Hexham backdated the bonds when they arrived, compromising proper procedure.[82] Although he did not specify whether the blanks he used were printed, the fact that he waited for bonds to arrive from York highlights how paperwork had to come from the appropriate office. He did not have the authority to draw up bonds himself and procedure prescribed that 'blank licences

---

78 Christopher Durston, 'Unhallowed Wedlock': The Regulation of Marriage During the English Revolution', *The Historical Journal*, 31:1 (1988): 45-59.
79 Ibid, 48.
80 Rev. Michael G. Smith, 'Pastoral Discipline and the Church Courts: the Hexham Courts, 1680-1730', *Borthwick Papers*, 62 (York: Borthwick Institute, 1982), 1.
81 BI, Hexham Papers, Hex.2.
82 For a discussion of the backdating of paperwork in relation to the state see, Aaron Graham, 'Auditing Leviathan: Corruption and State Formation in Early Eighteenth-Century Britain', *English Historical Review*, 128:533 (2013): 806-838.

were supplied by the actuary and later sent from York as the commissary needed them.'[83] Personnel travelled up to Hexham to distribute bonds. Registrars at Durham, who deputised when the court sat at Hexham, initially paid for the bonds, while, later on, the deputy registrar for York, Thomas Jubb paid for them.[84] Shifts in who paid for print affected who got hold of it. Changes in administrative procedure affected the purchase and distribution of print and these fluctuations, as well as issues of supply in Hexham, resulted in its inconsistent use. As with visitation articles, the uptake of pre-printed forms in the church courts in York did not automatically transfer to the adoption of print throughout the diocese. Even during the Restoration, issues of cost, supply and geographical distances continued to disrupt the adoption of print and compromise record keeping procedure.

The circulation of blank marriage licences, unfilled or filled incorrectly, was also a cause for concern. Jubb, complained about the lack of information given on marriage licences returned to the registry, in which 'very few, scarce any of them are quoted – and therefore I could not supply the places of the aboad of both man and women – or the Church to which the Licences were directed.'[85] In this instance, lax form filling lead to insufficient records. Printed pro forma failed to bring standardisation to record keeping when the negligence of form fillers persevered. Furthermore, problems with blank marriage licences extended beyond York. In his pamphlet concerning clandestine marriage, the Dean of Norwich, Reverend Humphrey Prideaux, derided the bulk selling of blank marriage licences to individuals who were unqualified to issue them or unable to complete them properly, 'For to fill up a blank Instrument after the Seal is put to it is Forgery…'[86] In this instance, lax form filling undermined the legal standing of the documents. Elsewhere, there were accusations of blank licences being issued fraudulently.[87] Blank space brought a degree of flexibility to print, but, at the same time, held the capacity for its abuse. Unfilled forms were potent and vulnerable objects in equal measure.

---

83 Smith, 'Pastoral Discipline and the Church Courts: the Hexham Courts, 1680-1730', 17.
84 Ibid, 21.
85 Purvis, 'The Archives of York Diocesan Registry: Their Provenance and History', 6.
86 Henry Prideaux, *The Case of Clandestine Marriages Stated* (London: s.n.1691), 5.
87 Christopher Haigh, 'The Troubles of Thomas Pestall: Parish Squabbles and Ecclesiastical Politics in Caroline England', *Journal of British Studies*, 41:4 (2002): 203-428; there is an extended discussion of forgery in Chapter Four.

Identifying this corpus of printed pro forma develops discussion of blanks made in the previous chapter. As well as finding blanks on booklets of visitation articles, in the church courts we find the varied functions of pre-printed forms. By focusing on 'blanks' as a homogenous category of print, Stallybrass compares them impressionistically to the manuscript alternative and presents them as a unique site to discuss the interaction between script and print. He argues that a pre-printed form, 'only fulfils its function as a form when it has been completed by hand.'[88] The documents in the church courts demonstrate that there must be a much greater delineation *between* different types of blanks and their function. This includes idiosyncratic episodes of form filling that contravened the intended function of the printed sheets. The diocesan accounts hold a single printed sheet containing five pre-printed receipts for the collection of the annual tenths (Figure 22).[89] By writing over the printed dates, the form filler recorded costs for successive years from 1664 to 1668. The format of the sheet gave five separate receipts for cutting out and distributing. Kept intact, it took on an alternative life as a yearly account record. In addition to previous examples of form fillers correcting spelling mistakes and changing place names, this exemplifies the significant shifts in function that could occur between unfilled and filled sheets. Form filling was not uniform in practice or result and the materiality of these sheets fostered patterns of use that varied from the printed framework provided.

Drawing these examples together underlines how print can be seen as performative in different sets of social relations. Ingram's analysis of penance, for instance, concentrates on the movement of people within institutions, both the 'humiliation of formal penance' for the individual in the parish church and the chain of people, including churchwardens, involved in its administration.[90] However, it is crucial to remember that there was a print and document culture to this process and other church court business. This involved the movement of paper and the attachment of signatures, encompassing both officers and ordinary men and women. Apparitors distributed citations in accordance with their role as 'diocesan policemen',

[88] Stallybrass, 'Printing and the Manuscript Revolution', 112.
[89] BI, REV.P. Procuration Receipts and Papers 1614-1953.
[90] Ingram, *Church Courts*, 336.

drawing individuals into court affairs, with their signatures at the bottom verifying delivery.[91] Elsewhere, people gave names for, and attached signatures to, administration bonds and marriage bonds that, usually, they never saw again. People encountered and consumed a range of print they never kept. Moreover, it punctuated and inscribed pivotal junctures of their lives, from holy matrimony to the bureaucracy of death. Pre-printed sheets tempered very different types of social interactions and exchanges.

Print in the Archive

The function of pro forma in church registries extends our understanding of the social life of print. Filed away in the registry, print became archival matter. As discussed in the introduction to this thesis, the recent 'archival turn' has emphasised the change in function of documents once they were inside repositories and subject to classification systems. Moreover, the colonial archival turn has explored the effect this had on the construction of state power, which has influenced recent studies of early modern institutional repositories.[92] This section follows print into repositories and examines its role in governance, power and knowledge production. Besides production and circulation, the preservation of these flimsy sheets underlines their broader significance as institutional records. This section also critically challenges aspects of the archival turn. While scholars have shown the controlled flow of material into and out of archives, looking at single sheets identifies a much more porous boundary between the archive and the court, as well as between institutions and individuals.[93]

Church registries as a type of repository warrants greater discussion. Inside the registry, documents were subject to record keeping practices. Although bibliographical study has sought to construct a narrative of print beyond the printing house, encompassing circulation and consumption, this rarely goes further than the

---

91 Colin Chapman, *Ecclesiastical Courts, Officials and Records; Sin, Sex and Probate* (Dursley: Lochin Publishing, 1992), 38.

92 See for example, Randolph Head, 'Knowing Like a State: The Transformation of Political Knowledge in Swiss Archives, 1450-1770', *The Journal of Modern History,* 75:4 (2003): 745-782.

93 Eric Ketelaar, 'Records out and archives in: early modern cities as creators of records and as communities of archives, *Archival Science*, 10:3 (2010): 201-210.

initial reception of texts.[94] Most recently, Bill Sherman emphasised that production must be understood in 'social terms', although his frame of analysis remained fixed resolutely on bound books and readers.[95] Thinking about the collection and cataloguing of administrative sheets inside the registry foregrounds a very different, and much longer, social life of print in archives. Here, printed sheets had as many uses as they did readers. Much more attention has been given to the registry as a site of document production for the church courts than to its function as a place of storage.[96] Moreover, the storage of printed pro forma in this repository is significant, as it challenges the assumption that all single sheet print was irreducibly ephemeral, transient and, therefore, dispensable.[97] As we have seen, the printed pro forma used in the church courts authorised the actions of church officials and were material proof of various contracts and obligations that had to be kept for safekeeping. Keeping this paper cost money. While single sheets did not take up as much space as registers and act books, this material had a scrap value. Waste paper had various uses, inside the privy as much as the office. What resided in the York registry was nowhere near all the paperwork produced, but what there was demonstrates the role of pre-printed sheets inside the institution as part of a record-making machine.

The function of sheets changed when entered in the registry. Filing paper away imposed an order onto it. Purvis referred to the 'copious flows of paper from at least seven Ecclesiastical courts' that entered the Diocesan Registry.[98] Storing and filing this paperwork was a substantial exercise in 'information management', that enabled the court to fulfil its administrative role.[99] Filing commonly involved stringing together documents with purpose-built needles and thread.[100] The puncture wounds, or 'filing holes' left on each sheet were the marks of these practices of information management. Church court records reveal such traces and are indicative of the fact

---

94 Donald F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Roger Chartier, *The Cultural Uses of Print in Early Modern France* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987); Robert Darnton, 'What is the History of Books?', *Daedalus*, 111:3 (1982): 65-83.

95 William Sherman, 'The Social Life of Books', in *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture, Volume 1*, ed. Joad Raymond (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 164.

96 Marchant, *The Church Under the Law*, 82.

97 See for example, Watt 10-11.

98 Purvis, 'The Archives of York Diocesan Registry: Their Provenance and History', 4.

99 On methods of information management see, Blair, *Too Much to Know*, 12.

100 Heather Wolfe, 'Filing, seventeenth-century style' *The Collation*, Folger Shakespeare Library, March 13th, 2013, http://collation.folger.edu/2013/03/filing-seventeenth-century-style/

that 'storage generates work with and on that which has been stored.'[101] Office work and archival practice merged when paper entered the registry. Again, administrative practice differed between church courts. In York, administration bonds were stored alongside the will and inventory of the deceased, whereas office clerks in the London diocese strung all administration bonds together for a particular year, as seen in Figure 23. This treatment of administration bonds gives another example of how binding gave new meaning to single sheets. In London, filing was by the type of document and the year, whereas in York it was a file of an individual to form a probate account. The former read as a file of administration bonds, the latter as a testamentary file of an individual. Whatever the arrangement, they had to be stored in a way which enabled them to be found again.

Filing systems were also retrieval systems. The table of fees held costs 'For Admission of an Account upon an Administration', 'For a Copy of any Act in the Registry' as well as 'For Search for a Will or Letters of Administration.'[102] Documents were not only filed for a fee, but also copied and, critically, searched for a price. The copying of documents demonstrates another form of textual reproduction that came about from this archival matter. Sheils' examination of the appeals court notes the copying of original evidence documents that 'were then sealed and attested as true copies by the inferior court' from which they had come. He also found bills for 'the cost of copying, binding and carriage of the transmitted papers.'[103] Paperwork multiplied and manoeuvred across various courts and offices during the often lengthy and drawn out process of resolving cases. Once interred in registries, documents had to be traceable. Arkell highlights that the preservation of documents was pivotal to the procedure of probate.[104] Things went into the registry, but they might also need to come out again. If issues over the completion of probate arose, locating and presenting the original administration bond the executors had entered was paramount. This recall of documents underlines the cyclical value of paper.

---

[101] Cornelia Vismann, *Files: Law and Media Technology*, Trans: Geoffrey Winthrop-Young (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008), 59.
[102] BI, DR/ACC 2/22/1.
[103] William J. Shiels, 'Ecclesiastical Cause Papers at York: Files transmitted on Appeal 1500-1883', Borthwick Texts and Calendars: Records of the Northern Province, 9 (York: Borthwick Institute 1983), ix-x.
[104] Tom Arkell, 'The Probate Process', 11.

Administration bonds and other documents formed an ongoing record bank for the administration of Canon Law. In Restoration York, the registry was a point of reference, as well as of exchange. It was an archive, and one that was a functioning part of the institution.

This transforms the way we understand the registry as an administrative centre. O'Day's depiction of the registry as a bureaucratic hub that revolved around the registrar requires a rethink. Certainly, registrars had considerable power over the content of registries, but, as demonstrated, the function of documents was considerable. People were inconstant, whereas paper lingered. Absenteeism and profiteering dogged the position of registrar in York during the seventeenth century.[105] In addition to the registrar, a number of men held several positions in the different courts in York. For example, Henry Watkinson, 'something of an ecclesiastical Poo Ba' sat in for Burwell in the Chancery and Consistory Courts and as a surrogate in the Exchequer Court, as well as 'Official to the Archdeacon of York and for the Hexham peculiar jurisdiction and the Commissary of the Admiralty Court.'[106] Accordingly, his signatures crop up on a significant amount of paperwork. Human agency must still figure within a material conception of the archive, as signatures activated pre-printed forms. What a material approach imparts is that documents also held agency.

The archival turn offers an important interruption in person-based discussions of administrative history as it foregrounds the significance of documents in the working of repositories. Thinking about the treatment of administration bonds in light of scholarship from the archival turn allows us to think more critically about the flow of paper into and out of storage. Looking at city registers in medieval Europe, Eric Katelaar argues that 'registers were both records and archives, inscription of the function and archival memories of the city.'[107] Blurring the distinction between permanent archive and functional record he details how registers and other records were brought out of repositories for ceremonial readings that were 'the basis for

[105] Till, 17-18.
[106] Ibid.
[107] Ketelaar, 'Records out and archives in: early modern cities as creators of records and as communities of archives', 206.

shared assumptions and a shared identity' amongst residents.[108] This is pertinent for thinking about church court records entering and coming back out of the registry. However, in contrast to Katelaar, the documents here were single sheets and, critically, had a much broader circulation than the ceremonial reading of registers. This pro forma passed through the hands of ordinary men and women, as well as court officials, providing a material basis for interactions between them. This material challenges colonial scholarship on archives in a similar way. Colonial scholarship emphasises the role which storage and retrieval of documents played in the production of knowledge and establishment of state power. Stoler asserts, 'colonial archives were both transparencies in which power relations were inscribed and intricate technologies of rule in themselves.'[109] The continuous flow of paper inside and outside the church registry attests to the movement of institutional records. Yes, officials guarded access to registry records, but for a fee and, in the case of dispute, these records were searchable. The formation and maintenance of repositories was constitutive of ecclesiastical power, but its boundaries were more negotiable than analyses of other archives have suggested.

Destruction was inherent in this archival process and must feature in an account of the repository as a functioning part of the church courts. Interring documents in the registry was a selective process. Value judgments made by both court personnel and others determined what was to be kept as archival record or discarded as waste paper. Referring to the Civil War, Deputy Registrar Thomas Jubb, complained of, 'the Troublesome Times during which the Office was gutted and loose papers destroyed.'[110] Most likely, these records were destroyed, as they were symbolic of a regime which had been toppled. Nonetheless, these deliberate acts of record destruction shape our understanding of the material archive. Jubb's own practices demonstrate how particular administrative regimes determined what was record or rubbish. It has been suggested that when he succeeded to the office of registrar in 1714, Jubb destroyed many of the records from before his term of office, in effect leaving only those needed to provide precedents for subsequent document

[108] Ibid, 202.
[109] Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain,* 20.
[110] Purvis, 'The Archives of York Diocesan Registry: Their Provenance and History', 6.

production.[111] Indeed, we need to see destruction as an inherent part of archive construction.[112] Not all paperwork was created with perpetuity in mind. In contrast to Derridean formulations of the archive, whereby the feverish compulsion to hoard records was fundamental to institutional power, this was selective documentation.[113] Jubb kept what he deemed relevant, which extended only to archetypal documents, rather than to the entirety of court proceedings. This illustrates the arbitrary notion of a 'complete record' and its problematic usage in discussion of archival collections. Besides this deliberate discard, it is also impossible to calculate the volume of paper scraps, notes and slips that informed the creation of official documents, but disappeared afterwards. Undoubtedly, the extent of church court records belies the volume of material that went into their construction. Nonetheless, what there is demonstrates the function of pre-printed sheets in the generation of institutional archives. This reveals a social life, and in particular a repository life for pre-printed sheets previously overlooked.

Conclusion

Situating church records within conceptions of the archive foregrounds the employment and storage of print in alternative places. In addition to considering the aesthetics of the page and the implications this has for our understanding of the use and circulation of print, locating it within an archival system presents a consideration of documents as objects. This is not to dispute the importance of the textual content of such sheets emphasised in previous scholarship. Rather, it argues that the physical form of documents is of equal importance to extending our understanding of how paper worked. In the context of the Church records, print inscribed the spiritual and moral wellbeing of society. Certificates legitimised holy matrimony, absolved individuals from sin, and set the boundaries between being inside and outside the godly community. They were expressions of church control and power. Crucially, they were also an alternative point in which ordinary men and women encountered print.

---

[111] Ibid, 5.
[112] For discussion of record destruction see Cornelia Vismann, 'Out of File, Out of Mind' in *New Media, Old Media: A History and Theory Reader*, ed. Wendy Hui Kyong and Thomas Kennan (London: Routledge, 2006), 100.
[113] Derrida, *Archive Fever: a Freudian Impression*; Steedman, *Dust*, 68.

The storage of documents and the capacity for their retrieval and consultation entrenched their potency. The registry as a space and what went on inside it needs to be apportioned the same significance as the individual carrying the title 'registrar'. Archival procedures were an intrinsic part of institutional procedure – a pivotal juncture where the papertrails of administration were stored or destroyed.

Pursuing an alternative reading of the church record has broader implications for print studies. Single sheet printing was not always transient news stuff that quickly became waste paper. These records contain single sheets which were variously distributed, collected and then stored. They were kept in bundles of like form, catalogued by date, region and other classificatory schema installed by the institution and officeholder. It was print that transformed function across time and space, to order as well as to certify. Subject to archival procedures, these records underline the need for a re-engagement with printed material that locates its place within a geography of the filing cupboard and the office, as much as of the printing house and the courtroom. The sociology of a text must extend to its storage and thus place the archiving of documents in dialogue with their production and initial circulation.

Moreover, this discussion has demonstrated that print did not prompt an automatic response, either on the surface of the page or from those expected to heed its order. Blank spaces created room for manoeuvre that contradicted the prescribed use of forms. Form filling was a context-bound practice embedded within contemporary routines of paperwork, subject to abuse and negligence as much as compliant form filling. The church courts in York commissioned printed instruments that encoded administrative procedure, although this did not ensure the supremacy of print. Document production and record making relied on a multitude of media.

Together, these two chapters redraw understandings of 'Church print'. The Church is routinely described as an early adopter of print because of the indulgences that ran off Gutenberg's press and then Caxton's. Both chapters demonstrate that this did not equate with a wholescale adoption of print at all levels of church administration. Modelled in the first instance on state print, printed visitation articles

emerged much later than indulgences, and the present chapter has documented an even later adoption of print, when it was adopted at all. It is easy to depict a snowball effect of more and more print over time, but this leads to simplistic assumptions that print was inevitable and desirable. Both of these chapters reveal variations in practice between offices and administrative levels that undermine ideas of standardisation and bureaucratisation. Apart from uptake, the consumption of print was equally patchy. Print flowing into parishes was dependent on location, what was in the kitty, and decisions made in the upper echelons of ecclesiastical administration. This section has raised critical questions about the production and consumption of print, developed in the next chapter of this thesis that turns to the fiscal print of the state.

Chapter Three War, Taxes and Print

Turning to the printed output of the state extends the questions of publics and audiences addressed in the previous two chapters. Discussions of the emergence of the nation state make substantial claims about the impact of print. In Eisenstein's proposal of a print revolution, she argued that 'typography arrested linguistic drift, enriched as well as standardized vernaculars.'[1] Print fostered the spread of a common language that was an essential component to a burgeoning sense of nationalism. Similarly, print, and in particular newspapers, was critical to creating the 'imagined communities' central to Benedict Anderson's articulation of nationalism.[2] It bridged the geographical distances between people, giving a material component to abstract notions of statehood and constructed collectivities. Print has also been prominent in discussions of early modern English monarchy and state power. For Elton, print was an intrinsic part of the propaganda machine orchestrated by the Tudor regime.[3] In a similar vein, Kevin Sharpe termed printed proclamations an 'indispensable media of royal authority and royal representation.'[4] Other work focusing on the seventeenth century centres on print and the emergence of a public sphere.[5] Scholars such as Jason Peacey and Joad Raymond argue that print enabled political debate beyond Westminster. The proliferation of pamphlets and newsbooks, particularly during the Civil War, established print as the mode of choice in the communication of political ideas inside and outside the governing elite.[6] Peacey argues that the 'cheap print', which flooded the market during the Civil War not only brought about the emergence of a news culture, but also fostered political participation, transforming 'the nature

---

1 Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, 117.

2 Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).

3 Geoffrey Elton, *The Tudor Revolution in Government; Administrative Changes in the Reign of Henry VII*, 5th ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 364-365; for a more recent account see John P. D Cooper, *Propaganda and the Tudor state: political culture in the West country* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 210-247.

4 Sharpe*, Selling the Tudor Monarchy: authority and image in sixteenth century England*, quoted 85, 87-88; Idem, *Image Wars: promoting kings and commonwealths in England, 1603-1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 150-159.

5 Lake and Pincus, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England'; Kyle *Theatre of State: Parliament and Political Culture in Early Stuart England*.

6 Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).

and shape of the political nation.'[7] The world of news also coincided with a huge increase in Parliamentary printing that began in 1641. Print 'became the basis of parliamentary administration and an instrument of government throughout the Civil War.'[8] Most of these scholars have largely equated print with books and pamphlets to give impressionistic accounts of how print constructed political power and a burgeoning concept of nationhood.

Elsewhere, scholars have also associated print with bureaucratic efficiency and the emergence of a fiscal state. John Brewer's initial articulation of the concept of the 'fiscal military state' post-1688 centres on administrative innovation. Brewer makes no explicit examination of print, but is effusive about the administrative changes that increased tax revenue year on year. Taxes paid for wars, and it was professional clerks and tax collectors, with ledgers under their arms, that kept revenue rolling in and, hence, England fighting on all fronts.[9] The story of the period is the exponential rise of tax revenue, helpfully plotted by Patrick O'Brien and Phillip Hunt.[10] The Excise was at the centre of this enterprise and symbolised the increased administrative capacity of government. Established in 1642, it flourished in the Restoration, epitomising models of professionalisation and bureaucratisation attributed to state office at the end of the period.[11] Figures such as Charles Davenant, commissioner for the Excise, revolutionised administration, employing the latest developments of political arithmetic to increase revenue.[12] Outside the Excise, the establishment of the hearth tax office in 1670 demonstrated the extension of these practices into other areas of revenue collection.[13] The state was counting and collecting in new and extensive ways. Various instruction manuals and pro forma for

---

7 Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution,* 1.

8 Sheila Lambert, 'Printing for Parliament, 1641-1700', *List and Index Society*, Special Series Vol.20 (1984), i.

9 John Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: war, money and the English state, 1688-1783* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989).

10 Patrick O'Brien and Phillip Hunt, 'The Rise of a Fiscal State in England, 1485-1815', *Historical Research*, 66:160 (1993), 150-152; see also William Ashworth, *Customs and Excise: Trade, Production and Consumption in England, 1640-1845* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 4-5.

11 Ashworth, *Customs and Excise: Trade, Production and Consumption in England, 1640-1845*, 4.

12 Miles Ogborn, 'The Capacities of the State: Charles Davenant and the Management of the Excise, 1683-1689', *Journal of Historical Geography*, 24:3 (1998): 289-312.

13 For a comprehensive accounts of state revenue in the Restoration see, C. D. Chandaman, *The English Public Revenue, 1660-1688* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975); see also Michael Braddick, *The Nerves of the State: taxation and the financing of the English state, 1558-1714* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996).

Excise officers and tax collectors expedited cash raising.[14] In these contexts, print has been construed as a medium that facilitated state growth.

Key aspects of the fiscal military state have been backdated to the Civil War period, including the adoption of print. Braddick refers to printed customs bonds in the 1640s and 1650s as part of the 'increasingly specialized agencies of revenue collection.'[15] He uses this to evidence a streamlined approach to administration that predated men like Davenant. As the Civil War raged on, both sides orchestrated campaigns to raise cash and resources for soldiers. Braddick concedes the 'evolution of the financial and administrative structures necessary to conduct war was haphazard' and that taxation during the 1640s was introduced 'within the confines of a limited bureaucratic apparatus.'[16] Nonetheless, there was an urgent need for cash, which necessitated the introduction of myriad rates, assessments and loans by both sides, as traditional systems of collection broke down. This brought areas of innovation in tax raising, notably the introduction of Excise, but not efficiency or the adoption of print for all aspects of fiscal administration. Thus, secondary literature cites numerous junctures where print facilitated administration and revenue collections, but provides no comprehensive analysis of the developments and shifts in printed output across the period.

There was an increasing use of print, particularly, in the Restoration with the administration of hearth tax, however, there still needs to be a more accurate account of print in the fiscal processes of the state during the early modern period. This chapter will re-examine the equation of print with state growth by looking at print and money raising. It will demonstrate the various ways in which print worked to solicit, extract and collect money for the government from the early seventeenth century onwards. Print, it will argue, was not *simply* an instrument of nation building. Firstly, state print took a variety of formats, both in terms of layout and typeface (civilité, blackletter, roman) and of literal forms, including proclamations, printed

---

[14] Slack, 'Government and Information in Seventeenth Century England', 60; Ogborn, 'The Capacities of the State: Charles Davenant and the Management of the Excise, 1683-1689', 297.
[15] Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England, c.1550-1700*, 275 and 234.
[16] Michael Braddick, *Parliamentary Taxation in 17th Century England* (Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1994), 130 and 126.

letters and multifarious blank forms. Secondly, and more importantly, large amounts of print passed solely between administrators. This included printed receivers' receipts, instruction booklets and exemption certificates used in the collection and collation of revenue. Therefore, much early modern print culture was for circulating information between parts of state administration, thereby producing very specific types of paperchains. This print had very little to do with nation-building. Indeed, the employment of printed pro-forma by fee-farmers and bishops in aspects of fiscal administration reveals that the adoption of print for counting and collection sometimes began away from Westminster. Rather than an uncomplicated relationship between print and state building from the centre, this presents a more complex picture. While the uptake of print intensified over the period, there needs to be closer examination of how it worked in state practice.

Given the sheer volume of state records, it was not practical to do in-depth studies of every tax and levy in the period. Nonetheless, this chapter outlines a wide network of print at work. Ideally, there would be sets of accounts detailing how much central offices in Westminster spent on print and its application, but, unfortunately, these rarely survive. Instead, this chapter offers a tentative reconstruction of print pieced together from some of what survives. It draws on a much wider range of examples than are used in existing studies of government print. Such studies tend to focus on the bills of royal printers and other central accounts.[17] The sections that follow explore print in several aspects of fiscal administration. The first section examines proclamations and associated documents to demonstrate how they worked in state administration, rather than treating them simply as propaganda. It shows the increasing amounts spent on print across the period, but also how printed forms of communication changed. By the 1660s, official newssheets supplemented proclamations and coordinated revenue collection. The remaining sections are broadly chronological and demonstrate the varied employment of print in state

[17] See for examples Rees and Wakely, *Publishing, Politics and Culture: the King's printers in the reign of James I and IV*; Kyle uses accounts in BL Add MS 5756 in, 'Monarch and Marketplace: Proclamations as News in Early Modern England', 776; Peacey discusses the accounts of the Scottish printer Evan Tyler printing during the Civil War, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*, 244; on the printing accounts of the *London Gazette* produced by the government see, Natasha Glaisyer, 'The Most Universal Intelligencers: The Circulation of the London Gazette in the 1690s', *Media History*, 23:2 (2017): 256-280.

administration. The second section shows the ways print was used to help raise money on extraordinary occasions before 1640, examining charitable briefs and privy seal loans in the context of wider revenue collection. The section that follows examines the use of print by bishops and fee farmers to return money to central government. The focus then turns to the Civil War, tracing the adoption of print to both demand and receive money. Finally, the analysis moves to the Restoration, giving a case study of the hearth tax, to examine the flow of print within the administration of a single tax. In addition to showing the adoption and adaptation of print for administration, the hearth tax is an important qualifier for Excise-led accounts of the fiscal military state. Together, these sections demonstrate that fiscal print provides anything but an unfettered story of state growth.

Constructing Collectivities: Print and the Fiscal State

The concentration on proclamations as an early form of mass communication obscures their functional role in governance. Too often scholars reduce government print to something that was quintessentially 'public facing'. Most recently, Kyle decries the fact that 'proclamations must be one of the most overlooked categories of printed material' in early modern England and seeks to rectify this by placing them in a 'news network.'[18] He recognises the different functions of these printed sheets, yet his analysis continues to focus on the communicative function of proclamations. Like the printed royal injunctions touched upon in the first chapter, proclamations typify the print that reinforced monarchical power, pinned up in parish churches and broadcast by the local crier or church minister. Usually made up of no more than three folio sheets, and following a formulaic structure, proclamations were recognisable to both the literate and the illiterate.[19] The frequent printing of proclamations during the Tudor period consolidated this format.[20] Coats of arms, blackletter typeface and the opening line of 'by the King' made sure that they looked and sounded 'official' to audiences around the country and this has since

[18] Kyle, 'Monarch and Marketplace: Proclamations as news in early modern England', 771 and 779.
[19] Graham Rees and Maria Wakely, *Publishing, Politics and Culture: The King's Printer in the Reign of James I and VI* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 140-44.
[20] P. L. Hughes and J. F. Larkin ed., *Tudor Royal Proclamations, Vol 1. 1485-1553* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1964), xxv.

underpinned their status as 'powerful textual totems.'[21] These sheets typify the way monarchs harnessed the printing press, whilst at the same time attempting (and usually failing) to control its seditious output, particularly in the Restoration.[22] Correlating proclamations to propaganda and news in this way overlooks the function of these sheets, as defined and explored in the early surveys of P. L. Hughes and J. F. Larkins, as well as Frederick Youngs.[23] They undoubtedly were communicative, but, rather than merely conveying government power, they were critical to the performance of government at a parochial level, alongside other paperwork.

Printing accounts demonstrate the increased production of proclamations across the period, providing a detailed picture of how the consumption of this print changed. The Henrician printer Thomas Berthelet produced some of the earliest printed acts and proclamations and an account of his printing for government between 1541 and 1543 survives.[24] Elton used this account to highlight that it was the clerks of Parliament who decided which acts and proclamations were printed.[25] Berthelet's accounts gave print runs and costs. From this, it is apparent that the size of the print job fluctuated, depending on the type of act or proclamation. For instance, the Lord Chancellor ordered fifty copies of an Act made out in a proclamation concerning paving in London and Westminster.[26] However, general proclamations for nationwide distribution typically ran to either 400 or 600 copies. For example, the 400 proclamations concerning hawks produced on 'bastard paper' at one leaf per copy which came to a total of thrity-five shillings.[27] This amounts to just over one

---

21 Lloyd Bowen, 'Royalism, Print and the Clergy in Britain, 1639-40 and 1642', *The Historical Journal*, 56:2 (2013), 318.

22 Harold Weber, *Paper Bullets: print and kingship under Charles II* (Lexington; The University Press of Kentucky, 1996), Chapter 4.

23 P. L. Hughes and J. F. Larkin ed., *Tudor Royal Proclamations, Vol 1. 1485-1553* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1964); P. L. Hughes and J. F. Larkin ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Vol 1, Royal Proclamations of King James I, 1603-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973); Frederic Youngs, *The Proclamations of Tudor Queens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976); see also R. H. Heinz, *The Proclamations of the Tudor Kings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

24 W. H. Black and F. H. Davies, 'Thomas Berthelet's bill, as King's printer for books sold and bound, and for statutes and proclamations furnished to the government in 1541-43', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 7 (1853): 44-52.

25 Geoffrey Elton, 'The Sessional Printing of Statutes, 1484-1547', in *Wealth and Power in Tudor England: Essays Presented to S.T Bindoff*, ed. Eric Ives, Robert Knect and Jack Scarisbrick (London: Athlone Press, 1978), 69.

26 Black and Davis, 'Thomas Berthelet's bill, as King's printer for books sold and bound, and for statutes and proclamations furnished to the government in 1541-43', 47.

27 Ibid, 48.

pence per sheet. However, another order for the same proclamation, this time on 'jene paper', cost sixteen shillings and eight pence, less than half the price.[28] The type of paper used had a dramatic impact on cost and the account reveals that most print ordered was on the more expensive bastard paper. It is unclear whether the distribution of these two types of proclamations differed because of the type of paper. This account shows just how much variation there was in state printing, almost from its inception.

When compared with printing accounts from the start of the seventeenth century the dramatic increase in the amount of print ordered is apparent. In 1603, 1,000 proclamations against the selling of ships cost two pounds, one shilling and ten pence, a substantial increase in volume and cost.[29] No detail is given about the length of each proclamation, although if they were one sheet each this equated to half a penny per sheet. The amounts printed compare with Graham Rees and Maria Wakeley's analysis of the King's printer, Robert Barker in 1604.[30] Just over fifty years after Berthelet's account, proclamations for general distribution were in runs of at least 1,000 and one issued to London was set at 500 copies (in contrast to the fifty Berthelet produced). Bibliographical studies have uncovered eleven variations of James I's coat of arms that headed two thirds of his proclamations, highlighting the extensive print runs of these items.[31] Amounts spent on printing continued to rise. Treasury books from the Restoration detail backdated payments of £485 11s. 00d. in 1662 to Anne Litchfield, widow of Leonard, 'in part of 1,094l 1s 11d remaining unpaid to him for printing divers public papers for the late King from 1642 to 1646.'[32] Having moved Parliament to Oxford in 1644, Charles I utilised the services of the local printer. This included proclamations to prompt government tax collection and sabotage revenue collection by Parliamentarians.[33] There are no itemised accounts to reveal what Litchfield printed, although, if we take the figure of one pence per sheet and apply it here, the sum equates to around a quarter of a million sheets. This was a

---

28 Ibid.
29 BL, Add MS 5756, f.140.
30 Rees and Wakely, *Publishing, Politics and Culture*, 141.
31 Hughes and Larkin ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Vol 1*, viii, n.1.
32 March 14 1662, William A. Shaw ed., *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1660-1667, Vol I* (London: Printed for his Majesty's Stationary Office, By Mackie and Co. Ltd., 1904), 375.
33 For details of Civil War printing in Oxford, see Harry Carter, *A History of the Oxford University Press* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), 37.

substantial amount of print in four years and far more than any of the previous accounts. It is evident that the Crown made increasing use of print and as such we need to look more closely at how it functioned and what else was printed.

Proclamations were part of a broader corpus of print that inscribed the state. This included Books of Orders, first produced in response to the outbreak of plague in 1578, that 'dictated policy from one end of the kingdom to the other.'[34] Furthermore, Youngs notes that, from 1577, the 'Council sent letters to local officers which contained a more comprehensive set of regulations than those in the proclamations alone' and, from 1589,

> Council articles were printed every year; they were supplemented from time to time with charts containing the points of the regulations and with printed forms for recognizances which were demanded so that the local officers had merely to fill the blanks.[35]

Aside from proclamations hung in public spaces, local officers received other printed sheets, including pro forma for their administrative duties. A surviving printed summons from 1598 gives an example of pro forma issued to rent collectors of royal estates (Figure 24).[36] It left a blank space for the county which auditors would visit (in this case Kent) to be written in and instructed the bearer to 'yeelde account of your office and collection for one whole yeere.' Along with the money, officers had to bring all records with them for inspection and, 'Warning all Farmers within your said collection to bring in their Patents, Leases and Indentures, of all such Lands as they hold by vertue of the same, within your said office.'[37] Systems of fee farming will be discussed in more detail, but this sheet shows other print, alongside proclamations, that circulated between state officers to coordinate rent collection. Together, these examples demonstrate the different types of print used in the paper chains of fiscal administration from an early point.

---

[34] Paul Slack, *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England* (London: Longman, 1988), 139.
[35] Youngs, *The Proclamations of Tudor Queens*, 124.
[36] For an account of revenue collection on royal estates, see Richard Hoyle, *The Estates of the English Crown, 1558-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
[37] BL, Add. MS 42596, f.68, Brockman papers Vol. XI.

Accounts also reveal the speed at which printers were expected to produce these materials for governance. In 1670, the Treasury warned printer Thomas Newcombe,

> if you do not send by Monday next the 100 copies of the new Wine Act my Lords will cause them to be brought elsewhere and will give order that other persons shall be employed in the business of His Majesty's printing for future.[38]

Getting instructions to revenue collectors quickly was paramount, and a further notice ordered 'the printer, to expedite the printing of the Act for getting in moneys out of the Receivers' hands.'[39] Even the proclamations produced by Berthelet regarding taxation were 'distributed to all the commissioners of the assessment and collection' and required, 'immediate and numerous copies.'[40] Print relayed instructions about collection to officers. The urgency here was to get print to administrators, not to have it posted in marketplaces. What is seen by Kyle and others as news, served another purpose as the materials for governance. At the end of the seventeenth century, Edward Collier's oil paintings of letter racks depicted proclamations alongside royal speeches and newspapers. They were, Dror Wharman argues, resonant of an information age, where rammed, folded and crumpled proclamations formed part of a miscellany of news. This 'print 2.0' haemorrhaged out of newsstands and onto the painted canvas; however, it is essential to recognise the broader function of these sheets beyond these striking visual representations.[41]

Moreover, by the end of the period, this overlap with official news and instruction extended to newssheets. The *London Gazette* gave notices of tax collections and other aspects of government administration.[42] Introduced in 1665, the *Gazette* was an official government publication printed by the King's Printer.[43] Print

---

38 June 3 1670, William A. Shaw ed., *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1669-1672, Vol III, Part 1* (London: Printed for his Majesty's Stationary Office, By Mackie and Co. Ltd., 1904), 583-4.
39 May 20, 1668, William A. Shaw ed., *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1667-1668, Vol II* (London: Printed for his Majesty's Stationary Office, By Mackie and Co. Ltd., 1904), 325.
40 Elton, 'The Sessional Printing of Statutes, 1484-1547', 76.
41 Dror Wahrman, *Mr Collier's Letter Racks: a tale of art & illusion at the threshold of the modern information age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 19-29.
42 Glaisyer, 'The Most Universal Intelligencers', 263.
43 P. M. Handover, *A History of the London Gazette 1665-1965* (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1965), 11-12.

runs of this twice-weekly publication peaked at over 22,000 in 1695 and averaged almost 13,000 between 1695-1697.[44] It was a critical component in communicating government information and the day-to-day organization of tax collection Instead of giving comprehensive instruction about the collection of tax, the *Gazette* gave last minute amendments, reminders and timings, as well as reprimanding those who had not paid up. It was a conduit for official communication and saved the expense and hassle of printing and distributing separate sheets of instructions or orders. A transcript of a notice placed in an edition of the *London Gazette* in the Treasury Books read,

> ...the Receivers of the revenue in jointure to the late Queen Mother have neglected to bring in their accounts for the year ended at Michealmas last and are keeping the money in their hands and that if they do not forthwith bring in their accompts and the said money to Sir Henry Wood process will issue against them.[45]

This was not general news about the realm, but a specific notice for the attention of receivers. The speedy circulation of newssheets made them a valuable tool to relay information and unveiled threats to officers. Usually seen as a forerunner of newspapers that started to flood the market in the period, the *Gazette* was also a critical piece of print for the workings of the fiscal state.

Print, Money Raising and Revenue Collection before 1640

Having outlined the broadly communicative types of state print, this section turns to look at how print was used to solicit money on extraordinary occasions before the Civil War. It demonstrates that, whilst national levies remained a predominantly manuscript enterprise, particular forms of money raising started to make use of print and this begins to unpack the different ways print worked in fiscal administration. When the Crown commissioned print to extract money, it circulated to select audiences rather than nationwide. Print here was not a tool for reaching as

---

[44] For detailed analysis of print runs and costs from the later seventeenth century see, Glaisyer, 'The Most Universal Intelligencers', 257-260; Slack, 'Government and Information in Seventeenth-Century England', 60-61.

[45] March 29 1670, Shaw ed., *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1669-1672, Vol III, Part 1,* 395.

many people as possible, but a means to prescribe particular exchanges between select groups.

The employment of print for charitable briefs offers an early example of print used for extra-ordinary money raising. These collections were 'a regular and accepted feature of early modern parochial life.'[46] Ministers read briefs at Sunday service before churchwardens conducted collections in church and went door to door. They raised money for disasters, including fires and the rebuilding of churches and, as such, formed part of the 'welfare machinery' of early modern England.[47] Monarchs granted briefs by letters patent, and printed examples of these survive from the reign of James I.[48] The existence of printed briefs from this point undermines R. A. Houston's recent assertion that they only 'became common after 1660.'[49] He does cite large collections of both printed and manuscript briefs that establish their medieval origins, but they were printed much earlier than he suggests. As we can see from Figure 25, printed briefs were similar in form to proclamations, large sheets printed on one side with blackletter font and headed with the royal coat of arms. Read by ministers from pulpits, there was also an overlap in the way they worked. Charitable briefs relied on monarchical authority to grant the brief and the administrative structure of the Church to collect it. As detailed in Chapter One, some visitation articles included instructions for collecting and returning brief money. This was then a traditional method of money raising, which harnessed print to expedite the solicitation of monetary donations from churchgoers.

The nationwide charitable brief issued for the rebuilding of St. Paul's during the 1630s saw an extended use of print down the paperchains. In addition to the printed brief, printed receivers' receipts confirmed the revenue collected from each

---

[46] Jacob Field, 'Reactions and Responses to the Great Fire: London and England in the later seventeenth century' (unpublished PhD Thesis, Newcastle University, 2008), 185; see also Michael Harris, "Inky Blots and Rotten Parchment Bonds': London, Charity Briefs and the Guildhall Library', *Historical Research*, 66:159 (1993): 98-110; Cornelius Walford, 'King's Briefs: Their Purposes and History', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 10 (1882): 1-74.

[47] R. A. Houston, 'Church Briefs in England and Wales from Elizabethan Times to 1828', Huntington Library Quarterly, 78:3 (2015), 493.

[48] For a broader discussion of the early printing of briefs see Frances Maguire, 'The Power of the Ephemeral: Print, Record Making and Government in Seventeenth Century England' (MA thesis, University of York, 2013), Chapter 2.

[49] Ibid, 501.

area. The rebuilding of St. Paul's became a pet project of King Charles as an opportunity for regal display and was resonant of the broader Laudian drive to improve churches.[50] Charles ordered the repair and redesign of the entire west front of St. Pauls in 1634, hiring Inigo Jones for the design.[51] The King had originally set up a Royal Commission in 1631 to raise money for the repairs and issued printed order books to the commissioners to collect money.[52] When initial collections for St Paul's waned, Charles ordered county commissioners, in December 1633, to collect money from the rest of the country, and with it, commissioned another set of printed instructions.[53] It is from this date that receivers' receipts also survive. Commissioners had to record the amount collected from a certain area and send it back along with the money to London.[54] Printed pro forma became part of the administration of charitable collection. A completed receipt in State Papers from 1633 detailed a second payment from the Bishop of Chichester for thirty pounds.[55] The text of the receipt verified the cause and the authority of the commission for collection,

> …towards the repairing of the decays and ruines of the Cathedrall Chruch of St. Pauls in London and in beautifying the said Church according to the true intent and meaning of His Maiesties Commission by Letters Patent...

The receipt, signed by Edward Hodgson, clerk of Robert Bateman the Chamberlain of London, confirmed the amount returned. This was intra-institutional print, passed solely between receivers and collectors. There was no public function attached to these sheets. Rather than soliciting donations from churchgoers it coordinated the administrative effort required to collect and collate money from all corners of England.

---

50 Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992), 322-328.
51 Gordon Higgott, 'The Fabric to 1670' in *St. Paul's: the Cathedral Church of London, 604-2004*, ed. Derek Keene, Arthur Burns and Andrew Saint (London: Yale University Press, 2004), 178.
52 *His Maiesties commission giving powers to enquire of the decayes of the cathedral church of St. Paul in London* (London: Printed by Robert Barker, printer to the Kings most excellent Maiestie: and by the assignes of Iohn Bill, 1631), S101045.
53 *His Maiesties commission and further declaration: concerning the reparation of Saint Pauls Church* (London: Printed by Robert Barker, printer to the Kings most excellent Maiestie: and by the assignes of Iohn Bill, 1633), S101047.
54 Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I,* 323.
55 SP 16/534/2; There are two entries for these on the ESTC see, *'Received the [blank] day of [blank]…* (London: s.n., 1635?), S123597; *'Received the [blank] day of [blank]…* (London: s.n., 1633), S95035.

This employment of print in fiscal administration was limited. More or less contemporaneous to the collection for St. Pauls was the controversial levy of Ship Money. Introduced in 1634, this levy was met with varying levels of dissent and has been cited as a contributory factor to the outbreak of the Civil War.[56] Crucially, except for some printed collection warrants that the City printer produced in London, the paperwork of this levy was overwhelmingly manuscript.[57] Indeed, most national levies made no use of print to collect money. This was because of how they were collected. Assessors drew up lists of people and collectors went from parish to parish taking payment. Assessments and returns for Ship Money, as well as those drawn up for subsidies that Parliament granted between 1563 and 1663 and other levies were manuscript.[58] Moreover, much of the medieval procedure outlined by Clanchy, including the use of tally sticks and pipe rolls, still formed the cornerstones of accounting practice in central government.[59] Both central records and those produced by collectors attest to the fact that there was little print in the administration of nationwide taxation.

This was also the case for the collection of local taxes. The collection of parish rates similarly relied on handwritten records. Parish officers collected these throughout the year going door to door with account books settling up amounts due from property owners for poor relief and other costs borne by the parish. Despite increasing requirements for 'formal records' for things like poor relief that were separate from standard parish accounts, these were still manuscript.[60] This was the

---

56 M. D. Gordon, 'The Collection of the Ship-Money in the Reign of Charles I', *Transactions of the Royal Society*, 4 (1910): 141-162; Sir Pete Temple in charge of collecting the levy in Buckinghamshire was brought before the Privy Council for his neglect in delivering accounts to government see Richard Grenville, *Ship Money Papers and Richard Grenvilles Note-book*, ed. Carol Bonsey and J. G. Jenkins, Buckingham Record Society Publications, 13 (Welwyn Garden City: Buckinghamshire Record Society, 1965), 45; see also Herick Langelüddecke, "I fine all men and officers all soe unwiliing": the Collection of Ship Money, 1635-1640', *Journal of British Studies*, 46:3 (2007): 1007-1026.

57 Jenner, 'London', 304.

58 Roger Schofield, 'Taxation and the political limits of the Tudor state', 236; R. G. Lang ed., *Two Tudor subsidy assessment rolls for the city of London: 1541 and 1582*, London Record Society Publications, 29 (London: London Record Society, 1993), lxv; see also Roger Schofield, *Taxation Under the Early Tudors, 1485-1547* (Malden: Blackwell, 2004).

59 Clanchy, 126; Tony Moore, "Score it upon my Taille': The Use (and Abuse) of Tallies by the Medieval Exchequer', *Reading Medieval Studies*, 39 (2013): 1-18; Elizabeth Tebeaux, 'From Orality to Textuality in English Accounting and its Books, 1553-1680', *Journal of Business and Technical Communications*, 7 (1993): 322-359.

60 Steve Hindle, *On the Parish?: the micro politics of poor relief in rural England, 1550-1750* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004), 242.

typical experience of rate paying for the majority of the population. After a succession of harvest failures at the turn of the seventeenth century, the Norfolk village of Cawston developed a sophisticated bureaucratic response that included the drawing up of a series of lists recording those who needed grain, and distributing it equally.[61] Complex methods of accounting and record making made no use of print. This is echoed in Paul Griffiths' recent study of surveying techniques used in local government in early modern England, as he argues, 'numbering and listing were routine practices in 'paper parishes."[62] Therefore, in many areas, there was a paper state in the manner Burke described, but it was a manuscript paper state.[63]

Even though money raising was overwhelmingly scribal, there were examples of print being used to solicit money in the Jacobean and Caroline periods. This included privy seal loans letters that monarchs sent to wealthy individuals requesting money. Unlike Parliamentary taxation, these printed sheets constructed a direct relationship between the monarch and the person approached for money. For those who received them and gave money, the printed letter also became a record of their contribution. A good number of these letters used civilité, whilst others were in a generous form of italic that also resembled manuscript.[64] Like the administration bonds from the previous chapter the typography provided an element of personalisation and in this context, civilité replicated the aesthetic of a handwritten letter. These loans were extraordinary charges, which raised a one-off amount with the promise of repayment - although many went unpaid. The money supplemented other forms of taxation during periods of 'crisis', usually warfare. Whilst regularly commissioned under Tudor monarchs, it was under James I that such sheets were printed and on a number of occasions.[65] The STC categorised these as receipts, 'since

---

61 Susan Amussen, 'A Norfolk Village: Cawston 1595-1605', *History Today*, 4:36 (1986), 18.
62 Griffiths, 'Surveying the People', in *A Social History of England 1500-1750*, ed. Keith Wrightson, 44.
63 Burke, *A Social History of Knowledge: From Gutenberg to Diderot*, 119.
64 The following references to privy seal loans are in chronological order, SP 16/248/55, (1604); *James, by the grace of God…* (London: R. Barker, 1604?), S91982; SP Lansdowne 89/41 (1605); *By the King James. By the grace of god…* (London: R. Barker?, 1611), S3038, S120203; *By the king. Right trust &c. wee greet you well…* (London: R. Barker, 1613), S92128; *By the King. Trustie and welbeloved* (London: s.n., 1625), S124027, S3123; Bod. Lib. G. Pamph.1675(l) Privy seal loan from Charles I, 1626; *By the King. Right and trustie, et Wee greete you well…* (London: Bonham Norton and Iohn Bill?, 1627?), S122721; Huntington Library, STT, Account Box 55 (38) (1628); SP 16/248/55 (1633).
65 Roger Schofield, 'Taxation and the political limits of the Tudor state', in *Government Under the Tudors: Essays presented to Sir Geoffrey Elton,* ed. Claire Cross, David Loades and Jack Scarisbrick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 229.

their *function* was to bring in money for the Crown even though their *form* is that of a Circular Letter.'[66] This brief description fails to give any comprehensive analysis of how these sheets worked to extract money from their recipients.

The printed letter was a 'polite' request for money that constructed a personal relationship with the recipient. Upon his accession to the throne, Charles I issued the example in Figure 26 in 1625. It explained that the King was following previous practice in asking for money, 'this being the first time that We have required any thing in this kind.' It was, however, not the last and Charles issued several such loans within the first few years of his reign.[67] The letter asserted that the twenty pounds requested (written by hand in a specified blank space) was a sum 'which few men would deny a friend.' It was a loan levied by 'personal letters.'[68] Nonetheless, twenty pounds was a sizeable amount, which precluded asking most of the population, or their 'friends'. The letter went on to promise repayment within eighteen months, insisting that, 'this Privy Seale, which together with the Collectors acquittance, shalbe sufficient warrant unto the Officers of Our Receipt for the repayement thereof.' The authority and assumed credibility of government backed these requests. Moreover, the sheet itself acted as both a request for payment and an assurance of repayment. The lender kept the letter to claim back the amount borrowed at a later date. Therefore, it was an early type of 'paper credit', whereby individuals kept letters to get money back.[69] The printed sheet was a mechanism to both raise and repay money.

The circulation of printed privy seal loan letters challenges the association made between print and massification. In its earliest incarnations, print targeted select audiences to cultivate and solicit an elite group of readers and donors. As the Crown faced financial crises at the end of the 1620s, a forced loan levied on the general populace replaced privy seal loans.[70] The forced loan was collected in the

---

[66] Pollard and Redgrave, *A short-title catalogue of books printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of English books printed abroad: 1475-1640*, Vol 1, 408.
[67] *By the King. Trustie and welbeloved* (London: s.n., 1625), S124027, S3123; Bod. Lib. G. Pamph.1675(l) Privy seal loan from Charles I , 1626; *By the King. Right and trustie, et Wee greete you well…* (London: Bonham Norton and Iohn Bill?, 1627?), S122721; SP 16/248/55 (1633).
[68] Cust, *The Forced Loan and English Politics 1626-1628*, 2.
[69] Natasha Glaisyer, 'Calculating credibility: print culture, trust and economic figures in early eighteenth-century England', *Economic History Review*, 60:4 (2007), 687.
[70] Cust, *The Forced Loan and English Politics 1626-1628*, 2.

same way as the nationwide levies described previously: manuscript assessment lists and returns. Script replaced print. Counterintuitively, print was for targeting select groups, whereas nationwide levies relied on the writing skills of collectors. The collection of levies like the forced loan and Ship Money was on a regional basis, with officials appointed in each county to raise the levy. It was de-centralised collection. For the majority of these collectors, then, the absence of a nearby printing press inhibited the rapid uptake of print in administrative routine. Once we start to look at particular levies, we can see how methods of collection determined the uptake of print.

If we look closer to the centre, the Customs House, in London produced a large amount of print and had a dedicated printing press. There was an early and extensive use of print for indirect taxation, and this press ensured a continual output of print. Raven notes 'bills of entry… printed under licence from the early sixteenth century, were the basis for customs statistics and fiscal calculations.'[71] An amendment made to the Bill for regulating printing, in May 1662, shows the early and persistent presence of a press there,

> The list of entries passed at the Customs House at noon is immediately printed and delivered to the merchants and other by four o'clock the same day. This can only be done by the continuance of the printing press as it is now over the Custom House in Thames Street. A printer free of the City and of the Company of Stationers has always been employed in this business.[72]

The press was critical for the day-to-day running of the office and for communicating the latest facts and figures. It provided up-to-date information that was intrinsic to the success of commerce, producing price lists, bills of entry and other items.[73] Much like the receivers' receipts for St Pauls, the print produced at the Customs House was

---

[71] Raven, *Publishing Business in Eighteenth-Century England*, 94-95.

[72] 'Amendments and provisos to the Bill for regulating printing', 19 May 1662, in Donald McKenzie and Maureen Bell ed., *A Chronology and Calendar of Documents Relating to the London Book Trade, 1641-1700*, *Vol 1* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 485.

[73] John McCusker, 'The business press in England before 1775' *The Library*, 6th Ser., 8 (1986): 205-231; Idem, 'British commercial and financial journalism before 1800', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume 5, 1695-1830*, ed. Michael Suarez and Michael Turner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009): 448-465.

for the circulation of information and documentation between officers, as well as for merchants and traders, rather than for general distribution.

Financial Paperwork

Although only a fraction of the print produced at the Customs House has survived, it does confirm that not all print was public facing. An examination of 'fiscal print' in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries reveals how pre-printed forms and receipts were used to record financial transactions between various officials. While their circulation was certainly limited, printed pro forma accompanied the movement of money from different county receivers for rent and levies to the centre. The adoption of much of this print did not start in the central offices of the Crown, but with the work of administrators who operated semi-independently of the state. This section examines the print that bishops and fee farmers used in this capacity. In doing so, it shows that the collection receipts issued for the rebuilding of St. Pauls mentioned previously had an earlier precedent.

The earliest examples of these were pre-printed receipts several bishops commissioned for clerical taxation in the sixteenth century. The production of printed receipts was in response to the restructuring of clerical taxation after the break with Rome and the 1534 Act of First Fruits and Tenths, which imposed an annual payment on the clergy. The changes placed bishops in charge of rate collections within their diocese and prompted some of them to adopt print.[74] Surviving receipts from John Longland, Bishop of Lincoln, William Rugg, Bishop of Norwich and a number from Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London, show the use of printed receipts in different dioceses.[75] Other bishops besides these men, may also have commissioned printed

[74] Felicity Heal, 'Clerical Tax Collection Under the Tudors: The Influence of the Reformation', in *Continuity and Change: Personnel and Administration of the Church of England, 1500-1642*, ed. Rosemary O'Day and Felicity Heal (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1976): 97-122.

[75] Bod. Lib., Arch A.b.8, fol. 36, receipt of John Longland (1538); *Nouerint vniuersi per…,* [William Rugg] (London: J. Mayler?, 1542?), S92117; *Nouerint vniversi per presenten me Edmundu* [Bonner], London: s.n., 1541, S92123; (1543), S92118; *Nouerint vniversi per presents nos Edmundum* [Bonner], London: s.n., 1544, S92119; (1545), S92120, S92121; further receipts produced by Bonner are held in TNA E 135/8/43, f.2 (1545) f.3 (1546), f. 4 (1547).

receipts which have not survived.[76] What does survive shows, once again, that particular churchmen adopted print, as seen in the previous chapters. Rowan Watson argues that these 'printed receipts must join visitation articles and injunctions as material supplied by contract with printers.'[77] In form, the receipts resembled ecclesiastical indulgences, because of the blank 'windows' left in the printed text, to be filled in by hand.[78] Bishops modelled their receipts on an established precedent in ecclesiastical culture, whereby forms exchanged hands for money.

The format of these sheets confirms that they were individual commissions. One of Bonner's receipts combined two payments: annual rents and the subsidy. As Figure 27 shows, these receipts used blackletter typeface and were in Latin. Bishop Rugg's receipt was also for two taxes: the tenth and subsidy, wherein he incorporated brackets to encase the main body of the text on the right hand side - a technique used in accounting books.[79] This variation in format demonstrates that they were a product of 'individual initiative,' although one may have been modelled on another.[80] Arthur Slavin equates the changing format of Bonner's receipts to more efficient administration, emphasising the 'zeal in shaping a reliable system for levying taxes on the king's behalf' shown by the bishop.[81] In contrast to the 'clumsy' design and overly wordy receipt of Longland, the later Bonner receipts 'show rapid movement from experimentation toward perfection of a bureaucratic instrument.'[82] By incorporating extra blank spaces, Bonner masterminded the collections of two charges on the same receipt and, by 1547, the printed text was without scribal abbreviations.[83] Print may have brought efficient administration in one area, but the overall yield of subsidies decreased with inaccurate assessments that led to elites being under-assessed and by the end Elizabeth's reign the collection of subsidies was an 'openly acknowledged

---

76 Peter Blayney, *The Stationers' Company and the Printers of London, 1501-1557* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 435.
77 Rowan Watson, 'Some early printed receipts for clerical taxation', *Journal of Society of Archivists*, 6:2 (1978), 98; see also Ida Darlington, 'Some early printed forms', *Journal of Society of Archivists*, 3:10 (1969): 575-576.
78 Arthur Slavin, 'The Tudor Revolution and the Devil's Art: Bishop Bonner's Printed Forms' in *Tudor Rule and Revolution: Essays for G.R. Elton from his American Friends*, ed. Delloyd Guth and John McKenna (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1982), 7-9.
79 *Nouerint vniuersi per…,* [William Rugg] (London: J. Mayler?, 1542?), S92117
80 Slavin, 'The Tudor Revolution and the Devil's Art: Bishop Bonner's Printed Forms', 12.
81 Ibid, 14.
82 Ibid, 16 -17.
83 Ibid.

farce.'[84] Methods of assessment undermined any efficiencies brought about by the adoption of print.

What these receipts do demonstrate is the transfer of substantial amounts of money between institutions with pro forma. A lack of surviving accounts means it is impossible to gauge whether print was as a cost-effective alternative to the fees of clerks or scribes for drawing them up by hand, but what survives points to a concentrated distribution of print between officers. Slavin suggests print countered the problem of manuscript forgeries, due to the 'prohibitive cost of setting up a press in the interest of avoiding a small tax.'[85] This makes sense since receipts were not required in large numbers. One set of receipts, issued by Bonner, was for payments to the King from the St Laurence Poultney College, London, a chantry with ample land. When dissolved as a result of the Chantries Act in 1547, it had an estimated income of £79 17s. 10d.[86] Similarly, the 1542 receipt from William Rugg was for a considerable sum.[87] There was a select circulation of this print between landowners and bishops and the Crown.

Fee farmers also used receipts to record the movement of money from periphery to centre from the early seventeenth century. Fee farming involved the sale of revenue collections from royal lands to private collectors. In return for a lump sum, private collectors took over rent collection and kept a proportion of the money raised. In effect, the Crown privatised rent collection. By selling off revenue collection in this way, the Crown raised much-needed cash.[88] This began in 1555 and increased throughout the period to encompass more and more avenues of revenue besides rent. Successive monarchs eagerly adopted farming, as it provided 'a means by which the Crown could have its capital and keep its income whilst shedding its responsibility for repairs.'[89] Ultimately, however, fee farming contributed to the depletion of the

---

84 Schofield, 'Taxation and the political limits of the Tudor state', 243.
85 Arthur Slavin, 'The Gutenberg Galaxy and the Tudor Revolution', in *Print and Culture in the Renaissance: essays on the advent of printing in Europe*, ed. Gerald Taylor and Sylvia Wagonheim (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1986), 101.
86 'Colleges: St Laurence Pountney', in William Page ed., *A Victoria History of the County of London: Vol 1, London Within the Bars, Westminster and Southwark* (London: Constable, 1909), 574-576.
87 *Nouerint vniuersi per…* (London: J. Mayler?, 1542?), S92117.
88 Braddick, *The Nerves of the State: Taxation and the Financing of the English State, 1558-1714*, 36.
89 Hoyle, *The Estates of the English crown, 1558-1640*, 28.

Crown's finances. Selling off revenue collection achieved short-term financial gain at the expense of long-term financial security. Importantly, printed receipts were used in this instance to coordinate private collection with state accounts.

Print acted as a check and balance between different arms of the state. The receipts declared the amounts farmers collected from particular estates and returned alongside the money. Some of the earliest printed receipts on the ESTC are for rent from Crown lands, where fee farmers had purchased the sold-off revenue. There are a number of examples produced almost yearly between 1601 and 1620.[90] Another surviving example, from 1601, combined payments for the tenth and subsidy and suggests these receipts copied those produced previously by bishops.[91] Again, these receipts constructed a particular 'textual community', between county receivers and central offices. Receipts provided the paper trail for the Crown to check what was collected, so that they could take their cut. Fee farmers were on commission, getting a percentage of the tax amassed, and had to demonstrate what they collected and recorded. As the summons in Figure 24 detailed, fee farmers had, intermittently to give all records of their collection over to auditors for inspection. The printed receipts had to match up to the farmers' accounts. In this instance privatisation precipitated the uptake of print. This was less to do with the growth of the state and more to do with its dilution from the centre. The changing nature of fiscal administration initiated new forms of print to keep track of where the money was.

Receivers' receipts held in State Papers show the return of this print to central government. These varied in appearance. For instance, a receipt returned in 1636 for ten shillings rent on a King's tenement was in civilité type, while a 1638 receipt from the deputy receiver for the county of Lancaster, for rents for ten pounds, was in roman type.[92] As we shall see these receipts increased perceptibly in the Civil War years, but it is important to note their existence before this.[93] Other types of revenue

---

90 *[Blank] Debet supercomum…* (London: s.n., 1601?), S92125; *Debet super computum suum determinatum,* (London: s.n, 1603?), S96028; (1605), S477949; (1607?), S477951; (1609), S477945; (1611?), S477953; (1612), S477948; (1614?), S477952; (1615), S92126; (1616?), S477947; (1618?), S477942; (1619?), S92127;(1620?), S477944.

91 *[ ] die mensis [ ] Anno* (London: s.n., 1601), S92122; (1602), S92124.

92 SP46/77/91; SP 16/538/42.

93 SP 46/82 has 17 printed receipts for rents between 1642 and 1644 all in either roman or civilité.

also provide examples of print pro forma returned to central government along with the revenue collected. Land tax records include printed receipts dating from 1637. These are filed alongside manuscript versions that have 'Dorset' or 'Somerset' printed in the top left hand corner, suggesting that sets of receipts were printed for specific areas to help with administration.[94] Therefore, certain types of revenue employed print to move money from periphery to centre. This extends the circulation of print between institutions we saw with the bishops.

Corresponding receipts in provincial accounts reveals that revenue collectors also gave receipts to those who paid the rents. The wider distribution of receipts will be explored further in the next chapter, but some examples here show that print passed from collectors to local institutions and landholders. For example, livery company records hold similar receipts for rents paid on Crown lands, as well as summonses.[95] The estate papers of the Finch Hatton family, Earls of Winchilsea and Nottingham, also hold three receipts that fee farmers issued in 1647.[96] As shown in Figure 28, these receipts had different typefaces, exemplifying the numerous print runs the material went through. Again, the distribution of this material was limited to landowners, including local institutions with considerable estates.

A set of receipts in the York Chamberlain's accounts from the Restoration shows how the receipts received from different collectors helped construct the accounts of local authorities. The receipts were for rents the City Corporation paid on Crown lands. Although revenue from Crown lands was 'extraneous to the tax system', these revenues were sold off to fee farms in the 1650s.[97] Charles II declared these sales void and orchestrated the full recovery of the crown lands and rents.[98] Local government officers for the Receiver General then collected them and, again, sent

94 TNA, LR 11/36/489; there is also a sheet of unfilled and uncut land tax receipts from the Restoration in LR 5/47.
95 There is a printed summons for rent arrears on royal lands from 1640 in the records of the Broderers Company, see GL MS 14675.
96 NRO, Finch Hatton Manuscripts, FH/D/B/A/2065 a-c.
97 Chandaman, *The English Public Revenue, 1660-88*, 113-115.
98 Ibid, 111.

corresponding receipts back to the State Paper office.[99] The Chamberlain's account books in York contain several sets of printed receipts issued to successive Lord Mayors, from 1664 onwards, for rent on various Crown Lands.[100] Rents were paid at six monthly intervals, at customary days of rate collection, and, in accordance, receipts had either the Feast of the Annunciation (25th March) or the Feast of St. Michael (29th September) incorporated into the printed text.[101] One distributor of printed receipts was Thomas Bland, the receiver general for Yorkshire. He commonly gave six receipts for rent payments on six pieces of land, although the account books only record the cumulative sum paid, 'Thomas Bland the Kings Steward for severall fee farm rents, 6:16:10.'[102] The written accounts condensed the sums from six receipts into one overall payment, demonstrating the transfer of information from printed scrap to institutional accounts.

Different collectors had their own receipts. George Rigden collected alongside Bland. Three receipts Ridgen issued in 1668 were all on the same uncut sheet. Each printed template gave details of a separate rent. Evidently, he saw no need to cut up each individual receipt when they were going to the same place. Rigden's receipts differed in format to Bland's. The printed text of one receipt from 1679 stated that it was 'fee-farm rent, due to Henry Guy Esq.' In need of money to fund the Dutch War, the Crown sold rents off to fee farms again in 1670. This receipt located payment to a particular person and their fee farm. Appointed as receiver-general of fee-farm arrears in 1677, Henry Guy installed a similar method of checking farmers' receipts.[103] Brewer suggests this was an innovation of the Excise in the 1670s, whereby 'commissioners carefully monitored the farmers' receipts in order to ensure the state shared any increase in revenue.'[104] However, the numerous examples cited

---

[99] SP 29/99/71, Receipt by E. Lewis, sub-collector from Sir Thomas Shirley, June 14th, 1664; SP 29/449/94, Account by Nicholas Spackman deputy auditor for money due for Royal Aid from Skidby Manor in the county of York, 1665.

[100] For discussion of the city corporation see Phil Withington, 'Views from the Bridge: Revolution and Restoration in Seventeenth-Century York', *Past and Present*, 170 (2001): 121-151.

[101] York City Archives (YCA), Chamberlains accounts, Y/FIN/1/2/25; Y/FIN/1/2/26.

[102] YCA, Chamberlains accounts Y/FIN/1/2/26, 1672, April 30, f.23.

[103] A. A. Hanham, 'Guy, Henry (*bap.* 1631, *d.* 1711)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11798, accessed 10 April 2017].

[104] Brewer, 93.

in this section from State Papers and elsewhere show this procedure began much earlier and away from the Excise.

War and Taxes

The Civil War prompted a dramatic increase of print for both demanding and collecting money. Although Parliament only started printing in 1641, the sheer number of publications that Sheila Lambert catalogued attests to the speedy adoption of print and in volume. Although exact figures are unknown, she suggests, 'each issue of a paper of any consequence can assumed to be 1,500 copies so four variants indicates an edition of 6,000 and this is the number we know Parliament ordered on several occasions during the civil war.'[105] Of course, this proliferation of print was not restricted to Parliament. The substantial collection of pamphlets and newspapers in the Thomason Tracts at the British Library is indicative of the volume of ephemeral print produced in response to the political and religious turmoil of the period.[106] The concentration of scholars on such collections has ensured that discussions of Civil War print culture focus on this narrow corpus of material.[107] Alongside his discussion of print as a form of political participation, Peacey makes a passing comment that print also served, 'as an organizational tool' during this period.[108] This section looks in detail at this type of material and reveals the significant amount of print both Royalists and Parliamentarians commissioned to solicit and collect money to fund their campaigns. It is evident that print played a significant role in generating the funds required to wage war.

Print was used in the administration of a flurry of new rates and levies imposed in the Civil Wars and continued in the Interregnum. The print people received in exchange for payments will be the subject of the next chapter. Here, the focus is on print in the paperchains of administration that demanded money and

---

[105] Lambert, 'Printing for Parliament, 1641-1700', viii.
[106] On the construction of this collection of print see Michael Mendle, 'George Thomason's Intentions', in *Libraries within the Library: the origins of the British Library's printed collections*, ed. Giles Mandlebrote and Barry Taylor (London: British Library, 2009): 171-186.
[107] Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain;* Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*; Jason McElligott, '1641', in *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture*, ed. Joad Raymond: 599-608.
[108] Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution,* 13.

recorded the amounts received. It is not immediately apparent why there was such an increase of print in fiscal administration. Was it a need for speed to get money quickly and keep campaigns afloat? Alternatively, did more centralised government initiate more print as traditional government structures fractured? Or was the increase in print the result of other influences? It may well have been a combination of various factors.

The taxes levied during the Civil War instigated new forms of weekly and monthly assessments on all but the very poorest. A 'bewildering' number of levies imposed on Londoners by Parliamentarians exploited all avenues to exact revenue from citizens and harnessed the printing press to do so.[109] The same went for the rest of the country. Along with undeveloped bureaucratic systems for collection, Braddick emphasises the significant burden these assessments placed on various counties unable to keep up with the constant demands for money to fund warfare.[110] These were not the annual collections of rents or subsidies, but direct taxes to provide ready cash and equipment for increasingly exhausted armies. Printed instructions sent to county officers outlined the amount of money required and how to collect it.[111] Loans were critical to campaigns, although what began as lending on 'public faith' increasingly 'transformed into taxation.'[112] In response to disappointing yields, from 1642 onwards Parliamentarians started arresting those unwilling to pay.[113] Weekly assessments imposed by Parliament in 1643 and replaced, from 1644 onwards, with monthly assessments demonstrate not only the burden on people, but also the extensive administrative effort involved in collection. Print was not just used to pronounce levies, but also to collect them.

Early requests for money from Royalists were modelled on privy seal loans discussed previously. A request issued in 1642 by William Cavendish, the Duke of Newcastle, for contributions to the royalist army in Yorkshire, used the same format

---

[109] Ben Coates, *The Impact of the Civil War on the Economy of London* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 22-23.
[110] Braddick, *Parliamentary Taxation in 17th-centruy England*, Chapter 3.
[111] Ann Hughes, "The Accounts of the Kingdom': Memory, Community and the English Civil War', *Past and Present*, 230, supplement 11 (2016), 315.
[112] Coates, *The Impact of the Civil War on the Economy of London*, 59.
[113] Ibid, 54-58.

and construction as those personalised requests for money (Figure 29).[114] Like privy seal loans, it had the 'material rhetoric' of a letter.[115] As Figure 29 makes evident the sheet has folds and a handwritten address on the back that demonstrates its circulation as a letter. It has the characteristics of a manuscript letter, but it was printed and was a financial instrument. The italic typeface, again offered the semblance of amiable correspondence. Newcastle's name imprinted at the end, separate from the main body of the text, stood in for a handwritten signature. Like the Privy Loan, the letters overlaid the request for money with polite rhetoric and an appeal to self-interest. The text declared the recipient to be a,

> Man of sufficient ability and therefore fit to contribute a reasonable summe to the maintaining of the Forces which are here ready for the Defence of the Country, and safety of your selfe and estate

A contribution to the Royalists was a contribution towards the individual's security. Leaving a blank space to specify the amount requested suggests that each letter tailored the amount to match the wealth of its intended recipient. It also stated the amount payable was 'by directions of the Committee for this purpose named and residing at York.' Regional collections aided speedy collection. From the backdated bill of Lichfield in Oxford mentioned previously, we know the Royalists printed in volume and this sheet shows the type of print produced. There was an explicit overlap with the pre-war methods of money raising monarchs employed and this was also perceptible in the adoption of charitable briefs.

Royalists also manipulated the traditional mechanisms of charitable collection discussed earlier. From 1643 onwards, Charles ordered charitable briefs to garner collections for military personnel. Legislation in 1593 had established compulsory provision for soldiers, but the committee for sick and maimed soldiers, reformed in 1643, introduced a more vigorous administrative campaign, harnessing the model of charitable briefs.[116] Again, print was apparent at each stage of administration, from

---

[114] Bod. Lib., G.S Pamph.1675(l). A printed letter from William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle, requiring contributions for the army in Yorkshire. 1642.
[115] James Daybell, *The Material Letter in Early Modern England: manuscript letters and the culture and practices of letter-writing, 1512-1635* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 2.
[116] Geoffrey Hudson, 'Disabled Veterans and the State in Early Modern England' in *Disabled Veterans in History*, ed. David Gerber (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000), 112 and 122.

the notices of collection to the receipts issued to churchwardens for donations. These printed briefs differed in both form and content from the large sheets carrying coats of arms which were discussed earlier. Announcements of collections did away with the lengthy preamble and other official motifs seen in the charitable brief in Figure 25. Rather than worthy causes legitimated by the Crown, this was a means to raise money and equipment quickly. Collections merged with tax collection and the frequency of collections saw a sustained uptake of print, scrappier and less polite than previous letters patent. The format of these sheets reflected the hasty administration of the charitable collection. In 1643 and 1644, these printed circulars became monthly, relaying details of where collections would take place and what was required (Figure 30).[117] Some asked for monetary contributions, whilst others asked for donations of linen and wool, the want of which 'keepes back the cure of their wounds and sicknesses.' Print was instrumental to the escalation of coercion.

The coordination of collections with public fast days illustrates how printed sheet and habitual custom reinforced one another. In addition to instilling 'a sense of 'humiliation' and an 'awareness of the insignificance and unworthiness of mankind when compared to God', the 85 fast days held between February 1642 and February 1649, which peaked in 1645, were also a convenient gathering of people from whom to extract money.[118] Prior to this, fast days for plague in 1625 coincided with collections, and, during the Elizabethan period, fasts were 'forms of political action', accompanied by an array of specially printed material, including special prayers and liturgies.[119] Civil War collections continued a tradition of fasting and collection that was coordinated via print. A number of entries in City printing accounts suggest the circulation of this print was restricted to capital.[120] Narratives of distress and relief echoed down these paperchains. Printed receivers' receipts noted payment for 'the sick and maimed Souldiers and Widdowes which lost their Husbands in the King and

[117] LMA, P92/SAV/1898-1951 contains seven of these circular letters from 1644; there is another from 1643 printed in Oxford held at Bod. Lib., MS Rawlinson D, Vol.399 f.207.
[118] Christopher Durston, "For the Better Humiliation of the People': Public Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving During the English Revolution', *The Seventeenth Century*, 7:2 (1992), 133-134; Lucy Bates, *Nationwide Fast and Thanksgiving Days in England, 1640-1660* (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Durham, 2012).
[119] Mears, 'Public Worship and Political Participation in Elizabethan England', 6; See also Mears, 'Brought to Book: Purchases of Special Forms of Prayers in English Parishes, 1558-1640'.
[120] LMA, Chamber Accounts 69, City Cash 1/5 f. 163 1643-44.

Parliaments service.'[121] They repeated the original printed announcements of collections referencing the 'sick and maimed soldiers' in the text. Notices also warned churchwardens that failure to deliver 'would tender his Maiesties high displeasure, and will answer to the contrary at your perils.' These were not neutral bureaucratic documents, but constructed a narrative of events that highlighted the urgency for collections.[122] The types of print produced, as well as its content, provide another example of how print elicited donations and was part of the wider administrative effort of both sides in the Civil War.

The print both Royalists and Parliamentarians used to demand money drew people into particular textual communities. In this way, printed demands in their various forms compare with the tracts focused on by Peacey and John Walter's recent examination of oaths.[123] Printed demands mustered contributions and some semblance of political participation. They must, therefore, be situated in 'the contours of early modern political culture' in the way Walter attempts.[124] The Haberdashers Company received a printed slip recording their contribution of £5,500 to Parliament, in 1642, from the Chamberlain's office.[125] The slip confirmed that it was,

> ... toward the somme of one hundred thousand pounds, promised on Friday the third day of June, 1642 at a generall assembly of all the Liverie of the severall Companies of the said Citie, to be lent by the Citizens of London for one yeare for and towards the relief and preservation of the Realm of Ireland

Parliamentary printed slips drew groups together via monetary contribution in a similar fashion to the printed sheets produced by Royalists. Although Walter and Peacey provide helpful ways for thinking about print and its role in nascent nation

---

[121] LMA, P92/SAV/1898-1951; Eric Gruber von Arni, *Justice to the Maimed Soldier: Nursing, Medical Care and Welfare for Sick and Wounded Soldiers and their Families during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum 1642-1660*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001); similar receipts were also issued after the great fire of London, for an example see Museum of London, A13271 http://collections.museumoflondon.org.uk/online/object/119389.html; for examination of London fire briefs see Jacob Field, 'Charitable giving and its distribution to Londoners after the Great Fire, 1666-76', *Urban History*, 38:1 (2011): 3-23.

[122] For discussion of administrative documents and neutrality see Hull, 'Documents and Bureaucracy', 267.

[123] John Walter, *Covenanting Citizens: The Protestation Oath and Popular Political Culture in the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017)

[124] Ibid, 6.

[125] Ian Archer, *The History of the Haberdashers' Company* (Chichester: Phillmore, 1991), 90, Fig.21.

building, we must understand the specific ways in which this print worked in Civil War money raising.

Whilst loans were ostensibly voluntary to begin with, printed notices and assessments demanded attendance and speedy delivery relaying strict instructions about payment. The Committee for the Advance for Money, operational between 1642 and 1656, collected loans, which eventually became compulsory assessments. In the 1650s, this committee was also in charge of sequestering land from Royalists. Only handfuls of the printed demands issued to individuals survive, but they do reveal the substantial and sustained use of print to raise contributions.[126] A notice served in 1645 to Thomas Townsend of St. Andrew-by-the-Wardrobe gave 'notice, that by vertue of an Ordinance if the 2 of December last you are assessed to lend the sum of…'[127] This was coercive, not charitable lending. The sum was payable to collectors at the Goldsmiths Hall, 'within eight dayes after the date of this ticket.' Collections took place at several livery company halls and printed slips notified citizens when and where to return money.[128] Subsequent pro forma ordered the seizure of goods belonging to those who ignored the demands.[129] Townsend's notice warned that, if he ignored the ticket, 'you shall forfeit for every day after the said eighth the twentieth part of the summe so Assessed, And shall likewise pay two shillings in every pound over and above to the Collectors.' The longer he took, the more he had to pay. A similar notice issued in 1644 to a John Knowe, demanding ten pounds, offered the sweetener that, 'those who shall willingly lend are first to be repaid' and assured him that upon giving his donation to the collector, 'whose Acquittance (being subsigned and entred as is directed) shall bee sufficient for you to receive the said summe…'[130] This pro forma informed individuals of their required contribution to the war effort and outlined the terms and conditions and any chance

[126] NRO, FH/D/E/A/3998, Christopher Hatton's assessment for £2000 by Commissioner for Advance of Money; *By the commissioner of the advance of money…* (London: s.n, 1651), R234393.
[127] SP 16/507/60.
[128] There was an order to appear at the Weavers' hall see *You are hereby required…* (London, s.n., 1645?) R219639; see also orders to appear at the Stationers' Hall in (1644), R11952, R11903; orders to appear at Haberdashers Hall (1644), R475279 (1643), R228141 (1645), R228149 (1645) R228148.
[129] *At the committee for Lords and Commons for advance of money…* (London: s.n., 1646?), R225045; see also Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution,* 334-335.
[130] SP 16/501/137. Printed form filled in for John Knowe of Down, 1644.

they had of reimbursement.[131] Print materialised the demands and unveiled threats of Parliament.

These demands extended to horses, hardware and soft furnishings, as well as money. One set of pro forma, c.1642, recorded donations of money and silver plate.[132] Furthermore, in 1648 a warrant was issued to the master and wardens of the Merchant Taylors for, '[6] Flock beds, [6] Boulster [6] pair of Blankets, and one Coverlet for each bed, and all sufficiently large for to lodge two men in a bed with a Mat to every bed.'[133] This was part of a collection that actually took place at the Merchant Taylors' own hall. Aside from cash, the administrative apparatus of the parliamentary campaign required the material needed to clothe and keep an army. A later, printed pro forma issued by the committee for the militia to Edwin Rich in 1651 worked as both a receipt of loan and record of its return. The top half of the document detailed his payment of twenty pounds to provide '[one] Horse, Armes, and Furniture, and for a months pay for the rider', the second half of the sheet recorded delivery back to Rich, 'Horse, Armes and Furniture valued at [twelve pounds twelve shillings]...'[134] Horses were in short supply and, at times, seized for the army.[135] Rich got some of his money back, but most loans went unpaid. These examples make evident the various types of printed forms issued to meet the disparate requirements of an army and its men. This went beyond announcement print, like proclamations, and serves to show the print people received as Royalists and Parliamentarians sought to extract money.

In addition to print flowing outwards to extort money, it was also used extensively to record the money raised. There was an increasing use of print in systems of receivership during the Civil War that developed from the receivers' receipts discussed previously. Stallybrass cites a set of parliamentary receipts in State

---

131 On the use of soldiers to reinforce tax collection in Westminster see, Julia Merritt, *Westminster 1640-60: A royal city in a time of revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), 57.
132 SP 16/492/105 and for corresponding printed receipt SP 16/491/26.
133 GL, MS 34104 f.46. Merchant Taylors Miscellaneous Papers 1575-1837.
134 Folger Digital Image collection, 'Receipt for £20 from the Committee for the Militia of London to Edwin Rich, Esq', Source call No. X. d. 451 (18), accessed April 14th 2016. http://luna.folger.edu/luna/servlet/detail/FOLGERCM1~6~6~692961~148175:Receipt-for-£20-from-the-Committee-?qvq=q:Edwin%2Brich%2Bmilitia&mi=0&trs=2
135 Merritt, *Westminster 1640-60,* 57.

Papers as evidence that pro forma were a regular feature of office routine in the 1650s.[136] This requires some qualification, both in relation to the function of these sheets and the extent of print. He refers to the file SP 28/296, which holds acquittances to accounts of receivers' assessments.[137] These acquittances, were receivers' receipts that confirmed the amount collected in a specific area, like the fee farm receipts. Going through the file systematically reveals the scale of print in paperwork. In total, there are 616 legible receipts in the file, alongside numerous fragments. Of the 616 receipts, 288 are manuscript and 328 are printed. Therefore, as Stallybrass suggests, there was a substantial amount of print used in office administration, but the use of print was not comprehensive and, in this instance, only just outnumbered manuscript receipts. The file includes receipts for every year from 1642 to 1661 for a large range of levies. Section 1 of the Printed Primary Sources in the bibliography of this thesis provides a full list of the printed documents found. It is difficult to know the number of levies these receipts refer to because the wording of sheets varied between print runs. Therefore, pro forma that varied considerably in format and content could have been for the same levy. However, the volume of print in these files attests to the significant amount of print in systems of receivership for the numerous assessments imposed during the Civil War.

This was print for internal administration and used on a much larger scale than anything seen previously. In his examination of tax collection under Cromwell's major generals, Durston notes printed receipts to receivers in one county.[138] This file reveals a much wider use of print, but requires further elucidation than Stallybrass attempted. Some pro forma were county-specific, while others were generic forms suitable for all collectors. Returned to Parliament, they highlight the significant amount of pro forma that passed between officers and Parliament in relation to a bewildering array of levies. Moreover, this is just one volume, and there are a further five volumes in this single reference, each with numerous parts. There are also

---

[136] SP 28/296; Peter Stallybrass, 'Ephemeral Matter', conference paper given at CRASSH conference, *Ephemerality and Durability in Early-Modern Visual and Material Culture,* Cambridge University (24-25 May 2013)

[137] For discussion of SP 28 and Civil War tax collection see Hughes, "The Accounts of the Kingdom': Memory, Community and the English Civil War', 315.

[138] Christopher Durston, *Cromwell's Major Generals: godly governance during the English Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 99.

several other files in SP 28 with revenue collection material and miscellaneous receipts.[139] Undoubtedly, further work is needed here and it is likely it would uncover more print in mechanisms of collection. This print enabled clerks to tally the money received, and identify where it had come from and what debts were still outstanding. The volume of print found here reinforces the fact that existing formulations of Civil War print culture have overlooked a significant corpus of print circulating between county officers and London.

In part, this is because surviving accounts from printing houses during the Civil War period, which scholars have cited, do not capture the variety of print in the paperchains of tax collection. The backdated bill paid to Litchfield's widow gave no details of expenditure. This is also the case for other printing accounts. Printing in Scotland, the 'Inventory of Worke done for the State By Evan Tyler his Majesties Printer', beginning in 1642, listed a range of jobs, including proclamations, Acts of Parliament and Letters from the King that Peacey detailed.[140] It also has four entries for printing blank bonds in relation to warrants and loans of money.[141] However, there are no surviving accounts that refer to any of the material found in SP 28. It is by combining an examination of accounts with an analysis of surviving print in various institutional repositories that we start to get a sense of the full scale of print circulated for fiscal administration in these turbulent years. Critically, it demonstrates the wider adoption of print for methods of money raising and receivership that were intrinsic to the coordination of resources during this period. Some of these items, such as the printed letters and demands for money, extend understandings of popular political engagement outlined by Peacey and Walter. However, the receivers' receipts in SP 28 show a very different print culture at work - one that does not fit into ideas of print as a tool of political participation. It was not about conscience raising, it was about raising cash.

[139] SP 28/293-97 are all Collectors' and Receivers' accounts.
[140] Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution,* 244.
[141] National Archives of Scotland, PA 15/2 Evan Tyler Accounts.

The Paperchains of Hearth Tax

In order to see how far the developments of the 1640s and 1650s continued, this section maps print in hearth tax administration. This provides a case study of how print was used in the collection of a new levy imposed at the end of the period. Introduced in 1662, hearth money was 'the one new tax introduced in the Restoration financial settlement' to bolster the coffers of the King.[142] In contrast to the Excise, hearth tax was a levy mired in administrative problems and met with local resistance.[143] Although there are all kinds of gaps in the records and, frustratingly, no accounts detailing expenditure on printing, reconstructing the paperchains of hearth tax reveals the flow of printed pro forma in to and out of state offices. This contrasts markedly from nationwide levies, such as Ship Money collected a few decades previously. There was an extensive use of print encompassing instructions, announcements, exemptions and, as the next chapter will explore, receipts. This section shows that the notion that 1670 was a key turning point in the use of print for bureaucracy efficiency in this area is, at the very least, overstated.

Hearth tax shifted administration between government control and fee farm. This shaped the use of print. It was a direct tax of one shilling on each hearth in a house. During the twenty-seven years hearth tax was levied, its collection changed hands numerous times.[144] The administration switched from Sheriffs (1662-64) to Receivers (1664-65), Sub-farmers acting as receivers (1666), Farmers (1666-69), Receivers (1669-74), Farmers (1674-84) and Commissioners (1684-89).[145] In all, fifty-four collections took place between 1662 and 1689. Unsurprisingly, because the collection switched between government office and fee farm, the record survival is uneven and largely from years of government control.

---

[142] Chandaman, 77.
[143] Braddick, *Parliamentary Taxation in 17th Century England*, 268-269.
[144] For an account of the troubled administration of hearth tax in a particular area see, Stephen Timmons, 'The Hearth Tax and Finance in the West Country, 1662-92', in *Money, Power, and Print: Interdisciplinary Studies on the Financial Revolution in the British Isles*, ed. Charles McGrath and Christopher Fauske (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004): 51-69.
[145] 'The Hearth Tax: A Census for the Seventeenth Century?', accessed from The National Archives: https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/cat-day-3-hearth-tax.pdf

Hearth tax assessment lists have been widely used by scholars of the late seventeenth century.[146] These lists are the closest the early modern period had to a census, as they gave details of the population parish by parish. The only other comparable set of data would be the records of the Marriage Duty Act of 1695.[147] As such, hearth tax lists were a goldmine of information for the emerging field of political arithmetic at the end of the seventeenth century. Men such as Gregory King and Charles Davenant extracted data from the lists to make wider speculations on the wealth of the country, as part of a grander scheme to transform government by taking a mathematical approach to policy formation.[148] Equally, historians have coveted these lists. The Hearth Tax Project transcribed these records by region and transformed the data into a myriad of maps and tables, demonstrating the quantitative applications of this information to trace wealth and demographic change.[149] These lists did not just provide a snapshot of demographic makeup; the updating of lists by collectors allows the tracking of people and places over time. Therefore, scholars draw on these lists in studies of everything from family structure

---

[146] For a detailed account of how assessment lists were constructed see Tom Arkell, 'Printed Instructions for administering the Hearth Tax', *Surveying the People: The interpretation and use of document sources for the study of population in the later seventeenth century,* ed. Tom Arkell and Kevin Schurer (Oxford: Leopard's Head Press, 2000): 39-64.

[147] Jeremy Boulton, 'The Marriage Duty Act and parochial administration in London, 1695-1706' in *The interpretation and use of document sources for the study of population in the later seventeenth century,* ed. Tom Arkell and Kevin Schurer,: 222-252.

[148] Slack, 'Government and Information in Seventeenth-Century England', 37; see also Peter Buck, 'Seventeenth-Century Political Arithmetic: Civil Strife and Vital Statistics', *Isis*, 68:1 (1977): 67-84; Ted McCormick, *William Petty and the ambition of political arithmetic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

[149] Catherine Ferguson, Christopher Thornton and Andrew Wareham ed. *Essex Hearth Tax Return: Michaelmas 1670,* Index Library 127 (London: British Record Society, 2012); Tom Arkell, and N. W. Alcock ed., *Warwickshire Hearth Tax Returns*: *Michaelmas 1670, with Coventry Lady Day 1666*, Index Library 126 (Stratford-upon-Avon: Dugdale Society; London: British Record Society, 2010); Colin Phillips, and Catherine Ferguson and Andrew Wareham ed., *Westmorland Hearth Tax: Michaelmas 1670 & survey 1674-5*, Index Library 124 (Carlisle: Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society; London: British Record Society, 2008); David Hey, et al. ed., *Yorkshire West Riding Hearth Tax Assessment Lady Day 1672*, Index Library 121 (London: British Record Society, 2007); Adrian Green, and Elizabeth Parkinson and Margaret Spufford ed., *County Durham Hearth Tax Assessment* Lady Day 1666, Index Library, 119 (London: British Record Society, 2006); Peter Seamen and John Pound and Robert Smith ed., N*orfolk Hearth Tax Exemption Certificates 1670-1674: Norwich, Great Yarmouth, King's Lynn and Thetford,* Index Library 117 (Norwich: Norfolk Record Society, London: British Record Society, 2001); Duncan Harrignton and Sarah Pearson and Susan Rose ed., *Kent Hearth Tax Assessment Lady Day 1664*, Index Library 116 (Kent: Kent Archaeological Society; London, British Record Society, 2000); Nesta Evans and Susan Rose ed., *Cambridgeshire Hearth Tax Returns Michaelmas 1664*, Index Library 115 (Cambridge: Cambridgeshire Record Society; London, British Record Society, 2000).

to the changing fortunes of the populace.[150] There has been some work on hearth tax administration as Tom Arkell has provided an insightful account of the swathes of paperwork produced.[151] However, there is no substantial analysis of the role print played in the paperchains of hearth tax.

A range of print was commissioned, produced and circulated in the administration of hearth tax. Figure 31 illustrates, diagrammatically, the different types of documents printed for hearth tax collection. The diagram shows the distribution of receipts, collection notices, proclamations and instruction booklets outwards, and that exemption certificates went out, were filled in and returned to Westminster. The majority of print produced, therefore, stayed with officers or passed on to the wider populace. Figure 31 also highlights the various 'office holders' that interacted with printed documents, filling them in, signing and sending them on. It does not concern itself with the various versions of these documents, such as the three editions of instructions produced, or the series of administrative regimes put in charge of its collection. Rather, it traces the general flow of print out of offices and, reveals the extent to which fiscal print passed through many hands. This section examines instruction booklets, exemption certificates and collection notices in turn to locate and situate each of these documents in tax collection.

Instruction booklets were sent out to collectors and each edition communicated changes in the collection of the tax. That there was substantial printing of instruction booklets points to the expanding use of print much further down the social scale than items such books of orders, but not as far down the social scale as visitation articles delivered to churchwardens. The series of instruction booklets issued to collectors of the hearth tax in, 1664, 1672 and 1684 offered a 'well meant but muddled manual.'[152] They gave details of how to construct the assessment lists of those chargeable and those exempt. Treasury Books detail the provision of

---

[150] Margaret Spufford, 'The scope of local history and the potential of the Hearth Tax returns', *Local Historian*, 30 (2000): 202-221.
[151] Tom Arkell, 'A Student's Guide to the Hearth Tax: Some Truths, Half-Truths and Untruths', in *The Hearth Tax: Problems and Possibilities*, ed. N. Allridge (London: School of Humanities and Community Education, 1983): 23-44.
[152] Arkell, 'Printed Instructions for administering the Hearth Tax', 46 and 43.

instruction booklets for fee farms. Sir George Downing, a key figure in Restoration finance, informed Newcombe,

> My Lords have seen the sheet of the book of particulars of fee farms, which you have been ordered to print, but they do not like the method of it. You are to proceed no further in any way, but observe the directions you will get from Mr Lightfoot and Mr Blaney.[153]

Government issued instruction booklets to shape the record production of local collectors and tax farms.[154] Some sets of hearth tax instructions carried a specimen form at the back, from which collectors constructed lists. Print steered and structured the creation of manuscript documents, as we saw with the visitation articles in Chapter One. However, print failed to bring uniformity to manuscript lists. Assessment lists returned from different counties varied wildly in detail and format. Elizabeth Parkinson attributes this diversity to the fact that the specimen form was based upon the legislation of 1662, which differed from amendments made in subsequent legislation in 1664, causing confusion amongst collectors as to what should be included in the lists.[155] Printed output failed to keep up with changes in legislation, resulting in contradictory instructions about the information required. This was not the manuscript revolution prompted by print that Stallybrass assumes.[156] Instead, outdated print led to administrative confusion and irregular paperwork.

Slack and Chandaman both inaccurately argue that there was a marked increase in the use of print for state administration in the 1670s. Slack cites printed forms and instructions used during the collection of hearth money as evidence of the increasing capacity of government to collect information.[157] This overlooks the substantial body of print circulating prior to this, as outlined in the previous sections of this chapter. Meanwhile, in his administrative history of hearth tax, Chandaman

---

[153] June 10, 1670, William A. Shaw ed., *Calendar of Treasury Books, 1669-1672, Vol III, Part 1* (London: Printed for his Majesty's Stationary Office, By Mackie and Co. Ltd., 1904), 589.
[154] There are further examples of printed sheets giving instructions about collections for disbanding armies and building ships in 1677 and 1678 in BL, Add MS 42956 f.27 and f.28.
[155] Elizabeth Parkinson, *The Establishment of the Hearth Tax, 1662-66* (Kew: List and Index Society, 2008), 146.
[156] Stallybrass, 'Printing and the Manuscript revolution', 114.
[157] Slack, 'Government and Information in Seventeenth-Century England', 60.

attributes greater organisational efficiency to the establishment of the hearth tax office under Richard Sherwyn, a Treasury Clerk, and William Webb, the auditor to the farmers in 1670.[158] Once again, the problem is the lack of printing accounts. The office burnt down, destroying all records. However, records from other offices show that printing expenses often formed part of more general administrative costs. For instance, accounts for the Commissioners for Highways and Sewers documented 'Paid for the Rent of a Roome for the said Comm[ission] to sittin in & for books fire candles printing coachire & other necessaries expended in the business of the said Commissioners.'[159] From the print surviving for hearth tax administration, it is apparent there was an increase in print with the establishment of central office.

Yet, the first examples of printed receipts survive from the administration of the tax by farmers, not from the establishment of central office in 1670. When first introduced, the collection of hearth money was the responsibility of local unpaid sheriffs who were appointed each year. Due to disappointing yields, professional receivers replaced sheriffs, although it was when farmers took over the collection that the earliest printed hearth tax receipt survives, dating from 1668.[160] This example predates any recorded on existing print catalogues and presents another example of farmers initiating the use of print. In 1666, farmers established an office, which then burnt down in the same year.[161] The instruction booklets issued in collection of hearth tax make no mention of the production or distribution of receipts. Given the wider use of print in fiscal administration detailed in this chapter, it comes as no surprise that the earliest use of print corresponds with the administration of farmers rather than with central office.

It is the exemption certificates from 1670 that Chandaman cites to signal the uptake of print for hearth tax collection. However, an earlier example of such a document survives.[162] A certificate issued to Robert Bromfield in the parish of Burslow in Surrey dated from 1665 (Figure 32). [163] The certificate referenced the Act

[158] Chandaman, 96.
[159] TNA, E360/98, Exchequer: Pipe Office: Declared Accounts (Taxes) London and Middlesex.
[160] TNA, E192/16/8, Estate papers of Richard Rich Earl of Holland and Warwick.
[161] Arkell, 'Printed Instructions for administering the Hearth Tax', 43.
[162] Chandaman, 96.
[163] TNA, E139/346 Reigate Hundred ff.185-282.

of Parliament concerning the yearly charges on hearths and was 'to certifie that the dwelling house of the said [*Robert Bromfield*] is not [*above*] the value of 20s per annum' and that, as a result, he was not charged the levy. It also declared Bromfield's exemption from poor relief to confirm his exemption from the tax, he 'doth not pay to the Church and Poor of the said parish of Burslow by reason of his poverty.' The imprinting of 'Surrey' at the top of the page is similar to land tax receipts previously discussed. Therefore, it is possible this was a local commission of print, distributed in a particular county, rather than something used in the broader administration of the tax. Nonetheless, it establishes the need to think about the development of printed exemption certificates by 1670, rather than their introduction from this point onwards. Certainly, the number of pre-printed certificates used from 1670 was substantial. There are thirty-eight boxes filled with these certificates, returned from across the country, at The National Archives, indicating the volume of print required.[164] When printed certificates ran out, officers drew them up by hand. Although not all of The Hearth Tax project publications for various counties break down the proportion of printed certificates, when numbers are given they indicate that the vast majority were printed. There are almost a thousand certificates from the East Riding, 2,599 from Norfolk, 3,154 from Yorkshire and 178 from Durham.[165] The amount required makes clear why the hearth tax office ordered print.

These later certificates also show how the format of printed pro forma developed to cater for the overwhelming number of names. Rather than one person per form, later certificates could exempt entire parishes. Much of the criticism levelled at the tax concerned the process of exemption. Instead of collectors, local parish ministers and JPs administered exemption, which often led to clashes between these two sets of officials. There were disputes in St Botolph Aldgate between hearth

---

[164] Peter Seamen and John Pound and Robert Smith ed., N*orfolk Hearth Tax Exemption Certificates 1670-1674: Norwich, Great Yarmouth, King's Lynn and Thetford,* Index Library 117 (Norwich: Norfolk Record Society, London: British Record Society, 2001), xxxv.

[165] David, Neave, Catherine Ferguson and Elizabeth Parkinson, ed., *East Riding Hearth Tax 1672-73* (Cambridge: Cambridgeshire Records Society; London, British Record Society, 2015), 15; Seaman, Pound, and Smith, ed., N*orfolk Hearth Tax Exemption Certificates 1670-1674,* xxxviii; Hey, Giles, Spufford, and Wareham, ed., *Yorkshire West Riding Hearth Tax Assessment Lady Day 1672*, 563; Green, Parkinson, and Spufford, ed., *County Durham Hearth Tax Assessment Lady Day 1666*, 217.

officers and magistrates over allegations of the selling of certificates.[166] Complaints were also made about one certificate with over eight hundred names entered.[167] Certificates produced after 1670 had enough blank space to exempt numerous people on a single sheet. Printed lines down the page sorted these names into columns and there was a line at the bottom of the page to declare the total number of names entered. Pro forma thus adapted to cater for more names. Instead of one sheet per person, these forms squeezed as many names as possible onto a page. Officers customised forms to accommodate even more names. In some instances, they left certificates uncut. Two forms became one, thereby doubling the space available. Figure 33 gives an example of such a certificate and the significant number of names entered. This contrasts markedly with Richard Bromfield's certificate a few years earlier. In other cases, multiple forms were stitched or pinned together to signify that they were part of the same parish, creating a booklet of exemption certificates. The materiality of the sheet was adapted to make it fit for purpose. Fewer forms also sped up the authentication procedure. Once completed and signed by the parish minister and churchwardens, certificates passed to two JPs for further signatures. Getting more names on fewer certificates saved time, paper and ink for all involved. This administrative process also shows the various hands these certificates passed through. The establishment of the hearth tax office did see a sustained uptake of print for exemption; however, what becomes apparent when going through these certificates is the adoption and adaptation of forms to meet the material demands of exemption parish by parish.

Miscellanea found amongst these certificates gives further evidence of the administration and flow of print for this levy. Collectors returned certificates to the office in bags, with the county and the collector's name written on.[168] These records contain remnants of other forms that became part and parcel of collection. This included a sheet of unfilled and uncut forms that gave notice of collection (Figure 34). The sheet declared,

---

[166] Lydia Marshall, 'The Levying of the Hearth Tax, 1662-1688', *English Historical Review*, 51:204 (1936), 639.
[167] Ibid.
[168] TNA, E179/80/362 Leather Bag ff1; there is also a hessian bag used for the same purpose E179/346/1.

> ...that the Officer or Officers, appointed to Collect and leavy his Majesties duty of Hearth-Money, Intend to be at [ ] in this County upon of about the [ ] days of [ ] in order to the viewing and numbering of the Fire-Hearths and Stoves.[169]

From this sheet of spares we get a sense of how this pro forma would have been filled in, cut out and distributed. Once filled, sheets like this gave notice of the specific time and place collectors would visit a parish to draw up the lists of chargeable hearths. Although the forms in Figure 34 are undated, an Act of 1663 required Constables to enter homes to check the accuracy of the numbers given by homeowners.[170] Unfilled and uncut, this sheet of 'spares', sent back to the main office, reveals the shifting status of these forms from office staple to circulating order and back again. Another notice, dated 1683, gave instructions about taxpayers and will be discussed in further detail in the next chapter.[171] Together, these notices evidence other print in the paperchains of administration that did not ordinarily return to the central office.

There were, then, a range of print used in the administration of hearth tax and it circulated between tax collectors and local offices. It documented exemption, instructed collectors and gave notice of collections. Detailing the material flow of tax collection reveals these varied exchanges and the print that encoded them. Instead of simply corresponding print to increased efficiency, this locates it in the back and forth of administration. Print did not just extend to instruction booklets and exemption certificates, but circulated much more widely. Locating print in this way demonstrates its intrinsic function in the paperchains of hearth tax administration.

Conclusion

Fiscal print culture reveals the emergence of more print-minded forms of government. Print was employed for more than announcement and propaganda. This has significant implications for understandings of governance and print culture more

---

169 TNA, E179/80/362 Buckingham Hundred ff.144-204.
170 Chandaman, 83.
171 LRO, DG9/815; Another example of such a notice survives from 1681 in relation to the collection of the Kings tenths, Bod. Lib., MS Rawlinson D, Vol. 400, f.195.

broadly. Whereas Sharpe and Elton equated printed proclamations to propaganda and, most recently, Kyle termed them a form of news, this chapter has emphasised the functional purpose of proclamations in fiscal administration. In doing so, it has placed them in a much broader corpus of print commissioned and circulated to raise and collect money. Much of this print, whether receivers' receipts or exemption certificates, passed between institutions and officers: its circulation was resolutely intra-institutional. This re-configures the status of print in models of state formation. It challenges the way scholars identify print as a stimulus of change, or as an indicator of it. Undoubtedly, the amount of print increased over the period, but this chapter argues that we need to look more rigorously at exactly how and where print was used in state administration. It has located different types of print and examined its function in paperchains of governance. Whilst scholars have lavished attention on the capacity of print to construct publics and bolster monarchical power, this chapter has shown how a very different body of print operated to solicit, collect and move money.

Significantly, the adoption of print for fiscal administration was often at the hands of the 'extra-state'. Fee farmers and bishops initiated the use of printed pro forma to transfer money from centre to periphery. There was a print culture to state administration that started away from Westminster. As well as communicating orders about levies and collection, printed pro forma accompanied revenue returned to government. Nonetheless, the Civil War brought about the adoption of print for both demanding and receiving money on a prodigious scale. Outlining how print worked to both extract and gather money foregrounds the very different types of participation prompted by print. Whereas Peacey focuses on tracts and pamphlets, this chapter has identified other print people were confronted with and the different sets of responses it required.

This raises the question of where administrative print fits into an understanding of the jobbing print trade and reading more broadly. Stallybrass calls for a concentration on printed sheets instead of books to give a better sense of printing practice.[172] Meanwhile, McKenzie's analysis of the print trade details how production shifted across the period. Whilst pre-1640s production was heavily

[172] Stallybrass, "Little Jobs", 334.

weighted towards the production of books, McKenzie argues that the period after this saw the increased production of pamphlets.[173] Both scholars attribute the importance of the output of the print trade to the consumption of reading material, without a contemplation of the consumption of this print. What this chapter has demonstrated is how an analysis of administrative print redraws understanding of the print circulating in early modern England.

Developing this theme, the next chapter examines how the print flowing out of state offices shaped exchanges between the state and early modern men and women. Instead of proclamations, it focuses on receipts. From the diagram of hearth tax print, it is evident that, by the time of the Restoration, a significant amount of state print went to taxpayers. Marrying up this printed output with its consumption redraws understandings not only of early modern 'print culture', but also of social relations. It gives a material account of interactions with the state by examining the print that entered households and notebooks.

[173] McKenzie, 'The London Book Trade in 1644' in McKenzie, *Making Meaning: "Printers of the Mind" and Other Essays*, ed. Peter McDonald and Michael Suarez, 130.

Chapter Four Printed Slips and Personal Solvency: The Life of Receipts

On May 28th 1675, John Wentworth paid fourteen shillings in hearth tax for his home, Woolley Hall, five miles south of Wakefield. The printed slip in Figure 35 is the receipt that Wentworth, head of one of the most prominent landholding families in Yorkshire, received from the collector in return. The text specifies the payment was for hearth tax due on Lady Day (March 25th). The collector signed the receipts, confirming payment. A bracket on the right hand side encases the text and, to the side, the amount is expressed numerically.

The receipt is a small piece of paper, roughly cut out, and forms part of the Wentworth Woolley estate papers now held at the archives of the Brotherton Library in Leeds. Its form is quintessentially ephemeral and typical of a kind of print that scarcely survives. Significantly, this printed slip is evidence of the state print that passed into individual hands. Developing the discussion of fiscal print in the previous chapter, this chapter concentrates on the exchange of printed receipts like this to explore the consumption of administrative print from the perspective of the taxpayer.

Whereas the previous two chapters have emphasised the way print moved between officers in and out of registries, this chapter examines print in fiscal interactions between state and citizen. Typically, paperwork is construed as something that tied people into systems of power.[1] We saw examples of how this worked with exemption certificates for hearth tax and much of the print emanating from the church courts. Paper contractually bound people and materialised the power of institutions. However, receipts show different kinds of print going into the pockets of taxpayers rather than the filing systems of state offices. This points to a more complex dispersal of power in exchanges between taxpayers and collectors. These slips of paper moved from person to person and were subject to individual practices of reading, filing and archiving, as pieces of state print were absorbed into personal accounting systems. By focusing on these small objects, we can see that people did not just encounter official print when it was stuck on walls, or read from pulpits, but in

1 See for instance, Burke, *A Social History of Knowledge*, 117; Higgs, *The Information State in England,* Chapter 3.

exchanges that took place on doorsteps. An analysis of receipts can thus help develop a more critical approach to the role of print and paperwork in transactions between institutions and individuals. The survival of numerous receipts demonstrates that there was an alternative corpus of print entering households from the chapbooks, almanacs and other items we already know so much about. Moreover, this was a type of print that materialised not only exchanges with state officials, but also an increasing number of other organisations. Once we appreciate the circulation and consumption of receipts, we can expand our understanding of what the spread of this print entailed and recognise the increasingly papery dimension to social relations in early modern England.

In addition to this, receipts reshape existing models of early modern economic transactions. There was an element of reciprocity in particular transactions, whereby money changed hands in exchange for paper proof. This revises key aspects of the face-to-face financial transactions central to Craig Muldrew's 'culture of credit.' His model of the early modern economy emphasises that people knew each other and that trust stood in for money in this cash-poor society.[2] Yet, the survival of receipts demonstrates that there were some financial transactions where paper provided material proof of money paid where there was no established personal relationship between the individuals involved. Paper stood in place of personal association and trust. Moreover, these paper technologies developed over the period. The template for 'A general quyttaunce', included in an anonymous manual printed in 1545, was composed of a lengthy, verbose script in both Latin and English.[3] However, the receipt in Figure 35 shows how the format of receipts advanced. Receipts adopted brackets, 'highly abbreviating and visualizing entries'; a practice particularly suited to print.[4] These diagrammatical features expressed oral calculations with greater clarity than lengthy written explanation, which facilitated the recording of fiscal exchange.[5] This necessitates a closer consideration of receipts as a body of print. Muldrew frames his

---

2 Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation*, 7.

3 Anon, *An introduction to the knowledge and vnderstanding as wel to make, as also to perceive, the tenor and fourme of inde[n]tures, obligatio[n]s, quittances, bylles of payme[n]t, letters of sale, letters of exchau[n]ge…* (London: 1545).

4 Elizabeth Tebeaux, 'From Orality to Textuality in English Accounting and Its Books, 1553-1680', *Journal of Business and Technical Communications,* 7:3 (1993), 352; see also Walter Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London: Routledge, 2002), 131-132.

5 Tebeaux, 'From Orality to Textuality in English Accounting and Its Books, 1553-1680', 354.

analysis around the 'the interaction between various forms of interpretive discourse and the cultural and institutional practices of individual agents.'[6] His discussion does not include tax collection, which was an integral part of the economy and one in which collectors were, increasingly, hired professionals who were often unknown to local communities. Therefore, an examination of receipts adds a significant component to our understanding of the early modern economy. Did receipts replace the need for personal networks? How do they correspond with hastily written IOUs and the accounting practices of individuals?

The rest of this chapter explores these questions. The first section focuses on the emergence and profusion of printed receipts. It demonstrates that receipts issued to taxpayers increased in the flurry of rates and assessments levied during the Civil War, but really proliferated in the Restoration. The hearth tax stimulated the widespread distribution of receipts to taxpayers throughout the country. From this point, local levies and companies also began to issue printed receipts. Print infiltrated a wider array of transactions. Did collectors or ratepayers initiate the use of receipts? By examining the function of printed slips for both tax collectors and taxpayers, this chapter argues that receipts were both a technology for collection and a record for the taxpayer. Accordingly, the second section examines the place of receipts in individual record-keeping practices and their role in constructing creditworthiness. These small pieces of print verified an individual's status as a taxpayer. It was material proof of financial competence and, thus, a sign of social standing. This has significant implications for the function of print in social relations and its consumption by early modern men and women. The printed tax receipt was not print which people encountered every day, or even that regularly, but it mapped, negotiated and recorded their exchanges with officialdom.

Current historiography concentrates on the personnel involved in the administration of taxation and the impact they had on yield, rather than on the attendant paperwork or taxpayers.[7] In this literature, 'receipts' more often refer to the collated amounts returned from each county to central office, as discussed in the

---

6 Muldrew, 8.

7 Braddick, *Parliamentary Taxation in 17th Century England*, 281, n.87.

previous chapter, not the slips given to taxpayers. These slips were often called 'acquittances', but, increasingly, receipts. Indeed, there is relatively little discussion of taxpayers in existing literature. They usually only appear in reference to occasional violent altercations with collectors. Tales of resistance, protest and assault make for a vivid story of state versus citizen.[8] Yet, collectors issued far more receipts than arrest warrants. Taxes were routine payments that made for a much more regular transaction between state and individual and receipts formed the material marker of these exchanges. An analysis of receipts expands our understanding of the paper state and its replication in household accounts.

Finding these receipts is less straightforward. Again, the print catalogues STC, ESTC and Wing completely fail to capture the volume of printed receipts in archival collections. Moreover, runs found in individual accounts often give a more accurate picture of the consumption of receipts. They demonstrate the episodic encounters with this kind of print culture. The listing of receipts compiled in Section 2 of the Printed Primary Sources part of the bibliography in this thesis details all the printed receipts given to taxpayers I have found in archives between 1640 and c.1710. This is far from comprehensive, but provides a far greater range of receipts than detailed anywhere else and underlines the need to discuss printed receipts in any account of early modern financial exchange. Unreliable and inconsistent archival catalogue descriptions hinder attempts to find this kind of receipt, as they frequently fail to mention if something is printed. Often, locating one printed receipt in a catalogue will result in finding many more in the account book or bundle. Undoubtedly, exploring more household accounts would uncover hundreds more receipts and many more different types.

The personal papers that survive tend to be those of landed and wealthy individuals. This can skew our perception of print and its pervasiveness throughout early modern society. Most remaining receipts, such as Wentworth's, come from estate papers of aristocratic families. They often had substantial amounts of property and paid some taxes levied only on landlords. The poorest in society were exempt from tax, and therefore never received receipts like this. Moreover, not everyone was

[8] Ibid, 256-258.

diligent in keeping their receipts and, of course, the papers of the vast majority of early modern men and women do not survive. Beyond their immediate use, receipts were liable to become waste paper or kindling. It is a case of piecing together leftover scraps. Otherwise, we are at the mercy of collectors and contemporary hoarders, including Richard Rawlinson and Samuel Pepys. These collectors were selective in what they kept or threw away. Rawlinson, who was responsible for compiling a large collection of early modern material now held in the Bodleian library at Oxford, sold back what he thought unimportant as waste paper to chandlers.[9] Did Rawlinson consider scrappy receipts for bygone levies unimportant and therefore discard them? It is impossible to know, but it reinforces the precarious survival of this kind of print. There are also collections of ephemera that antiquarian collectors from the nineteenth century assembled. Again, these men were selective in what they collected. For instance, within the thirty-one bound volumes of printed ephemera amassed by James Halliwell-Phillips, now held at Chetham's library in Manchester, are receipts from hearth tax collectors and the New River Company.[10] Administrative print was amassed here, along with trade cards, sheet music, ballads, advertisements and other associated forms, to compile a 'collection' of ephemeral print. These retrospective acts of weeding and filing shape any attempt to trace the circulation of printed receipts.

Printed Receipts and Rate Paying

The distribution of receipts to men and women began with the myriad rates and assessments levied during the Civil War. Table 3 details the types of receipts from the Civil War and Interregnum distributed to taxpayers. In total, there are 55 receipts included in this table, which is far fewer than the amount of receivers' receipts found in State Papers, exemplifying the scale of loss of print distributed outwards to taxpayers. Many of the receipts in Table 3 come from a collection of 41 receipts in the records of the Merchant Taylors' Company.[11] In a volume of miscellaneous papers

[9] Brian Enright, 'Richard Rawlinson and the Chandlers', in *Richard Rawlinson: A Tercentenary Memorial*, ed. Georgia Tashjian, David Tashjian and Brian Enright (Michigan: Western Michigan University, 1990), 129.
[10] Chetham's Library Manchester, H.P. 1126; H.P 1128.
[11] GL MS 34104, Merchant Taylors, miscellaneous papers, 1575-1837.

from the company records there survives a collection of receipts from the Civil War and Interregnum. Two of them are manuscript, one from 1643 for £220 for maintaining the army and another, from 1651, for 04:06:08. These amounts are substantially more than ordinary men and women would have paid. The rest of the receipts in the collection are printed and show the types of printed receipts distributed to taxpayers. Of these, thirty seven date from the 1650s, corresponding to levies that began in the Civil War and continued at a pace in the Interregnum. Indeed, the majority of receipts given were for three, six and twelve month assessments, raised for the militia in London as well as the Parliamentarian armies elsewhere. The Merchant Taylors' accounts have numerous entries relating to the payment of these assessments and, usually, a corresponding payment of a couple of pence for an acquittance.[12] This reveals that the company paid for printed slips to prove they had paid their taxes, and these receipts then served as records for the company.

[12] GL MS 34048/18-21, Merchant Taylors accounts 1641-1660.

Year	Total Number	Levy						
		Loan	Assessment					Other tax
			3 month	4 month	6 month	12 month	Other Assessment	
1640	0							
1641	1	1						
1642	1	1						
1643	1						1	
1644	2						2	
1645	1							1
1646	2	1					1	
1647	1	1						
1648	2		1		1			
1649	4		2				2	
1550	9		6	2				1
1651	4	2	1	1				
1652	2				2			
1653	1				1			
1654								
1655								
1656	1							1
1657	11		3		5		3	
1658	4				4			
1659	8		3		1	4		

Table 3 Printed receipts for rates and assessments 1640-1659

Early printed receipts made promises of repayment. As such, these slips were both proof of payment and a guarantee that the money would be returned. A slip from 1641 for the collection for the relief of English protestants in Ireland specified that it was 'lent towards the loane of fifty thousand pounds', whilst a charge from 1642 'towards the arming, maintaining and payng of souldiers', declared that it was 'to be repayed again upon the publicke faith of the kingdome.'[13] These receipts were kept like the privy seal loan letters discussed in the previous chapter, so that the recipient

[13] TNA, E192/13/5.

could claim back the money they gave. However, later receipts made no promise of repayment. An example catalogued on the ESTC simply states, 'The day of [blank] 1644. Received the day and yeer above written by mee… for our brethren in Scotland.'[14] Similarly, the example in Figure 36 simply refers to a sum assessed on the landlord for the relief of Ireland. Dated 1649, the receipt is scrappy and not very well printed. As discussed in the previous chapter, loans levied at the beginning of the Civil War soon gave way to compulsory assessments. The early exchange of printed receipts ensured the taxpayer was compensated, but when promises of repayment waned the distribution of receipts carried on. Therefore, whilst the function of the receipt as a mechanism for reimbursement ended, its purpose as proof of payment continued.

Surviving examples and corresponding printing accounts suggests the circulation of these printed receipts was limited to London. The example in Figure 36 belonged to Richard Rich, Earl of Warwick and Holland, who had a number of properties in the capital. He also received receipts for donations to English Protestants in Ireland, which were probably those recorded in the cashbooks of the City of London Corporation and printed by Robert Young. 1500 receipts for money lent by the wards for suppressing the rebels in Ireland were ordered from Young in 1641/2, 'being altered afterwards and for printing 1400 of the same after they were altered', the total coming to '1570 sheet 61d a sheet in all = 7:5:10.'[15] Further entries in the accounts included 250 aquittances for money lent towards the army in the north and another 480 for money lent by the livery companies for the relief of Ireland.[16] In addition to items of civic governance, City printers produced printed receipts for extraordinary revenue collection in London during the Civil War.

The lack of surviving printed receipts from outside the city, further suggests this was a London phenomenon. Although there were printed receipts for the campaign of Lord Fairfax, those that the collector William Royle issued to Mrs. Anne Dixon, of Keythorpe in Leicestershire were all manuscript.[17] She received two

---

14 *Received the [blank]…* (London: s.n. 1646), R187618.
15 LMA, Chamber accounts 69, City cash 1/4 f.152 1641-42.
16 LMA, Chamber accounts 69, City cash 1/4 f.65 1640-41; f.152, 1641-42.
17 LRO, DG 21/264-65.

receipts in 1647 for monthly assessments: one from October for 04:13:09 and another from November for 02:06:10 ½. These were amongst other handwritten receipts issued to Dixon. This indicates that the use of printed receipts was limited to London during the Civil War. Print saved collectors from having to write out receipt after receipt, and there was a definite proliferation of printed receipts for a range of levies in the Restoration.

The hearth tax saw the widespread distribution of printed receipts. Issued from at least 1668, there was an extensive circulation of print throughout the country. Surviving printed receipts stretch from a Mr Oswald Hynd, of Stelling in Northumberland, to twenty-five issued to a Nicholas Donnithorne in Cornwall between 1667 and 1688.[18] They also extended to Scotland.[19] Not everyone received printed receipts, but their volume certainly increased. In his study of hearth tax collection in the West Country, Stephen Timmons uses successive receipts issued to the Hele family of Gnaton, Newton Ferrers, Devon to show, 'thirteen different men signed twenty surviving copies of hearth tax receipts from Lady Day 1673 through Michaelmas 1686.'[20] This highlights the number of different men that collected the levy and the flow of print into households as a result. Some accounts hold series of receipts for hearth tax stretching across the length of its administration. Alongside the receipt in Figure 35, John Wentworth had at least six further receipts for hearth tax, for anything from two shillings to as much as eighteen shillings.[21] These materialised his numerous interactions with tax collectors.

Why did taxpayers start acquiring receipts and why, in particular, did the hearth tax generate them? Certainly, the hearth tax was an unpopular levy, beset with administrative issues, as discussed in the previous chapter. This troubled administration not only led to inconsistent records, but also instigated the use of receipts. Once collection passed from local sheriffs to receivers and fee farms, the

---

[18] There are references to receipts in Northumberland Archives EP/45/134 and Cornwall Record Office X173/27/1, this information was gathered from The National Archives online catalogue.
[19] National Library of Scotland, MS 14547, f.168 and f.172.
[20] Stephen Timmons, 'The Hearth Tax and Finance in the West Country, 1662-92', in *Money, Print and Power: Interdisciplinary Studies on the Financial Revolution in the British Isles*, ed. Charles McGrath and Christopher Fauske (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2004), 59.
[21] Brotherton Library, MS/DEP/Wentworth Hall/15.

collectors became strangers in the parish. Receipts, in this instance, offered legitimacy to the unknown collectors and assurances for the taxpayer. This exchange contrasts starkly to the interpersonal relationships at work in the economy Muldrew describes and the extension of credit, whereby 'people were constantly involved in a tangled web of economic and social dependency…'[22] Muldrew's model is resolutely 'local' in orientation and does not account for the fact that professional men from outside the local area increasingly collected taxes. Receipts were the product of transactions in which there were no pre-exiting relationships, and where paper stood in trust. In some ways, this supports Muldrew's model, as it shows there were explicit differences in how transactions took place within communities where people knew one another to those conducted with unknown tax collectors. Receipts provided a material record from the faceless collectors. Examining the transactions people conducted outside of their immediate social networks, and the material demands of these exchanges, contributes in vital ways to our understanding of the early modern economy.

Significantly, the form of hearth tax receipts changed to expedite revenue collection. As I described in relation to John Wentworth's receipt (Figure 35), the earliest hearth tax receipts had brackets encasing the text and the amount also written numerically. However, the format of receipts altered during the course of the levy to assist the work of collectors. Another receipt given to Wentworth in 1684 (Figure 37) illustrates this. From the 1680s, receipts started to include 'Fol.' and 'L.' beneath the main text of the receipt. This gave designated space on the receipts in which to add a folio and line reference, corresponding to where the taxpayer's details were in the collector's book. In this particular example, the collector has also given an 'N' with a number next to it, presumably as a reference for where it was on the relevant page. Including this information on the receipts made the taxpayers easier to find in the collectors book. Receipts were both printed proof and finding aid. They worked as reference tools, to navigate the written records of collectors. Paper slips and collectors' books corroborated one another, ensuring that individual accounts matched up to government records. Circulating between collectors and taxpayers,

[22] Muldrew, 97.

receipts were a 'paper mobile.'[23] They functioned as inscriptions (which Latour argues have to be mobile) that transferred and translated knowledge. At the same time, collectors' books were centres of calculation, in which 'inscriptions are combined and make possible a type of calculation.'[24] The receipt was a paper technology that enabled tax collection and changes to its design facilitated social exchanges between collector and taxpayer, as well as record production.

A rare printed notice issued by collectors of the hearth tax explains why the format of receipts changed in this way. The sheets, given to the constable in Beaumanor, Leicestershire, on 8th May 1683, announced when officers would be arriving into the parish to collect the levy. It ordered the constable to assist them by advising that,

> all persons concerned in payment of the said Duty, are desired to have ready their last Acquittance, and to provide Money for the discharge thereof accordingly: That so themselves and the Officers may be put to no further trouble [25]

This confirms receipts were both a record of transaction and an ongoing collection tool. Unless exempt from the levy, householders had to present their previous receipt to show how much they owed in the next round of collection. From the folio and line reference on the receipts, collectors could quickly locate the individual in the assessment book. The amount on the receipt also specified what the taxpayer owed. Therefore, the material power of receipts was re-performed in further exchanges between collector and taxpayer. In this respect, it could well be that administrators determined the distribution of receipts to assist in the ongoing collection of the levy. The notice also gives some indication of the numbers of receipts required. That 'all persons concerned in payment' had to present their receipts illustrates the distribution of receipts to every taxpayer and makes clear why printed receipts were used as the circulation and consumption of printed receipts proliferated in the Restoration.

---

[23] Anke Heesen, 'The Notebook: A Paper Technology', 584.
[24] Latour, *Pandora's Hope*, 304
[25] LRO, DG9/815.

By the end of the seventeenth century, receipts were a regular part of numerous taxes. Successive poll taxes and other assessments adopted similar collection techniques to the hearth tax.[26] Again, the expense of war prompted these levies. Surviving receipts refer to levying money for building ships, supplying arms and raising money for what became the Nine Years' War (1689-97) that drained state finances.[27] Receipts were no longer the small jobs of City printers and were increasingly stocked by stationers. An entry in the *London Gazette* in 1678, concerning the Eighteen Months Tax, informed collectors that the Lord High Treasurer,

> …hath been pleased to direct and appoint His Majesties Printers to Print and Sell Such Papers and Forms of Blanks as do any way relate to His Majesties Revenue, being first approved by His Lordship at their Office in Blackfryers London, where at present are to be had Warrants to the Assessors and Collectors of the Eighteen Months Tax, Commencing from the 24th of August last, together with Aquittances for the same and the same likewise for more conveniency at Mr Robert Hornes a Bookseller at the Royal Exchange and at Mr George Mariots a Stationer at the Sign of the Temple near the Inner Temple-gate at Fleet-Street, whereof all persons concerned are desired to take Notice.[28]

Collectors bought aquittances alongside the other pro forma they needed to collect the tax. Stationers also took advantage of this market, placing adverts in newspapers detailing the administrative print they sold. In 1694, Joshua Brixey gave notice that warrants and blank certificates for the Quarterly Pole were to be found at his shop.[29] In 1697, land tax receipts were sold 'by Abel Roper and Roger Clavel both in Fleet Street, B Aylmer at the Three Pigeons in Cornhill and R. Cumberland at the Angel in St. Pauls Churchyard.'[30] Receipts became part of the printed paperwork bought and sold from stationer's shops and stalls.

Imprints on receipts assured consumers that they came from reputable printers. The personal papers of Joseph Cope, jeweller, diamond merchant and

---

26 For table of the direct taxes levied 1660-1688 see Chandaman, Table 2, 157.
27 P. G. M. Dickson, *The Financial Revolution in England: A study in the development of public credit, 1688-1756* (London: Macmillan, 1967), 10.
28 *London Gazette*, August 29th 1678 – September 2nd 1678, Issue 1334.
29 *Collection for Improvement of Husbandry and Trade*, May 11th 1694, Issue 93.
30 *Post Boy*, March 25th 1697, Issue 293.

banker in London, contain several receipts with various stationers imprinted at the bottom.[31] Two separate receipts in 1707 and 1708, both for Land Tax, came from different stationers. One was 'Printed and sold by Ed. Berington in Silver Street Bloomsbury' and another 'Printed and sold by J. Mayo at the sign of the Printing Press, over against Water Land in Fleet Street.' Robert Vincent, who specialised in fiscal print, also printed several of the receipts Cope received. Imprints attributed receipts to known stationers and thereby gave the sheet authenticity. In addition to paper providing proof of transaction, it was paperwork from the right stationer and thus purchased by legitimate collectors.

The development of printed receipts was not confined to national taxes. This practice was adopted both for metropolitan taxes and by joint stock companies. Printed receipts for payments to local militia survive from the 1650s onwards, and other metropolitan levies imposed in the Restoration adopted printed receipts.[32] Under an Act of 1662, the Lieutenant for the City of London levied Trophy Tax every three years to pay for the staff and headquarters of the militia. By 1671, we find Trophy tax receipts that usually refer to 'duties and trophies' in the printed text. Again, these printed slips had a specified geography in London and its hinterland. The receipts that individuals received drew them into both local and national collectivities. This included receipts that officers of the Commissioners of Sewers issued in London and its environs. Slips referred to 'casting, reforming and amending common sewers' in the 'City and liberty of Westminster and part of Middlesex' and there were several variants for this levy.[33] An act of 1531 established local Commissions to maintain sewers, which had the authority to collect money, using appointed collectors and bailiffs. After the Great Fire, a permanent court of Commissioners of Sewers was set up in 1667 and printed receipts appear some years later. Besides paving slabs and drains, printed receipts were another material product of paying local taxes.

---

31 TNA, C104/197.
32 There are examples of these in TNA, E192/16/22.
33 TNA, E192/14/6; E192/14/7; on the reform of paving and sewers see Miles Ogborn, *Spaces of Modernity: London's geographies, 1680-1780* (New York: Guilford Press, 1998), 91.

Printed receipts for water, lighting and insurance payments underscore the printedness of rate paying more widely in post-Fire London. The London New River Company, which supplied water to residents of the capital, issued receipts to customers much like tax collectors.[34] Personal accounts contain New River receipts alongside, and sometimes pinned to, tax receipts. New River charges were quarterly (the cost of which was determined by the size of the property), paid either to collectors or at the Water House at New River Head. Therefore, payment patterns resembled government rates and assessments. From Figure 38 it is clear that New River receipts replicated the format of those for taxes. Quarterly payments, along with an expanding customer base, indicate the volume of receipts required and explains the uptake of print. In 1638, the company was supplying water to 2,154 homes. [35] To issue a receipt to each house for every quarterly payment would have required at least 8,616 receipts a year. However, printed receipts date from the 1670s onwards, when the customer base had expanded further. This surge in customers came after the Great Fire, which increased demand for a direct water supply to newly rebuilt homes. Crucially, the adoption of printed receipts at this point coincides with the uptake of printed receipts for other revenue payments, such as the hearth tax. The way in which the New River Company collected rates and communicated with its customers mirrored the administration of government taxes and there was a corresponding use of print.

The fact that the New River Company had been issuing printed leases to its customers for some time before this confirms that their adoption of printed receipts duplicated tax collection. Given to customers at the start of their contract, the earliest printed leases for the piped supply of water date from 1616.[36] Figure 39 shows a printed lease from 1652 which contrasts markedly to the printed receipt in Figure 38. Issued to James Bellew, of Low Holborn London, it was for a water pipe in the yard of Hatton House and is noticeably larger and more decorative than receipts. It is printed

---

[34] For a discussion of the growth of The New River Company and the commodification of water see, Mark S.R. Jenner, 'From conduit community to commercial network? Water in London, 1500-1725', in *Londinopolis: essays in the cultural and social history of early modern London*, ed. Paul Griffiths and Mark S. R. Jenner (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000): 250-272.

[35] Ibid, 257.

[36] *This indenture made [blank] in the fourteenth yeare…* (London: s.n., 1616), S4784; there are another two indentures are listed on the ESTC S96132 (c.1640); R185052 (1680); see also Harry Hoppe, 'John Wolfe, Printer and Publisher', *The Library*, 4th Ser, 14:3 (1933), 270.

on parchment with civilité typeface, like the administration bonds discussed in Chapter Two. This ostentatious design was in no doubt to reinforce the authority of the contract. The company copied the format and feel of other legally binding documents to foster its own legitimacy. Again, leases were documents to be kept and whilst later versions had roman typeface, they still used parchment. Alongside receipts, they show how the company produced different types of print to record exchanges with customers. The distinct chronologies of these two types of document highlight that the Company's distribution of printed receipts was in response to a receipt culture that tax collectors had cultivated.

Government levies precipitated the use of printed receipts by a broader array of utilities and services. Documenting the commodification of water in early modern London, Jenner draws parallels with other services, once managed locally, which 'were increasingly taken over by salaried and commercial operators.'[37] Urban improvement not only instigated cleaner, wider, brighter streets, but also printed receipts for streetlights and fire insurance. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, civic authorities in London ordered homeowners to have candles to light the street and, in the Restoration, this developed into 'the enterprise of individuals, who were willing to contract with householders to light and extinguish the lanterns required by the City Council.'[38] In the transformation of London after the Great Fire, improvements in street lighting began in the 1680s and, in 1694, the City contracted the Convex Lighting Company.[39] The earliest printed receipt which survives from the Convex Lighting Company dates from 1690, preceding this contract.[40] Mr Cartwright received this for a payment of six shillings. Again, the payment was due by Lady Day: companies used traditional days of rate paying to make their own collections. Not only were commercial companies issuing printed receipts like government tax collection, but also making their collections on the same days to effect officialdom.

---

37 Jenner, 'From conduit community to commercial network?...', 264.
38 William R. Scott, *The Constitution and Finance of English, Scottish and Irish Joint-Stock Companies to 1720, Volume 3, Water Supply, Postal, Street-Lighting, Manufacturing, Banking, Finance and Insurance Companies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911), 52.
39 Roy Porter, *London: A Social History* (London: Penguin, 2000), 153.
40 *Received of [blank]... (*London, sn, 1690), R217522.

Insurance companies operated in the same way. Unlike life and marine insurance, companies issued fire insurance for set periods.[41] Accordingly, companies sent reminders to customers to keep up with payments. Printed demands and receipts coordinated relations between these joint stock companies and their customers. The papers of Richard Graham, 1st Viscount Preston, contain a receipt for 1:17:02 for a year's payment to William Hale and Henry Spelman in 1686 for 'the loss of 640l. Burn and damnified'. A note at the bottom of the receipt states 'the contribution this Year, is less than the Interest of the Money given in the other office.'[42] In 1684, Hale and Spelman set up a mutual fire insurance company, which was one amongst a number of like schemes operating in London, including Nicholas Barbon's that became the Fire Office in 1680. It appears that most used print, as there is a similar receipt on the ESTC, issued in 1685, to 'Cyril Wyche relative to policy no.1350 brick insuring a brick house in Jermyn St. London against £100 loss by fire.' [43] Furthermore, the papers of Joseph Cope contain a notice for renewal from 1704, which stated that the four years of insurance taken out on twenty houses was about to expire and ordered,

> That you will give/ Notice to the Office in Fourteen dayes/ If you intend to Renew the Insurance: If not That you will Order, that our Marks may be taken down according to the Agreement for that purpose.[44]

If he did not pay, they would remove the plaque affixed to the front of his houses. Print negotiated an increasing array of household costs.

This was, undoubtedly, an urban phenomenon, which was often confined to wealthy parishes and residents who could afford such services. Receipts issued for one-off occasions provide further evidence of this. The wife of Richard Rich, Earl of Warwick and Holland, received a printed receipt in 1684 for her donation towards the building of St. James Church Piccadilly, London, which was designed by Sir

---

[41] Scott, *The Constitution and Finance of English, Scottish and Irish Joint-Stock Companies to 1720,* 372-75.
[42] BL, Add MS 6377 f.70.
[43] *Number. [blank] Brick… (*London: s.n., 1685), R228480; another fire insurance receipt from 1699 is held in Chetham's Library H.P1125.
[44] TNA, C104/197.

Christopher Wren.[45] In return for her contribution of thirty pounds, she got 'the whole seate or pew in North Gallerie of the said Church marked number 24.' Buying pews was not a new phenomenon, nor was building new churches, as London continued to expand. Parishioners meeting the cost of these new churches through donations was also an established practice.[46] Viscount Preston's papers include three printed slips, one from 1685 and two from 1686, all for the same amount of 03:08:08, for quarterly assessments for building St Ann's in Westminster.[47] This was an assessment levied on landlords, according to an act of Parliament. However, Rich's donation was not prompted by an act of Parliament, as it was a local project funded by London's elite. Local resident, Henry Jermyn, the Earl of St. Albans, organised the construction of the church, using his own funds, along with contributions from the other wealthy inhabitants of the parish. In 1720, John Strype remarked that the Church 'adds much Splendor to this End of the Town, and serves as a Land-mark', adding that 'There is a Table hangs in the Vestry, with the Names of such as had been Benefactors…'[48] Lady Rich's receipt was a personal record that corresponded to this public documentation of benevolence that hung inside the new church. It was also printed proof of her claim to a pew in the same way that a settlement certificate validated a person's place in the parish, or a freedom certificate denoted an individual as a citizen of London. Again, the printed receipt was for more than simply recording monetary exchange; this time it bestowed certain rights onto the recipient.

The dissemination and consumption of receipts in this way demands their consideration alongside other printed sheets exchanged in the city. Receipts circulated together with different kinds of print that recorded and denoted different types of transactions between residents and commercial enterprises. For example, trade cards, which retailers gave to their customers with the purchase of goods and services. These have been readily associated with 'polite consumption' and a burgeoning consumer society in the second half of the seventeenth century.

---

45 TNA, E192/14/6.

46 See, Julia Merritt, 'Voluntary Bounty and Devotion to the Service of God? Lay Patronage, Protest and the Creation of the Parish of St. Paul Covent Garden, 1629-41', *English Historical Review*, 125:512 (2010): 35-59.

47 BL, Add MS 6377 f.33 and f.61.

48 John Strype, *A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster*, Book 6, Chapter 6 accessed from John Strype's Survey of London Online: https://www.hrionline.ac.uk/strype/ (accessed August 8th 2015).

Concentrating on examples of trade cards that depict images of genteel refinement and modish living, scholars have pitched these printed sheets as 'transmitters of fashionable forms.'[49] They were certainly more visually striking than the receipts discussed here, often incorporating rococo cartouche and expert engraving. Alongside these decorative sheets, other pro forma for fiscal exchange proliferated, including stocks and bonds that trading companies issued, as well as bills of exchange.[50] The emergence and spread of printed receipts occurred at the same time as the profusion of lottery tickets in the 1690s. Lottery tickets were another way the state raised funds for warfare and it has been estimated that 3.5 million lottery tickets were sold between 1693 and 1699.[51] Scholars have affiliated print like this to new modes of exchange and commerce resonant of the financial revolution at the end of the seventeenth century. Undoubtedly there was more fanfare around lotteries and stock trading than tax collection. However, the extensive use of pre-printed receipts must feature in considerations of the print culture that surrounded fiscal exchange at the end of the seventeenth century, given the array of transactions printed receipts mediated and the fact that they materialised interactions between people and institutions.

The use of printed receipts did not spread to all areas of rate paying and therefore the proliferation of print should not lead to the assumption that men and women grew accustomed to receiving printed receipts in all types of exchange. Payments to scavengers and the parish poor rate did not typically occasion printed receipts. This further supports the idea that printed receipts appeared when there was little in the way of a personal relationship. Scavengers and rate collectors were local residents who showed their accounts to vestries, undermining the need for written proof of payment. This would correspond with Muldrew's model of exchange, where trust underwrote financial transactions. Equally, local rates may not have warranted print runs because of the relatively small area and number of households

---

[49] Maxine Berg and Helen Clifford, 'Selling Consumption in the Eighteenth Century Advertising and the Trade Card in Britain and France', *Cultural & Social History*, 4:2 (2007): 154-170.

[50] The East India Company issued printed stock bonds see for example, Bod. Lib., MS Rawl. D, Vol.747 f.360; there is an example from 1620 in Chatham's Library H.P.1134; and by the Company of Scotland in Africa and India, *Edinburgh, 1696, Received then… (*Edinburgh, s.n. 1696), R182539; for discussion of this type of print see Raven, 96-103.

[51] Anne Murphy, 'Lotteries in the 1690s: investment or gamble?', *Financial History Review*, 12:2, (2005), 227.

covered.[52] The printed output of livery companies provides another pertinent example here. Whilst Chapter Six details the proliferation of printed tickets given to company members notifying them of meetings, they did not typically receive printed receipts for paying quarterage. Customary rate paying in many areas continued to operate in the manner Muldrew describes.

Moreover, manuscript receipts outnumbered print. The estate papers of Robert Rich, and his second wife, Alice, typify this. Their accounts contain numerous printed and manuscript receipts relating to levies on themselves and their houses in Kensington, Pall Mall, Holborn and St James' Square. Manuscript receipts recorded the payment of wages, buying meat and all manner of costs incurred running the household. They were kept to balance the 'house booke'.[53] Walter Mortimor, the Richs' steward, who was responsible for the day-to-day management of the estate, was the recipient of most of these receipts. From such personal papers, it becomes evident that printed receipts were part of a much wider flow of paper into the seventeenth-century household and that the majority of receipts remained manuscript. Print was the preserve of tax collectors and a few companies.

Importantly, bundles of printed receipts in the Rich papers demonstrate the specific function of printed receipts in paperchains between tenant and landlord. Tenants paid certain levies. They were given receipts, which they then presented to landlords to get the amount deducted from their rent. The texts of many receipts stated, '...being so much charged upon [ ] for the Landlord of…' The Rich papers included whole bundles of receipts thonged together on pieces of string that they had evidently collected from their tenants. These were for payments for the subsidy in 1684, charges relating to armies and for sewers rates.[54] An entry in the Stationers' register on January 30th 1689 shows this was a general practice. Robert Vincent placed an entry for,

---

[52] On the wealth and size of London parishes see, Craig Spence, *London in the 1690s: A Social Atlas* (London: Centre for Metropolitan History, 2000), 107-112.
[53] There are numerous boxes of receipts for the Rich household see TNA, E192/16/22; E192/17/5; E192/16/8; E192/14/3; E192/14/7; E192/14/6.
[54] TNA, E192/14/7; E192/14/6

> …blank acquittances from the head collectors, and blanck acquittances from the sub collectors to their neigh[bour]s who shall on the behalf of their landlords pay the tax laid on their landlords to be deducted out of the rent.[55]

Like the hearth tax receipts discussed previously, these slips therefore negotiated a number of exchanges. However, rather than re-presenting them to collectors at the next round of collection, tenants presented them to landlords, indicating that there was no duplicate given to the tenant to keep. The intention was that the tenant would pass them on. There was a print culture to tenancy and, in this context, printed receipts functioned as paper money. Tenants handed receipts over to get the amount taken off the rent. Landlords kept receipts to balance the books when rent was due. Receipts then became tools for accounting.

Building Accounts and Social Standing: Receipts in Personal Records

Having established the types of printed receipts distributed to taxpayers, this section focuses on how printed receipts were used to construct personal accounts. It shows the entry of institutional print into household accounts and the change in function that followed. From the receipts that survive, it is easy to suppose that it was standard practice to keep receipts; there is inevitably more evidence of fastidious collecting than there is of careless discard. Nonetheless, the rest of this chapter will focus on what individuals did with their receipts. As well as serving as proof of payment, receipts were critical to building accounts and, consequently, individual reputations. Paper scraps and personal solvency were intimately bound.

The early modern period witnessed the spread of double entry bookkeeping in the commercial sphere, although it is harder to find evidence of these practices in people's everyday dealings. Mary Poovey argues that the establishment of fact in the early modern world centred on the particular 'rhetoric' of double entry bookkeeping. To construct a truthful account, incomings and outgoings had to be written in a certain way. The entry of figures into account books 'transformed representations of

[55] Edward Arber, *A transcript of the registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers', from 1675-1708, Vol.3* (London: Stationers' Company, 1913), 361.

these things into usable facts.'[56] Scholars have predominantly focused on the written records of traders and merchants and the stimulus this gave to governmental procedure.[57] How fully bookkeeping permeated individual accounting is less clear. Although receipts suggest a ready exchange of cash, there is little evidence of many men and women doing much bookkeeping to record these transactions. Most people were more concerned with chasing up debts than with balancing the books. Nonetheless, there are examples of receipts in personal records, which do show how they were used to construct individual records of creditworthiness.

Although hearth tax was an assessment levied on property, the receipts were an assessment of the individual. The hearth tax receipt of 'Lady Archer' recorded 'eight & twenty shillings' paid for one half years' duty for 'her houses in Theyden Garner.' The collector James Ayleet noted, 'Two of these are in Earl's house & three were in [illegible] Hemmonds house: one whereof was demolished before Michls 1684.'[58] Rather than one receipt per property, Lady Archer received a single receipt for the hearths in all her properties. Of course, practice may have fluctuated between collectors, but, once handed over to the taxpayer, the receipts became an individual record of dutiful payment. It is, therefore, surprising that receipts have not figured more prominently in discussion of early modern accountancy, in the way that ledgers and ready reckoners have.

Accountancy has been termed 'intrinsic to, and constitutive of social relations' and although studies of accountancy have started to look at the ledgers of individuals, there has been no analysis of the receipts they received that recorded financial exchanges.[59] Numeracy was advancing amongst early modern men and women and, with it, there was a growing appetite for accounting manuals.[60] Examinations of

---

[56] Mary Poovey, *History of the Modern Fact: Problems of Knowledge in the Sciences of Wealth and Society*, 29-30; see also Grahame Thompson, 'Early double-entry bookkeeping and the rhetoric of accounting calculation', in *Accounting as Social and Institutional Practice*, ed. Anthony Hopwood and Peter Miller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994): 40-66.

[57] See for example Jacob Soll, 'From Note-Taking to Data Banks: Personal and Institutional Information Management in Early Modern Europe' *Intellectual History Review*, 20:3 (2010): 355-375.

[58] Chetham's Library, H. P. 1126.

[59] Peter Miller, 'Accounting as social and institutional practice: an introduction' in *Accounting as Social and Institutional Practice*, ed. Anthony Hopwood and Peter Miller, 1.

[60] Keith Thomas, 'Numeracy in Early Modern England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 37 (1987): 103-132; Templates for various types of receipts are given in John Carpenter, *A most excellent*

account books not only detail a burgeoning numerate society, but also recognise that constructing accounts was a form of self-presentation.[61] With this, the ways to read account books have expanded. In his examination of the accounts of Richard Stonely, one of the four Tellers of the Exchequer of Receipt from 1554, Jason Scott-Warren argues for the 'need to examine the documentary mode of early modern diaries and account-books.'[62] Stonely was scrupulous in making sure his accounts looked right to hide the fact he fudged the numbers. Examples like this have made account books and, especially their construction, an intriguing topic of study. Seventeenth-century taxpayers received an increasing number of receipts at the same time that there was a greater onus placed on their ability to produce accounts that at least looked plausible. This was no coincidence.

Once one considers receipts as part of accounting processes, it becomes clear that these printed sheets played an important role in the transfer of information necessary to build accounts and, in turn, the construction of individual creditworthiness. By following receipts into accounts, the crossover of the slip as state print and personal record becomes apparent. Shepard argues, 'A culture of appraisal was firmly woven into the fabric of social relations and articulation of social difference.'[63] From bartering on the street to giving testimony within the courtroom, making an account of oneself intertwined financial credibility with moral rectitude. Shepard also argues there was a 'material basis' to understandings of social worth as the ability to appraise moveable goods was integral to 'social estimation.'[64] Although, Shepard is referring to things such as livestock and furniture here, the receipt as a material possession of an individual warrants discussion. It was proof of financial

---

instruction for the exact and perfect keeping merchants books of accounts (London, 1632); for a detailed discussion of this literature see Natasha Glaisyer, *The Culture of Commerce in England 1660-1720* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006), Chapter 3, 'The compleat comptinghouse: manuals for merchants'.

61 Adam Smyth, *Autobiography in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), Chapter 2; Jason Scott-Warren, 'Books in the bedchamber; religion, accounting and the library of Richard Stonely', in *Tudor Books and Readers; Materiality and the Construction of Meaning*, ed. John King (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010): 232-252; Basil Yamey, 'Daniel Harvey's Ledger, 1623-1624 in context', *Accounting, Business and Financial History*, 20:2 (2010): 163-176.

62 Scott-Warren, 'Books in the bedchamber; religion, accounting and the library of Richard Stonely', 251; see also Idem, 'Early Modern Bookkeeping and Life-Writing Revisited: Accounting for Richard Stonley'. *Past and Present*, 230, supplement 11 (2016), 151-170.

63 Alexandra Shepard, *Accounting for oneself,* 47.

64 Ibid, 32.

credibility. Yet, existing literature on accounting focuses exclusively on the completed ledger, from which to 'read' the individual, overlooking these paper slips. In his equation of account books to a form of autobiographical writing, Adam Smyth emphasises the textual transience of these books, as information was 'shunted from text to text.'[65] Nonetheless, he concentrates solely on how individuals transferred notes from pocket books, ready reckoners and other notebooks into formal accounts and makes no mention of such paper slips. Receipts were integral to this record production. Good accounting practice and the promise of a full ledger required a written slip for each transaction. When people did keep accounts, receipts were integral to this mode of self-presentation.

This gives another dimension to signatures and other marks of authentication inscribed on receipts. The importance of securing signatures was outlined in Robert Chamberlain's contemporary guide to accounting, which instructed, '…to which Receipt in your Book the person receiving the said money is to set his hand and if he be a Servant the said Servant is to let his hand in the behalf of his Master.'[66] Signed receipts not only confirmed the initial transaction, but also substantiated the accounts drawn up from them. Like other financial paperwork, such as bonds and bills of exchange, a signed endorsement underwrote the exchange. Signatures 'were essential for secure and trustworthy financial transactions.'[67] As state material, tax receipts, once signed, were a form of governmentality, as well as a piece of fiscal print. Signatures activated the pro forma and subsequent presentations of receipts constituted another display of this governance.[68] This was also the case for company receipts. New River receipts carried the printed statement 'By me' before the collector's signature, making the signature a printed declaration of the collector. Towards the end of the period, some receipts started to have the names of collectors printed on them. The same names appeared on receipts for different levies. Collectors, including William Pedley and Littleton Westley, were on receipts for land

---

65 Smyth, *Autobiography in Early Modern England,* 59.

66 Robert Chamberlain, *The Accomptants Guide or Merchants Book-keeper* (London: 1679), 56.

67 Glaisyer, 'Calculating credibility: print culture, trust and economic figures in early eighteenth century', 708; see also Randall McGowen, 'Knowing the Hand: Forgery and the Proof of Writing in Eighteenth-Century England', *Historical Reflections*, 24 (1998): 385-411.

68 Francis Cody, 'Inscribing subjects to citizenship: Petitions, Literary Activism and the Performativity of Signatures in Rural Tamil India', *Cultural Anthropology*, 24:3 (2009): 347-380.

tax payments, as well as receipts for an assessment for disbanding the forces and paying seamen.[69] In addition to showing that individual collectors commissioned their own printed paperwork, this also reveals the way in which collectors 'signed' their receipts. Printed names, rather than handwritten signatures, legitimated these sheets. Whether written or printed, the inscription of the collector enabled the transfer of information from receipt to ledgers.

The correspondence of early modern men and women discloses that there was demand for this material proof. Samuel Pepys was fastidious in getting receipts for his business dealings. He recorded receipts he drew up as well as those he received, often for considerable amounts of money. In relation to a sum of seven hundred pounds on behalf of his Lord to a Mr Moore, he wrote,

> After long discourse with him of the fitness of his giving me a receipt for this money, which I for my security think necessary and he otherwise do not think so, at last, after being a little angry, and I resolving not to let go my money without it, he gave me one.[70]

For Pepys, the production and exchange of a receipt was pivotal for the transaction to take place, regardless of Moore's reluctance. In another exchange, he took a receipt 'for the remainder of my money' and 'saw it entered in their ledger.'[71] He not only ensured he got a receipt, but checked that it matched those with whom he was doing business. Material proof provided a form of security and guided his business encounters.

Accounting in his professional role fed into Pepys' personal dealings. As Chief Secretary to the Admiralty, Pepys needed accounting skills. Moreover, because basic numeracy was not part of his education at either St. Paul's or Cambridge, Pepys relied on classes from 'Richard Cooper, the one-eyed ship's mate of the Royal Charles' to learn his multiplication tables.[72] To help organise his transactions, he also referred to

---

69 TNA, C104/197.

70 26th August 1663, Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys, Vol IV, 1663*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews (London: Harper Collins, 2000), 288.

71 10th May 1667, Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys, Vol VIII, 1667*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews (London: Harper Collins, 2000), 209.

72 Thomas, 'Numeracy in Early Modern England', 112.

accountancy books, alongside other mathematics books, typifying his 'use of manuals as resources for social advancement.'[73] Although his accounts do not survive, Pepys appears to have followed these guides to the letter, keeping financial documents in order to construct ledgers and his famous diary. A diary entry on 3rd April 1666 referred to 'the account which I raise from my acquittance[s]', demonstrating that receipts built accounts and assured accuracy.[74] Receipts were part and parcel of his accounting practice, thereby evidencing the interplay of Pepys' paperwork. They contribute to the 'mutual textual pedigree' that has already been established between Pepys' account books and diaries.[75] Accounting technique shaped his diary keeping as, '…Pepys jotted down notes in a manner closely resembling the keeping of a register or ledger. A central column noted key events, which were linked, by dashes and brackets, to corresponding indices of time past and money spent...'[76] Pepys' capacity for bookkeeping infused his wider record keeping. Of course, holding a senior position in government, Pepys was not typical of most men and women, and this necessitates locating receipts in other accounts.

The receipt book of Robert Nailer, resident of Blackfriars parish in London, offers an alternative example of what people did with printed receipts.[77] This receipt book survives in the Chancery records at The National Archives, along with the rest of his personal papers. Its depository in the assignments in bankruptcies indicates that Nailer had fallen on hard times. In the manner Shepard describes, Nailer was accounting for himself and, in addition to personal testimony, was supplying all available paperwork to do so. Aside from this receipt book, I have not found any further record of Nailer in the Hearth Tax lists or other data sets on *Locating London's Past*, including the four shillings in the pound lists.[78] Nonetheless, the book provides an intriguing example of what people did with their printed receipts. Placed inside a receipt book, government receipts gave an account of Nailer as a dutiful taxpayer.

---

[73] Peter G. Boys, 'Samuel Pepys's personal accounts', *Accounting, business and financial history*, 5:3 (1995), 311; Kate Loveman, *Samuel Pepys and his Books: Reading, Newsgathering and Sociability, 1660-1703* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 77.
[74] Boys, 'Samuel Pepys's personal accounts', 311.
[75] Mark Dawson, 'Histories and Texts: Refiguring the Diary of Samuel Pepys', *Historical Journal*, 43:2 (2000), 417.
[76] Ibid, 416.
[77] TNA, C110/2.
[78] *Locating London's Past* https://www.locatinglondon.org/index.html (accessed March 7th 2017)

This was more than a notebook for memorandum.[79] It also went further than the handwritten marginal note in Charles Stanhope's copy of Francis Bacon's *Advancement of Learning* to 'Remember to pay shippe mony…'[80] Nailer pasted his hearth tax receipts onto the pages of the book (Figure 40). Inside the pocket-sized book, a hearth tax receipt from 1680 filled an entire page. Many more people may have kept receipts books like this without facing bankruptcy and so such books have not survived. Equally, the blank pages of almanacs provided handy places to store receipts. There are also examples of receipts becoming binding material. In the binding of a 1670 edition of John Milton's *The History of Britain* listed on the ESTC, there is a poem and a receipt for land rents paid by Andrew Hall on 19th January 1687.[81] Keeping his receipts in a dedicated book Nailer was, then, an exemplar of the conscientious bookkeeper.

Nailer followed best practice. In his guide to accountancy, by way of a dialogue between a merchant and his apprentice, John Vernon highlighted the importance of receipt books. The merchant warned, '…much Money is carelessly lost for want of it. For if you take Receipts for money upon Papers and then scatter them carelessly, you are subject to lose them.'[82] Transferring receipts into books assured their survival. The format of receipts, as small paper slips, suited exchanges on doorsteps, but it did not constitute a permanent record. Vernon also advised that receipt books needed to be bound longways, '...for generally receipts are short, and little Paper serves, and therefore it would be but waste to rule it and bind it broad-ways, and ruled with a Margent, and Pounds, Shillings and Pence.'[83] The distinct format of receipts demanded a particular type of binding. This distinguishes receipt books from the design of account books, and reiterates the importance of paper slips in the conception of a complete account. Scholars' preoccupation with account books has meant these constituent parts have been overlooked. Receipts bridged the gap

---

[79] Richard Yeo, *Notebooks, English Virtuosi and Early Modern Science* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2014), Chapter 2, 'Capacious Memory and Copious Notebooks.'
[80] Sarah Werner, 'Surprised by Stanhope', *The Collation*, The Folger Library, September 16th 2014, http://collation.folger.edu/2014/09/surprised-by-stanhope/
[81] John Milton, *The History of Britain, that part especially now call'd England* (London: by J. Macock for James Allestry, 1670), R13663, Huntington Library shelf mark, 105617.
[82] John Vernon, *The compleat comptinghouse: or, The young lad taken from the writing-school and fully instructed, by way of dialogue, in all the mysteries of the merchant* (London: 1683), 78.
[83] Ibid, 79.

between fiscal exchange and record. The pasting and archiving of paper slips was practiced much more widely than the famous collecting and cataloguing conducted by the likes of Ulisse Aldrovandi and Christophe Plantin.[84] It was a routine part of balancing the books. Clearly, the stages by which the flotsam of receipts were stuck or pinned down were as important to the construction of accounts as the writing of the final version.

The rest of Nailer's receipt book shows that interactions with tax collectors were not as routine as pre-printed receipts suggest. The hearth tax receipt in Figure 40 is one of eleven held inside the book, although not all of them were stuck in, which means, of course, that further examples could have been lost. Nailer had hearth tax receipts for every year from 1683 to 1689 and two receipts for the years, 1684, 1685, 1686 and 1688. Each receipt was for six shillings. The dates written on the receipts do not correspond to the designated collections of hearth tax every six months, in March and September. Instead, the receipts show collectors came at various points throughout the year. It was not a regular or routine flow of print at chosen points in the year. Instead, it was whenever the collector came around or, perhaps, when he could lay his hands on receipts. This was also evident in the numerous receipts issued to Wentworth and Rich. Furthermore, one receipt could cover a few scheduled payments. The six shillings Mr Cartwright paid to the Convex Light Company was for 'two quarters.'[85] Schedules of collections determined encounters with print. From the dates written on receipts it is evident that the consumption of these printed slips was neither quotidian nor routine.

Nailer archived hearth tax receipts alongside other receipts and memoranda to construct an account of himself. There were ten other printed receipts folded inside his book. They were for payments to the militia and government assessments, including four receipts for payments of ten shillings towards a 'Quarterly payment of the Aid lately granted to Their Majesties of the Summ of Sixteen Hundred Fifty One Thousand Seven Hundred and Two Pounds Eighteen Shillings.' Together with hearth tax receipts, this reveals the various junctures at which Nailer obtained printed

---

[84] Considine, 'Cutting and Pasting Slips: Early Modern Compilation and Information Management', 493.

[85] *Received of [blank]... (*London, sn, 1690), R217522.

receipts from different collectors. Further manuscript entries included a written receipt from churchwardens for fifteen shillings, paid for a pew in St Anne's Church, Blackfriars, as well as one for three shillings and four pence for a gallon of brandy, and a note that a Mary Young owed him thirty-three pounds. Nailer's tax receipts were part of his wider financial and social exchanges. There were two written confirmations that he received sacrament and a memorandum that people had been sitting in his pew. These written entries took up entire pages of his notebook, revealing what else Nailer was minded to record. Inside the book, state material sat alongside written notes to give an account of the individual. Tax receipts formed part of the day-to-day expenditure to construct Nailer's identity, not just as a dutiful taxpayer, but also as an upstanding member of his local community. Not only did he pay his taxes, he also gave generously to the local church.

In this way receipts can help us redraw understandings of the circulation and consumption of print. It is well established that printed books transformed early modern literacy and a litany of studies chart the appetite of particular individuals and the emergence of a reading public more broadly.[86] In turn, studies of cheap print are emphatic about the influx of ballads, chapbooks and other printed sheets into early modern homes.[87] Receipts widen the body of print encountered across society still further. Of course, the very poorest in society were exempt from the majority of these taxes and corporate charges. Nonetheless, a growing number of men and women received printed receipts with their names and details on them. These slips differed markedly from the other print that people might have owned. They supplement and extend recent work that has emphasised the diverse practices that constituted reading. Reading went beyond the bound book and incorporated the materiality of texts on walls, tapestries and other surfaces.[88] However, as Scott-Warren notes, within the history of reading, 'The emphasis has increasingly fallen on *how* things

---

[86] For example, see the seminal essay of Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton, "Studied for Action": How Gabriel Harvey Read his Livy', *Past and Present*, 129 (1990): 30-78; Kevin Sharpe, *Reading revolutions: the politics of reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000).

[87] For an illuminating accounts of ballad reading by looking at libel cases see Fox, *Oral and Literate culture in England*, 1500-1700 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 299-325; see also Watt, *Cheap print and popular piety, 1550-1640*; Spufford, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: popular fiction and its relationship in seventeenth-century England*.

[88] Juliet Fleming, *Graffiti and the Writing Arts of Early Modern England*; Susan Frye, *Pens and Needles: women's textualities in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 2010).

were read, rather than on *what* was read.'[89] While Scott-Warren sets out the case for Stonely's accounts and the texts he bought, my discussion of receipts has wider implications for this perspective. An increasing amount of administrative print entered the early modern household at various intervals and was subject to particular kinds of reading and record keeping. While this print engendered practices of annotation, compilation and binding that literary scholars have emphasised was part and parcel of early modern reading, receipts also elicited practices of exchange and information transfer that contrast in important ways from the texts examined by these scholars.

From the examples of receipts given to women, we can expand our understanding of women's experience of print and shed light on their financial dealings. There are swathes of work on the reading practices of early modern women, yet the issuing of receipts highlights another type of text they encountered.[90] The receipts already discussed in this chapter that were issued to Anne Dixon during the Civil War, Lady Archer for hearth tax and Anne Rich for her church donation demonstrate that fiscal print was for both sexes.[91] Scholarship increasingly points to the literacy rates of women being higher than initial studies suggested, using their signatures on administrative documents to do so.[92] However, in terms of women's engagement with print, scholars continue to focus on a narrow corpus of material, usually books. In addition to showing the other print women encountered, receipts provide material evidence of women's participation in economic transactions. This corresponds with a broader consensus of their economic activity in the period. Far from being 'shadowy bystanders' in economic transactions, receipts confirm that women played a role in the accounts of the household, as well as in exchanges beyond

[89] Scott-Warren, 238.
[90] For an overview of this literature and further discussion see Heidi Brayman Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender and Literacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University 2005).
[91] LRO, DG 21/264-65; Chetham's Library, H. P. 1126; TNA, E192/14/6.
[92] For a discussion of women initialling documents in the London Consistory Court Records see, Eleanor Hubbard, 'Reading, Writing and Initialling: Female Literacy in Early Modern London', *Journal of British Studies*, 54:3 (2015): 553-577.

it.[93] Women paid their taxes and received the correct paperwork in return. Institutional print reformulates broader discussion of social relations.

At the end of his chapter on jobbing print, Stallybrass claims pre-printed sheets became the 'texture of everyday life', as people encountered this print all the time, without necessarily being able to read it.[94] There were different types of literacy in the early modern period.[95] This analysis of receipts has shown what was done with the sorts of print people may not have read. They may have only glanced at receipts to check the billing was correct, but, as the case of Nailer demonstrates, receipts served many purposes beyond the initial transaction. People were obliged to keep them even if they could not read them. Even though receipts were not quite the 'texture of everyday life', which Stallybrass suggests, because of their uneven distribution, they do evidence the growing demand for written documents, confirming rights and obligations. Andrew Wood argues that 'By the sixteenth century, many copyholders had their own little archive of written material that had been passed on to them by their ancestors.'[96] Institutional print infiltrated and extended these little archives.

Conclusion

Tax receipts identified an individual as a taxpaying citizen. These paper slips made a statement about a person's property and status as a member of society. Once again, this undermines the categorisation of items of jobbing print as simply transient and throwaway. As a result, receipts cannot be described as ordinary items of print or indicators of the 'quotidian' for which Peacey is desperately in pursuit, or the 'everyday' that Stallybrass suggests. This was not everyday print. It was cheap, but not ubiquitous. By further distancing receipts from other 'cheap print', such as broadsides and ballads, the multifaceted life of single-sided sheets is exposed. Tax

---

93 Alexandra Shepard, 'Crediting Women in the Early Modern English Economy', *Historical Workshop Journal*, 79:1 (2015), 2; see also Eleanor Hubbard, *City Women: money sex and social order in early modern London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

94 Stallybrass, 'Little Jobs…', 340.

95 For discussion of different types of literacies see Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: written language and models of interpretation in the eleventh and twelfth centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 7.

96 Andy Wood, *The Memory of the People: Custom and Popular Senses of the Past in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 54.

collection, whilst routine, was not something that occurred each day. Aside from weekly and monthly collections during the Civil War, most tax collection was less frequent, and the dates on receipts reveal an even more scattered consumption of print. What printers produced in bulk for institutions, men and women experienced sparingly, if not sporadically. Collections of receipts in personal papers show the receipts individuals received, often over an extended period, revealing the fits and starts in which it was encountered and, with it, the varied interactions between state and citizen.

Undoubtedly, the fastidious preservation and filing of receipts by some ran parallel to the careless scatter of others. Nonetheless, this chapter has shown receipts used in transactions that demanded their retention. Even if individuals eventually threw away their receipts, they kept them provisionally to negotiate further encounters with hearth tax collectors, or to pass on to landlords. Elsewhere, individuals constructed personal accounts out of printed slips. In each case, the function of receipts as a printed technology in the construction and performance of social relations was apparent.

In my previous chapter on visitation articles, I questioned whether the term 'jobbing' adequately describes the type of print commissioned by institutions. The material considered here extends this in another way. Administrative print not only flowed from presses and into offices, but also constituted a key avenue through which people experienced print and were thus drawn into various collectivities. Unlike the sheets circulating within church courts and registries, this print entered the homes of early modern men and women. Receipts were not read aloud, like the family bible, nor pasted on walls, like ballads and broadsides, but they provided material proof of one of life's inevitabilities: taxes. The next chapter will consider other junctures when people encountered and consumed print via parochial officers and courts. It examines the print culture of local governance.

Chapter Five Making Paper Work: Print in Local Governance

At the Surrey Quarter sessions on 4th August 1665, Thomas Hawes, of St Olave parish, appeared before the court, 'for saying he cared not a fart or a turd for the Justices of the peace or their warrants or the Constable that executed the same warrants.'[1] This presents us with an example of the limits of the early modern state and its paperwork. From Ogborn's discussion of the East India Company to Valentin Groebner's exploration of identity technologies in early modern Europe, scholars make significant claims about the power single sheets bestowed on the individual, and their capacity to enact and perform governance and to construct power. Ogborn asserts, 'For both script and print, it is the detailed geographies of local process of production that can explicate the process of the making of meaning in texts as they are produced as material objects.'[2] This chapter focuses on print in the performance of governance at a local level. It examines the kinds of print that passed into the hands of local officers and on to the wider populace developing the discussion of fiscal print in the previous two chapters to think more critically about print and paperwork in the workings of the state.

Historiography of early modern state formation and governance has increasingly taken a local approach to rethink power structures. It has focused in particular on JPs and local quarter sessions that were the first point of contact with officialdom for the majority of the populace.[3] The 'revolution in officeholding' during this period meant more people were involved in governance throughout England.[4] Added to this, the responsibilities of office holders expanded in areas of

1 Dorothy Powell and Hilary Jenkinson ed. *Surrey Quarter Sessions Records: the order books and the session rolls, Easter 1663-Epiphany 1666,* Vol. 39 (London: Surrey Record Society and the Records Committee of the Surrey County Council, 1939), 261.

2 Ogborn, *Indian Ink: Script and Print in the Making of the East India Company*, 8.

3 Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England, 1550-170,* 30-32.

4 Anthony Fletcher, *Reform in the Provinces: The Government of Stuart England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 8; Mark Goldie, 'The Unacknowledged Republic: Officeholding in Early Modern England' in *The Politics of the Excluded, c.1500-1850*, ed, Tim Harris (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001).

tax collection and law enforcement.[5] Incorporating the 'local' has replaced traditional top down models of state power with an understanding that governance was a 'process' and power was dispersed.[6] Steve Hindle and others have presented a more complex model of governance that emphasises the varied interactions between different levels of the state, whereby exchanges between central and local government were dynamic, complex and flexible. This work built on from the new social history, which refigured histories of politics. Most obviously, Keith Wrightson's seminal study of English society.[7] Wrightson and his contemporaries concentrated on networks of human relationships in local settings, turning explicitly away from Westminster as the traditional chamber of political power. They argued that the workings of the state could be found in provincial contexts, whether in the suppression of alehouses or the officeholding of the 'middling sort.'[8] Politics was everywhere and manifest in diverse and often muted ways.

While this work has been incredibly important for rethinking approaches to state formation, little space has been made for the role of paperwork. Hindle does comment on the volume of recognizances justices used to bind people into good behaviour and loyalty to the state.[9] There has also been some recognition that provincial authorities had the capacity to implement their own policies and Paul Griffiths has recently focused on the 'paper regimes' of local governance.[10] His study of Norwich court records stresses the sophistication of local record keeping prior to the implementation of landmark legislation, such as the Poor Law. Instead of collecting information to pass on to central government, city administrators created records for local use. However, the way in which paperwork was part of these new state ties has scarcely been mentioned or explored. As a consequence, print has been

---

5 Joan Kent, *The English Village Constable 1580-1642: A Social and Administrative Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986); Gerald Aylmer, *The State's Servants: The Civil Service of the English Republic, 1649-1660* (London: Routledge, 1973); for a recent account of local governance during the Civil War see also Hughes, "The Accounts of the Kingdom': Memory, Community and the English Civil War', 317 and 313.

6 Steve Hindle, *The State and Social Change in Early Modern England, 1550-1640* (Basingstoke: Palgrave 2000).

7 Wrightson, *English Society, 1580-1680*.

8 Ibid; see also Clark and Slack ed. *Crisis and Order in English Towns, 1500-1700: Essay in urban history*; for an insightful overview of the field see Hindle, Shepard and Walter, 'The Making and Remaking of Early Modern English Social History'.

9 Hindle, *The State and Social Change in Early Modern England, c.1550-1640*, 114-115.

10 Griffiths, 'Local Arithmetic: Information Cultures in Early Modern England', 116.

a minor feature of this story. As previously discussed, scholars point to the production and distribution of proclamations, pamphlets and books of orders from centre to periphery to characterise print as a nation-making technology.[11] Where examples of print commissioned locally have been found, they have been depicted as responding to the demands of national politics. In his examination of early modern Bristol, Barry argues that local governors spent very little on print 'except in political emergencies.'[12] Furthermore, Peacey cites printed petitions ordered by local authorities, which were used to lobby Parliament.[13] This presents a very limited remit in which local authorities commissioned print.

Equally, there has been little discussion of the use of print in local governance. Both Raven and Jenner mention the early adoption of printed passes commissioned by the London Corporation.[14] On a wider scale, the administration of Poor Law legislation by local officers has been identified as an area in which printed pro forma became increasingly common. Hindle's discussion of 'technologies of identification' notes four identification materials; begging licences, vagrants' passports, poor badges and settlement certificates, invariably administered by parish officers. Not all of these were printed. However, he discusses them in conjunction with one another to emphasise how these documents 'validated claims to certain rights' and asserted, 'local thresholds of belonging.'[15] He outlines the distinct chronology of each,

> licences were largely … granted before 1601 (when they were in principle discontinued by the poor relief statute of the same year); and certificates were overwhelmingly drawn up in the period after 1662 … Although there were some experiments in badging the poor before the 1690s, the practice seems to have been common only in the two or three decades after a statute of 1697. Only the issuing of passports to vagrants was carried out with any constituency over the whole period …[16]

---

11 Slack, 'Books Of Orders: the Making of the English Social Policy, 1577-1631'; Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy*, 87-88; Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*, 1.

12 Barry, 'Communicating with authority: the uses of script, print and speech in Bristol, 1640-1714', 200.

13 Peacey*, Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*, 271, 274-275.

14 Raven, 76-77; Jenner, 'London', 306-307.

15 Hindle, 'Technologies of Identification under the Old Poor Law', 231.

16 Ibid, 221; For an overview of legislation see, Paul Slack, *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England* (London: Longman, 1988).

The legislation of 1662 that installed the widespread use of settlement certificates has been pinpointed as a turning point for the adoption of print. These printed pro forma proved an individuals' residence in a parish and their right to claim poor relief. Naomi Tadmor's recent work on settlement certificates uses these documents to advance the idea of a burgeoning marketplace for print in local government in the eighteenth century.[17] She focuses on the production of certificates by printer John Coles, who developed a standardised form used throughout the country, to suggest that the print trade drove the adoption of print by local government. This was not print returned to central government. Instead, quarter sessions and JPs dealt with the provision of the poor, and certificates were resolutely local in circulation and often kept in the parish chest.[18] While settlement certificates may have instituted a wider and sustained use of print, this chapter focuses on a range of print used by local officers. It argues that there was a broader print culture to local governance that requires greater extrapolation.

In doing so this chapter qualifies the notion that print was a signifier of state formation. When print has been mentioned in examinations of local governance it has, again, been uncritically equated to increasing standardisation. Exploring the increasing power of parish constables, Joan Kent states 'one of the clearest reflections of … standardisation in the procedures is the increasing use of printed forms.'[19] Just as we saw in relation to tax collection in Chapter Three, print seemingly brought a uniformity of practice. Similarly, Braddick argues that in the Restoration, 'Procedures were routinised - the use of printed warrants ... bears testimony to a wider process.'[20] Eisenstein's model of standardisation wins out again here. Print is seen as evidence of greater efficiency in administration that fits neatly into overarching themes of state formation and increasing control from governing authorities that characterise the early modern period.

---

17 Naomi Tadmor, 'The settlement of the poor and the rise of the form c.1662-1780', paper given at Sheffield Centre of Early Modern Studies, University of Sheffield, 29 Oct 2015, article forthcoming in *Past and Present*.

18 Hindle, 'Technologies of Identification under the Old Poor Law', 228.

19 Joan Kent, 'The Centre and the Localities: state formation and parish government in England, circa 1640-1740', *The Historical Journal*, 38:2 (1995), 390.

20 Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England, 1550-1700*, 167.

This chapter re-examines these assumptions by looking at surviving examples of civic and quarter session print and printed licences issued by local officers. While it is clear that there was an increased flow of print to provinces, especially in the latter part of the seventeenth century, this chapter challenges the presumption that standardisation was an inevitable consequence. Just how much print was there in provincial governance? Did the impetus to use print come from central directives or was it the proclivity of local officers? How did the adoption of print shape state practice? This chapter focuses on governance outside of London to show that the uptake of print by secular authorities was uneven and fairly slow prior to the mid-seventeenth century. There are some early examples of printed pro forma, most obviously alehouse licences that predate the watershed moment of 1662 that Tadmor proclaims and reveal how certain local authorities commissioned print. Eschewing the idea that print can automatically be equated with the increased efficiency of governance, this chapter engages with the various levels of state that ordered and used print.

To gauge the extent of print in local governance necessitated looking at both central and provincial government records to see what passed from one to the other. I surveyed the accounts of secular government in York and Oxford.[21] However, I was unable to find any accounts from quarter sessions that detailed either payments to printers or purchases of print. In lieu of accounts, I examined printed editions and calendars of session records to supplement what is on the ESTC.[22] Whilst these editions give comprehensive lists of those issued with licences, warrants and recognizances, they rarely detail whether such documents were printed. This reflects

---

[21] Mary Hobson and Herbert Salter ed., *Oxford Council Acts, 1626-1665* (Oxford: Clarendon Press for the Oxford Historical Society, 1933); I examined York City Chamber Accounts, YCA, Y/FIN/1/2/25 (1653-1665) and Y/FIN/1/2/26 (1666-1679); see also Jenner, 'London', 303 n.61 and D. M. Palliser, *Tudor York* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929), 169-170.

[22] John Bennett and John Dewhurst ed. *Quarter Sessions records with other records of the justices of the peace for the county palatine of Chester, 1559-1760, Vol 1*, Lancashire and Cheshire Record Society Publications, 94 (Chester: Printed for the Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 1940); Edward Benjamin Cunningham, *Records of the County of Wiltshire, Being Extracts From the Quarter Sessions Great Rolls of the Seventeenth Century* (Devizes: G. Simpson & Co, 1932); James Howell ed. *Norfolk Quarter Sessions Order Book, 1650-1657*, Norfolk Record Society, 26 (Norwich: Norfolk Record Society, 1955); Powell and Jenkinson ed. *Surrey Quarter Sessions Records: the order books and the session rolls, Easter 1663-Epiphany 1666;* E. H. Bates and M. C. B. Dawes ed. *Quarter Session Records for the county of Somerset, Vol III: Commonwealth 1646-1660* (Frome: Somerset Record Society, 1912); William Le Hardy, ed., M*iddlesex Sessions Records Vol IV 1616-1618,* Middlesex County Records, 4 (London: Middlesex County Council,1941).

the minute books they transcribe. Court clerks seldom commented on the materiality of documents issued. This problem of description was also apparent in archival catalogues. Regional record offices with surviving paperwork from quarter sessions do not typically describe whether it is printed or manuscript. Whereas I examined the Borthwick records box by box, to measure the amount of print in the church courts, it was not possible to do this here. Accordingly, I accompanied this analysis of quarter sessions publications with an examination of licensing records at the National Archives to get a sense of how much and what kinds of print were distributed to the provinces and then returned to government. Whilst not comprehensive, the material found gives a very different picture of print at a local level.

The three sections of this chapter explore particular types of print and administrative processes to assess the performance of print in local administration. The first section compares the print distributed from central government to local incumbents, to that commissioned provincially. This encompasses different types of local institution, including quarter sessions, corporations and university towns and reveals that, whilst presses in university towns did produce material for local governance, secular government used less print than the church courts examined in Chapter Two. A closer analysis of licensing in the second section develops this further. It looks in turn at passes for maimed soldiers, the administration of wine licences, Lenten licences and alehouse licences. This reveals how the uptake of print varied according to the dictates of central procedure and the proclivity of local officers. Detailing the circulation of this material develops the arguments made in the previous chapter that administrative print transforms our understanding of the print culture early modern men and women encountered. The final section looks at forgeries, for forgery cases provide a different perspective on the functioning of the paper state. As the expectation for particular documents to be printed increased, it became necessary for fraudulent versions to follow suit. Examples of fakes show how a material understanding of administrative culture and the place of print within it permeated beyond officeholders.

Print in the Provinces

The mass of paper involved in local governance is frequently seen as a marker of state formation. Hindle points up the extensive use of recognizances as evidence of the 'participatory nature of state formation in the English context.'[23] Paper bound people in huge numbers to the state and to each other, tying them socially and financially into obedience.[24] Document creation was at the centre of state control. In Cheshire alone, Hindle counted 4,120 recognizances for peace and good behaviour in the sessions record books between 1590 and 1609, and the numbers increased year on year.[25] Often pre-written, these slips testify to the material output of a state that sought to gain greater control over its people. Similarly, Bob Shoemaker gives a breakdown of the number of recognizances administered by secular courts in Middlesex and Westminster between 1661 and 1725 to unpack government attempts to impose law and order.[26] This is demonstrative of how scholars have concentrated on the volume of paperwork produced to think about governance in action.[27] However, existing scholarship has not engaged with the paperiness of these records, or the paperchains that were at work here. The central purpose was control, but the paperwork was unrelenting.

Equally, the swathes of literature produced for officeholders reflected the appetite for governance by the middling sort. Manuals for officeholders gave examples of the myriad documents they issued, as well as explaining the conditions of use. In his opening epistle to the 1626 edition of his work *The Countrey Iustice,* Michael Dalton declared,

---

23 Hindle, *The State and Social Change in Early Modern England, c.1550-1640*, 114.

24 For discussion of paper as binding material see also the discussion of penal bonds in Tim Stretton, 'Written Obligations Litigation and Neighbourliness, 1580-1680', *Social Relations and Social Change in Early Modern England,* ed. Hindle, Shepard and Walter, 194.

25 Hindle, *The State and Social Change in Early Modern England*, 103.

26 See Table 5.1 in Robert B. Shoemaker, *Prosecution and Punishment: Petty crime and the law in London and rural Middlesex c.1660-1725* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 96.

27 For further examples see Bernard Capp, 'Republican reformation: Family, community and the state in Interregnum Middlesex, 1649-60.', in *The Family in Early Modern England*, ed. Helen Berry and Elizabeth Foyster (Cambridge University Press ,2007): 40-66; Sharpe, *Crime in seventeenth-century England*, Fig.4, 194.

> I have therein indeavoured to set downe things so plainly, and briefly as I could with reference to the statutes abridged, whereby the Reader may better resolve and satisfie of himself what he ought to do in every particular almost, that shall come before him, or them, out of their generall sessions of the peace[28]

This book, like William Lambard's *Eirenarcha* (1581), gave examples of all sorts of licences, bonds and warrants, as well as details of the legislation that underwrote them.[29] Reprinted throughout the seventeenth century, these texts incorporated changes in the laws with each new edition and became standard texts for office holding. It comes as no surprise, then, that printers produced pro forma of the paperwork included in these manuals. The 1623 and 1628 Letters Patent of Symcocke and Wood both referred to writs and warrants for sheriffs and JPs.[30] This would seem to support both Kent and Braddick's assertion that print bought standardisation to state administration, however looking more closely at the adoption of print like this shows it did not.

To start with, print produced centrally could leave space for regional variation. As we saw in Chapter Three, Robert Bromfield's hearth tax exemption certificate had Surrey printed in the top left hand corner and receivers' receipts also had the names of various counties printed on them. This helped the filing of these documents when returned, but also meant that there was a level of variation in the print produced. This was also true of pro forma administered by local courts and officers. Stationers' registers include two entries for printing sacrament certificates in 1673 by a Master Isted and another by John Bellinger and Charles Harper.[31] Significantly, the entry made by Bellinger and Harper specified that they would have 'the word (county) in the sevall places aforesaid or with a blank.'[32] They produced items in bulk, with the

---

[28] Michael Dalton, *The Countrey Iustice...* (London: s.n. 1626).
[29] William Lambard's *Eirenarcha: or of the office of the iustices of peace* (London: imprinted by Ra: Newbery and H. Bynneman, by the ass. Of Ri. Tot[ell] & Chr. Bar[ker], 1581); see also J. P. Gent, *A New Guide for Constables...* (London: Printed by the assigns of Richard and Edward Atkins, 1692); For discussion of the transcripts for Alehouse licenses in Dalton see Judith Hunter, 'Legislation, Royal Proclamations and Other National Directives affecting Inns, Taverns, Alehouses, Brandy Shops and Punch Houses, 1552 to 1757' (PhD, University of Reading, 1994), 62.
[30] Youngs, 124; for transcripts of Wood and Symcocke's Letters Patents see Greg ed. *A Companion to Arber*, Vol 1, 165-167 and 172-173.
[31] Arber, *A transcript of the registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers; from 1640-1708*, Vol. 2, 459- 461.
[32] Ibid, 461.

names of various counties in them or blank spaces for the manuscript addition of this information. The centralised production of pro forma therefore incorporated regional variation. It is quite possible that this practice was common for other pro forma local officers used. Indeed, there are further entries by John Bellinger for burial in woollen certificates and bonds that would have also found their way into the hands of justices.[33] This compares with identical sets of visitation articles for various dioceses and archdeaconries, discussed in Chapter One, which had different title pages, and presents another example of how one print run might produce multiple print jobs. The sacrament certificate in Figure 41, from Middlesex quarter session records dates from 1675 and is printed on parchment with italic typeface. Without an imprint at the bottom, there is no way of knowing if Bellinger and Harper printed it, but the certificate does have the blank space for the handwritten addition of the county, as Bellinger and Harper specified. Secular authorities bought an increasing amount of 'off the shelf' pro forma that left room for the particularities of place to be specified.

An absence of local presses did not prevent quarter sessions from commissioning print altogether. Undoubtedly, it was after the lapse of the Licensing Act in 1695 that local printing took off. By the eighteenth century, presses had sprung up in all major towns and, furthermore, Raven asserts, 'the earliest regional printing originated from the demands of municipal government.'[34] Sure enough, printed pro forma in regional archives dating from the end of the seventeenth century carried the imprints of local printers.[35] This shows the level of printedness reached in the 1700s. However, there is evidence that some local authorities ordered print before this. This included two orders for print in the Kent record office catalogues. The East Kent Order book from Midsummer 1655 detailed,

> Mr John Fry, the Treasurer of the country stock, shall pay Andrew Broughton, clerk of the peace, 30s for orders concerning the rates of wages which he had printed for the benefit of the county.[36]

---

[33] Arber, Vol. 3, 69, 72, 73, 75; Vol 2, 317; see also Peacey, *Print and Public Poltics*, 335.
[34] Raven, 75; see also Ian Maxted, 'Single Sheets from a County Town: the Example of Exeter', in *Spreading the Word The Distribution of Print 1550-1850*, ed. Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Winchester: St. Paul's Bibliographies, 1990).
[35] Devon Record Office, QSB, Epiphany and Easter 1689/90, Box 126, holds pauper apprentice indentures printed in Exeter from the 1690s, my thanks to Dr. Mark Hailwood for this reference.
[36] Q/SO/E1/f.14, this information is from the Kent archives online catalogue, http://185.121.204.47/CalmView/Default.aspx.

If we take the figure of one penny per sheet, this order equates to 360 sheets. There was a larger order, on 7th November 1655, for 'Printing and delivering Sessions' orders 1500 copies.'[37] In addition to the print supplied from the likes of Harper and Bellinger, there was some print commissioned specifically for local circulation. This also gives a sense of the cost and quantity of print required for distribution in the county. Crucially, none of these orders are in the ESTC and the records also detail later examples of printed forms used to fine those who refused to take the office of surveyor of the highways and for the reimbursement of parish surveyors.[38] The scant accounts demonstrate some commission of print at a local level before the establishment of local presses, but this was not comprehensive.

Surviving examples of quarter sessions orders support these initial findings that only a few local authorities ordered print. As already stated the ESTC is not comprehensive, but records some further examples of quarter sessions that supplement the order from Kent. The Essex quarter sessions issued a single sheet publication '*For the better control of rogues and vagabonds…*' in 1623.[39] London presses produced this print for local sessions. These printed orders provided instructions to officers and parishioners, usually about vagrancy and the regulation of prices, reinforcing central legislation. Figure 42 maps the other surviving orders issued from different quarter sessions in England and Scotland, outside of London. Those mapped are the earliest found on the ESTC. The ESTC also records further examples of orders from the same places.[40] In comparison to the visitation articles mapped previously, print was adopted later and by fewer offices. Apart from the Essex order from 1623, all date from the second half of the seventeenth century. Those from Ayrshire, Aylesbury and Hertford all date from the Interregnum, which

---

[37] Q/SB/6/71 this information is from the Kent archives online catalogue, http://185.121.204.47/CalmView/Default.aspx.

[38] Q/SB/22/244-45; Q/SB/7/1660, this information is from the Kent archives online catalogue, http://185.121.204.47/CalmView/Default.aspx.

[39] *For the better control of rogues and vagabonds…* (London: W. Jones, 1623), S92491.

[40] The earliest example for each place has been given in each case; *Hert. ss. At the general session…* (S.I.: s.n, 1656), R232493; *At a Quarter Session held at Air…* (Edinburgh: Printed by Christopher Higgins, 1657), R172624; *Southt. ss. Ad General Quarterial Session…* (London: s.n. 1678), R213917; *Devon ss. Ad general. Quarterial. Session…* (London: printed by J[ames] C[ottrell] and Freeman Collins for Charles Yeo bookseller in Exon, 1683), R216569, R233404; *Dorset ss. De record general session…* (S.I: s.n, 1683) R205909; NRO, ZB0076/63/02 general order, 1682; *Bucks. Ss. To all well disposed people… (*London: s.n., 1654), R492135.

corresponds to the orders for print in the Kent quarter sessions records. The majority of these orders were for quarter sessions located in the southern half of England. Again, those closest to the printing presses in London were more likely to order print. In addition to indicating the relatively small amounts of print commissioned locally, this shows that it was confined to a few areas.

Despite the fact that little print commissioned locally survives, what there is does show a more diverse print culture operating at a local level than previously assumed. Papers of the Brockman family, from Kent hold a number of printed sheets concerning governance in the county.[41] It gives a sense of the print received from both central and local government. In addition to pro forma to do with tax collection, detailed in Chapter Three, there are two copies of a printed table of 'The Rates of Wages of Artificers, Servants and Labourers' according to assessments made at the Maidstone Quarter Sessions in 1672 by Henry Head, Clerk of the Peace for the county.[42] This listed numerous occupations, from thatchers to reapers, and specified the wages they should expect, depending on the time of year and nature of the job. Not only does this add to the types of print commissioned within the county, it also shows what else hung up in marketplaces besides the regular publications of the assize of bread and ale, printed from the 1530s onwards, as well as proclamations and orders, distributed from central government.[43] In her discussion of playbills, Tiffany Stern argues that playbills hung separately from proclamations and tables of weights and measures as 'different kinds of texts were expected to occupy their appropriate spheres.'[44] What the wage tables from Kent make apparent is that public spaces were conduits of official print from different state levels.

---

41 BL, Add MS 42596, Brockman Papers Vol XI, f.68, 22, 27, 28, 116, 155; Add MS 42597 Vol XII f.9, 10, 20, 102, 103.

42 BL, Add MS 42596, Brockman Papers Vol XI, f.22.

43 For example, *The assise of bread and ale and dyuers other thynges, as appeareth on the other side of the leafe* (Imprynted at London: In Fletestrete in the house of Thomas Berthelet, nere the Cundite,1532), S133; John Penkethman gained a monopoly for these publications in 1637 see Greg ed., *A Companion to Arber,* 104; for discussion of The Assize of Bread see E. G. Dowdell, *A Hundred Year of Quarter Sessions: The Government of Middlesex from 1660 to 1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932), 176-181; there is an example on the ESTC of a form filled in by local officers about market prices, *An inquisition taken [blank] in the county [blank]… (*London: s.n., 1633?), S114745.

44 Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England*, 54.

Bills of mortality produced from various towns highlight that this adoption of print was not restricted to simply regulating local markets, but also communicated vital statistics within the vicinity and on to central government. Towns produced bills during outbreaks of plague. There has been much discussion of the printed bills of mortality produced for London throughout the seventeenth century, and, whilst Slack referenced a number of regional examples, they are overlooked as a form of print.[45] State Papers include a large number of bills from Norwich, as well as examples from Bristol and Great Yarmouth, from the 1660s.[46] The commission of provincial bills was in response to Books of Orders that specified the need to have ready accounts of mortality. The substantial variation in the format of bills from different places is indicative of the fact that sourcing print was down to local officers. The surviving examples were those sent to central government to keep them up to date with mortality in the provinces and it is also likely that they were distributed locally. This production of bills of mortality fits with Barry's assertion that the print local authorities ordered was in response to 'political emergencies.' Pro forma communicated mortality data to central government. Furthermore, payments for bills in Oxford and printed bills for Cambridge from the 1630s and the 1660s reveal that university printers in each town produced bills of mortality.[47] There was an increasing print traffic between central and local government and bills of mortality demonstrate that this was, in part, two-way traffic.

The production of bills of mortality by university printers warrants a closer analysis of the other print produced for local administration in Oxford and Cambridge. A vagrant's pass printed in Cambridge in 1617, demonstrates another type of print ordered for the use of officers in the town.[48] Passing reference has been made to print such as this in discussions of the university press, but there has been no

---

[45] Paul Slack, *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003), 239; for discussion of London bills see Robertson, 'Reckoning with London: Interpreting the Bills of Mortality before John Graunt'; Jenner, 'Plague on a Page: Lord Have Mercy Upon Us in Early Modern London'.

[46] TNA, SP 29/185/[V]; there are also more Norwich bills in SP 29/229/945; there is also a printed cumulative bill of an outbreak in Chester during 1647 in BL, Harley MS 1929, V.69, f.36; for further discussion of these local bills see Frances Maguire, 'The Power of the Ephemeral: Print, Record Making and Government in Seventeenth Century England' (MA thesis, University of York, 2013), Chapter 1.

[47] Payments to university printers in Oxford for bills of mortality are noted in, Jason Peacey, 'Printers to the University, 1584-1658', in *The History of Oxford University Press Vol 1*, ed. Ian Gadd, 56; Cambridge University Archives CUR 54, no. 242; CUA T. X.21.

[48] *Memorandum that [blank] being taken vagrant and wandring..,* (Cambridge?: s.n., 1617), S91285

comprehensive examination of it.[49] In turn, town council records from Oxford highlight a comparable use of print. On December 21st 1646,

> It is agreed that the ffreeman's Oath shalbe printed att the Towne Clarke's chardge and that hereafter when every ffreeman shalbe sworne he shall have a Coppie of the same Oath onder the Towne Clark's hand paying for the same to the Towne Clarke twoe pence.[50]

The council ordered print and freeman of the town had to purchase their own copy. It is evidence of the local production, circulation and consumption of print. A further entry, on October 14th 1659, explained that, because chamberlains had 'general and constant trouble to ... go from house to house to demand the rents due from the City tenants', they were given a letter of attorney under the city seal to empower collection and,

> in order that the City tenants shall have knowledge of this Council order, tickets are to be printed at the expense of the City and sent to every tenant signifying that is the rents are not paid to the chamberlains at the Guildhall in the days thy are due then the said chamberlains shall have the power of re-entry.[51]

Much like the collection notices issued for tax collection detailed in Chapter Four, residents of Oxford received printed demands for rent. In this instance, however, print negotiated interactions with local offices responsible for collecting rent money. Print interspersed the paperchains of local governance in university towns.

The establishment of presses in Oxford and Cambridge undoubtedly facilitated the adoption of print for aspects of local governance, although the presence of a press was not tantamount to the adoption of print. Whilst printing houses in York supplied the church courts, there is no evidence that the Corporation ordered print in the same period.[52] The print culture of local government, therefore varied considerably from place to place. Once again Stallybrass' summation that 'every branch of …local

---

49 Print order by the town is mentioned in passing in Ould, 'Ephemera and Frequently Reprinted Works', 294; see also, Peacey, 'Printers to the University, 1584-1658'.
50 Hobson and Salter ed., 142; there is a detailed examination of printed oaths in Chapter Six of this thesis.
51 Ibid, 250.
52 YCA, Y/FIN/1/2/25 (1653-1665) and Y/FIN/1/2/26 (1666-1679).

government' ordered an endless supply of small jobs falters.[53] Overall, local secular authorities commissioned relatively little print before 1640. Local officers were increasingly familiar with various printed forms produced centrally and this mediated their interactions with the populace, but it did not bring standardisation to governance in the way scholars previously described.

Licences for sale

Licensing develops this discussion as it reveals the fluctuations in state practice that resulted in a mixed adoption of print. Licenses were usually administered by local officers, but coordinated by various levels of the state. As we saw, church courts dealt with the licensing of preachers, midwives and schoolteachers, whilst secular courts and their associated officers dealt predominantly with public houses and paupers. The fees charged for drawing up these items were a steady source of income for quarter sessions and JPs also supplied licences out of court. Central directives for licences relied on the localised infrastructure of quarter sessions and JPs. The exchange of documents established a contractual relationship between institution and individual. Moreover, presentation of licences and recognizances at subsequent quarter sessions, or before justices, underlines the social life of these administrative documents. In this sense, they were less like the recognizances Hindle described as binding people into good behaviour and more like Gowing's discussion of apprenticeship indentures, where the document was subject to a number of performances. This section looks, in turn, at licences issued to maimed soldiers, the wine licences issued under the monopoly of Walter Raleigh, the administration of Lenten licensing and, finally, alehouse licences that shows both the central and local production of printed pro forma.

Soldiers' passes were not issued by local officers, but had to be presented to them so that military men could receive charity as they travelled home. As such, these passes present an early example of printed pro forma passing through parishes and into the hands of JPs. An act of 1593 installed a 'state system of benefits for rank-and-

[53] Stallybrass, 'Small Jobs…', 331.

file disabled veterans' that was amended at various points during the 1600s.[54] It included a pension scheme for injured soldiers and was funded by local rates. To get a pension and charity on the parish, soldiers needed certificates from military captains, which confirmed their disability. Geoffrey Hudson invokes Foucauldian ideas of state control over the body to quantify these developing systems of relief, as 'increasingly applicants cited their inability to work rather than serve again' in passes.[55] A printed pass for a Thomas Hobbs in 1612 worked much like a vagrants pass. The pass of Hobbs declared he 'hath served in the Warres in the Low Countries...and is now to repaire unto the County where he was borne, there to remaine and and to be set on worke.'[56] On the back of the certificate, handwritten notes by officeholders detailed the towns through which he passed. One states, 'Pade the 17 of Maye 1612 to the bearer nere of to passe oute of mydellsaxe [Middlesex] the some of twelvpence. John Robynsone, Tresere.' Another note from the Treasurer in South Wiltshire gave him money 'to mayntayne him untill the next qter Sessions.' The pro forma had a dual function. It secured charity for Hobbs and gave him free passage home. There was then a much wider use of print to bestow rights than Hindle's discussion of settlement certificates would have us suppose. Printed forms underwrote state provision for the injured body that elicited a distinct set of interactions from officers. Unsurprisingly, these passes proliferated in the Civil War. A printed pass issued to John Cumin in 1646 came from General Fairfax. The pass ordered that Cumin be granted free passage to Winchester, and stated that 'Magistrates of Townes and Constables of villages are to accommodate him with competent lodging and free quarter…'[57] The Treasurers for Maimed Soldiers, the body responsible for organising collections for injured soldiers discussed previously also issued certificates.'[58] These examples demonstrate the alternate flows of print into parishes and the hands of local officers, by way of war weary solders.

---

54 Geoffrey Hudson, 'Disabled Veterans and the State in Early Modern England' in *Disabled Veterans in History*, ed. David Gerbier (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2012), 117.
55 Ibid, 126.
56 Transcript of a printed pass for a soldier from 1612, in Cunnington, *Records of the County of Wiltshire, Being Extracts From the Quarter Sessions Great Rolls of the Seventeenth Century*, 304.
57 Ibid, 323.
58 Ibid, 341.

Wine Licences

The wine licences issued under the monopoly of Walter Raleigh present another example of the 'extra-state' adopting print for administration, akin to fee farming examined in Chapter Three. Before being sold off to private collectors, wine licences were issued by JPs under an Act of 1553 by both Mary I and Elizabeth I. Sir Edward Horsey was then granted the patent in 1570 to license fourteen towns and, in 1575, this patent was extended to include London.[59] The licences issued during Horsey's administration were manuscript.[60] It was when Walter Raleigh took over the wine licensing monopoly that the first printed licences survive. Raleigh held a patent for issuing wine licences between 1583 and 1588. This was subsequently renewed until 1602, when James I terminated the contract, under pressure from Parliament to curtail the number of monopolies given out by the Crown. The end of his licensing monopoly meant a substantial loss of revenue for Raleigh.[61] However, the remaining paperwork shows how a scheme coordinated by the extra-state initiated the use of print.

The uptake of print was in no doubt prompted by the national scale of the monopoly. Both the licences issued to retailers and the counterparts kept centrally were printed. Six printed licences, all from 1583, survive in Essex.[62] This was because they wrapped the session rolls, rather than because of any systematic filing of the forms. It is another example of the often incidental survival of this type of print. This distribution of printed licences to local officers corresponded with the pro forma returned to central offices. The example of a counterpart in Figure 43 shows how the ostentatious design of these pro forma bolstered the legality of Raleigh's licence. It uses civilité typeface and Raleigh's printed signatures adorns the page, together with

---

59 Youngs, 126.

60 For a surviving licence from 1578 for Francis Garten of Arundel see West Sussex Record Office, Lavington Mss 152, this information is from West Sussex Record Office online catalogue http://www.westsussexpast.org.uk/SearchOnline/Overview.aspx; for indentures TNA E 176 Exchequer: King's Remembrancer: Vintners' Fines.

61 For discussion of the value of the monopoly to Raleigh see, Raleigh Trevelyan, *Sir Walter Raleigh* (London: Penguin Books, 2002), 360.

62 Q/SR 95/78 (1583); Q/SR 153/75 (1583); Q/SR 130/56 (N.D); Q/SR 120/54 (1583); Q/SR 121/51 (1583); Q/SP 44/74 (This is incorrectly dated 1573), this information is from the Essex Record Office online catalogues, http://seax.essexcc.gov.uk/.

wax seals and a decorated initial.[63] The gesture of the signature and use of civilité is similar to the scribal aesthetic examined in New River Company leases. Private schemes used print to effect the authority of a governing body.

This displays a unique engagement with print in the context of projects. Selling off the administration of wine licences reflected a wider projecting frenzy taking place in crown finance. Backdating the 'Age of Projects' from the 1680s, Joan Thirsk highlights the spread of projecting under Elizabeth I, which persisted during James' reign. Whilst initiated to stimulate domestic industries, Thirsk argues that, by 1580, projects were money-making schemes for the Crown and speculators alike.[64] Projects incorporated existing areas of government revenue, as well as exploiting new areas of interest, such as the draining of the Fens. James Cramsie likens projects under James I to 'proto-privatisation', wherein politics and finance converged. He argues that projecting was a 'mentality' that 'either paired public and private or remade political relationships along the same lines to serve the ends of governance.'[65] Raleigh's licences not only serve as one of the earliest examples of a printed licence, they also show the use of print for the administration of the project.

Print performed projects, rather than just promoting them. Whereas existing scholarship focuses on the employment of print for lobbying schemes, these licences and the counterparts evidence a very different engagement with print. As with fee farming detailed in Chapter Three, this privatisation of government bought administrative demands. Scholars lavish attention on the printed books produced by projectors to 'counsel policy makers.'[66] Outlining the case for a particular project as well as its expected profit, print in this instance marketed a project as a profitable and bona fide undertaking. Print and projecting went hand in hand. During the 1640s Balthazar Gerbier used print 'strategically' to promote his academic academy and lobby political authorities, and in similar fashion, Valentine Knight produced printed

---

63 TNA, C 238, Chancery: Wine Licenses; for survival rates and distribution of the licences, see also Hunter, 101-111.

64 Joan Thirsk, *Economic Policy and Projects: The Development of a Consumer Society in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 51.

65 John Cramsie, *Kingship and Crown Finance under James VI and I, 1603-1625* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002), 36.

66 John Cramsie, 'Commercial Projects and the Fiscal Policy of James VI and I', *The Historical Journal*, 43 (2000), 353-354.

proposals for rebuilding London after the Great Fire in 1666.[67] Nonetheless, Raleigh's licences and counterparts illustrate a very different use of print. Not only were these produced much earlier than these subsequent discussions of print and projecting, they performed a different function. Print was not adopted to reach a wide audience and promote a scheme, it was used to effect 'official' paperwork beyond the initial pitch of an idea. It reinforced the privileges bestowed by the letters patent to collect fees and impose fines. This print reached local officers charged with administering the licences. As well as carrying out an administrative function, the use of print, parchment and paratextual features here effected a projecting 'charisma'. Raleigh patterned his paperwork to elicit the necessary reception and response from administrators and licence holders.

Not all liquor licensing projects employed print in this way. The infamous Giles Mompesson, granted the patent to license inns in 1617, did not print licences.[68] This was licensing for revenue, not regulation. There were no restrictions on what Mompesson could charge for a licence. He was running a racket and started to overreach into lesser alehouses, which clashed with the jurisdiction of JPs. Moreover, it was counterproductive to effective regulation as the more inns he licensed the more money he made, so there was no incentive to limit drinking holes.[69] Inns were just one of Mompesson's projecting interests, as he was also involved in selling decayed timber from royal forests, which he deliberately undervalued for greater profit, in addition to other licensing commissions for goldsmiths, silkmen and coal.[70] The paperwork he managed to produce was questionable. There are examples of inn licences with forged signatures of JPs and other instances of bribing assize judges to sign them.[71] Paperwork failure and excessive profiteering were symptomatic of the wider condemnation of projects. James withdrew several monopolies after the House

---

[67] Jason Peacey, 'Print, Publicity and Popularity: The Projecting of Sir Balthazar Gerbier, 1642-1662', *Journal of British Studies*, 51:2 (2012), 288; Mark S.R. Jenner, 'Print Culture and the Rebuilding of London after the Fire: The Presumptuous Proposals of Valentine Knight', *Journal of British Studies*, 56:1 (2017): 1-26.

[68] Hunter, 'Legislation, Royal Proclamations and Other National Directives affecting Inns, Taverns, Alehouses, Brandy Shops and Punch Houses, 1552 to 1757', 126.

[69] Cramsie, *Kingship and Crown Finance under James VI and I, 1603-1625,* 65.

[70] S. Lee, 'Mompesson, Sir Giles (1583/4–1651x63)', rev. Sean Kelsey, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18932, accessed 3 Feb 2016]

[71] Hunter, 'Legislation, Royal Proclamations and Other National Directives affecting Inns, Taverns, Alehouses, Brandy Shops and Punch Houses, 1552 to 1757', 133.

of Commons investigated the King's grants of monopolies and patents between 1621 and 1624, although they continued relatively unabated under Charles I.[72] The case of Mompesson demonstrates that print was not present in all areas of the extra state. Raleigh's licences present a singular adoption of print from this perspective.

Lenten licencing

Lenten licensing provides an example of how the legislative drive of central government initiated the use of print to bind people into abiding by the law. These licenses, were implemented some years after Raleigh's monopoly and restricted victuallers, alehouse owners and other retailers from selling meat during Lent and other holy days. Orders and proclamations to abstain from meat, particularly in London, 'were an almost annual occurrence from 1559 onwards.'[73] However, it was under James I that there was a determined administrative effort to enforce such legislation, not least because it offered a means to raise revenue by charging for the necessary bonds.[74] In 1619, two separate proclamations were issued that directly concerned Lenten licensing.[75] The latter declared that, despite previous legislation,

> Wee yet find the inordinate libertie now usually taken by all sorts of people to kill, dresse, and eate Flesh in the Lent season and on other dayes and times prohibited by Law, is become an evill of such inveterate growth, as requireth more than ordinary care to suppresse the same…[76]

Accordingly, the proclamation ordered justices to compel innholders, alehouse keepers, butchers and other purveyors of meat to enter recognizances to ensure they complied with Lenten laws. As we shall see, this initiated the uptake of printed pro forma. However, it is important to document the print disseminated before this in order to see how the paperwork of licensing developed in an attempt to enforce Lenten laws.

---

72 Elizabeth Read Foster, 'The Procedure of the House of Commons against Patents and Monopolies', in *Conflict in Stuart England: Essays in Honour of Wallace Notestein*, ed. W. Appleton Aiken and B. Duke Henning (Hamden: Conn: Archon Books, 1970).

73 Youngs, 123.

74 Chris Kyle, ''A Dog, a Butcher and a Puritan': The Politics of Lent in Early Modern England', Paper given at the Institute of Historical Research, 3 May 2016.

75 Hughes and Larkin, *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Vol 1*, no.181 and 184.

76 Ibid, no. 184.

Printed orders and tables accompanied the proclamations that relayed instructions for the sale of meat during Lent. The 1561 proclamation, republished each week before Lent, ordered abstinence from flesh between Shrove Tuesday and the Tuesday after Palm Sunday.[77] Hefty fines and disenfranchisement faced those who contravened the statute, yet it was weakly enforced. A Letter from the Lord Mayor of London to the Lord Chancellor on 9th February 1612 complained,

> So great has been the abuse and contempt of the former Orders for the keeping of Lent, that His Majesty had been enforced to prohibit absolutely the killing of flesh by any butcher or other person in the City, or any other part of the Kingdom, during this Lent, and therefore caused certain new Orders to be printed and published for that purpose.[78]

In an attempt to counter abuses of the law, officers ran up, hung up and read out print. Printed orders circulated elsewhere. The Kent catalogue refers to a letter from the Privy Council to the Lord Warden forwarding a printed order regarding the eating of flesh in Lent, dated February 7th 1590/1.[79] This print failed to prevent persistent flouting of the law and those caught rarely faced the full fine, as many officers turned a blind eye to meat consumption.[80]

This outpouring of print extended to the display of tables in the premises of retailers, highlighting the other spaces official print penetrated. A copy of a warrant in State Papers from 1585 commanded Mayors and Sheriffs to,

> …charge every inn holders, tavern keeper, and other common victuallers to place in their rooms a breviat or table printed by John Storye, of Redcliff (Ratcliffe), Middlesex, for the better observance of fish days…[81]

This warrant is significant in two respects. Firstly, it shows the production of printed tables from an early date.[82] Secondly, it indicates the widespread display of official

---

77 Youngs, 123.

78 Quoted from W. H. Overall and H. C. Overall ed., *Analytical Index To the Series of Records Known As the Remembrancia Preserved among the Archives of the City of London 1579-1664* (London: E.J Francis & Co., Took's Court and Wine Office Court, E.C 1878), 399.

79 Kent R.O., NR/CPw61, this information is from the Kent archives online catalogue, http://185.121.204.47/CalmView/Default.aspx.

80 Youngs, 124; Kyle, ''A Dog, a Butcher and a Puritan': The Politics of Lent in Early Modern England'.

81 SP 12/185/100.

82 Youngs noted this order but failed to detail it was printed, 124.

print in drinking establishments. I have found no surviving examples of these documents; their display in alehouses inevitably limited their chances of survival.[83] As a result, there is no information on what they looked like or what they contained. Most likely, they gave an overview of Lent legislation and fasting days, without the lengthy preambles and wordy explanations given in acts and proclamations. By the beginning of the seventeenth century, a "table' referred to a systematic list of facts, arranged in columns.'[84] It was a reference point for both licensee and customer. This reveals the other types of print state officials circulated and posted in different places. Not only was there a print culture to local government, but it entered spaces like alehouses, as well as marketplaces.

Although it was under James I that the first printed recognizances concerning Lenten laws were issued to retailers, early printed alehouse recognizances make reference to the sale of meat. Alehouse keepers entered recognizances to get licences for their establishment. The earliest printed alehouse recognizances refer to Middlesex in the printed text, which suggests their circulation in this county only. The example in Figure 44 is from the Liberty of St Katherine's by the Tower in London. The single sheet printed on one side has the parish of the licence-holder written at the top. The printed text is in civilité type. This example was for Anne Chamberlain, bound for the sum of ten pounds on April 4th, 1600. It asserted that there would be no gambling or unlawful games; no eating of meat on fast and holy days; no selling of drink on the Sabbath; no lodging for more than a day; no lingering or loitering; no drinking after nine; no selling of stolen goods; no harbouring of rogues or vagabonds; that ale was to be sold at the right price, strength and measurement and, finally, that the alehouse keeper would observe all other statutes and ordinances relating to victuallers or alehouse keepers. The sheet bound Anne Chamberlain to observe a lengthy list of requirements that covered Lenten laws as well as other government concerns, such as vagrancy, Sabbath breaking and gambling. One pro forma covered a lot of ground. Alehouse licensing will be discussed in more detail in the following

---

[83] There is a later reference in 1595 to a printed table from a Captain Robert Hitchcocke entitled, 'A briefe note of the benefits that grow to this realme by the observation of fish days', in Richard Roberts ed., *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. The Marquis of Salisbury, Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire, Vol. 5, 1591-95* (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1894), 528, calendar entry no. 1079.

[84] Watt, 224.

section, however, these recognizances represent a remarkable example of printed pro forma for licensing in the Elizabethan period from which we can see the development of printed pro forma for Lenten licensing.

The rigorous enforcement of Lenten laws under James I instituted the wider use of printed recognizances. These differed markedly in format from the recognizances issued in Middlesex. They were smaller slips, with texts on both sides of the paper or parchment. Some of these again had a printed reference to the county in the top left hand corner. Figure 45 shows a bundle of bonds returned from Norfolk during the Jacobean period.[85] The contrast from Anne Chamberlain's recognizance is evident. In Lenten recognizances, the instructions in English were in roman type and the Latin preamble in italic. Other bundles of bonds were in civilité, highlighting the changes in format that resulted from different print runs. The length of instruction also varied between different print runs of the Lenten bonds. The shortest bond read,

> The Condition of this Recognizance is such, That if the within bounden [ ] or his Assignes shall not kill or dresse to put to sale, any kinde of Flesh victuals, at any time during the time of Lent next coming contrary to the Lawes of this Realme, Then this Recognizance shall be voide, or else it shall stand and remaine in full force and effect…[86]

Rather than Anne Chamberlain's alehouse recognizance, these printed forms resemble the administration bonds from the church courts. Again, the majority were small parchment slips inscribed on both sides. Even the illiterate could recognise parchment slips as bonds, despite the legal jargon and Latin, because of the format of the sheet.

Crucially, the early alehouse recognizances from Middlesex and the later Lenten recognizances are held in the classification E180 at The National Archives, which enables an examination of the uptake of print in this aspect of local governance. The file E180 has been pinpointed as an exemplar of the early adoption of print and civilité for government paperwork.[87] However, as already demonstrated,

---

85 TNA, E180/114/27.
86 TNA, E180/14/9.
87 Jenkinson, 'English Current Writing and Early Printing', 291-293; Youngs, 123-124.

this classification is made up of different types of documents, some alehouse recognizances and some Lenten recognizances. Furthermore, not all of the documents are printed. In total, there are 194 files in E180, of which the majority are Lenten recognizances issued in the seventeenth century. Given the large number of documents, it was impractical to look at each to see what was printed. I therefore took samples of documents catalogued as printed and those catalogued as manuscript to examine whether the catalogue descriptions matched the materiality of documents. From the samples I looked at, the catalogue descriptions were correct and, therefore, I used it to glean the levels of print.[88] Going through the catalogue entries for this file systematically revealed a variable degree of print in local administration.

The centralised organisation of Lenten licensing, whereby justices had to return the bonds they issued every three month to the Exchequer, did initiate a wider use of print than the recognizances typically issued out of quarter session described by Hindle. It did not, however, ensure the blanket uptake of print. London Corporation accounts included payments to the Deputy Common Clerk, Robert Mitchell, of two shillings and six pence, 'for filing up the exchequer the Certificates for eating of fflesh in Lent last.'[89] The files in E180 are organised by county. Of the thirty-nine historic counties, there are records from thirty, although the periods covered and the number of records from each varied. Therefore, we do not have a consistent set of records from each county over the same period of time and the records include the schedules for some counties, as well as the recognizances. Figure 46 graphs the printed and manuscript recognizances by county. It reveals that there were low levels of print and that the uptake of print varied from place to place. Of the 194 files in E180 (two have been removed from the file and three do not give details of which county they are from) only 22, from eight different counties, contain printed documents. 'Norf county' (Norfolk) holds the most examples of print, with eight bundles recorded. The vast majority of these recognizances were manuscript, demonstrating that print in one county cannot be taken as evidence of its presence throughout local administration. Surveying the contents of the file systematically foregrounds the relative scarcity of print in a select number of counties and, thus,

[88] Youngs notes one printed bundles not stated on the catalogue, TNA, E180/104, see Youngs, 124.
[89] LMA, Chamber Accounts, City Cash 1/1 f. 66.

once again, the patchy uptake of print. Centralised policy did not institute the wide scale use of print, which is a recurring theme throughout this thesis.

Detailing the chronology of this print also reveals distinct patterns of use. As we saw from Anne Chamberlain's recognizance, the earliest use of print was exclusively in London, while the rest dated from the administrative drive in licencing conducted under James I. The graph in Figure 47 plots the dates of these printed recognizances in E180 by reign. Only three bundles, which were exclusively the alehouse recognizances from the county of Middlesex, date from the reign of Elizabeth.[90] The majority of the other printed recognizances in E180 date from James' reign as he sought to raise money for the cash-strapped crown. Under James, the bond rate increased to £100 and a rigorous administrative regime of licensing was installed in the hope of raising revenue from bonds and fines.[91] While these measures were largely unsuccessful, this file demonstrates the scale of paperwork produced as a result. Some schedules produced under Charles II from Norfolk reflect the brief reinforcement of the laws in the Restoration. Two printed bonds forbidding flesh to be served during Lent, from 1660, also survive in Kent and in addition to this there are some printed dispensations to eat meat that survive from his reign.[92] Together, these documents span almost a hundred years and, far from demonstrating the widespread engagement with print, show its adoption in fits and starts, in line with the fluctuations of government policy. Affixing print to models of state formation must account for changes in policy and the changes in paperwork that resulted.

Alehouse Licences

Despite the degree of overlap between Lenten laws and the regulation of alehouses, these establishments were subject to their own licensing procedures that prompted the local commission of print. An act of 1552 made a licence a prerequisite for running an alehouse, although various provincial systems had been in place before this. A flurry of legislation at the beginning of the seventeenth century refined and

---

90 TNA, E180/104; TNA E180/105; TNA E180/174.
91 Kyle, ''A Dog, a Butcher and a Puritan': The Politics of Lent in Early Modern England'.
92 Kent R.O., Q/SB/7/89, this information is from the Kent archives online catalogue, http://185.121.204.47/CalmView/Default.aspx; *[blank] Sacrae theologiae professor…* (Oxford?: s.n., ca.1660), R181268; there is also an example of a pre-printed dispensation from Rome in BA, Elmhirst Papers, EM 1287, Pye 7 c.

altered the conditions for licensing as the number of alehouses continued to rise. In total, 'four new Acts were passed between 1603 and 1609, followed by the detailed Royal Proclamation of 1619, and three further Acts in the 1620s.'[93] Information on alehouse legislation was also included in Books of Orders published in 1607 and 1609.[94] This didactic literature, and other proclamations, underwrote the function and content of licences, although central policy was sometimes at odds with local administration. Officers were not always up to date with the latest legislative developments and in his study of alehouse licensing in Southampton, James Brown argues that these officers also pursued local agendas to alleviate pressure on poor relief by allowing unlicensed alehouses to continue operation.[95] Alehouses could alleviate poverty by providing an income to the very poorest, but this had to be offset against curbing the perceived social disorder caused by drink.[96] The 1619 proclamation was not only an 'important shift in the law' but also gave a 'boilerplate text' of a licence.[97] It was the same year that James tightened up the Lenten laws, and points to a broader administrative reform in government to increase revenue that prompted a substantial amount of document production.

The regulation of alehouses has become standard ground in accounts of early modern state formation. For Wrightson, it was an example of the 'middling sort ... exerting themselves in a redefinition of local social relations' and it is also well-trodden ground in discussion of the 'reformation of manners.'[98] Alehouses were the targets of reform to combat the perceived disorder propounded by drink and those at the lower rung of the social strata. In order to obtain a licence, individuals had to attend court, with proof of their character from upstanding members of their parish who acted as guarantors and entered sureties or recognizances, along with the alehouse keeper. There was a standard charge for a licence and the requirement that two JPs sign it. Again, the numbers speak for themselves. Braddick counts 1,682

---

93 Mark Hailwood, *Alehouses and Good Fellowship* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013), 24.
94 Slack, 'Books of Orders: the Making of the English Social Policy, 1577-1631', 5.
95 James Brown, 'Alehouse Licensing and State Formation in Early Modern England', *Intoxication and Society: Problematic Pleasures of Drugs and Alcohol*, ed. Johnathan Herring (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 123-124.
96 Keith Wrightson, 'Alehouses, Order and Reformation in Rural England, 1590-1600' in *Popular Culture and Class Conflict*, ed. Stephen Yeo and Eileen Yeo (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1981), 3.
97 Brown, 'Alehouse Licensing and State Formation in Early Modern England', 117.
98 Wrightson, *English Society, 1580-1680*, 227; Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England, c.1550-1700*, 140-146; see also Fletcher, *Reform in the Provinces*, 229-251.

presentments at quarter sessions in Essex between 1620 and 1680 and a further 873 indictments in relation to alehouse licensing.[99] Regulation not only had implications for business going through the courts and the paperwork required from officers, but also for the function of the alehouse as a social space.[100] Furthermore, licensing procedure has also been used as a way to explore relationships between central and local authorities. Brown argues 'the regulation and licensing of alehouses was a vital topoi or pretext around which central-local and local-local identities were expressed and reshaped.'[101] During the seventeenth century, licensing was increasingly left to local government and studies of particular areas detail both the zeal and lapses in enforcing the law.[102] While alehouse licensing features heavily in accounts of early modern state formation, the paperwork has been overlooked.

Peter Clark vaguely remarks that licences, 'became generally more formalised and uniform, frequently they were printed', but the fact that surviving printed licences vary in format and were produced for different places demands more considered analysis.[103] Aside from the examples from Middlesex, the earliest reference to the general production of alehouse recognizances in Stationers' records was in 1609. On 3rd May, Stationers' court records contained the entry,

> It is agreed vpon betwen mr Eldred mr Anguish and mr Beale, That the said mr Beale shall print for them of Recognizances for alehouses 1000 for 40s vizt 500 in paper and 500 in parchm[en]t, and for mr Millyson halfe so manye of each and for mr Rowley 200 of each at the same rate…[104]

---

[99] Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England,* 141.
[100] Hailwood, *Alehouses and Good Fellowship* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013); for a European perspective see *Beat* Kümin, *Drinking Matters: Public House and Social Exchange in Early Modern Central Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan 2007).
[101] Brown, 'Alehouse Licensing and State Formation in Early Modern England', 112.
[102] Peter Clark, *The English Alehouse: A Social History 1200-1830* (London: Longman, 1983), 179; For details of the legislative history of different drinking establishment and liquor across the period see Judith Hunter, 'English Inns, Taverns, Alehouses and Brandy Shops: The Legislative Framework, 1495-1797', *The World of the Tavern: Public Houses in Early Modern Europe*, ed. *Beat* Kümin and Ann Tlusty (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002): 65-82; for local studies see W. J. King, 'Regulation of Alehouses in Stuart Lancashire: An example of Discretionary Administration of the Law', *Transactions of the Historical Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 129 (1980): 31-46; S. K. Roberts, 'Alehouses, brewing and government under the early Stuarts', *Southern History*, 2 (1980): 54-71.
[103] Clark, *The English Alehouse: A Social History 1200-1830*, 180.
[104] Stationers Company*, Records of the Court 1602 to 1640,* ed. William Jackson (London: Stationers Company, 1957), 109.

Beale held a monopoly over this type of print before Wood and Symcocke made their claim. The cost of forty shillings for one thousand recognizances did not distinguish between the two different types of recognizance produced. The footnote to this entry suggests that Eldred and the others were either the patentees for the licensing order or their agents. In addition, it states that the parchment bonds were for central records, whilst retailers received the paper licences. If this was the case, the materiality of the bonds reinforced the institutional archives as one of permanence. Central records were parchment, whilst men and women received comparatively flimsy paper copies. Undoubtedly, Beale's contract instigated the wider use of printed pro forma, although there are examples of secular courts ordering printed licences that point to a more varied adoption of print at a local level that supplements and extends the previous examples from Middlesex.

Printed alehouse licences exemplify an early adoption of pro forma in the context of local governance. Figure 48 maps alehouse licences attributed to a specific place. Most of these predate the printed orders in the previous map. Furthermore, this was not print commissioned by local governments for political emergencies, in the manner Barry described. Printed alehouse licences demonstrate an employment of print for what became routine quarter session business and support models of state formation that emphasise dynamism between centre and periphery. The map gives the earliest date of any surviving licences, although the database currently in production by the 'Intoxicants and Early Modernity, England, 1580-1740' project could significantly alter this picture.[105] Surviving licences tend to be the unfilled spares rather than those issued to alehouse keepers, which underlines the huge scale of loss. William Lambarde's *Eirenarcha* outlined that clerks of the sessions should keep registers of alehouse licences and warned that the clerk of the peace faced fines for overcharging for licences.[106] Many of these registers survive in local record offices and quarter session books copied the conditions for keeping alehouses.[107] Although we cannot know how many of the entries in registers correspond to the issue of

[105] The database is set for release in the coming months see, https://www.intoxicantsproject.org/
[106] Lambarde, *Eirenarcha: or Of the Office of the iustices of peace*, 420.
[107] Eight numbered articles are recorded in the Wiltshire Quarter Sessions from 1643, Cunningham, *Records of the County of Wiltshire,* 143; Norwich Session books also held eight principles for alehouses in 1656, Howell ed. *Norfolk Quarter Sessions Order Book, 1650-1657*, 86.

printed licences, it suggests that a significant body of print circulated at a local level and that this was prior to the watershed moments of Civil War and Restoration noticed elsewhere.

The considerable variation between surviving examples suggests these were commissioned locally. Figure 48 demonstrates that several licences predated the 'boilerplate' licence given in the 1619 proclamation. The Act from 1608/9 specified that licences had to be, 'sealed with a Comon seale ingraven in brasse with a Rose, and the inscripcon of the Countie, Cittie or towne corporate…'[108] Local seals validated licences outlined in central legislation and it seems this was also a prompt for local authorities to order printed licences. Examples from Essex and Kent both date from 1608.[109] In addition, a printed set of articles for alehouse keepers and victualing houses in Kent included a blank form of licence in Roman letter.[110] Therefore, alehouse keepers received licences alongside articles, which they kept as a reference point, in a similar way to the tables about Lenten laws John Story produced in the 1580s. Instruction booklets for issuing licences in Westminster from 1655 also included a blank form at the end to be filled in and used by officers as a warrant to 'make discovery of all persons offending against any the Laws and Ordinances aforesaid.'[111] This starts to unpack the different pieces of administrative print filled in and filed for alehouses with both local and central origins.

The ongoing inspection and presentation of licences past the point of issue underlines the lifecycle of these printed documents in dynamics of local governance. The 1619 proclamation made licensing an annual procedure. It is unclear whether a new sheet was issued each year or whether the same one was kept. Indeed, procedure may have differed from place to place. Nonetheless, relicensing and rebinding at quarter sessions became a regular procedure and, in Essex at least,

---

[108] 7 James I c.10; Quoted from the transcript of this legislation in Bennett and Dewhurst ed. *Quarter Sessions records with other records of the justices of the peace for the county palatine of Chester, 1559-1760, Vol 1*, 63.
[109] *At a general asse[m]blie of the iustices of the pea[ce]…* (Cambridge: C.Legge?, 1608), S2659; *Articles, vvhich are to be obserued performed and kept…* (London: s.n., 1608?), S126443.
[110] Kent R.O., Sa/ZP3/327, this information is from the Kent archives online catalogue, http://185.121.204.47/CalmView/Default.aspx.
[111] *Several Orders Made and agreed upon by the Iuctices of the Peace for the City and Liberty of WESTMINSTER, Vpon Monday the 10. day of March 1655* (London, Printed by W. G, 1655), R210600

officers used printed licences throughout the period.[112] By the end of the seventeenth century, many counties set aside special days, called 'brewster sessions', for licensing, while a printed circular letter issued in 1672 by the Lord High Treasurer to JPs reinforced the process of recognizances being set at two shillings and sixpence.[113] Moreover, a draft warrant for the renewal of a licence in Dalton's guidebook matched, almost word for word, a surviving printed notice from Kent dating from 1697/8.[114] The notice left blank spaces for time and place to be specified and required licence holders to,

> bring with them their former Licenses, together with sufficient sureties; and a Certificate under the hands of several of the cheifest Inhabitants of their several parishes, of their fitness to be continued in the said calling...[115]

This was a warning for alehouse keepers to get their papers in order. Once issued, alehouse keepers kept licences for future inspections. Like hearth tax receipts discussed in the previous chapter, with each presentation of the printed licence, its governance was re-performed. These printed sheets had an ongoing function in distinct interactions between state and citizen.

Significantly, when commissioned by local authorities, printed licences interwove provincial concerns with the stipulations of legislation. The ESTC records nine surviving printed licences relating to alehouses, in addition to those printed for Beale.[116] This includes three from Kent, two from Cambridge and one each from Essex, Suffolk, Nottingham and Oxford. Printers in London produced the majority of these, although univeristy printers ran up those for Oxford and Cambridge. Many

---

[112] Essex Q/SR 404/28, Pre-printed alehouse license for use in the county of Essex from 1664, this information is from the Essex Record Office online catalogues, http://seax.essexcc.gov.uk/.
[113] Clark, 179; Thomas Clifford, *A true copy of the Lord high Treasurers letter to the justices of the peace...* (London?: s.n., 1672?), R173959.
[114] Dalton, 360.
[115] BL, Add MS 42597, Brockman Papers Vol XII f.9.
[116] *At a general asse[m]blie of the iustices of the pea[ce]...* (Cambridge: C.Legge?, 1608) S2659; *Articles, vvhich are to be obserued performed and kept...* (London: s.n., 1608?), S126443; *At the general Sessions of the Peace holden at [blank]...* (London: J. Beale, c.1615), S92132, S3092; *To all Christian people to whome these presents...* (Cambridge: s.n., 1616), S2547; *To all Christian people to whome these presents...* (Cambridge: s.n., 1618), S2548; *Know all Men by these present...* (London: W. Stansby, ca. 1620), S92133; *Suff. ss. Wheras at the general session at the peace...* (London: s.n., 1631?) S1009; *Villa Nottingham ss. Whereas at the general session of the peace...* (London: s.n., 1631?), S920; T*o all christian people to whom these presents...* (Oxford: s.n., 1640), S94563; *Articles, which are to be observed performed and kept...* (London?: s.n, 1650?), R225710.

followed a similar format to the earlier example of Anne Chamberlain and those produced by Beale. At least one article in all the licences prohibited dice games, while other common topics included prohibiting drunkenness, prescribing the measurements of ale, drinking on the Sabbath and the ongoing issue of vagabonds. The typical format of these sheets was a statement at the top of the page, with blank space for the handwritten entry of date and name of the licensee, followed by the list of articles. Format also reflected local politics. The number of articles varied between licences for different places. Those produced by Beale in 1600 had six articles, as did the licence for Essex, printed in Cambridge by Cantrell Legge in 1608. Meanwhile, the licence for Cambridge had seven, whilst those for Suffolk, Nottinghamshire and Kent had nine, ten and twelve respectively. Undeniably, central legislation provided a model for local licenses and indeed the licences Beale produced may well have informed these too. What a close examination of these sheets reveals is that printed forms mirrored (differences in) local politics. This provides an important qualification to the degree of standardisation print bought to state paperwork.

Licences from university presses reflected the separate governance of Oxford and Cambridge, where the university traditionally had control over licensing. Raleigh faced a backlash from the Vice Chancellor of Cambridge when he tried to impinge on his established right to issue wine licences.[117] Shepard cites tensions surrounding the licensing of victuallers in Cambridge in discussing the distinct jurisdictional rights of university towns.[118] The university forcefully maintained rights to all licensing. In a letter to Archbishop Laud, Chancellor of Oxford, in 1639, the Vice Chancellor, Dr Accepted Frewen, explained that he had not returned (and did not intend to return) recognizances of alehouse keepers and victuallers to local quarter sessions because the privilege to license was held by the university.[119] Explaining why he withheld this paperwork, he displayed a clear sense of the university's privilege over licensing and cited the comparable example of Cambridge University to do so arguing,

---

[117] Hunter, 87 and 105.
[118] Alexandra Shepard, 'Contesting communities? 'Town' and 'gown' in Cambridge, c.1560-1640', in *Communities in Early Modern England: Networks, Place and Rhetoric*, ed. Alexandra Shepard and Phil Withington (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000): 216-234.
[119] SP 16/425/30; on relations between the university and the city see also Alan Crossley, 'City and University', in *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume IV*, ed. Nicholas Tyacke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997): 105-134.

> By virtue of his Majesty's grant to us, we license alehouse-keepers and victualers… his Majesty by the forementioned letter was pleased to grant us the same authority over alehouses and victuallers which the University of Cambridge has. No recognizances are returned there, whereof I am certain, for I sent thither purposely in November last to inquire and therefore none by us. The University there keeps them in its power, and so do we.

His possession of the physical records bolstered his claims to governance. Justifying his decision to keep the recognizances, he went on to declare he had reduced the number of alehouses from 300 to 100 and, therefore, the town was not missing much revenue from licences anyway. This explanation was alongside a much longer list of instances in which the town had impinged on the university's jurisdiction in other areas of governance in Oxford, insisting 'nothing will satisfy them unless they may trample our charters under their feet.' The right to license was symbolic of a much broader struggle for power between university and town council. The alehouse licences printed for Cambridge and Oxford reflected these local power relations.

Both university and local officers endorsed printed licences in Cambridge, which makes apparent that the printed page was a space in which local power negotiations took place. The preamble proclaimed the Vice Chancellor (a blank space was included for his name to be added) as the issuing authority, as well as 'one of his Maisties Iustices of peace within the Vniunersitie and Towne of Cambridge.'[120] Licences still needed the authorisation of a JP. The other particular concern of university towns was with the students. The first article declared, 'That you suffer no schollers, no neighbours children, nor servants, nor any dwelling in your parish to tipple in your house'[121] Keeping students out of alehouses, along with those underage and servants, was only a apprehension for the university towns. These licences add to the body of print coming off the university presses used in parochial governance and, more importantly, show how this print inscribed local politics.

Printed alehouse licences give further evidence of the diverse display of print that local officials commissioned. Most licences had an article concerning the

---

[120] *To all Christian people to whome these presents…* (Cambridge: s.n., 1618), S2548.
[121] Ibid.

measures and prices of drinks. As a result, additional publications provided tables for retailers to calculate the cost of various measures of alcohol and quarter session orders also reinforced what the statutory prices were.[122] Meanwhile, a Nottingham licence from 1631 gave very specific directions about the distribution and display of the sheet. The final article instructed, 'That he shall cause this Licence to be openly fixed vp in the Hall Roome of his dwelling House, to the end that every one may see what Articles he is bound to observe.'[123] The display of licences inside the alehouse for all to see was an attempt to regulate the behaviour of both customers and proprietor. As well as demonstrating what happened with the licence once JPs had issued it, this evidences its wider consumption and circulation.

Alehouse walls displayed both bawdy and bureaucratic print. Printed licences entered popular spaces in a different way to ballads and other cheap print, but shared the same space. John Story's tables and various articles issued to licence holders have already shown administrative print entered alehouses in the sixteenth century. However, it is hard to determine what happened to it. Landlords may have folded it away and forgotten about it, or pasted it up, like the Nottingham licence, for wider display and consultation. Only this sheet, instructed the licence, was to be 'openly fixed vp' and 'observed.' This type of print alters previous conceptions of the interior decoration of alehouses. For Tessa Watt, drinking houses were spaces filled with imagery that had previously adorned the walls of churches, prior to the whitewashing of the Reformation. Interior walls were 'nodal points of communication' because they were public spaces.[124] The alehouse itself was a, 'point of intersection between this network of communication and the local community of which it was also an important focus.'[125] Accordingly, she describes these walls as bedecked with paintings and printed ballads. In turn, printed ballads have been used by scholars to garner evidence of early modern drinking cultures, as well as being the wallpaper of these establishments; hung on walls, sung by drinkers and peddled by itinerant

---

[122] For example, *An Useful for all Victuallers + others dealing in Beer and Ale* (London: printed for the author and published by Randolph Taylor over against Stationers Hall, 1685), R222258; For example, *At a general and open quarter sessions of the publicke peace, holden at the said county Rigate* (London: 1655), R228816.
[123] *Villa Nottingham ss. Whereas at the general session of the peace…* (London: s.n., 1631?), S920.
[124] Watt, Chapter 5, 'Stories for Walls', quoted,185.
[125] Ibid, 195.

sellers.[126] The placement of licences on the same walls shows that alehouses were also spaces in which to certify the legality of the establishment. In between the presentment of licences to JPs, the printed sheet was for public display, which suggests that inspections of alehouses checked to see if licences were up on the wall. Inside alehouses then, there was no distinction between 'official' posting and the barrage of print in the manner that Stern describes for the posting of playbills on London streets.[127] Official print intermingled with other single sheets, pasted alongside ballads, wall paintings and other visual imagery and texts. Licences had a mnemonic function, like the godly imagery that Watt describes, but in this instance, provided a reminder of the rules of the alehouse, rather than godly temperance. The display of licences here presents another avenue in which men and women consumed official print. Importantly, it develops this by showing that such print was encountered alongside an array of other texts and print. There was a melding of 'high' and 'low' as much as 'cheap' and 'official' forms on pub walls.

Forging Formality: Counterfeit Print and Cultures of Documentation

Fraudulent documents provide crucial detail on the place of function of print in administrative procedure. With a few exceptions, there has been very little consideration of the forgery of printed administrative documents. It has been limited to discussion of identity documents. Certainly, Groebner asserts that the history of identification is one of 'deception, pretense and ambivalence.'[128] In England, physical descriptions and 'pen portraits' were added to poor passes to limit abuses of the documents.[129] Hindle cites forged examples of Poor Law documentation, although they were manuscript.[130] In turn, examinations of forgery in print studies have concentrated on books. Johns' discussion of piracy focuses on the printers as

---

126 For instance, Angela McShane, 'Roaring Royalists and Ranting Brewers: The Politicisation of Drink and Drunkenness in Political Broadsides Ballads from 1640-1689' in *A Pleasing Sinne: drink and conviviality in seventeenth-century England*, ed. Adam Smyth (Cambridge: D S Brewer, 2004).
127 Stern, *Documents of Performance*, 6.
128 Valentin Groebner, 'Describing the Person, Reading the Signs in Late Medieval and Renaissance Europe: Identity Papers, Vested Figures and the Limits of Identification', in *Documenting Individual Identity: The Development of State Practices in the Modern World*, ed. Jane Caplan and John Torpey (Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001), 23.
129 Hindle, 'Technologies of Identification under the Old Poor Law', 232.
130 Ibid, 227.

'manufacturers of credit' and their production of fraudulent books.[131] In a footnote, he remarks that forgeries constitute a field of study in medieval studies, which has not translated to early modern or print studies more generally. There is much work on medieval forgery because medieval bureaucratic documents 'were distrusted for the good reason that many of them (in particular monastic charters) were forgeries.'[132] However, early modern bureaucratic documents are not scrutinised in the same way. Instead, discussions of print and forgery concentrate predominantly on literary texts or other types of fraud that arose with the burgeoning financial revolution at the end of the seventeenth century, concentrating on the perceived dangers of printing paper money in place of coins.[133] Examples in previous chapters of this thesis have highlighted the dangers of paper and, in particular blank forms, variously getting in the wrong hands and being left unfilled, but this needs to be accompanied with an examination of forgery. Fundamentally, the illicit production of printed forms displays that an understanding of how official paperwork worked went beyond officeholders. Broader sections of the populace knew what official paperwork should look like and, thus, how to fake it. This sheds light on contemporary understandings of documentary culture in a pivotal way.

The emergence of counterfeit print confounded initial ideas that the printing press would curb forgeries. When first introduced, print was a guard against fraud, because few could afford it and, of course, there were fewer presses. Contemporaries suggested sufferers of scrofula receiving the Royal Touch should be given printed certificates to prevent their illicit reproduction.[134] As discussed in Chapter Three, early printed receipts also sought to reduce the circulation of fakes.[135] Securing access to a printing press was apparently harder than getting access to a bribable

---

[131] Johns, 32.
[132] Clanchy, 'Looking Back from the Invention of Printing',19; see also, 'Forging Documents' in Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, 318-328.
[133] For example, Kate Loveman, *Reading Fictions 1660-1740: Deception in English Literary and Political Culture* (London: Routledge, 2008); Robin Myers and Michael Harris ed. *Fakes and Frauds: Varieties of Deception in Print & Manuscript* (Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies, 1989); Donna Andrew and Randall McGowen, *The Perreaus and Mrs. Rudd: Forgery and Betrayal in Eighteenth-Century London* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
[134] John Brown, *Adenochoiradelogia* (London: printed by Tho. Newcombe for Sam Lowndes over against Exeter-Exchange in the Starnd, 1684), 85, R24241; this is discussed in Stephen Brogan, *The Royal Touch in Early Modern England: Politics, Medicine and Sin* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015), 147.
[135] Slavin, 'The Tudor Revolution and the Devil's Art', 10.

scribe. A forged passport from 1610 and a fraudulent licence to collect alms, recorded in Wiltshire, were the latest in a long line of manuscript fakes, examples of which continued to arise at the end of the period.[136] The early expense of printing and the relatively small number of presses reduced the capacity for forgery of certain documents. Nonetheless, printed fakes soon became a problem.

Quarter session records provide valuable information about the types of fake documents produced and how they were used. At a quarter session in Somerset, in 1655, the testimony of Joseph Ring detailed,

> Mr George Derby servant to Mr Edward Penny of Glasing Bradford did procure a quire of warrants to be printed in the name of Robert Hunt Esq., sheriff of Somerset, and did also procure two seals of office of the said sheriff to be cut for which he paid ten shillings and did set the name of the said sheriff's stamp upon the said warrants which he did cut himself, and certain of these warrants have been issued out for execution[137]

The scale of Derby's fraud was substantial and printing was just one part of the operation, as he also got stamps to certify the sheets. The consequence of using the printing press for official documents was that print produced political effects in the manner Johns described.[138] Printed forms denoted officialdom. It makes sense, then, that those wanting to replicate officialdom realised that they also needed to use the printing press.

Counterfeit charitable briefs demonstrate that the business of fakery kept pace with administrative developments by harnessing print. Patrick Little details the journey, in 1656, of John Campbell, who passed through English and Scottish parishes using a combination of forged manuscript certificates and printed briefs to claim charitable relief before arrest.[139] Little does not discuss the production of these documents; however, this example shows the level of detail required for a passable fake. Firstly, Campbell's scheme involved two types of forgery. Getting something

---

136 Cunnington, 30, 38 and 236.
137 Bates and Dawes ed. *Quarter Session Records for the county of Somerset, Vol III: Commonwealth 1646-1660*, 296.
138 Johns, *Nature of the Book*, 30-31.
139 Patrick Little, 'A Fraudster in Cromwellian Scotland', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 91:2 (2012): 336-345.

printed illicitly was quite a different process from obtaining fake written documents. Regarding a printed brief, which, upon closer inspection, 'was full of errors and inconsistencies', Campbell later admitted, 'he had paid for it to be 'counterfeited' at Newcastle and had added some of the commissioners' names himself.'[140] He knew the correct format of official documents. Briefs needed the correct names of officers and they had to be printed to be plausible. As early as 1586 the printer Thomas Purfoote held a monopoly for printing 'briefs for casualties', which he subsequently renewed on December 11th 1592.[141] There was, then, an established precedent for an appointed printer to produce charitable briefs. In contrast, manuscript certificates remained widespread in local government and, therefore, Campbell made sure his was handwritten. Campbell had an awareness of the materiality and form of administrative documents which enabled his illicit reproduction of documents for less legitimate ends. Fakes show how the paper state was replicated elsewhere.

Campbell's case was not a one-off. Concerns over the illicit replication of charitable briefs were strong enough to warrant a proclamation, in 1633, on the basis that 'sundry places of this Kingdome have beene much wronged and abused by forged and counterfeited Certificates and Warrants, or Licences for Collections…'[142] Meanwhile, the printer Nicholas Okes was fined ten shillings by the Stationers' court on 3rd December 1627, for printing the names of the Sheriff 'w[i]thout lycense & for a stranger.'[143] Therefore, printers were also liable for a fine if they took business from unknown customers. Quarter session records provide various examples of fake briefs. At Middlesex sessions in July 1617, John Browne, of St. George's Southwark, was indicted for 'begging with a counterfeit brief.'[144] The number of briefs in circulation made it harder to distinguish between legitimate claims and fraudulent ones and the proclamation failed to eradicate fakes. In 1686, John Nowell appeared at the Old Bailey for forging a printed brief. The proceedings detailed,

---

[140] Ibid, 342-3.
[141] Greg, *A Companion to Arber Vol 1*, 169.
[142] *A Proclamation against making Collections without Licence vnder the Great Seale* (Imprinted at London by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Maistie: and by the Assignes of Iohn Bill, 1633), S3591; for a broader discussion of counterfeit briefs see Houston, 'Church Briefs in England and Wales from Elizabethan Times to 1828', 508-509.
[143] Jackson, *Records of the Court of Stationers' Company, 1602 to 1640*.
[144] Le Hardy, ed., M*iddlesex Sessions Records Vol IV 1616-1618,* 172.

> he has Printed several Copys of the Brief, with the Kings Arms on the Top, which were produced in Court, and proved to be the same by the Printer and others, &c. and that he had gone to several places in England, where he had gathered some Money, by virtue of the same[145]

Again, this shows that Nowell knew what briefs were meant to look like as he headed the page with the royal coat of arms to make a passable fake. It corresponds to the format of official briefs discussed in Chapter Three. Although access to a printing press placed the opportunity for fraud beyond the capacity of some, it was not an effective deterrent for others and, as the expectation for administrative documents to be printed grew, so did replicas on the black market. All told, these examples demonstrate the kinds of forgeries conducted with print and are significant when considering cultures of documentation. From fakes, we can see what official documents were expected to look like and, crucially, which were printed.

Conclusion

There was an increasing amount of print flowing into the hands of local officeholders over the course of the seventeenth century; however, this chapter has distinguished what kinds of print this comprised, how widely it was used and where it came from. Whereas previous examinations of print in provincial government have either focused on a particular type of document, most obviously the settlement certificates discussed by Tadmor and Hindle, or considered print in generalised terms as Kent and Braddick did, this chapter has examined a range of documents in depth and, in doing so, highlighted very different patterns and chronologies for the adoption of print. Although settlement certificates were issued in huge numbers from 1662 onwards, the alehouse licences and Lenten recognizances discussed here demonstrate other printed pro forma local officers and secular courts issued in volume and from an earlier point. Whilst these forms may not necessarily have been employed extensively or consistently, they show that there was a print culture in operation in local government which was quite separate from that discussed in existing studies of print. Indeed, examples of official documents fraudulently printed

[145] Proceedings of the Old Bailey, John Nowell, 8th Dec 1681, Old Bailey Online, http://www.oldbaileyonline.org/browse.jsp?id=t16861208-21&div=t16861208-21&terms=printer#highlight.

shows an awareness of this print culture permeated outside state office and was available on the black market for the right price.

Locating and analysing the print culture of local governance has found print in different places and doing different things. The display of printed pro forma and tables in alehouses outlined in this chapter produced very different effects from the print usually discussed in relation to these places. Rather than a stimulus to discourse and debate, these printed sheets laid down rules against ribaldry, drunkenness and Sabbath breaking. Print bound landlords, innkeepers and victuallers into good behaviour and was for public display. Whereas we saw with receipts print being received from taxpayers, here there were different junctures in which print passed through the hands of local officers and onto the wider populace. It highlights that people encountered state print in various forms and that it was used to mediate different kinds of social exchange, whether it was relaying plague mortality from a particular town or pro forma entered into quarter session records confirming an individual had received the sacrament. This contributes in new and vital ways to our understanding of how print was encountered and consumed in early modern England.

This chapter has significantly challenged the association usually made between the uptake of print and the standardisation of administrative practice. This is not to say print does not figure in articulations of state formation. Indeed, the employment of print found in local governance complements and extends recent scholarship that emphasises the complexity of state models. The production of pre-printed alehouse licences demonstrates an early adoption of print by local authorities. Various levels of the state commissioned and utilised print for governance. Moreover, central policy did not always lead to the adoption of print locally. Lenten licensing under James did stimulate a comparatively early adoption of print, as did the administration of wine licences when under Raleigh's monopoly; however, this did not ensure the ongoing use of print. Our understating of print in models of state formation must adjust accordingly.

Print gives material evidence of the overlaps between central policy and local paper regimes. When exploring ideas of state formation, what local institutions did not print is as significant as what they did print. This includes the purchase of printed pro forma from printers authorised centrally, as well as local commissions for alehouse licences and bills of mortality. Each demonstrates a different interaction between centre and periphery. The next chapter, which analyses the print London livery companies commissioned, builds on this further. It demonstrates another way in which people encountered print through participation. Company membership brought fraternity, political involvement and, increasingly, print.

Chapter Six 'A means to preserve unity and beget amity': Print and the London Livery Companies

So far, this thesis has cited numerous examples of metropolitan print. It opened by describing a summons to the Sheriff's court; Chapter One showed London was at the forefront of printing visitation articles. We saw in subsequent chapters how early print was used for metropolitan alehouse recognizances and marriage bonds. We have also seen how companies based in the city, such as the New River, were quick to adopt print. Existing scholarship emphasises the frequent encounters people had with print in the city. Print has been discussed in relation to the Royal Exchange, coffeehouses and the other locations of polite consumption and sociability that cemented seventeenth-century London as the epitome of urban development and modernity.[1] The circulation of print was not just restricted to modish areas of London. For instance, Tiffany Stern argues that, in the sixteenth century and early seventeenth century, playbills were 'printed in large numbers and literally scattered as flyers and posters over the London that had rejected playhouses.'[2] In turn, Adrian Johns' examination of the radical enclave of Coleman Street describes a place associated by Presbyterians with 'an anarchy of cheap print.'[3] Print suffused all aspects of London life. Jenner details the increasing amounts of print the City Corporation ordered from the 1630s onwards, as well as *Lord Have Mercy Upon Us* sheets that relayed plague statistics.[4] He argues there was 'considerable traffic between 'official' culture and cheap print' in London.[5] This chapter explores the London livery companies' use of print in order to redraw understandings of print culture in the metropolis.

---

1 See for example, Lloyd, "'Ticketing the British Eighteenth Century': A thing…never heard before', 851-2; Michael Harris, 'Exchanging Information: Print and Business at the Royal Exchange in the Late Seventeenth Century' in *The Royal Exchange*, ed. Ann Saunders (London: London Topographical Society, 1997): 188-97; Steve Pincus, "Coffee politicians does create': coffeehouses and Restoration political culture', *Journal of Modern History*, 67:4 (1995), 319.

2 Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England*, 6; see also eadem, "On each Wall and Corner Post': Playbills, Title-pages, and Advertising in Early Modern London', *English Literary Renaissance*, 36:1 (2006): 57-89.

3 Adrian Johns, 'Coleman Street', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 71:1 (2008), 53.

4 Jenner, 'London', 299-300.

5 Ibid, 296.

The abundance of print in London could easily be seen to complement the arguments of Kyle, Peacey and others who equate an abundance of print with an emerging public sphere. Kyle claims the printing of petitions by livery companies in the 1620s transformed political lobbying and was a turning point in the engagement with print by livery companies.[6] Backdating the use of print by those addressing Parliament from the 1640s to the 1620s, he details a sea change in lobbying as 'cheap print ... revolutionised parliamentary business, moving argument from a primarily oral and scribal tradition to a printed one.'[7] Printed petitions reached a wide audience quickly and their proliferation sparked unsuccessful attempts to stop their production in 1624. These texts were part of an 'expansion and creation of new public spheres in and around Parliament.'[8] Both Peacey and Kyle situate print in a model of politics and the attendant public sphere flowing from centre to periphery. Even Peter Lake and Steve Pincus' more nuanced understanding of the public sphere stresses that print was a communicative tool and therefore can be used to 'explain changes in both popular politics and governance.'[9]

But does print always create the big Habermasian public of Peacey and Kyle's Parliament? Examining the print commissioned by livery companies over the course of the seventeenth century, this chapter uncovers a very different situation. It challenges the assumption that lobbying print monopolised printing presses and looks at what else companies used print for. Ian Gadd suggests that livery companies were slower than the Church or state in recognising the 'bureaucratic advantages of print', but describes the regular printing of 'material as diverse as invitations for meetings, parliamentary petitions and ordinance books' from the late sixteenth century onwards.[10] Printed booklets for the Lord Mayor's Show distributed to the

---

6 Kyle, *Theatre of State*, Chapter 5; idem, 'Parliament and the Politics of Carting in Early Stuart London', *The London Journal*, 27:2 (2002): 1-11; idem, 'From Broadside to Pamphlet: Print and Parliament in the Late 1620s', in *The Print Culture of Parliament, 1600-1800*, ed. Jason Peacey (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007): 30-48.

7 Kyle, *Theatre of State*, 163.

8 Ibid, 1.

9 Lake and Pincus, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England', 287.

10 Ian Gadd, 'Early Modern Printed Histories of the London Livery Companies', in *Guilds, Society and Economy in London, 1450-1800*, ed. Ian Gadd and Patrick Wallis (London: Centre for Metropolitan History, Institute of Historical Research in association with Guildhall Library Corporation of London 2002), 30.

members of the livery companies can be added to this list.[11] Therefore, scholars have detailed various items of print livery companies commissioned and purchased. However, there has been no analysis of the volume, chronology or frequency of the companies' use of print. Company accounts reveal a print culture that was less explicitly 'public' and political than that which Kyle and Peacey depict. Most of the print companies commissioned constructed a very different type of public, one that was sub-national and civic in character.

This finding revises exclusive associations between company print and the emergence of a public sphere in early modern England. Recent discussions have challenged the exclusive focus on print in examinations of the public sphere. Studies of early modern Bristol and Venice have emphasised the interplay of print, script and oral culture, which produced communication networks and fostered political engagement.[12] In his analysis of scribal publications, Noah Millstone argues that, '...recovering manuscript pamphlet literature means increasing the available stock of early Stuart political texts by an order and magnitude and vastly expanding what we know of the range and content of their discourse.'[13] With almost 10,000 such pamphlets surviving, any account of the public sphere must incorporate a consideration of manuscript.[14] Whereas Millstone and others concentrate on other media to extend discussion of public sphere, this chapter argues that there must also be a more comprehensive account of the kinds of print produced and in circulation. The majority of the print livery companies used was for customary interactions with their members and apprentices. Examining this material reveals a complex set of exchanges, which print negotiated.

Livery companies held a significant institutional presence in the city. Along with the structures of parish and ward, scholars have often seen them as providing

---

11 Tracy Hill, *Pageantry and Power: A cultural history of the early modern Lord Mayor's Show, 1585-1639* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), Chapter 4.

12 Barry, 'Communicating with authority: the uses of script, print and speech in Bristol, 1640-1714'; de Vivo, *Information and Communication in Venice: rethinking early modern politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)

13 Millstone, *Manuscript Circulation and the Invention of Politics in Early Stuart England*, 3.

14 Ibid, 4.

stability and consistency in this tumultuous period.[15] A significant proportion of London residents were members of a livery company, as having freedom of the City was required to trade. Estimates suggest that, midway through the seventeenth century, around three quarters of adult males in the City were freemen of the City, although this was not the entire metropolis. The size and number of companies necessitated a significant administrative effort to enrol members and keep them involved in company life.[16] Livery companies were not the elite group once supposed. Whereas historians used to pinpoint the seventeenth century as a period of irreparable decline for livery companies, scholars now emphasise that companies adapted to shifting political and economic circumstances.[17] By the end of the century, London companies were undoubtedly smaller after the 'purges' of 1680s and widespread indebtedness, but the rituals and administrative functions of companies endured, fostering a civic identity amongst liverymen.[18] More broadly, scholars now emphasise the growing civic culture in early modern towns during this period and its convergence with new forms of political identity.[19] Membership of a livery company brought obligations, along with 'freedom.' Attendance at meetings, elections, funerals and other events was expected, and it has been suggested that communication about these events increasingly 'took written form.'[20] This chapter demonstrates the growing role of print in the performance of company life.

Moreover, livery companies are precisely the type of institution that Peter Stallybrass suggests ordered myriad print jobs.[21] They were supposedly the customers of Humphrey Lownes' patent over apprenticeship indentures obtained in

---

15 Ian Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability: social relations in Elizabethan London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Jeremy Boulton, *Neighbourhood and Society: A London Suburb in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 293; Michael Berlin, 'Reordering rituals: ceremony and parish, 1520-1640'.

16 Valerie Pearl, 'Change and stability in seventeenth century London', *London Journal*, 5:1 (1979), 13-14.

17 Michael Berlin, 'Guilds in decline? London livery companies and the rise of a liberal economy, 1600-1800', in *Guilds, Innovation and the European Economy, 1400-1800*, ed. S. R. Epstein and Maarten Brak (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

18 Mark Knights, 'A City Revolution: The Remodelling of the London Livery Companies in the 1680s', *The English Historical Review*, 112:449 (1997), 1168.

19 Phil Withington, *The Politics of Commonwealth: Citizens and Freemen in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

20 Joseph Ward, *Metropolitan Communities: Trade Guilds, Identity and Change in Early Modern London* (Stanford: Stanford University Press 1997), 74.

21 Stallybrass, 'Small Jobs', 328.

1604. Indentures were the contracts that bound apprentices to their masters, according to a generic set of conditions listed in the text.[22] The standardised nature of the text enabled the use of printed pro forma, with names and dates filled in as required. The sheer number of apprentices bound each year offered a readymade market to Lownes. Gowing details 'thousands of indentures… used in London every year.'[23] Stationers' records reveal the lengths Lownes went to in enforcing the contract. In January 1612, William Jaggard had to pay Lownes ten shillings for 'his damage in printinge prentises Indentures contrary to order and iijs iiijd for a fine to the House.'[24] The following year, the Court fined William Stansby 'for printing mr Brighte book of melancholy and prentice indentures.'[25] Indentures were printed prior to Lownes' patent. The Stationers' register also included an entry for indentures by the Marchant Taylors in 1594/5.[26] The City Chamberlain's records include a printed indenture for the Merchant Taylors dated 1602, and ESTC catalogues another from 1611.[27] A further four indentures are catalogued on the ESTC before 1620, although without imprints it is impossible to know if Lownes produced them.[28] These scattered examples indicate that some companies used pre-printed indentures from the early seventeenth century and they also raise the question of whether the livery companies were using print for other routine functions. Kyle examined company accounts to trace the printing of petitions, but they have not been subject to systematic analysis to consider what other print companies commissioned.

This chapter examines all ways livery companies employed print. The first section analyses a selection of livery company accounts to track payments made to

---

[22] As well as London livery companies there are examples of printed indentures issued by the city of Bristol from 1658 onwards held at the Birmingham Archives, MS 3101/E/1. This information was accessed from the National Archives Online catalogue; on the function of indentures in the enrolment of apprentices see, Gowing, 'Girls on forms', 456.

[23] Gowing, 'Girls on forms', 456.

[24] Jackson, *Records of the Court of Stationers' Company 1602 to 1640*, 57.

[25] Ibid, 454.

[26] William C. Hazlitt, *The Livery Companies of the City of London; their origin, character and social and political importance* (London: S Sonnenschein, 1892), 282.

[27] LMA, COL/CHD/AP/05/026, my thanks to Michael Scott for providing me with this reference; for Indentures in Court of Aldermen records see LMA, COL/CA/05/01/01; COL/CA/05/01/02; *This indenture witnesseth that [blank] doth put himself apprentize to [blank] citizen and marchaunt-tailor of London…* (London: s.n, 1611), S96105.

[28] *[Indenture for an unidentified company]* (London: s.n., c.1605), S94012; *This indenture witn[e]sseth that [blank] doth put himselfe apparent[ic]e* (London: s.n., ca. 1615), S2217; *This indenture witne[sseth]…* (London: s.n., 1616), S94019; *This indenture witne[sseth]…* (London: s.n., 1616), S94020.

printers. In doing so, it shows the evolving relationships between companies and printers and establishes the frequency with which they ordered print. Payments for print shifted from bulk orders for items every few years, to annual bills for a range of print jobs, which challenges understandings of jobbing print and the print trade. A number of companies regularly ordered print by the 1660s and yet more in the 1680s. The second section explores the types of print ordered, investigating the function of these documents in administrative practice and how they established bonds between company members. Most of this print was single sheet. The orders, oaths and tickets that companies ordered worked in different ways. The last section uses this material to rethink 'print culture' in the metropolis. It highlights that livery companies used printed tickets extensively, thereby undermining claims that this form of print should be associated exclusively with eighteenth-century polite sociability.[29] Over the seventeenth century, in London, print and paperwork became the warp and weft of exchanges between institutions and individuals. In this capacity, print forged intra-communal associations. This chapter uncovers print which worked to bind company members together, rather than print which lobbied members of Parliament. As another sphere where men and women encountered print, evidence from livery companies builds upon the analysis of receipts, alehouse licences and other print discussed in previous chapters. Seemingly banal items of print such as this transform understandings of print culture and social relations in the capital.

Companies and Printers

To gauge the amount of print commissioned by livery companies, I carried out two analyses of company accounts. First, to gain a sense of the volume and frequency of print being ordered, I surveyed the seventeenth-century Wardens' accounts of fourteen companies. An effort was made to look at a range of companies, including some of the 'great twelve'. Those examined were the Grocers (2), Fishmongers (4), Merchant Taylors (6) and Vintners (11), as well as the Bakers, Cordwainers, Curriers, Poulters, Woolmen, Blacksmiths, Plumbers, the Tylers & Bricklayers and the Founders. I took a sample year from every decade from 1599/1600 to 1699/1700.

[29] Lloyd, 'Ticketing the British Eighteenth-Century:' A thing...never heard before.'; Gillian Russell, *Women Sociability and Theatre in Georgian London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 20-26.

Obviously, print could be stockpiled, so a second intensive sampling, to give a sense of the volume of print ordered and distributed year on year, supplemented this initial analysis. This examined the accounts for every year in four decades, the 1620s, 1640s, 1660s, and 1680s, for eight companies: the Haberdashers, Blacksmiths, Poulters, Merchant Taylors, Vintners, Grocers, Curriers and Founders. Those selected had some record of print in the first analysis. My analysis focuses on print companies ordered, rather than any purchases of printed material, such as proclamations and other orders issued by the Crown or City. This allows me to locate the point in the seventeenth century when print came to mediate interactions between companies and members.

There are problems with accounts as a source material that requires discussion at this point. Accounts have their own document histories, which shape how and whether payments for print can be found. Survival is an issue: there are gaps and sometimes accounts are no longer legible. Moreover, the construction of accounts and the level of detail given varied from clerk to clerk. As Jennifer Bishop's study of the Goldsmiths Company shows, accounts were constructed fictions.[30] A change of clerk could bring a change in written procedure and accounts became more general over the period. Payments for print may also have been incorporated into the general expenses of lower bureaucratic office holding. Beadles usually distributed tickets, and it is possible that their yearly wages in the accounts covered any outlay for print. The structure of accounts, therefore, can lead us to underestimate the amount of print ordered. Furthermore, as print became more common, it was less likely to be described. In 1640, the Cordwainers accounts detail 30 shillings paid for filling in blanks.[31] An entry ten years later gave a similar costing, but this time noted that they were printed blanks.[32] The earlier entry could have been manuscript blanks. However, the two strikingly similar entries also point to the marginal differences in description that alter our perception of print. Likewise, three entries in the accounts of the Tylers and Bricklayers refer to filling in tickets, two in 1639/40 and one in

[30] Jennifer Bishop, 'The clerk's tale: civic writing in sixteenth-century London', *Past and Present*, Supp. 11 (2016): 112-130; for a broader discussion of how the interpretations of court clerks framed court records and depositions see Gowing, *Domestic Dangers*, 235-238.
[31] GL, MS 07351, 17th June 1640, unf.
[32] GL, MS 07351, 1649/50 unf.

1649/50.[33] None mentions whether the tickets were printed. Despite these limitations, the accounts provide important detail about the adoption of print by livery companies.

Puzzlingly, the accounts contain virtually no payments for printed indentures. Despite the fact that indentures survive with coats of arms of specific companies on them, the patent held by Lownes prevented companies ordering indentures from other printers. The only entries found of payments made to a printer for indentures were much later. An entry in the Drapers Renters Accounts in 1687/8 stated, 'Paid the Printer a bill for Ticketts & Indentures 2:15:00.'[34] There was also an entry in the minute book for the Carpenters' Company in 1736, 'Ordered That the Clerk get One thousand Indentures printed on parchment for the use of this Company.'[35] Well into the eighteenth century, indentures were printed on parchment, which helped the preservation of indentures that were subject to ongoing presentation throughout the period of apprenticeship, which was usually seven years.[36] Despite these two outlying examples of orders for indentures, there are no other orders in company accounts for indentures. This muddies the idea of what constitutes 'company print.' Companies, in conjunction with the City courts, administered apprenticeship. The binding of apprentices took place at the company hall and it was the duty of the master to register the indenture with the clerk of the Chamberlain's office at the Guildhall for two shilling and six pence.[37] If disputes between master and apprentice arose, the terms of the indenture framed the arguments presented at the Chamberlain's court.[38] Indentures may have been the material contract that bound an apprentice to the master of a company, but they were not company print.

---

33 GL, MS 3054/002, unf.

34 Arthur Johnson, *The History of the Worshipful Company of the Drapers, Vol IV* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922), 314.

35 Carpenters Company: Minute Books of Courts and Committees CC/MC, 4th May 1731 – 2nd August 1737, accessed from London Lives 1690 to 1800, http://www.londonlives.org/browse.jsp?div=GLCCMC25105MC251050420 (my thanks to Prof. Laura Gowing for this reference).

36 Gowing, 'Girls on forms', 457.

37 On this enrolment procedure see Michael Scott ed. with Patrick Wallis and Cliff Webb, *Apprenticeship Disputes in the Lord Mayor's Court of London, 1573-1723, Index Library, 132, Apprenticeship Series Vol.1 Part 1* (London: British Record Society, 2016), 6 and 20.

38 For discussion of how these contracts were used in and out of court to dissolve apprenticeships see Patrick Wallis, 'Labor, Law and Training in Early Modern London: Apprenticeship and the City's Institutions', *Journal of British Studies*, 51:4 (2012): 719-819.

Merchant Taylors' accounts had separate payments for buying indentures and ordering print, thus confirming that companies did not order printed indentures. There were three biennial payments for indentures in 1679/80, 1681/2 and 1683/4.[39] Critically, these entries were separate from payments to the printer Anne Maxwell and show that, long after Lownes' patent, companies purchased indentures separately from orders to printers. On each occasion, the Merchant Taylors purchased 500 pairs of apprenticeship indentures at two pence per pair, totalling 04:03:04. Pairs of printed indenture came on a single sheet. The single sheet was cut up, with one part given to the apprentice and the other to his or her master (Figure 49). There was one payment for apprenticeship indentures in the City accounts on September 17th 1683 to the printer Samuel Roycroft, 'To the Chamber Indentures for Apprent[to] 20q[rs]20:01:08.'[40] This was a big order for print and suggests some companies and masters may have acquired the indentures from the Chamberlain's courts when they registered the apprentice. However, this is the only order for indentures in the City accounts. It does not clarify where companies typically obtained indentures, but it does reinforce the fact that they did not commission them. It is apparent that print suffused certain types of company activity that is not always visible from company accounts.

Although orders for print increased, again there was not a conclusive turn to print. Table 4 details the analysis of accounts from the fourteen companies. It shows that even at the end of the seventeenth century not all companies ordered print. An 'X' denotes an entry in the accounts for buying print and the boxes shaded grey indicates where there is no account for the company for that year. There was no record of the Tylers and Bricklayers purchasing print, though Kyle notes two instances in which they bought printed breviates in 1614 and 1621.[41] Looking at one year of accounts in every ten only gives a snapshot of accounts, but reveals that companies did not order very much print. There was only one entry in the accounts of the Woolmen for printing 1000 acquittances, at a cost of ten shillings in 1699/1700.[42]

---

39 GL, MS 34048/027 unf; MS 34048/028 unf.
40 LMA, COL/SJ/27/316/5888; for discussion of this account see Raven, 89.
41 Kyle, *Theatre of State*, 166.
42 GL, MS 6901/001, 3rd Dec 1700, unf.

As can be seen from Figure 50, only one company out of twelve got print in the 1620s, as did seven out of twelve in the 1670s, and five out of eleven in the 1680s. There was certainly an increasing use of print by a number of companies from the Restoration onwards. The second, more intensive, sampling of accounts will show a few more entries for print in the 1620s, but reinforces the fact that companies did not commission print at the same rate and frequency. This was not a comprehensive turn to print for livery companies by any means. Livery companies' accounts, like the other records of institutions examined in this thesis, confirm the mixed uptake of print.

COMPANY	1599/1600	1609/10	1619/20	1629/30	1639/40	1649/50	1659/60	1669/70	1679/80	1689/90	1699/1700
Cordwainers						X					
Bakers	X					X		X			
Curriers					X						X
Merchant Taylors				X				X	X	X	X
Poulters							X		X		X
Grocers							X			X	X
Woolmen											X
Blacksmiths	X				X	X	X		X		
Plumbers								X			
Vintners									X	X	
Tylers + Bricklayers											
Haberdashers						X	X	X	X	X	X
Fishmongers								X	X	X	X
Founders									X		

Table 4 Entries for print in fourteen company accounts 1599-1700

While the second sampling of accounts year on year does not significantly increase the level of printedness in companies already described, it does show that the way companies ordered print changed. Table 5 details the print found in this survey (this includes the data from the first survey to provide full decades). Again, 'X' denotes a payment for print and a grey box indicates there were no accounts that

year. Although all companies used print, it was never a yearly expenditure for all. There are more entries for print in the 1640s than the previous samples suggested, with all but the Poulters making at least one payment for print. This second survey confirms that orders for print increased in the Restoration. The table shows that Haberdashers, Vintners, Merchant Taylors and Grocers made fairly regular orders from the 1660s onwards, as did the Curriers from the 1680s. The graph in Figure 51 shows the percentage of companies with entries for print in each year. It gives percentages because the number of accounts varied each year and so percentages provide the proportion of companies ordering print. This graph shows the general trends from the data and the increase in print purchased over the period. These accounts contrast sharply from the surviving accounts for the City Corporation, which ordered substantial amounts of print every year uninterrupted from 1632 onwards.[43] By the 1640s, some companies got a stockpile of printed items every few years. For instance, the Vintners commissioned printed bills every three years, with two of these payments being for a ream.[44] Although they were not ordering print every year, like the City, these bulk orders suggest that print had entered the paperchains of company administration.

[43] For the annual totals for each year see Table 23.1 in Jenner, 'London', 302.
[44] GL, MS 15333/004, 1640/1, 1643/44, 1646/47.

YEAR	COMPANY							
	Haberdashers	Blacksmiths	Poulters	Merchant Taylors	Vintners	Grocers	Curriers	Founders
1620/21						X		
1621/22		X						
1622/23								
1623/24								
1624/25								
1625/26								
1626/27								
1627/28				X				X
1628/29								
1629/30				X				
1640/41				X	X			
1641/42						X		
1642/43	X					X	X	
1643/44	X	X			X	X		
1644/45								
1645/46							X	
1646/47		X			X			
1647/48				X				
1648/49								
1649/50		X						
1660/61	X	X						
1661/62	X					X		
1662/63	X							
1663/64	X		X	X		X		
1664/65	Illegible			X	X	X		
1665/66	X		X	X				
1666/67	Illegible		X		X	X		
1667/68	Illegible	X		X	X			
1668/69	X	X			X			
1669/70	X			X				
1680/81	X			X				X
1681/82	X		X	X			X	
1682/83					X			
1683/84				X		X	X	
1684/85	X			X		X	X	
1685/86	X				X	X		
1686/87				X		X	X	
1687/88	X		X	X				
1688/89	X				X	X	X	
1689/90	X			X	X	X		

Table 5 Entries for print in company accounts in four decades, 1620-1690

This charts a very different engagement with print by livery companies than Kyle and others suggest. An analysis of accounts reveals that the printedness of companies has, in many instances, been overstated. In his discussion of petitions, Kyle argues that livery companies, 'took no time at all to adopt the new strategy of turning to print, and the flexibility it provided, to produce more than one document for circulation.'[45] In his examination of a dispute between the Wharfingers, Carmen and Woodmongers in the 1620s, he details printed flyers produced at speed to counter the arguments of another company that contrasted to the lengthy procedure required to enact a bill and the decision to go to the grievances committee that was the usual lobbying strategy.[46] Kyle identifies the adoption of print for an important part of company business from the 1620s. Companies adopted print for particular types of communication. Petitions, as well as examples of printed charters highlight the employment of print for the representation of companies.[47] However, the accounts show that this employment of print did not transfer into other aspects of company business. Print was ordered strategically for particular forms of discourse and these examples were not representative of a high level of print in the wider paperwork of livery companies. Therefore, the list of printed items reeled off by Gadd gives an impressionistic view of company print, with no consideration of the chronology of when, and in what volume, companies started to order different types of print.[48]

By the end of the period, several companies made yearly payments to named printers, which was a significant shift in the way they ordered print. Early payments for print had been for specific items, such as bills or oaths, with printers sometimes being named. For example, the Merchant Taylors ordered prayers from the printer Richard Cotes in the 1620s and 1640s and the ESTC catalogues an earlier example

---

45 Ibid, 165.
46 Kyle, 'Parliament and the Politics of Carting in Early Stuart London', 7-8.
47 Printed charters were discussed by Ian Archer, 'Charter Consciousness in Early Modern London', paper given at Textual Cultures in Early Modern Europe, Keble College, Oxford, 28th September 2013; examples of printed charters include: *[Charter to Shipwrights]* (London: T. Dawson, 1612?), S114020; *The charter of the Company of Cloth-vvorkers* (London: 1648) R213361. There is also a record of a printed charter of the Apothecaries from 1617 in LMA, COL/CP/02/003.
48 Gadd, 'Early Modern Printed Histories of the London Livery Companies', 30.

from 1603.[49] Elsewhere, beadles and clerks received payment for procuring print. Increasingly, however, this system of officers getting print gave way to direct payments to printers. The amounts spent duly increased. Whilst some payments were specifically for tickets or other items, many became an annual bill for items printed throughout the year. The expenses of the Haberdashers amply demonstrate how payments changed over the period. In 1679/80 an entry was 'To the clerk for tickets, 04:00:00', in 1689/90 'Mr Mott printer for tickets, 05:05:00' and in 1699/1700 'Mr Mott printer 06:18:00.'[50] There are a number of points to unpack from these three payments. In the first, the clerk received payment, in addition to his annual salary, to cover costs for printing (there were subsequent payments in the early 1680s to beadles for tickets). The last two payments were directly to the printer Benjamin Motte. Companies, in some cases, used the same printer or publisher for prolonged periods. Payments for print shifted over the period from occasional print jobs ordered as needed to established contracts between printers and companies. Interrogating these relationships between companies and printers sheds light on the role of institutional contracts in the print trade, revising assertions made in previous histories of this printing.

Printers who are relatively unknown for their published output come to the fore in institutional accounts. Before the Haberdashers ordered print from Benjamin Motte, they paid John Playford in 1685 and 1686.[51] The Merchant Taylors' accounts also named a number of printers, including Edward Mottershead (1663/4-1664/5), Anne Maxwell (1680/1, 1681/2, 1683/4), Francis Clarke (1689/90) and Thomas James (1689/90, 1699/1700).[52] All of these printers were located within the City and, thus, were within walking distance of company halls. Looking at more accounts would doubtless reveal other printers supplying print to companies. Significantly, three companies, the Fishmongers, Vintners and Grocers, used the same printer, John Richardson, on multiple occasions. Richardson's printing house on Fenchurch Street was less than a mile from the halls of companies he printed for. Apart from Motte,

---

[49] GL, MS 34048/14, 1627/28, MS 34048/18, 1647/8; *[A Prayer to be said by the poor of the company]* (S.I.: F. Kingston?, 1603?), S3052.
[50] GL, MS 15866/003 f.26 (1679/80), f.124 (1689/90); MS 15855/006 f.126 (1699).
[51] GL, MS 15866/006, f.87 and f.95.
[52] GL, MS 340488/22 unf; MS 340488/27 unf; MS 340488/28 unf; MS 340488/29 unf.

who was also printer to the Company of Parish Clerks, none of these printers held notable contracts for particular offices. Looking at company accounts, as opposed to imprints on the ESTC, gives an alternative perspective of the print trade and reveals the other types of work these printers produced. We find printers who are less known because they produced items such as tickets and orders that rarely survive and had no imprints, but, paradoxically, this is also the kinds of print that people encountered on an increasingly regular basis.

Institutional accounts, therefore, alter our understanding of the print trade. Henry Plomer's dictionary of printers and booksellers gives little detail about Richardson, other than his address, his dates of operation and that he was Under-Warden for the Stationers' Company in 1696/7.[53] Company accounts cast a new light on Richardson's business. In 1689/90, he appeared in the accounts of the Grocers (06:00:00), Vintners (05:05:00) and Fishmongers (07:13:00), receiving a total of 18:18:00 from these accounts alone.[54] Richardson acquired business from a number of companies. This extends, significantly, what we know about the print Richardson produced, although it is impossible to work out what proportion of his yearly income this constituted. We know about printers to the Company of Parish Clerks because they had a press to produce bills of mortality. We also know about printers to the City and the Crown because of surviving records and the fact that these printers used this title in the imprints of their work. However, printers to other institutions remain unexplored because institutional records have not been examined rigorously as a source for print studies.

Crucially, institutional accounts challenge key assumptions made about jobbing print. Once again livery company records contradict Stallybrass' assertion that institutions ordered an 'endless series of small jobs.'[55] Orders for print certainly increased over the period, but this demand for print was far from 'endless'. Stallybrass gives a misleading impression of institutions' appetite for print and of printers' profits from institutional jobbing. The amount of print ordered varied

---

53 Henry Plomer, *Dictionaries of the printers and booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland, 1668-1725* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1968), 253.
54 GL, MS 11571/016 unf; MS 15333/006, Nov 12th 1690; MS 05561/003 f.88.
55 Stallybrass, 'Little Jobs', 331.

widely between institutions. The City, the Crown and Parliament may have required a large amount of print, but printers could not rely on the demand for print by livery companies. This certainly contradicts Kyle's claim that 'The London companies kept printers in business Parliament after Parliament' and supports McKenzie's assertion that, in the print house, 'income and output might fluctuate greatly week by week.'[56]

Company accounts reveal significant chronological trends in the adoption of print. What companies ordered, and the frequency with which they ordered, changed over the seventeenth century. Yet, even in the 1680s, when payments to printers were more common, the sums spent were not sufficient to keep a printer in work. Table 6 gives the entries for print in the accounts of six companies during the 1680s (it excludes the Blacksmiths, as there were no entries for print, and the Founders, as there are no accounts for these years). The amounts spent on print ranged from a few shillings to several pounds. In any year, the most the Haberdashers spent was ten pounds, and the average payment was just a few pounds. This was also the case with the Merchant Taylors. Apart from one payment of eleven pounds and fourteen shillings, none of the other six annual payments exceeded seven pounds. The Curriers' nine payments for print never exceeded seventeen shillings. This was far less than the amounts spent by government which were detailed in Chapter Three. The annual bill for print for the Crown office in 1603 alone came to 105:01:06.[57] Company print might not have been that important for printers.

[56] Kyle, Theatres of State, 168; McKenzie, 'Printers of the Mind: some Notes on Bibliographical Theories and Printing-House Practices' in McKenzie, *Printers of the Mind*, ed. McDonald and Suarez, 20.
[57] BL, Add MS 5756, f.140.

YEAR	Haberdashers	Poulters	Merchant Taylors	Vintners	Grocers	Curriers
1680/1	To beadle for printing tickets 04:00:00	X	Paid Mr Maxwell printer for summons and tickets 07:00:00	X	X	-
1681/2	To beadle for printing tickets 04:00:00	Paid Mr Thompson for tickets 00:05:00 Paid for tickets 00:10:00 Paid for 3 wooden stamps for tickets 00:07:00	Paid Mr Maxwell printer for summons and other tickets 06:05:00	Paid Mr Richardson for printing for tickets 03:00:00	X	Paid for printed tickets and for a stamp of the Curriers arms 00:10:00
1682/3	X	X	X	Paid Mr Richardson the printer 04:05:00	X	X
1683/4	X	X	Paid Anne Maxwell printer for summons and tickets 06:00:00	X	(payments for Lords May Day) Paid Mr Richardson Printer 01:00:00	Paid for printed summons for the Company 00:07:00
1684/5	To Mr Playford for printing tickets 10:00:00	X	Paid to the printer for summons and tickets 11:14:00	X	To John Richardson in full for printing bills 03:00:00	Paid for printing papers for the high court of Parliament 00:17:00
1685/6	To Mr Playford for printing tickets 10:00:00	X	X	Paid to Mr Richardson printer 06:15:00	To Mr Richardson Printer as ye bill 02:00:00	X

YEAR	Haberdashers	Poulters	Merchant Taylors	Vintners	Grocers	Curriers
1686/7	X	X	Paid Mr Cawthorn for tickets 06:07:00	X	To Mr Richardson Printer 06:08:00	Paid for [?] and printing tickets 00:04:00 Paid for printed tickets for Lords Mayors Day 00:08:00 Paid for printed tickets for election day 00:04:00
1687/8	To Mr Motte for printing tickets 02:04:00	Paid for several things of the Company business 05:03:06	Paid to the printer 04:16:06	X	X	X
1688/9	To Mr Motte for printing tickets 05:05:00	X	X	Paid John Richardson for printing tickets 02:12:6	To John Richardson Printer 04:14:00	Paid for printing the reason 00:13:01 Paid for printing the reason 00:08:00 Paid for printing tickets 00:05:06

Table 6 Orders for print in company accounts 1680-89

By comparing bills for printing from different institutions, it becomes evident that 'small jobs' were not all worth the same to printers. Moving away from livery company accounts demonstrates this. Andrew Clark printed, at various points, for the Stationers' Company, the Company of Parish Clerks, and the government wine office. He was also printer to the City of London from 1672 until his death in 1677.[58] He was clearly an established printer, with contracts with several institutions. Raven discusses Clarke's invoices for the City, arguing 'The Corporation and jobbing work continued to offer a safe, low-risk and lucrative commission.'[59] Wine office accounts record regular payments to Clarke at the same time.[60] He printed for different institutions; however, he charged them different rates. Comparing wine office accounts with those of the City shows that he charged the government office less than the City. In the six months from Midsummer to Christmas 1672, the City ran up printing costs of 52:13:09 and, over roughly the same period (July 1672- December 1672), the wine office ran up a bill of 10:00:00.[61] The City ordered more print, but the invoices indicate that he charged the City more per item. For example, on July 5th, 1672, Clarke printed '1000 bonds, being 20 quires' for 01:00:00 for the wine office, whereas on July 16th 1673 he printed '1000 Freemans Oaths, 10 quires' for 01:00:10 for the City.[62] He charged the City more money for less print. Although typesetting costs were a proportion of the printing cost, whatever the print run, and paper was the biggest expense, he made more money from City print. The average cost for twenty quires of an item for the wine office was 1:00:00, but for the City it was 02:01:08. In terms of the type of jobs from each, the wine office orders were larger, but less frequent, whilst the City ordered smaller amounts more regularly, making a greater volume of print overall. Raven misses how Clark negotiated different rates for his printing contracts. The indiscriminate discussion of jobbing print and 'little jobs' has failed to recognise the marked differences between jobs and the variable cost of single sheets. The price of print and, thus, the value to the printer, depended on the deal brokered between institution and printer.

---

58 Plomer, *Dictionaries of the printers and booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland, 1668-1725*, 70-71.
59 Raven, 88-90, quoted 89.
60 TNA, E101/639/3 Wine office accounts.
61 LMA, COL/SJ/27/316, f.229; TNA, E101/677.
62 Raven, 89; TNA, E101/677.

Binding Material: Company Print and the Construction of Civic Identity

The work of political historians interested in livery company's lobbying of Parliament has led us to think that printed petitions were the most common form of print commissioned by livery companies. In fact, most of the print that companies ordered was for the intra-communal paperchains of company life. In different ways, this print bound members to livery companies. This section will seek to demonstrate that this was the case by examining statute books, orders, oaths and tickets in turn. Each of these sheets worked differently and commanded particular responses. This was print variously pasted on walls, read aloud, signed and kept in exchange for entry to meetings. Once we examine how this print worked, it becomes clear that these less 'public' and more banal items of print shaped interactions within company membership.

Statute books

Statute books were some of the earliest printed items companies commissioned; however, other types of print quickly succeeded them to enforce the authority of companies. There are six entries in the ESTC of company print pre-dating 1600: an Ordinance from the Stationers (1566), an Order from the Goldsmiths (1588), two sets of statutes for the Pewterers (1589, 1593), *A profitable and necessarie discourse…* from the Grocers (1592) and a petition from the Carpenters (1593).[63] This makes it clear that companies initially ordered print to inscribe their rights and privileges and distribute them more widely. Their accounts reveal more examples. The Pewterers paid for printing statute books in 1579/80: 'payd ffor a

[63] *Ordinaunces decreed for reformation of divers inpryntyng and vtteryng of books* (London: s.n., 1566), S1095; *A declaration of an order for making cases for ballaunces* (London, 1588), S115393; *Anno IIII Henrici octavi. These be the statutes established in diverse Parliamentes for the mistery of ye pewterers of London* (London, 1589), S100296; *Anno quarto Herici octavi. These be the statutes established in divers Parlyaments, for the mistery of the pewterers of London* (London, 1593), S107729; *A profitable and necessarie discourse for the meeting with the bad garbelling of spices, vsed in these dayes* (Printed at London: By R. B[ourne] for Thomas Man, dwelling in the Pater noster Row at the signeof the Talbot, 1592),S108793; *Abuses vsed concernin heawing, sawing and measuring of timber...[Against the sale by wharfingers and merchants of wood not cut to lawful size]* (London, 1593), S94013.

pryntyng of j C of statut bookes xvjs viijd.'[64] Their records detail the numbers and cost of the 1593 statutes, 'payed ffor pruntynge of iij C of statut bookes ptaynyng to pewterers xxvs.'[65] The number of books ordered increased substantially from 100 to 300. As far as the Pewterers were concerned, they had national powers of search into the quality of pewter throughout England, which may well account for the large numbers printed and their intended distribution beyond London.[66] These statutes circulated like the books of statutes produced by the King's printers, discussed in Chapter Three. While Gadd cites items such as statute books to emphasise the print culture of livery companies, the accounts show this to be an exaggeration. Beyond the 1620s, there were no orders for books of statutes. While the use of print to encode the legal standing and remit of companies continued, it increasingly took the form of single sheet orders.

Orders

Over the long seventeenth century, companies increasingly came to use printed orders to distribute to their members and the form of these sheets indicates that they were modelled on other 'official print.' Orders were an important part of the print world of early modern London, but do not fit easily into existing formulations of print culture. In addition to the Goldsmiths order from 1588, the ESTC catalogues a printed order issued by the Stationers.[67] Livery companies sometimes reprinted orders and proclamations issued by the City and the Crown. In 1599/1600, the Bakers, 'Paid to John Windett Stationer, a brother of this company for printing all the papers of the Counsells orders for sopressing the baking of great bread, cakes and other unsized breads xijs xid.'[68] The Bakers ordered the reprinting of Council orders to reinforce rulings made about their trade. Similarly, Kyle notes that the Woolmen paid 02:05:00 in 1604 for the printing of a further 500 copies of a proclamation

---

64 Charles Welch, *History of the Worshipful Company of Pewterers of the city of London, based upon their own record*, Vol. 1 (London: Blades, East & Blades, 1902), 287.
65 Charles Welch, *History of the Worshipful Company of Pewterers of the city of London, based upon their own record*, Vol. 2 (London: Blades, East & Blades, 1902), 16.
66 For discussion of Pewterers' national jurisdiction see Ian Gadd and Patrick Wallis, 'Reaching Beyond the City Wall: London Guilds and National Regulation, 1500-1700', in *Guilds, Innovation and the European Economy, 1400-1800*, ed. Epstein and Prak: 288-316.
67 *Vicesimo octavo Ianuarji, 1611. Nono regni regis Iacobi present, the master, wardens, and the assistants of the Company of Stationers* (S.I : R. Barker?, 1612), S3060.
68 GL, MS 5174/003, unf.

which related directly to the remit of the company.[69] Re-circulating these orders kept members and the wider populace up to date with legislative change and new rulings of Council and company. They can be compared to the printed orders distributed by quarter sessions detailed in the previous chapter and show that, as well as commissioning their own print, companies organised the reprinting of other 'official' print to entrench their own authority.

The specified oral performance of orders, alongside their distribution in print, points up the performative function of these texts. A new set of by-laws issued by the Stationers on 3rd January 1678 outlined that,

> All the Orders and Ordinances of the said Society or so many of them as shall be held necessary shall be then and there distinctly read and published before the Members of the said Society who shall be assembled the better to acquaint them with the same…[70]

These by-laws stipulated that orders were to be read aloud during company meetings. They also stated that the by-laws themselves '...be read at the administering of the freemen Oath and a printed Copy thereof to be delivered to every member of the said Company.'[71] Therefore, company members received their own copy of the order to keep. This circulation of printed orders extended company authority beyond company halls and was part of a broader corpus of print that reinforced and regulated civic culture.

The Vintners commissioned their own printed orders on several occasions to relay details of orders passed by government concerning the selling and trade of wine. There were three entries in the company accounts during the 1660s for printed orders. The first was in 1664/5, followed by another payment for orders in 1667/8, which cost eight shillings; 350 orders concerning selling wine in bottles cost ten shillings in 1668/9.[72] The numbers ordered point to their extensive circulation to

---

69 Kyle, 'Monarch and Marketplace: Proclamations as News in Early Modern England', 776.
70 Full transcript of by-laws given in Donald F. McKenzie and Maureen Bell, *A chronology and calendar of documents relating to the London book trades Vol 2, 1671-1685* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 165-181, quoted, 167.
71 Ibid, 180.
72 GL, MS 15333/005, July 14th 1664/5; October 17th 1667/8; September 2nd 1668/9.

members of the Vintners and elsewhere. The fact that there are no Vintners' orders recorded on the ESTC reaffirms that little of this print survives. However, from Vintners' accounts and a surviving order, we can see the transfer of information from government print to company order. Kyle records Vintners buying government print.[73] It seems likely the Vintners relayed information from government print on to their members in printed orders they commissioned and distributed themselves. This was a very different engagement with print and government policy than scholars have previously outlined. Discussing the wine monopoly held by the Vintners in the 1640s, Phil Withington argues the company's engagement with print can 'illuminate the relationship between civic and printed public discourse.'[74] Again, he refers to a very narrow corpus of print, focusing exclusively on pamphlets produced by the Vintners to 'argue their case' in Parliament and the wider public sphere, where debate was 'central' to citizenship.[75] Yet, the Vintners did not just print pamphlets, they also printed orders for their members and this print worked in a different way to exercise the Vintners' authority over aspects of trade and assert themselves as a governing body in the metropolis. Orders do not fit into ideas of the 'public sphere' and notions of corporate citizenship and public discourse, as Withington understands it. However, these sheets were certainly in the public gaze when they were on display in shops and pasted to walls. Unlike lobbying pamphlets, their function was not to inform civic discourse; they were public announcements to members and the wider populace.

A surviving printed order issued by the Vintners c.1665 shows that they invoked company and government authority to regulate the wine trade. The order was in response to retailers selling wine at higher prices than specified in a government proclamation. First, it reveals the broader circulation of proclamations.

---

73 Kyle, *Theatre of the State*, 134.
74 Phil Withington, 'Public Discourse, Corporate Citizenship and State Formation in Early Modern England', *American Historical Review*, 112:4 (2007), 1020.
75 Ibid, 1017-1018.

The order instructed that,

> …every Person will cause the said Proclamation to be set up and affixed in the most open place of their respective houses where it may be visible to all Comers; And that they do strictly observe the Prices limited thereby...[76]

In addition to marketplaces and other public places, when relating to aspects of trade, retailers hung proclamations in their shops. Like licences pinned to the walls of alehouses outlined in the previous chapter, institutional print was published through display. Secondly, the Vintners' order told members to display the proclamation. Company print reinforced government print. It was in the interests of the company, as much as the government, to enforce legislation to preserve their authority within the trade. The organisational structure of wardens and other officers of livery companies also helped to impose the letter of the law. The order declared, 'Master, Wardens and Assistants, are resolved to make diligent enquiry…to cause the laws against them to be put into speedy and effectual execution.' Print communicated company policy and declared its coordination with government directives. In turn, beadles passed this print around and retailers pasted it onto their walls to enforce regulation.

It is, therefore, no coincidence that the format of company orders echoed those of City and government. Paratextual features demarcated the sheet as official print, and underwrote the textual content. Both the Vintners' order from c.1665 and a 1672 order from the Goldsmiths, which concerned the circulation of fraudulent silver with counterfeit marks, replicated City orders and royal proclamations. Each was on one side of a single sheet, so that they could be posted up, and carried the company coats of arms. On the Vintners' order, the coat of arms was inside the decorative initial, whilst the Goldsmiths' arms headed the page of their order. Thus, these orders resembled proclamations headed with the royal coat of arms and City orders that carried the arms of the City of London. This is similar to the visitation articles described in Chapter One, with bishops' mitres on the title page. The Goldsmiths' order instructed people to 'give speedy notice to the Wardens or other the Officers of

[76] SP 29/143/96.

the said Company' if such items, or those responsible for them, are found, offering a five pound reward in return.[77] The order was in response to criminal activity uncovered by a company member. Printed instructions for selling gold and silver issued to members may have assisted this discover of forgery.[78] Together these sheets show that printed orders of different institutions converged in format and this common physical appearance actively contributed to the authority of the sheet and, in turn, the institution.

Oaths

Companies also commissioned printed oaths from an early point, thereby demonstrating a different type of interaction negotiated via printed sheet. Apprentices took oaths when they were bound and oaths were taken again when individuals were made freemen. An order in the Stationers' Wardens' Accounts from 1584/5 detailed, 'Item paid for a paper booke and v. quiers of paper to printe the Freemans oathe ii.s iv.d.'[79] In 1620/1, the Grocers paid twenty shillings for 2000 apprentice oaths, while in the following year the Blacksmiths paid twenty shillings for 2000 freemen oaths.[80] How long did it take these companies to use 2000 oaths? London Livery Companies Online enables a comparison of the number of oaths ordered with the number of apprentices bound and freedoms granted by companies each year. Although this database does not include records of the Blacksmiths or Grocers, in 1620/1, the Mercers (the most prominent livery company in London) enrolled 251 apprentices and in the following year granted 115 freedoms.[81] This was far less than the number of oaths ordered. Companies clearly ordered oaths in bulk and then distributed them to apprentices and freemen over a number of years. Accounts from several companies show repeated purchases of oaths every few years, although they do not always specify whether they were for apprentices or freemen. In consecutive years, the Vintners 'paid for a ream of printed oaths for swearing apprentices 18s' in 1666/67 and in 1667/68 'paid for a ream of printed oaths for

---

77 The Goldsmiths' Company, J.V.iii.8. 'Sundry broadsheets 1672-1909', I would like to thank Sophia Tobin at the Goldsmiths' archive for providing me with this reference and a copy of the order.
78 *Instructions for all buyers and sellers of wares made of gold and silver* (London: Printed by order of the Wardens of the Worshipful Company of Goldsmiths, 1685), R178686.
79 Quoted in Greg ed., *A Companion To Arber,* 46.
80 GL, MS 11571/010, f.445; MS 1533/003 f.334.
81 The Records of London Livery Companies Online, http://www.londonroll.org/home (accessed 08/05/2017).

freemen 01:00:00.'[82] This has significant implications for thinking about print and oath culture and for how a material text approach can offer alternative interpretations. Livery company oaths exemplify that the exchange and presentation of printed sheets was central to the performance of oath-taking in civic culture.

Oaths were a key part of civic life. From the late sixteenth century onwards, civic offices adopted pre-printed oaths.[83] Joan Kent emphasised the increasing use of oaths by local officials in the 1650s, necessitated by the expansion of office holding, including parish officials and the new positions of hearth tax collectors and surveyors of highways.[84] Chapter One discussed oaths on the inside pages of visitation articles that parish officials took before making their surveys. Within London specifically, from the 1630s, oaths were printed for freemen of The Corporation of the Brick and Tile Makers of the City of Westminster, as well as for scavengers and constables.[85] Entry into the service of the East India Company also involved oath-taking.[86] These examples illustrate the widespread issue of oaths on single printed sheets and the numerous points at which people took them. Oath-taking was embedded into administrative practice, running the gamut of office positions.

Historians have noted the extensive use of print for national oaths and related it to national politics and nation making. This is clearly important, but neglects the ways in which London print antedated and complemented it. National covenants, including the Protestation oath and the oaths of supremacy, saw the emergence of

---

82 GL, MS 1533/005, July 5th 1666/7; May 30th 1667/8.

83 Jenner notes the printing of oaths for local office in London from the late sixteenth century onwards, 305; on oath taking in court and church offices, see Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1964), 387-390.

84 Kent, 388; see also John Spurr, 'A Profane History of Early Modern Oaths', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th ser. 11 (2001): 37-63.

85 *The oath of a free-men* (London?: s.n, 1638), S124037; Jenner, 305; For examples see, *The oath of a free-men* (London?:s.n, 1638), S124036; *The oath of the scavengers* (London; Printed by Samuel Roycroft, printer to the honourable city of London, 1667?), R234947; *The oath of the scavengers* (London?: s.n, 1667), R216872.

86 *You do swear to be good and true to our Sovereign Lord the Kings Majesty, and to his heirs and successors and that you will be faithful to the governour, his deputy and Company of merchaunts of London, trading into the East-Indies*… (London?: s.n., before 1698), R475275.

political oath-taking.[87] Successive regimes ordered oaths to be taken in parishes throughout England in an attempt to secure loyalty. Christopher Hill estimates that a man might have taken up to ten such oaths between 1640 and 1660.[88] Print enabled the dissemination of oaths on a national scale. As Peacey argues in relation to the Protestation Oath of 1641, 'print technology permitted it to be circulated aggressively' and, similarly, Walter stresses that printing 'was important to its successful subscription.'[89] Moreover, Peacey emphasises the resonance of oaths as material objects, arguing they were 'treated as an empowering text that sanctioned the expression of popular opinions and, indeed, fairly dramatic forms of popular political action, including religious iconoclasm.'[90] Oaths brought the semblance of a new political regime to the rest of the country and print provided the volume to ensure coverage throughout England.[91] Into the Restoration and renewed with vigour in 1688, oaths became a means to secure loyalty and ostensibly legitimise a regime. This demonstrates a very different adoption of print. For political regimes, print enabled the distribution of oaths throughout the country on a scale previously unseen, while for companies, it enabled the stockpiling of oaths they could use year after year.

City freedom and civic freedom confirm that there was an experience and awareness of printed oaths beyond a strictly political outlet. A mayoral order of 1672 shows the enforcement of political, religious and administrative oaths together,

> …his Lordship doth earnestly admonish and command all Citizens and Inhabitants of the City deeply to consider, examine and observe the points of their OATHS, as first the Oath of Supremacy, provided for Extirpation of the Romish Religion. Secondly, the Oath of Allegiance ordained for preservation of the honour and fidelity due to his Majesty. Thirdly, the Oath taken by all persons admitted to the freedom of this City, which for want of due

---

87 Edward Vallance, *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant: state oaths, Protestantism and the political nation, 1553-1682* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005); idem, 'Women, Politics and the 1723 Oaths of Allegiance to George I', *The Historical Journal*, 59:4 (2016): 975-999.

88 Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England*, 409.

89 Jason Peacey, 'The Revolution in Print', in *Oxford Handbook to the English Revolution*, ed. Michael Braddick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 282; Walter, *Covenanting Citizens*, 120.

90 Ibid.

91 On the broader administration of the Protestation oath see Walter, *Covenanting Citizens*, Chapter 4.

> Consideration, is in many particulars and frequently infringed and the good and necessary franchise and customs of this City thereby violated.[92]

The practice of taking oaths and then upholding them was the cause for concern here. As such, the proper adherence to freemen's oaths was instructed alongside, and in conjunction with, the oath of supremacy and the oath of allegiance. The political and the civic overlapped here. People took oaths from printed sheets more frequently and for a variety of positions and responsibilities.

The City printed freedom oaths from an early point and these provided a blueprint for oath-taking in livery companies, as well as in other incorporated towns. The earliest recorded printed oath was produced by Christopher Barker in 1580.[93] In 1581, Hugh Singleton, the City printer, produced 2,800 oaths, and the ESTC catalogues freedom oaths produced by successive City printers throughout the seventeenth century.[94] Initially produced on an 'ad hoc' basis, City printers soon printed oaths regularly.[95] These were single sheets, headed with the city arms and usually in blackletter font. Freedom oaths from other incorporated towns replicated those produced in London in format and content.[96] They covered much of the same ground as London oaths regarding civic duty. Legislation enforced this oath-taking and a 1649 Act ordered newly admitted Freemen of London and other corporate towns and boroughs to take an oath, which also pledged allegiance to the

---

92 *By the Maior…* [An order for the suppression of abuses, disorders, etc.] (London: Andrew Clark, 1672) LMA, CLA/048/PS/01/053.

93 *The othe of euery free man* (London?: C. Barker, ca.1580), S105585.

94 Jenner, 306; *The oath of euery free man, of the Citie of London* (Imprinted at London: by Iohn Windet, printer to the Honourable Citie of London, c.1605), S124571; *The oath of euery free-man* (London: Printed by William Iaggard printer to the Honourable City of London, ca 1610), S125103; *The oath of euery free-man* (London: Printed by William Iaggard printer to the Honourable City of London, ca 1610), S102946; *The oath of every free-man of the citie of London* (London: Printed by Robert Young, printer to this honourable city, 1628?), S4375; *The oath of a freeman* (London s.n. 1645), R181141; *The oath of every free-man of the city of London* (London: Printed by James Flesher, printer to this honourable city, 1653?), R221935; *The oath of a freeman of the city of London* (London: printed by T.J, 1682), R188704.

95 Jenner, 'London', 306 n.79.

96 *The oath of a burgess. Civitas Bristol* (Bristol: s.n., 1637), S126504; T*he oath of a burgess* (London? s.n 1637?), S95990; *The oath of a burgess* (Bristol: s.n, 1672), R225195; *The oath taken by every free-man of the honourable city of Chester* (Chester: Printed by I. Dawks, 1689), R181147; *The oath of every free-man of the City of Oxford* (Oxford: printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1646), R214670; Gravesend and Milton undated BL, Add MS 42597, Brockman Papers Vol XII f.20.

Commonwealth.[97] There are also examples of printed freedom certificates confirming the completion of apprenticeship, demonstrating that other printed sheets were produced by the City and exchanged in the negotiation of freedom. Figure 52 is a freedom certificate dated 12th June 1683 for Joseph Collyer, who was the apprentice of William Wavell, Citizen and Leatherseller of London.[98] On parchment, with civilité typeface and bearing the City coat of arms, these slips had the same aesthetic as indentures, highlighting the similarity between documents signed and received at the start and end of apprenticeship. Together, oaths and certificates demonstrate the employment of print to foster a sense of civic identity and obligation.

Freedom oaths produced by City printers and versions which livery companies commissioned themselves evidence that the exchange of texts was intrinsic to the performance of oath-taking. The Merchant Taylors' records contain signed City freedom oaths. After taking the oath, freeman signed the sheets, which were then kept by the company.[99] This presents another example of single sheets that became archival records. The sheet was an intrinsic part of oath-taking and then became material confirmation of the pledge made. City and company oaths looked alike. 'The Oath to be taken by every Brother Admitted into the Company and Fellowship of Parish Clerks', printed in 1636, was a single sheet, headed with the company coat of arms at the top and blackletter.[100] An oath from the Company of Leathersellers, c.1610 and another for the Company of tin-plate workers in 1670 shared this format.[101] However, company and City freedom oaths differed in content. City oaths emphasised service to the City, 'ye shall be contributory to all manner of charges within the City, as summons, watches, contributions, taxes ... bearing your part as free-man ought to do.'[102] As well as this, they included general rules regarding 'foreigners' and apprentices. In contrast, company oaths extracted vows of loyalty

---

97 'An Act for the form of an Oath to be administered to every Freemen of the City of London and in all Cities, Boroughs and Towns Corporate in England and Wales', in C. H. Frith and Robert S. Rait ed., *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum 1642-1660* (London: H. M Stationary Off., Printed by Wyman and Sons, 1911), 2.

98 LMA, COL/CHD/FR/09/089.

99 GL, MS 34104 f.52-55.

100 GL, MS 4894, f.46.

101 *The oath of euery freeman of the company of Leathersellers London* (London: s.n., c.a 1610), 006200398, S125112; *The oath to be taken by every freeman of the Company or mystery of tin-plate-workers, alias wire-workers* (London: s.n, 1670?), R216875.

102 *The oath of euery free-man* (London: Printed by William Iaggard printer to the Honourable City of London, ca 1610), S125103.

and secrecy, quite separate from the terms of City oaths. Along with promising attendance at meetings, the Leathersellers oath required an obligation to,

> All the lawful secrets of the fellowships and all such things which at any time of Assembly shall be lawfully incommunication among them at the common hall you shall keepe not disclose the same to any such person to whom the same matter doth in any wise concerne or touch.

This vow of secrecy reflected the wider confidentiality surrounding institutional records that all company members had to uphold.[103] The different slant of each type of oath suggests members might have taken both to pledge loyalty to City and company. It is not always clear from company accounts whether they ordered their own freedom oaths or bought those produced by City printers. Surviving examples suggest practice may have differed between companies. What is apparent was the substantial use of printed sheets to bind company members into secrecy and loyalty.

Apprenticeship oaths reveal the other printed sheets, in addition to indentures, that were exchanged between companies, masters and apprentices. Not all companies printed apprenticeship oaths, but they also extracted oral pledges of loyalty to the company. The ESTC records a Grocers' apprentice oath from 1611.[104] The oaths the Grocers purchased in the 1620s were from a 'Mr Lownes', presumably Humphrey Lownes, who held the copy to printed indentures. Lownes was evidently capitalising on his captive market by printing other documents for the admission of apprentices. Oath-taking was part of the process of entering apprentices, even if not a legally binding contract. In 1649, the Blacksmiths 'Paid Nicholas Sparkes for delivering some of the tickets to give notice of binding apprentices at the hall only ijs.'[105] Companies summoned members to witness the binding of apprentices. The occasion for binding apprentices and freedom underwrote a broader performance of the company from the printed page. Print underpinned the rituals of company life.

---

[103] Paul Griffiths, 'Secrecy and authority in the late sixteenth- and seventeenth-century London', *Historical Journal*, 40 (1997): 925-951; vows of secrecy were also central to oaths for clerks and beadles of livery companies see Johnson, *The History of the Worshipful Company of the Drapers*, Vol IV, 277; *The distiller of London* (London: Richard Bishop, 1639), S113984; *1570. The book of ordinances belonging to the Company of Tylers and Brick-layers*… (London, 1640), S125115.
[104] *[Apprentice's oath]* (London: s.n., 1611), S94018.
[105] GL, MS 02883/005 f.32.

These oaths worked in a different way to indentures, which are more commonly discussed in the binding of apprentices. An Apothecaries' apprenticeship oath from 1670 detailed, 'And well and truly you shall serve your Master...and in lawful and honest causes you shall be obedient to him.'[106] Rather than the contractual obligations outlined in indentures, these single sheets confirmed subservience to the apprentices' master, as well as promises of good behaviour. This chimed with wider anxieties about the behaviour of apprentices and the impressionability of their age.[107] A Mayoral order from 1681 cited, '...frequent complaint made of a strange sort of Women (called Night-walkers) who go about the Streets in the Evening, tempting and inticeing Apprentices and others to Lewdness.'[108] The texts, which apprentices read and received, railed against worldly temptation, as much as relaying the conditions of their contracts. The oath also gave instructions for what to do if the apprenticeship broke down, warning that 'you shall not serve any person out of the said fellowship without licence of the Master and Wardens.'[109] The breakdown of apprenticeships was common enough to warrant this information, which was not included in indentures.[110] A network of printed sheets regulated the work and play of apprentices.

This included City print. *Instructions for apprentices*, issued by the City, worked in conjunction with the print companies commissioned The first entry for these *Instructions* in surviving City accounts was in 1632/3, for 5000 copies, which was 1250 sheets at 1d each totalling 05:04:02.[111] In the decade between this entry and 1641/2, City printers produced 35,000 copies of the *Instructions*.[112] They were, therefore, a regular purchase by the City. A surviving example inside the Merchant Taylors' records shows how they functioned. Headed with the City arms, the text instructed obedience to Master and God and that, 'You shall often read over the

---

[106] *The oath to be ministred by the Master and Warden of the Apotherca[ri]es unto every apprentice of...* (London: s.n., 1670?), R216902.
[107] Paul Griffiths, 'Tudor Trouble: problems with youth in Elizabethan England', in *The Elizabethan World*, ed. Susan Doran and Norman Jones (London: Routledge, 2011); see also idem, *Youth and Authority: formative experiences in England, 1560-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).
[108] *By the Mayor...[An order concerning the observation of the Lord's Day]* (London: Samuel Roycroft, 1681), LMA, CLA/047/LR/04/011.
[109] *The oath to be ministred by the Master and Warden of the Apotherca[ri]es unto every apprentice of...*
[110] Wallis, 'Labor, Law and Training in Early Modern London: Apprenticeship and the City's Institutions'
[111] LMA, Chamber Accounts, City Cash 1/1 f. 65v.
[112] Jenner, 'London', 303.

covenants of your Indenture and see and endeavour your self to perform the same to the uttermost of your power.'[113] *Instructions* reinforced the authority of indentures and established their ongoing consultation throughout the apprenticeship. Again, the examples in the Merchant Taylors' records had the names of apprentices written on the sheet as a record of their submission to the guidelines.[114] The single sheet became an archival record of an apprentice's pledge. It is hard to establish whether this was common practice. Nonetheless, the production of *Instructions*, as well as indentures and company oaths, exemplifies the range of print produced in the administration of apprenticeship, coming from both company and court. Print worked here in very different ways from the orders commissioned by companies, underwriting the multifaceted adoption of print in company life to foster loyalty and obedience.

Tickets

Companies ordered increasing numbers of a new type of print: tickets. These flimsy printed slips negotiated exchanges between companies and their members. From the accounts surveyed, there were two records for ordering printed tickets in the 1620s. In 1629/30 the Merchant Taylors ordered 1,000 summonses and in 1627/8 the Founders' Company paid fourteen shillings for a ream of tickets.[115] Orders for tickets, typically given to company members to inform them of upcoming meetings, became routine over the period. The Blacksmiths got a ream of printed tickets or bills in 1639/40, 1643/44 and 1649/50.[116] This production of printed tickets for livery companies challenges the association of these printed items with polite society in eighteenth-century London. Sarah Lloyd points up the plethora of tickets distributed from the Restoration onwards, asserting that the 'proliferation of uses suggests a close, but not exclusive association with new forms of sociability, commerce and urban amenities.'[117] Printed tickets not only circulated much earlier than Lloyd suggests, but, crucially, it was civic institutions which distributed them.

[113] GL, MS 34104 f.54 and f.55.
[114] This is comparable to the signing of oaths discussed by John Spurr, 'A Profane History of Early Modern Oaths', 46.
[115] GL, MS 34048/15 unf; Guy Parsloe ed., *Wardens' Accounts of the Worshipful Company of Founders of the City of London, 1497/1681* (London: The Athlone Press, 1964), 289.
[116] GL, MS 2883/4(1639/40), f.273(1643/44); MS 2883/5 f.32 (1649/50).
[117] Lloyd, 'Ticketing the British Eighteenth-Century: 'A thing...never heard before.'', 846.

These orders for printed tickets prompt the question of why and when companies began using tickets. Was this a case of printed tickets replacing handwritten ones? Alternatively, did the adoption of print for other items of company paperwork initiate the use of printed tickets? Certainly, there are examples of tickets issued by other civic bodies from a similar point. From the 1640s onwards, City printers produced thousands of tickets to warn members of the Common Council and the Court of Aldermen about meetings.[118] Just as we saw with receipts in Chapter Four, tickets demonstrate another type of printed slip people encountered that has not figured in existing discussions of print culture, but mediated a distinct type of exchange in the metropolis.

In the first instance, there needs to be a broader understanding of what tickets were, to account for their social function. Company accounts refer variously to tickets, bills and summonses and the differences between these is not always clear. They could simply reflect disparities in terminology from clerk to clerk. In 1666/67, the Grocers gave 'To Major Brooks for printed tickets for Sumons & Rents & other printed bills for ye Compa[ny] Occasion did in ye forme & this last year 02:16:00.'[119] They used printed tickets to summon members to meetings, as well as to collect rents. In contrast, the seamen's tickets that Margaret Hunt discusses were financial instruments. These tickets were given to the female kin of sailors so that they could collect the wages of sailors when they were at sea.[120] The Navy Board also issued other pre-printed tickets for sailing, leave and discharge.[121] The first record of 'ticket' from 1528 in the Oxford English Dictionary refers to written proof for a financial transaction whereby, 'The Bailiefe shall not priese no flesh…unlesse he can get a ticket or bill of the merchanndes hand with the boucher to whom he sold the same.'[122] There was an obvious overlap between the ticket and the receipt or promissory note that was prevalent in an economy where cash could be sparse. Therefore, the term 'ticket' covered the paperwork of different types of exchange. Entries for tickets in

[118] LMA, Chamber accounts 69, City cash 1/4 f.223, 1642-43; 1/5 f.65, 1643-44; 1/5 f.159, 1644-45; 1/5 f.259, 1645-46; 1/6 f.163, 1647-48; 1/6 f.265, 1648-49; 1/7 f.66, 1649-50.
[119] GL, MS 11571/014 unf.
[120] Hunt, 'The Sailor's Wife, War Finance, and Coverture in Late Seventeenth-Century London'.
[121] There are numerous references to different types of printed tickets in Navy Board Records TNA, ADM 106, these certainly require further study amongst a broader study of print commissioned and used by the Navy.
[122] 'ticket, n.1', Oxford English Dictionary Online, March 2017, def. 1a.

company accounts typically refer to paper slips for company meetings. Companies ordered increasing amounts of printed tickets across the period to corral members.

The adoption of printed tickets was not for new types of events. Tickets were incorporated into existing communication networks in companies. It was, and continued to be, the job of the beadle to summon company members to meetings. The 1570 Book of ordinances of the Company of Tylers and Brick-layers instructed,

> That it shall be lawful for the Master and Wardens aforesaid, to have a Beadle to be attendant upon them to warn the Company, to come to their Hall or other place, where any Assembly shall be for any matter touching the said Fellowship, or otherwise…[123]

This arrangement was typical for beadles in all companies. So why start sending tickets? Why did the exchange between beadle and member require a material component? While there was more paperwork generally, these tickets had a different function. The earliest reference to tickets in company accounts I have found is from the Pewterers in 1609/10, where the conditions of tickets were 'offended & broken.'[124] It does not state whether these were printed, although in 1647/8, the clerk received payment for writing tickets. Not until 1713/14 was there an order instructing 'that for the future all summons to the assistants for their appearance at court be by printed tickets.'[125] There are references to writing tickets in company accounts, and the yearly wages paid to clerks may have covered this activity. The few references to writing tickets that are in company accounts suggest printed tickets replaced handwritten precepts. The profusion of printed tickets reveals that there was increasingly a material element to customary exchanges between company beadles and members.

There was a greater impetus for larger companies to print tickets, as they had more members to contact. The payment for 1000 printed summonses by the

---

123 *1570 Book of ordinances belonging to the Company of Tylers and Brick-layers* (London 1640), 9, S12515.
124 Welch, *History of the Worshipful Company of Pewterers, Volume 2*, 55.
125 Ibid, 113 and 180.

Merchant Taylors in 1629/30 is suggestive of this.[126] However, accounts detail that writing tickets for certain meetings continued. In 1647/8 the Blacksmiths, 'Paid the Clarke for 40 noates for to warne men into the Livery and others against severall Courts dayes and for attendance at the view of the companies houses at puddle docke & fleet lande xx.s.'[127] As the company had paid for printed tickets on previous occasions, this entry suggests that unanticipated court days required the hasty production of tickets by hand. The '40 noates' produced was noticeably less than the thousands of printed tickets they had had printed for twenty shillings previously. Therefore, printed tickets may also have offered a cheaper alternative to handwritten tickets. Records of the Military Company of Westminster reveal another organisation writing and printing tickets. This was one of the military companies set up as a 'focus for Protestant civic militarism in the wake of the confessional warfare of the continent.'[128] Established in 1616, the company was formed of amateur soldiers, typically local tradesmen, who performed ceremonial duties in the city. The company purchased printed tickets from the 1630s, but payments for writing tickets continued alongside these. In 1633, they paid '10s for writing 250 tickets to warn the Comp. to the last fast', which was significantly more than the '6s for printing 260 tickets for electing a new assembly' they paid the following year.[129] The military company also paid for written tickets for funerals, showing that manuscript continued to supplement print for unplanned events.[130] Nonetheless, this makes apparent that other fraternal organisations adopted print to communicate with their members.

This uptake of print becomes clearer when looking at later accounts of the livery companies. The Haberdashers bought printed tickets in every year in the 1660s where the accounts are legible.[131] In 1668/69, this was alongside other papers, coming to a total of 04:01:06.[132] This was the case for almost all other companies apart from the Curriers' accounts. Given that the Curriers made three payments for printed tickets in the 1640s, this could be an example of how a change in clerk gave a

[126] GL, MS 34048/15 unf.
[127] GL, MS 02883/005, f.21.
[128] Merritt, *Westminster 1640-60: A royal city in a time of revolution*, 51.
[129] Queens College Oxford, MS 77 f.25v and f.31v.
[130] Ibid, f.16v.
[131] GL, MS 15866/002, f.308, f.352, f.398, f.444, f.483, f.559; MS 18566/003, f.22.
[132] GL, MS 15866/003 f.22.

very different presentation of expenses. In the years 1664/5 and 1667/8, the Vintners made more than one payment for print, and the bills paid by Merchant Taylors were for several items, including tickets and receipts.[133] This confirms that cumulative payments for numerous 'small jobs' replaced purchases of specific items. The Fishmongers, in 1669/70, 'Paid fore severall bills for printing tickets for this Company's use ...04:17:00.'[134] This pattern continued into the 1680s, as is evident from Table 6. More and more, companies made annual payments for tickets to named printers. For the first two years, the Haberdashers paid the beadle for tickets; there is then a gap in payments for print between 1682 and 1684.[135] After this, the company made payment directly to the printer John Playford, and, after his death in 1686, to Benjamin Motte.[136] Not only were more tickets printed, but they were printed for particular occasions.

Tickets became more specific in content and function. The Merchant Taylors' accounts in 1629/30 read, 'Item paid to Robert Churchman Beadle of the livery for 1000 printed bills to give sumons to the assistants and livery upon all occasions the sume of xxxxjs xiijd.'[137] Printed for 'all occasions', these were generic pre-printed forms, with blank spaces left to give specific dates and details for any type of company meeting. Blanks gave printed flexibility. Ordering generic forms in bulk meant fewer trips to the printers for the beadle, kept costs down, and still sped up the process of producing tickets. Later payments show companies ordered printed tickets for particular events. In 1667/8, the Blacksmiths paid five shillings for feast tickets.[138] Included in expenses for the Lords Mayors Day, in 1683/4, the Grocers paid one pound to John Richardson for tickets.[139] Meanwhile, in 1686/87, the Curriers made three separate payments for tickets: one set were for Election Day, at a cost of four shillings, and there was a further payment for Lord Mayor's Day tickets costing eight shillings.[140] The majority of payments for printed tickets give no details of what they

[133] GL, MS 15333/005 April 29th 1664, July 14th 1664, October 17th 1667, May 30th 1667; MS 34048/22 1663/4, 1664/5.
[134] GL, MS 05561/002 f.208.
[135] GL, MS 15866/006, f.26, f.37.
[136] GL, MS 15866/006, f.87, f.95, f.115, f.124.
[137] GL, MS 34048/15 unf.
[138] GL, MS 02883/005 f.289.
[139] GL, MS 11571/016 unf.
[140] GL, MS 14346/003, f.167.

were for, but these later examples suggest a shift to more specialised printing. This chimes with the change in printing patterns discussed earlier. Employed on a regular basis, companies evidently settled up at the end of the year with a cumulative payment. It seems that beadles made multiple trips to the printers throughout the year for various kinds of tickets. Of course, just because tickets proliferated, it did not mean that they were effective. They invoked a language of 'unity' and 'amity' and offered dinner as a sweetener, or, alternatively, threats of fines for non-attendance, although poor attendance persisted.[141] What orders for printed tickets do demonstrate is that print embedded the rhythms of company life.

Surviving examples of tickets reveal important details about the format of tickets, which were not available from written accounts. Merchant Taylors' records contain a sheet of unfilled and uncut blank tickets (Figure 53).[142] This sheet had different types of ticket. Of the five blank tickets on the page, two ordered members to appear, 'in your Gown faced with Damask and Liveryhood, to choose the new Sheriffs, according to custome, Merchantailors-hall this [ ] of June 165[ ].' The other three ordered, '…in your Gown faced with Budge and Liveryhood, to choose the new Lord Maior, according to custome, Merchantailors-hall this [ ] of September, 165[ ].' The single sheet contains tickets for two separate elections, each with a different dress code. One order for tickets in company accounts could therefore include different types of ticket given out at different times. Critically, the format of the page facilitated the cutting of these tickets at different points in the year and kept the sheet intact. Tickets for the sheriff's election in June were at the top and bottom of the page. These could thus be cut off first and then the tickets for the next meeting in September would still be a whole sheet (albeit a bit smaller). The layout of the sheet shaped the cutting practices of beadles. Printed slips inscribed the rituals of meetings, as each ticket instructed that these details were 'according of custom'. Receiving these tickets at particular points in the year invoked the rhythms of company life, as well as providing a material reminder of the obligations members had to uphold them.

[141] Ward, *Metropolitan Communities*, 95.
[142] GL, MS 34104, f.49, Item, 46.

The ritual calendar of company life fostered this adoption of print. Companies could produce tickets in advance because elections and meetings took place at the same point each year. Company ordinances often outlined specified days for meetings and attendant feasting.[143] A collection of summonses for meetings of the Worshipful Company of Distillers during the 1640s shows the blanks produced as a result. As the month, time and day of meetings was always the same, as was its location at the company hall, there were just blank spaces on the tickets for the day and year to be written in.[144] Quarterly meetings took place on a Tuesday at nine o'clock in January, April, July and October each year. The routine scheduling of meetings meant summonses for all months could be run up at the same time and in advance of the meeting, like the sheets of tickets in Figure 53. The eleven surviving examples of Distillers' tickets are all for one of these months, with little variation in wording and all carry the warning that failure to appear would 'undergo the penalty'. A similar ticket from 30 March 1640, issued by the Stationers' Company, was fully printed.[145] Later examples of tickets had no blank spaces, indicating that the company ordered print as required, rather than in bulk, like the entries in accounts discussed previously.[146] Whether blank or fully printed, these examples establish that institutions in London issued printed tickets on a broader scale and earlier than previously discussed. Tickets may have become *de rigeur* in elite circles in the eighteenth century, but they were a habitual part of company transactions before this.

It was indisputably the case that printed tickets proliferated in the eighteenth century in the manner Lloyd described however; printed tickets had far more customary origins. Traditional livery companies adopted printed tickets to notify members about routine meetings, election days and feasts. These were far less elaborate than the tickets discussed in relation to the new spaces and social groups of London. For Gillian Russell, printed tickets provided invitation and entry to exclusive

---

143 Archer, *The History of the Haberdashers' Company*, 126.
144 *These are to warne and require you (being lawfully summoned) according to your oath when you were...* (London: s.n., ca.1645), R476127 (x2); R476126 (x2); R476125; R476123 (x2); R476089; R476088; R476087; R476086.
145 *These shall be to ware and require you…* (London: s.n., 1640), S94024.
146 *Sir you are desired to meet the loyal livery-men of the city of London...* (London: s.n., 1683), R233348.

events and were a prerequisite for the phenomenon of visiting.[147] The tickets she describes were more grandiose in prose and decorative in format than livery company tickets, but they were not a new type of print. Instead, the use of tickets for visiting mirrored the established practices of civic institutions, including livery companies and the aldermen court, in announcing a meeting and prescribing who should be invited to it. The decoration of these later tickets was scrutinised as much as the event. Tickets to the trial of the Duchess of Kingston were described in *The Morning Post* from 15th April 1776 as,

> …meaner than those generally delivered for a puppet shew… the whole is wretchedly engraved, and printed upon a narrow slip of paper; in short it has more the appearance of a wrapper of Hebb's best Virginia than an admission ticket to the supreme tribunal of this great empire...[148]

This contrasts markedly with the Merchant Taylors' tickets in Figure 53, which are narrow slips of paper with no decoration. Regardless of this lack of decoration, scholars of the long eighteenth century have ignored the substantial amount of printed tickets civic institutions ordered. Print was not polite in this context. A very different rhetoric of obligation and custom overlaid company tickets. Civic institutions began commissioning printed tickets, which transferred and transmuted into the broader use of tickets for very different types of social interaction.

Livery companies were, therefore, both leaders and laggers when it came to the adoption of print. In contrast to the City, companies were not routinely printing from the late sixteenth century. When companies initially printed, it was for specific items that included petitions to Parliament, as well as the occasional book of statutes and batch order of oaths. However, companies and the City adopted printed tickets from an earlier point than Lloyd and Russell suggest. There was a civic origin to cultural pioneering in this instance. Lloyd attributes ticketing with new forms of sociability, which are voluntaristic, but company tickets reveal an older form of association and one that was only partially voluntaristic. Adoption of print amongst livery companies was by no means complete or uniform, but from what was found

---

147 For discussion of visiting and tickets, see Russell, *Women Sociability and Theatre in Georgian London*, 20-26.
148 Quoted in Ibid, 168.

sampling company accounts, and given the significant proportion of London residents that were members of a company, it is apparent that membership was a critical avenue through which people encountered print, via tickets, indentures and other communication besides. This body of print elicited different practices and responses, underlining the varied way in which print created bonds of association.

In addition to these regular occasions, the companies' facility with pre-printed forms by the 1660s meant that it seemed quite natural to turn to print for extraordinary occasions. A sheet of filled-in, pre-printed forms from 1669, produced for the Weavers' Company, were donations made towards rebuilding the company hall, which burnt down in the Great Fire. The Weavers' hall was ready by Election Day in July 1669.[149] The sheet details three donations, two for ten shillings and one for five shillings, from company members to the bailiffs and wardens as a 'voluntary gift.'[150] The Weavers commissioned print to coordinate the administration of post-fire reconstruction. Company histories often make passing reference to the process of rebuilding halls after the Fire, although it is not linked to the reconstruction of London more broadly. This organisation of donations for rebuilding speaks to the wider tradition of charitable briefs discussed in Chapter Three and, in particular, the receivers' receipts issued for collections for the rebuilding of St. Pauls' in the 1630s. Companies had to rely on their own members to raise the money for their halls after the Great Fire. Discussing the rebuilding of livery halls, Anya Matthews argues that halls were a 'source of corporate honour and reputational capital' and ties the urgency of a livery company to rebuild with a need to restore 'order and rituals.'[151] Print was part of the company infrastructure that made this happen. In addition to routine interactions between companies and members, companies commissioned print for the particular task of raising money. While company halls provided an imprint of company identity on the landscape, printed slips were a material marker of company affiliation that passed directly into the hands of company members.

---

[149] Anya Matthews, 'Honour, Ornament, Frugality: The Reconstruction of London's livery Halls after the Great Fire' in *Court, Country, City: British Art and Architecture, 1660-1735, Studies in British Art 24*, ed. Mark Hallet, Nigel Llewellyn, and Martine Myrone (New Haven, Yale University Press, 2016), 80.
[150] Alfred Plummer, *The London Weavers' Company 1600-1970* (Routledge: London, 1977), picture page opposite, 334.
[151] Matthews, 'Honour, Ornament, Frugality: The Reconstruction of London's livery Halls after the Great Fire', 87 and 89.

The inscription of company insignia on printed sheets, including tickets, illustrates that print functioned to flag company identity. Company halls had insignia engraved on gates and wainscoting, as well as the frames of portraits of liverymen hung inside them.[152] It was also on flimsy printed slips. As we have seen, coats of arms were on indentures and company orders, but purchases of stamps in company accounts shows a much broader inscription of insignia on company paperwork. In 1681/2, both the Poulters and the Curriers bought stamps alongside tickets. The Poulters paid 'for 3 wooden stamps for tickets, 00:07:00', and the entry in the Curriers was 'for printed tickets and for a stamp of the Curriers arms, 00:10:00.'[153] These purchases imply that clerks or beadles imprinted slips with coats of arms before dissemination. John Stow's 1633 *Survey of London* gave the coat of arms of companies and from this we can get a sense of what the stamps would have looked like.[154] The arms for the great twelve had elaborate cartouche surrounding them, while the rest of the company arms were simple woodcuts that could also have acted as stamps. Indeed, whilst emphasising the antiquity of established companies, Gadd suggests that these illustrations 'functioned as a pattern book for local craftsmen' producing company paraphernalia.[155] Print houses regularly traded in such woodcuts. Stamps with company insignia transformed generic printed tickets into company print. Some companies, such as the Merchant Taylors and Haberdashers, commissioned their own printed tickets, with details of their company hall in the printed text. However, smaller companies, such as the Curriers and Poulters, may have bought generic pre-printed forms and then stamped them with the company's coat of arms. This makes sense when companies purchased tickets from publishers and booksellers, rather than directly from printers. Members did not need to be sat in company halls to be reminded of their civic identity and company affiliation. It was imprinted on the paper slips they received from beadles. Tickets were semiotic, as well as transactive, in function.

---

[152] For discussion of coats of arms on livery company portraits see, Robert Tittler, *The Face of the City: Civic portraiture and civic identity in early modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 5.
[153] GL, MS 2150/001 f.208; MS 14246/003 f.97.
[154] John Stow, *The Survey of London* (London, 1633), S117597, 599-610 and 621-645.
[155] Gadd, 'Early Modern Printed Histories of the London Livery Companies', 43.

In this way, tickets were items of what might be termed 'banal corporatism'. Michael Billig stresses the texts and objects that flag nationalistic sentiments, but often go unnoticed in day-to-day life. Like the 'banal nationalism' invoked by the Queen's head being positioned on stamps and banknotes today, tickets were mute transmitters of a corporate identity.[156] It is difficult to ascertain the impact of print in forging ideas of company loyalty, but it does show a way in which corporal bonds of association were established and reinforced in the city through, and on, seemingly mundane and almost invisible paperwork. The distribution and exchange of tickets enmeshed members into the company networks and broader notions of civic identity. This offers a very different perspective on company print. Whereas previous literature has focused on the public representation of companies via print, this examination of company accounts shifts the focus decidedly away from printed petitions and on to documents used in the intra-communal communication between companies and members. As Joseph Ward suggests, concepts of community were ultimately down to the individual and 'how closely they chose to identify themselves and their interest with their guilds.'[157] Nonetheless, it is necessary to integrate the print found here into discussions of civic culture and social relations in London more widely. Company halls and portraits of liverymen provided a potent expression of company identity, and, in addition to this, the tickets company members received on an increasingly routine basis gave another type of material reminder of company affiliation. The majority of print which companies commissioned was resolutely intra-communal in circulation and exemplifies a very different type of 'public' that was constructed as a result. Company identity was built in no small part on flimsy sheets.

This extends the discussion of print in tax collection examined in chapters Three and Four. Critiquing ideas of a 'print revolution' in the 1640s, Peacey stresses that the overall volume of printed pages did not increase in this period and, instead, different types of print proliferated. His emphasis is on the increase in cheap forms of print that, in turn, facilitated 'the enlargement of the political nation.'[158] Company accounts highlight the need to look at items besides the overtly political. Tickets and receipts demonstrate not just the proliferation of 'cheap print' in political culture, but

[156] Billig, *Banal Nationalism,* 11.
[157] Ward, 5
[158] Peacey, 'The Revolution in Print', 283.

the increasing use of print in more straightforwardly administrative interactions between the populace and different institutions. Exploring the birth of a political nation, Peacey is predisposed to look for a certain type of print, which reinforces ideas of politics. Company print was by no means neutral; the extensive use of coats of arms reveals that even tickets to meetings were political texts. However, it was not print actively used in political debate, like the pamphlets and tracts Peacey cites. Instead, it highlights the other kinds of print Londoners were habitually coming into contact with, which complicates previous formulations of early modern print culture. It is therefore necessary to turn to consider how residents of London experienced the types of print outlined here.

Rethinking Print Culture in the Metropolis

A complementary way to think about the ticket culture described in the previous section and how it interacted with individuals is to look at Charles II's Secretary of state Joseph Williamson's papers. These show the various types of tickets he received from different organisations. As head of the state paper office, Williamson was at the centre of information coming into central government, and to examine the functioning of this office scholars have relied heavily on his personal notebooks and papers.[159] The printed tickets Williamson received were often quite separate from state matters, but they demonstrate the wider use of print in routine communications.

Going through Williamson's papers, I found seven different printed tickets. This included a printed invitation to the consecration of the Bishop of Chester in 1668 and, in 1672, an invitation to Christ's Hospital, where he was to attend in 'your Gown of Foyns and a Green Staff' and then go to the Tabernacle of Christs-Church to hear a Sermon.'[160] The latter was an event funded by a bequest of Lady Mary Ramsey. She

[159] For a discussion of the organisation of the state paper office under Williamson see Popper, 'Archives and the Boundaries of Early Modern Science', 91; see also Alan Marshall, 'Sir Joseph Williamson and the conduct of administration in Restoration England', *Historical Research*, 69 (1996): 18-41.

[160] SP 29/249/459; SP 29/319/590 Stallybrass records the printing of tickets by Christ's Hospital see, 'Little jobs…', 300; the substantial amounts Christ's Hospital spent on print by late 17th century is

was a well-known philanthropist who had died in 1601 and was the wife of a former president of Christ's hospital.[161] Such an event was a common form of memorialisation for the wealthy. There are two tickets for elections. One was for the council and officers of the Royal Society, of which Williamson was a member and later president, and another was for the Royal Company, where 'you are desired to bring your Votes with your shares endorsed on the same for those you desire to be chosen.'[162] He also received pre-printed correspondence from the Royal African Company. One was a ticket for a meeting of the Court of Assistants, with blanks on the slip to specify date and time, and another was a notice for payment of 'whatever sums he is behind of the payment he ought to have made to the end of February...'[163] Two tickets were for funerals, one for a Thomas Vyner, who was most likely the son of the former Lord Mayor and goldsmith who had died the previous year, and one for the poet Abraham Cowley at Westminster Abbey in August 1667.[164] These funeral tickets do not have blank spaces. Printed especially for the event, Williamson's name was written on the back of these slips. Williamson received tickets for a mixture of events and this provides evidence of the types of printed slips that circulated around London. Some are similar to the tickets Lloyd describes, but the convergence with civic forms of print is apparent.

Funeral tickets highlight the changing material culture of commemoration within companies and London more broadly. Quotidian print underwrote the practice of mourning.[165] Ralph Houlbrooke notes the adoption of funeral tickets 'by Londoners with aspirations to gentility.'[166] Funerals were important events in the social life of companies. Another point of performance, funerals often included a procession and

---

discussed in Susi Jeans, 'The Easter Psalms of Christ's Hospital', *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, 88 (1962), 55; see also Jenner, 'London', 300.

[161] Ian Archer, 'Ramsey, Mary, Lady Ramsey (*d.* 1601)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, May 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/95611, accessed 23 June 2017]

[162] SP 29/249/587; SP 29/287/46.

[163] SP 29/334/299.

[164] SP 29/193/62; SP 29/212/8.

[165] Just three funeral tickets are catalogued on the ESTC, *You are desired to accompany the corps of the right reverend father in God, Nicholas Lord Bishop* (London: s.n., 1661), R186927; *You are desired to accompany the corps of Mr Robert Huntington…* (London: s.n., 1685), R186923 ; *Sir you are desired to accompany the corps of Mr John Dryden, from the College of Physicians in…*(London: s.n., 1700), R186921.

[166] Ralph Houlbrooke, 'Civility and Civil Observances in the early modern English funeral' in *Civil Histories: Essays presented to Keith Thomas*, ed. Peter Burke, Brian Harrison and Paul Slack (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 82.

attendance was obligatory, at least for those in the 'upper levels of Company hierarchy.'[167] There was an attendant material culture to these ritual occasions. The deceased often left bequests to ensure their memorialisation, which included items for company halls in addition to covering the expenses of feasts and processions.[168] Accordingly, tickets often give instructions about dressing in the appropriate garb to accompany the coffin in the procession. A ticket for a funeral of a militia member from 1641 read,

> Sir You are intreated to make your appearance on Thursday next being the 29 of this instant Aprill at one of the Clocke in the afternoone at the Artillery garden, to Solemnize the Funerall of Mr John Vnderwood and to come in your compleat Armes and habit, with blacke feathers, and Ribands and not to faile as you tender the honour of the Company[169]

The paratextual features of this ticket relayed its dual purpose (Figure 54). The coat of arms of the Honourable Artillery Company took up half of the sheet, clearly showing where the ticket came from. This was another voluntary military organisation, like the Westminster Company discussed previously. Meanwhile, the border of skulls and crossbones demarcated that this was as a funeral ticket. The ticket itself became a material artefact of remembrance.

Tickets served as both an invitation and an object of memorialisation. These printed slips elicited emotional responses, as well as fulfilling a functional purpose to gain entry to a service. On Friday 12 April 1661, Samuel Pepys wrote,

> …and while I am now writing comes one with a ticket to invite me to Captain Robert Blake's burial, for whose death I am very sorry, and do much wonder at it, he being a little while since a very likely man to live as any I knew.[170]

Receipt of the ticket prompted Pepys to ruminate about the deceased individual and the inevitability of death. Tickets often carried visual cues to prompt this. Like the

---

[167] Archer, *The history of the Haberdashers' Company*, 32.
[168] Jasmin Kilburn-Toppin, 'Material Memories of the Guildsmen: Crafting Identities in Early Modern London' in *Memory Before Modernity: Practices of Memory in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Erika Kuijpers, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions, 126 (Leiden: Brill, 2013).
[169] Bod. Lib., Rawlinson D Vol.317 f.90b.
[170] 12th April 1661, Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys, Vol II, 1661*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews (London: Harper Collins, 2000), 73.

tickets in Figure 54, the funeral ticket of Mr Richard Hampden in 1662 had thick black or 'funerary' borders and a black wax seal.[171] This extensive use of black space corresponded with printed funeral elegies, which sometimes had entire pages blacked out.[172] Elsewhere, hourglasses, skeletons and father time embellished funeral tickets, including those of John Moore in 1702, held at the Mercers' Company.[173] This use of *memento mori* reflected a broader visual culture of death on funeral paraphernalia.'[174] Importantly, it was a visual culture shared with other types of printed 'ephemera'. Skeletal figures appear in the borders of *Lord Have Mercy Upon Us* sheets, burial in woollen certificates, trade cards of coffin makers and popular ballads.[175] The same imagery on administrative documents, funeral tickets and stereotypically 'cheap print' starts to blur the distinctions made about print. Company tickets were intra-institutional print informing members of a meeting, while burial in woollen certificates confirmed the legal burial of corpses, but both shared the same visual cues found in ballads and other 'cheap print'. When faced with the format and circulation of much of this print in the metropolis, the way scholars have previously categorised it falls apart.

The distribution and circulation of feast tickets develops this point further, as it demonstrates that print became integral to old and new types of feasting. As we have seen, feasting was a traditional activity, which was central to the ritual calendar of company life, but it was also adopted by newer forms of association. Another ticket in State Papers, addressed to the Earl of Arlington, was an invitation from the Honourable Artillery Company in October 1672 to dine at Drapers' Hall, highlighting other fraternal bodies whose sociability centred on ritual feasts and the adoption of

---

171 BA, Elmhirst Papers, Pye 7, EM 1287.
172 See for example, Richard Brathwait, *Anniversaries upon his Panarete* (London: Felix Kingston, 1634), S119292; Joshua Sylvester, *Lachrimae Lachimorum* (London: Humphrey Lownes, 1612), S118066.
173 Mercers' Company archives, my thanks to Donna Marshall for providing me with this reference.
174 Nigel Llewellyn, *The Art of Death: The Visual Culture in the English Death Ritual c.1500-c.1800* (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, by Reaktion 1991), Chapter 12.
175 Jenner, 'Plague on a Page: Lord Have Mercy Upon Us in Early Modern London', 275-6; The Affadavit of Burial in Woollen for Joan Smith of Netherexe Parish, Devon, 26th January 1714 accessed from http://www.devonheritage.org/Nonplace/Genealogy/BurialinWoollen.htm; John Johnson Trade Card Collection 28 (89) William Boyce Coffinmaker (c1680), http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/johnson/online-exhibitions/a-nation-of-shopkeepers/development/trade-cards#gallery-item=

print, in the same way as livery companies.[176] Feasting took on new prominence during the turbulence of the seventeenth century. Berlin cites the growing exclusivity of parish feasting during the period, with new groups appropriating feasts to forge political bonds and social association.[177] County feasts, which were gatherings of men from particular counties dwelling in London, emerged in the 1650s. Pitched as a type of charitable society, these groups of men converged for sermons, feasting and donations but were thinly veiled political groups.[178] In addition to appropriating feasting rituals to evoke a sense of heritage, organisers sold tickets to gain admission.

Tickets for Westminster feasts make clear the very different types of association negotiated via print. The ESTC records a ticket for one such meeting, dating from 1660, where there would be a sermon followed by dinner at Westminster Hall.[179] From another ticket for a Westminster feast, held in the Pye family papers, we can see that the tickets were printed for every meeting, as the names of officers on the tickets changed (Figure 55). The ticket used the same language as those companies issued, 'friendly society being a means to preserve unity and beget amity.' [180] Unlike livery companies, where membership was dependent on apprenticeship and affiliation to a particular trade or craft, this was a form of association purchased for the right sum. The ticket required for admittance to the feast cost two shillings and six pence. It also instructed 'indorsing your name on the backside of it with the place of you abode, for the ease of your next Steward.' Accordingly, on the reverse of a ticket for 26th August 1658, 'John Pye att Sir Robert Pye his house in St Stephens Court within the new palace in Westminster' was written. The ticket did not just notify the recipient and enable entry, but helped the administrative task placed on stewards. These sheets were noticeably bigger than the printed slips discussed earlier, although they display similar methods of inscription. A coat of arms headed the page and it had wax seals attached. Tickets prompted ideals of fraternal

[176] SP 29/316/378.
[177] Berlin, 'Reordering Rituals: ceremony and parish, 1520-1640', 55.
[178] Newton Key, 'The Political Culture and Political Rhetoric of County Feasts and Feast Sermons', *Journal of British Studies*, 33:3 (1994): 223-256.
[179] *1660. Westminster. Sir, friendly society being a meanes to preserve unity and beget amity…* (London: s.n., 1660), R2340.
[180] BA, Elmhirst Papers, Pye 7, EM 1287.

community along the same lines as livery companies. However, their distribution points to a very different type of sociability initiated via print.

Unlike the company tickets doled out by beadles, these tickets were commercial items advertised in the *London Gazette*. Purchasing a ticket distanced oneself from the puritanical fasting of the Commonwealth and brought 'association to social groups at the margins of the governing elite.'[181] This presents a form of association, which was far more voluntaristic than the tickets of livery companies. A letter sent to Joseph Williamson from a steward, Michael Arnold, requested the details of a Westminster feast be placed in the *London Gazette*. Arnold asked, 'The said notice, to the effect that it is to be kept on Thursday, September 7 and that tickets may be had up to the previous Saturday at Mr Gill's at the coffee house in King Street.'[182] In addition to advertisements in newspapers, fashionable coffee houses in the metropolis sold these tickets. Newton Key suggests the *Gazette* advertised up to ninety per cent of these feasts, along with published sermons.[183] Whilst membership of companies relied upon serving an apprenticeship, these tickets purchased a particular type of sociability and political alliance loosely based on place of birth. This has significant implications for thinking about how and where people encountered print in the metropolis.

In addition to selling coffee, coffeehouse owners supplemented their income by selling tickets for admission to particular events.[184] Coffeehouses have been pinpointed as places where political pamphlets and seditious newssheets were distributed and discussed. The sale of tickets in coffeehouses expands the corpus of print circulating in these spaces and has a knock-on effect for considerations of print in the public sphere. As a pivotal site in the construction of a public sphere, the coffeehouse was a place of conversation and socialisation, as much as of print.[185] The sale of tickets not only adds to the print in coffeehouses, but also reveals another type

[181] Key, 'The Political Culture and Political Rhetoric of County Feasts and Feast Sermons', 225.
[182] SP 29/316/2856.
[183] Key, 227.
[184] Brian Cowan discusses the sale of tickets and other items see Brian Cowan, *The Social Life of Coffee: the emergence of the British coffeehouse* (New Haven: Yale, 2005), 165; Lloyd, 852.
[185] Steve Pincus, "Coffee politicians does create': coffeehouses and Restoration political culture', 807-834.

of print that offered some form of political association. If these tickets gained access to a type of political grouping, they did so by adopting an established practice of ticket distribution by livery companies and other civic institutions. Printed tickets were political, drawing those that bought and received them into different kinds of association. Nonetheless, it was a mode of communication adopted and adapted, rather than constitutive of a public sphere.

The print of polite sociability and fashionable consumption circulated alongside, and in conjunction with, a wider nexus of print in the city outlined here and in the previous chapters. Chapter Four noted the emergence of trade cards in London, which have been associated with transmitting the latest fashions and broader aspects of modish living. Yet, trade cards for nightsoil services and coffin makers show that they were not always about leisurely shopping, and the volume in which they were produced contradicts any notion of their existence as rarefied items.[186] In form, they are not much different from the outpouring of playbills and assorted forms of advertising found on the streets of London, or quack bills that crammed as many words as possible onto the single sheet.[187] We must add the items of print discussed in this chapter to this milieu. People read and encountered the printed output of institutions alongside the polite, cheap, vulgar and everything in between. Distribution and circulation may have differed, but, crucially, the way this print is categorised belies much overlap in its consumption. Trade cards were not just collectable items, they were stuck to furniture and became an aide memoire of purchase.[188] Beyond the initial points of reception and intended audiences, the materiality or 'paperiness' of printed sheets came to the fore. Tickets gave instructions for meetings and, afterwards, would have been very good kindling.

---

[186] Mark S. R. Jenner 'Polite and Polluted? Nightmen and the Selling of Sanitary Services in London c.1600-c.1850' paper given at *Sociability and Print Culture*, November 9th 2013, University of York; Raven, 11.

[187] Stern, "On each Wall and Corner Post': Playbills, Title-pages, and Advertising in Early Modern London'; Francis Doherty, 'The anodoyne necklace: a quack remedy and its promotion', *Medical History*, 34:3 (1990): 268-298; Roy Porter, *Health for Sale: Quackery in England 1660-1850* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989), Chapter 4.

[188] For examples of trade cards stuck to furniture see, Ambrose Heal, *The London Furniture Makers From 1660-1840* (London: B. T. Batsford, 1953), 31.

Conclusion

This analysis of livery company print has uncovered a very different experience of print in the metropolis that reconfigures understandings of print culture. In doing so, it challenges several historiographical points about print, publics and social relations in London. Most of the print commissioned by livery companies circulated between company members rather than around Westminster. This print punctuated the rhythms of civic life. Like the emails we get today, the majority was intra-institutional. Intra-institutional communications create huge amounts of what is often pointless correspondence, but this communication ties small institutions together. Locating the junctures at which people encountered print constructs a series of social exchanges that were marked materially, as well as ceremonially. In addition to landmarks such as apprenticeship and freedom over the seventeenth century, print was increasingly distributed to communicate the routine aspects of company membership. This presents a very different type of print culture in operation in early modern London. Up to this point, scholars have concentrated too narrowly on particular types of print and too often explored its reception in a vacuum. The focus of Kyle, Peacey and others on print as constitutive of politics neglects a broader corpus of print commissioned and circulated by civic institutions. Indentures, orders, oaths and tickets each performed very different functions but together show the different ways print made bonds. This chapter has demonstrated that finding print in interactions between individuals and institutions expands the milieu of print in the metropolis. Crucially, the flow of single sheets from institutions was consumed alongside all manner of sheets printed on one side. This comprised playbills, ballads and other items raised in existing discussion of print culture, but also the other print identified in this thesis, including receipts and alehouse licences.

Emphasising the flow of this print amongst standard items of print culture should not be mistaken for its profusion. Instead, we need to be aware of the distinct chronologies of the print which companies ordered and in varying volumes. The distribution of printed tickets on a wide scale began later than the adoption of printed oaths. Crucially, institutional accounts give a very different perspective on the production of jobbing print. Rather than a constant stream of print from presses to

institutions, these accounts reveal the variable demand of jobbing print by many offices. The evidence here suggests that jobbing could not keep a printing house afloat. The findings of this chapter undermine key assertions made by Stallybrass and the subsequent assumptions of Kyle that livery companies kept presses going during Parliament sessions. It is not enough to say that institutions printed more over the period; closer attention needs to be paid to the relationship between printers and institutions. However, the need to look beyond 'published' print stands for showing another aspect of the print trade at work and, with it, the different types of print encountered by men and women in exchanges with institutions.

Conclusion

Whilst previous studies of print have focused on the published, public and popular, this thesis has identified and analysed the printed output of the state, the Church and livery companies. It has advanced an alternative approach to print in early modern England. The implications of this study are, in turn, illuminating and wide-ranging. Firstly, it recasts existing notions of 'print culture' by uncovering a corpus of print circulating in this period that scholars have overlooked. This has transformed our understanding of where people encountered print and what it was used for. I have shown that print infused a range of administrative processes. From marriage licences to tax receipts, an increasing array of contractual and financial dealings were conducted on and with printed sheets. As a consequence, my research brings about a more fundamental revision of the period by showing the materiality of social relations and governance. The importance of this is hard to overstate. Pivotal to advancing this argument has been recognising the print which flowed into people's pockets as much as that which was filed away in institutional repositories. From this, I have reimagined a whole stratum of social exchanges.

Print functioned in diverse ways as binding material. Much of the print discussed was liable to become kindling, lining for pie tins and the type of binding material that shored up the weakened spines of books, worn out with reading or overloaded with extra sheets once it served its initial purpose. However, over the course of these chapters, the other ways in which print worked as binding material prior to this has been revealed - it bound people in social networks and contractual relationships. Moving beyond the prosaic idea of official print as something proclaimed from pulpits and hung in marketplaces, this thesis has identified the various ways in which printed sheets encoded transactions between institutions and individuals, shoring up less tangible bonds of association.

My thesis sets out a new agenda for the study of print by illustrating the need to look more rigorously at institutional output. Each chapter has unearthed different types of print and shown how this worked in diverse ways. To fully understand the work that print did requires an examination of its production, distribution and

circulation in turn. While numerous scholars stress the movement of print (and more commonly books) in terms of 'geographies', 'promiscuity' and circuits of communication, my analysis has provided a more comprehensive analysis of the flow of print from printing house to archive.[1] As the mapping of visitation articles in Chapter One revealed and subsequent chapters reiterated, there were distinct geographies to the print institutions commissioned and, as a result, this shaped how this print was read and engaged with. Tracking print through paperchains and its passing from person to person demonstrated the performative function of these sheets. Penance certificates and company oaths were read aloud, while licenses hung on alehouse walls. Each was a critical way in which the authority of institutions was inscribed and the social standing of individuals demarcated. Engaging fully with the geography of print also exposed its function inside the repositories of institutions and individuals. Printed sheets became archival material. Print was not just constitutive of a burgeoning public sphere and nascent nation building in the way Peacey, Kyle and others understand it.[2] It might have been far more mundane in purpose, but the print discussed in this thesis gives a more profound insight into the material demands of record keeping and knowledge production in early modern England.

Equally, the focus on institutional output has tested claims about jobbing print and found them wanting. Firstly, not everything institutions commissioned fits prescriptive notions of jobbing print. Visitations articles ran up to forty pages and carried the printer's imprint, title pages and other printing motifs. These were not single sheets flowing from printing presses to institutions in the manner Stallybrass described, but the Church required them in huge numbers.[3] Up to this point, studies of jobbing print have overlooked institutional records, resulting in a skewed conception of institutional demand in the print trade. By focusing on institutional accounts, this thesis has sought to redress this omission. There simply was not an endless stream of small jobs rolling off printing presses and destined for offices. As the survey of livery company expenditure in Chapter Six made apparent, the amount of print ordered differed considerably between companies. The amounts printers

1 Ogborn and Withers, *Geographies of the Book*, 5; Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*, 90; Darnton, 'What is the history of books?', 65-83.
2 Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*; Kyle, *Theatre of State*.
3 Stallybrass, 'Little Jobs', 331.

charged also varied. Not all small jobs were equal and, certainly, the amounts spent suggest this type of work was not necessarily very profitable. Definitions of jobbing print, as they stand, fail to account for the full range of print that suffused institutional activities. Charting the printed output of institutions with greater accuracy not only revises ideas of jobbing print, it fundamentally alters understandings of the print trade, showing the specific contracts forged between printers and their customers.

The adoption of print differed from court to court, office to office and parish to parish. Exposing this, my research moves beyond simplistic assumptions that print went hand in hand with standardisation. Print did affect office routine and there was an undoubted increase in form filling. However, a recurring theme throughout these chapters was the uneven uptake of print and, in many instances, its complete absence. The appearance of print cannot be taken as a signifier of bureaucratic efficiency. As Chapter Two made clear, print in the York church courts did not correspond to court records elsewhere, which was a pattern also evident in local government and livery companies. Examining the adoption of print at different institutional levels, a protean picture emerges in which manuscript persisted and proliferated. Print operated in a world of script. Not only was print and script used interchangeably for everything from administration bonds to receipts, but the output of clerks and scribes remained considerable, evidenced by mountainous tax assessment lists and cause papers that take up much of the space in repositories. Instead of standardisation, this thesis has exposed the particularities and peculiarities of paper regimes at all administrative levels.

Consequently, this thesis complicates existing models of state formation and institutional development in important ways. There was print in the 'paper state' but it cannot be readily attributed to increasing state control.[4] Slack and Braddick both claim there was more print in governance and suggest this demonstrated the extending reach of the state from the centre outwards.[5] By examining the adoption of print in closer detail, I have set discussions of print and institutional development on

4 Burke, *A Social History of Knowledge*, 119.
5 Slack, 'Government and Information in Seventeenth Century England', 60; Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England, 1550-1700*, 167.

a very different trajectory. As we saw in Chapter Three, only a select few received printed privy seal loan letters from the monarch. Here, print had a very limited circulation, which contradicts the idea that the uptake of print was about massification. Elsewhere, the provincial production of administration bonds and alehouse licences, in response to transcripts provided in government proclamations, revealed the provincial production of print for local dissemination. This highlighted the capacity of local offices to shape administrative culture and the adoption of print. It presents state building as a mutable process, which corresponds with the intricacy of power networks now emphasised in scholarship on governance and record keeping.[6] Whether it was the official in Hexham who had no marriage bonds to hand, or the extended discussion of forgery in Chapter Four, this document-led approach also gave new perspectives on paperwork failure and its impact on governance. Both examples are antithetical to notions of state formation or institutional development more widely and, as a result, show how examinations of print actually reveal more complex articulations of governance in action.

'Blanks' demonstrate how greatly print varied in administrative practice. Routinely used as a catchall term, in fact this category of print illustrates how a deeper understanding of the work print did relies upon a closer examination of the page itself. Examples of printed pro forma that had civilité typeface surfaced throughout. This included administration bonds in church courts, Raleigh's wine licences, fee farm receipts and New River Company leases. Civilité was entwined in an idea of official print, but not a constitutive element of it. There were plenty of other legally binding contracts that used italic, roman and hybrids with both. What this study makes apparent is the importance of aesthetics in an analysis of print - not by proving that a particular typeface was demonstrative of a particular type of text, but in showing a far more messy reality. When we look closely at the page, many of the ways in which print was previously categorised fall apart. In addition to typeface, these chapters examined paratextual features, as well as the things done to printed sheets, including signatures, wax seals, and its surface, whether paper or parchment. The materiality of these sheets conveyed meaning and dictated the ways in which they were read and engaged with. Did it matter whether something was printed?

---

6 Griffiths, 'Local Arithmetic: Information Cultures in Early Modern England', 116.

Engaging with the aesthetics of print and the transactive and symbolic aspects of the material sheet has shed new light on this question. It has shown that bureaucratic efficiency and cost effectiveness was not always a drive to print. We must situate print more comprehensively in the function of institutions.

Beyond the office, these chapters revealed interactions with officialdom, whether church court clerks, tax collectors or company beadles, as a key juncture in which people encountered print. When pasted to walls, people experienced things like alehouse licences and company orders alongside ballads, broadsides and other 'popular print'. Yet people were also exposed to print in alternative places and sets of exchanges. Printed sheets encoded particular practices, whether it was oath-taking or excommunication, and, thus, were part of far more complex processes and performances of social relationships. The print that institutions commissioned was consumed in diverse ways, variously sworn upon, signed and interred into repositories. Moreover, the governance conferred via printed sheets was also re-performed at subsequent points, whether it was the presentation of last year's hearth tax receipt to collectors or alehouses licences brought before the court the following year, these sheets held an ongoing function to the recipient. By looking beyond booksellers' stalls, a very different print culture came to the fore - one experienced through participation as a taxpayer, parishioner or livery member. This printed matter tells us far more about the ways in which creditworthiness was established, civic identity maintained and religious integrity preserved than the contents of pamphlets, didactic literature or newspapers otherwise convey. It was the material product of people's transactions with officialdom and, as a result, shaped their social standing.

Recognising the diverse ways in which print like this was consumed expands our comprehension of reading practices and shows the salience of this study for broader scholarship. These chapters have documented the appropriation of print in very different settings. Annotation, cutting and sticking was not the preserve of literary texts; other print was subject to these practices in both offices and households. When stuck inside his notebook, Nailor's receipt became a record of his financial credibility. When strung together inside the Church registry, the

administration bond of an individual became a probate file for a particular year or place. Therefore, whilst there were similarities with the things done to texts in terms of cutting and sticking, it is important to be aware that this had very different outcomes for the comprehension of official print. These printed sheets were not encountered everyday, but looking at what people did with them and the traces they left behind on the surface of the page shows the dynamic interactions and reading practices it prompted. Crucially, this applied to both men and women. As Chapter Four argued, finding women's names in blank spaces on tax receipts gives critical evidence of their economic role in early modern England. The same applied to Ann Chamberlain's alehouse recognizance in Chapter Five and much other pro forma cited. This builds on Laura Gowing's work on the social 'life' of apprenticeship indentures to reinforce the capacity of print as a source material to gauge much more profound ideas about social structure in the period.[7]

Fundamentally, by taking a material approach to the study of institutions and social relations, this thesis has reverberations for a range of scholarly fields. The preceding chapters demonstrated the increasing printedness to all manner of interactions inclusive of financial transactions, church court proceedings and livery company memberships besides much else. Thinking about documents as objects brings a physical element to the ways in which bonds of association were constructed and maintained. This touches on civic identities, religious communities and burgeoning ideas of citizenship in relation to the state. Paper slips captured abstract notions of collectivity, revealing how the material turn provides new perspectives on fundamental concepts of belonging that underpinned early modern life. Rather than being dismissed as dry, dusty records, documents redraw our understanding of the performance of social relations and, along with, it our conception of what print did, whether received on doorsteps or filled in and filed away by court clerks. Repositories and the wealth of material they contain deserve to be explored with a fresh eye.

Identifying and analysing alternative sources of print enabled this new methodological approach to the early modern period. Consequently, this thesis

[7] Gowing, 'Girls of forms', 448.

contributes to ongoing revisions in the study of institutional records. The scope of sources examined and the material found as a result recapitulates print studies and social relations, as defined in the broadest way. It foregrounds institutional repositories and personal papers as places in which to find print and revise understandings of print culture. More commonly regarded as manuscript entities, these archives and repositories have print hiding in plain sight. Over the course of this thesis, the scrappy printed summons to the Sheriff's court described at the outset has been situated amongst a welter of other material. It might be the only slip like that in the file, but it was part of a much broader nexus of pro forma. Institutional records and personal papers offer fresh ground for examinations of print. It is not just about finding new types of print in these places, but also what these resting places say about its circulation. The questions we ask of this print must correspond to the diverse archival spaces in which it ended up. This approach demands a broader application.

As is the case with any new research, this study has raised as many questions as it has answered and laid the groundwork for further investigation. It is clear that there is a lot more to be done on the paperwork of the period and that this has the potential to reinvigorate study of a number of historical fields. As suggested in the introduction, each section could warrant an entire thesis and, in light of the ensuing discussion, it is helpful to identify some specific areas for exploration. There is, of course, the possibility of studying more offices. For instance, it would be illuminating to examine other church court records and livery company accounts to get a sense of the wider engagement of print across an institution. Similarly, looking through more personal papers would bring additional print to the surface and show the materialisation of other types of transactions. This could also extend to other arms of the state. For example, the seamen's wills and array of pre-printed tickets flagged in my discussion suggest that the administration of the admiralty and navy warrants a comprehensive study. My method of analysis could also be applied more extensively to other types of print identified in this thesis. Initial investigation indicates that both the Crown and the Church made increasing use of circular letters over the period. An analysis of each of these sources, comparable to my analysis of visitation articles, would enhance understandings of both. Furthermore, a comprehensive study of

forged print across various institutions would place documentary culture in sharper relief. All told, this topic is far from complete. The methodology of the thesis and the significance of its findings have set frameworks for further work.

Covering such a wide range of institutional print has meant that certain themes and methodological approaches were not explored as fully as others. While the focus of my study was on the mainstay of institutional structures in early modern England, looking outside of this has the potential to develop the arguments made. For example, examining the organisation of political and religious non-conformity. An in-depth study of the material output of groups like the Quakers, which were using print, could nuance our understanding of the construction and maintenance of religious communities more broadly.[8] Was the adoption of print here innovation or replication? Trading companies and the other societies that Joseph Williamson received tickets from would be a further avenue to explore in this respect. In addition, while my study focused solely on England, there is an evident need to place it on an international footing that both takes in Europe and extends across the Atlantic to America. How does print figure in governance elsewhere? This is an expansive topic but one that would give a more accurate account of how printing presses figured in state formation and institutional development. There is also the possibility of what could be achieved by changing the timeframe. Whereas the burgeoning fiscal military state was the end point of this study, shifting the timeframe could put it at the apex. Encompassing the heady days before the South Sea Bubble, where lotteries, stocks and bonds abounded, would place tax receipts in a printed milieu of risk, debt and gambling. Each of these would proffer further insights to compliment and extend the significant findings of this thesis.

In resetting the parameters for analysing print, this thesis has opened up a much bigger conversation about the lived environment of early modern England. Drilling down into its papery underbelly gives a new dimension to the performances of people in the world, foregrounding the print enmeshed in social processes and corresponding paperchains. This sets us on a very different course than the

[8] Kate Peters, *Print culture and the early Quakers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

conventional trajectory to Grub Street, away from hack writing and towards a deeper understanding of print in relation to people, place and power.