7 *Setting Conditions*

IN the previous chapters, the emphasis has been on understanding the material and textual analysis of early modern books and manuscripts. The focus now needs to turn to the other kinds of archival and historical information relating to the book-trade, in particular the commercial and political aspects of the business: the economics of the trade, the forms of regulation, and the role and records of the Scriveners' and Stationers' Companies. These sources describe how the book-trade was organized, and the constraints under which it operated. From a broad perspective, that context is part of an evolving narrative of the history of the book; whilst for analytical purposes, the archival records are essential as they provide details of dates, events, and formal decisions that were made about both books and members—these details act as an important control on speculative impulses and convenient assumptions.

The Companies

By the end of the fourteenth-century, the London book-trade was well established, with scribes, limners (illustrators), and binders plying their related trades.[1] Even at this stage, it was apparent that there were two types of scribes: those who primarily prepared books and longer tracts, and those who prepared legal and other documents using a hierarchy of specialized scripts. It was the former who worked most closely with the limners and the binders. On 12 July 1403 (some 70 years before Caxton), the two groups separated into the Writers of the Court Letter and the Writers of the Text Letter, with the latter joined by the limners.[2] That early division of text production between two different companies had implications for the book-trade that contemporaries could not have foreseen. Thereafter, the companies kept separate statutes, records, members, and apprentices. In the following decades, the Writers of the Text Letter began to use the word 'stationer' to describe their activity, and from 1443, they were known by that term alone.[3]

With the arrival of the printing trade, a number of other companies became involved in book production, including the Drapers, Grocers, and Haberdashers. Whilst the two great successors to Caxton, Pynson

[1] For a discussion of manuscript production in the fourteenth-century, see R. Hanna, *London Literature, 1300–1380* (Cambridge, 2005).
[2] P. W. M. Blayney, *The Stationers' Company before the Charter, 1403–1557* (London, 2003), 13; Steer, *Scriveners' Company Common Paper*, ix, as before.
[3] Blayney, *The Stationers' Company before the Charter*, 15–18.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

and de Worde, were Stationers (Caxton was a Mercer), the guild was slow to move from manuscript book production to print. To the extent that its members sold printed books, many of these would have been imported from the continent. Indeed, by 1547, only six of the 15 printing-houses in England (not all of them in London) were owned by Stationers.[4] It is probably that lack of dominance that doomed their first attempt at incorporation in 1542.[5]

With the accession of Mary (1553–8), England reverted to Rome and a number of Protestant printers went into hiding. This put the printed trade back in the control of the Stationers who, on 4 May 1557, became a corporation.[6] Their control was further consolidated by the Star Chamber decree of 1586 (which vested powers of search and oversight in the Company and set out the requirements for licensing), although the Drapers continued to dispute the Stationers' exclusive right to print books through the late sixteenth-century.[7] As the Stationers took control of the printed trade, the Writers of the Court Letter evolved into Scriveners, who became a corporation on 28 January 1617.[8]

Broadly speaking, the Stationers and the Scriveners had very similar structures, governance, and responsibilities; and it is clear that Bacon, Montague, and Hobart must have based the Charter for the Scriveners on that of the Stationers.[9] Both companies had a Master, two Wardens, and a Court of Assistants, as well as a Beadle and a Clerk. At the lower levels, a Stationer was first apprenticed, next freed as a yeoman, and then made a member of the livery. As a member of the livery, he had to serve as Junior and Senior Renter-Warden before rising to the Court of Assistants, from which the Master and Wardens were chosen.[10] Some chose not to take this step. In the Scriveners' Company, the junior ranks are referred to as Stewards and Younger Members.[11]

Both companies grew consistently, with the Stationers doing so more substantially. From 1558 to 1567, Gadd noted that 271 apprentices were bound and 119 freed (not all apprentices remained in the trade); from 1681 to 1690, 672 were bound and 467 freed. He estimates the size

[4] Blayney, *The Stationers' Company before the Charter*, 45–7.
[5] Blayney, *The Stationers' Company before the Charter*, 41.
[6] Blayney, *The Stationers' Company before the Charter*, 49–53.
[7] G. D. Johnson, 'The Stationers versus the Drapers: Control of the Press in the Late Sixteenth Century', *The Library*, VI: 10 (1988), 1–17.
[8] Steer, *Scriveners' Company Common Paper*, vii.
[9] For the Charter, see Steer, *Scriveners' Company Common Paper*, 92–107.
[10] I. A. Gadd, *Being like a Field: Corporate Identity in the Stationers' Company, 1557–1684* (University of Oxford, MS DPhil c.15604; 1999), 67–83.
[11] Steer, *Scriveners' Company Common Paper*, 125.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

of the Company as being 120–50 members in 1557, and some 5–600 in 1684.[12] Comparatively, between 1557 and 1580, the Scriveners made free 141 apprentices, of which one was not expert in the skill; between 1581 and 1604, 168 were made free, of which 11 were described as being not expert; and between 1605 and 1628, 217 were made free, of which 39 were described as being not expert.[13] Once the non-expert members are removed from the figures, the trade shows a consistent growth from 140, to 159, to 178 for each period, or just under an extra apprentice per year. In 1671, the Scriveners had one Master, two Wardens, 21 Assistants, nine Stewards, and 25 Younger Members.[14]

The companies were bodies corporate: this gave them a permanent legal status that was at once inanimate (and therefore free of personal jeopardy and liability), but otherwise equivalent to that of an adult male. A corporation could enter into contract, sue and be sued, purchase and alienate land, and be granted privileges by letters patent.[15] As a consequence, it could act collectively on behalf of its members in the broad defence of their interests, and it could regulate the behaviour of its members in the interests of the greater good. It was both the representative of the trade to society and government, and the guardian of its members' lives. For the members, it was the point of authority that they turned to in order to conduct their business activities.

In his study of the Stationers' Company, Gadd has identified five main areas of corporate responsibility, and these roles apply in much the same way to the Scriveners as well. First, the right to own property meant that a Company could acquire a Hall that served as a focal point both for entertainment and administration. In particular, the Stationers kept such records in the Hall as to who in the trade owned the rights to the copy of any given book, as well as of its role as an arbiter of disputes and manager of trade activities, and it kept records of its financial activities.[16] These documents are of prime importance for understanding the organization of the trade and the activities of its members. Second, the Company had powers of jurisdiction over its members and the ability to regulate their conduct.[17] Some of these powers had been vested in the Company by such instruments as the decree of the Star Chamber from 1586, which allowed for the search and seizure of

[12] Gadd, *Being like a Field*, 23.
[13] Steer, *Scriveners' Company Common Paper*, 28–62.
[14] Steer, *Scriveners' Company Common Paper*, 125.
[15] Gadd, *Being like a Field*, 31–6.
[16] Gadd, *Being like a Field*, 84–8; C. C. Blagden, 'The Accounts of the Wardens of the Stationers' Company', *Studies in Bibliography*, 9 (1957), 69–93.
[17] Gadd, *Being like a Field*, 88–99.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

unauthorized books upon 'reasonable cause for suspicion', and the arrest of those involved (including bookbinders).[18] It could also fine members for disorderly conduct (swearing is the most usual foible so punished), or for the failure to present an apprentice in a timely manner. In addition, the Company set limits as to how far any one member could encroach on the interests of the others by setting limits to the number of presses, apprentices, and the quantities of books that could be printed, and by establishing a standard retail price per sheet in order to ensure that members of the trade did not undercut each other to the detriment of all. Third, the Company looked after the social and corporate welfare of its members.[19] It did this primarily through the provision of financial relief to those in distress and, from 1603, through the dividends paid (relative to their rank in the Company) from the English Stock; a joint property arrangement that vested the income from psalm-books and almanacs into a common account shared by the members.[20] Fourth, the Company had civic obligations, not least the storage of grain and arms, the provision of men at times of need, and the attendance of its members at city and royal events. It could also be asked to collect taxes.[21] Fifth, the Company made petitions to the government and City of London on behalf of the trade when it sought redress of grievance, the relief of its members, or the protection of their interests.[22] It is the cumulative aspect of all these roles that allows a picture to be built up of the production and publication of books in their historical context, and for specific events to be related to particular items at the press.

Blagden has sketched out, in a calendar, the typical activities of the Company over a year.[23] Most of the day-to-day detail is about the entry of copy, and the admission and freedom of apprentices. This however, is interspersed with the other matters that arose from time to time: disputes, regulatory activities, a petition, and the corporate dinner. This suggests that, while other issues would impinge from time to time, what really mattered to the Company was the control of trade assets; that is the people that were employed, and the property of its members. It was precisely those issues that were also the concern of the authorities, and

[18] Arber, *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers*, II: 811 (item 6).
[19] Gadd, *Being like a Field*, 99–109.
[20] See, W. C. Ferguson, *The Loan Book of The Stationers' Company with a List of Transactions 1592–1692* (London, 1989); C. C. Blagden, *The Stationers' Company: A History 1403–1959* (London, 1960), 92–109. There were also Irish and Latin Stocks, but these were not as financially lucrative.
[21] Gadd, *Being like a Field*, 109–112.
[22] Gadd, *Being like a Field*, 139–52.
[23] Blagden, *The Stationers' Company*, 47–55.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

so in their management there was a confluence of interest that served both, for the most part, conveniently.

Allowance, Licence, and Entry

After 1586, there were two stages that a printed book had to go through once a publisher had decided that there was a sufficient market for it to be viable. First of all, the book had to be allowed; that is, a copy of the manuscript had to be approved for publication by the ecclesiastical authorities. Second, the copy that had been allowed was then presented to the Stationers' Company to be licensed by the Master and one of the Wardens. This was a formal protocol that demonstrated that the proper procedures had been followed. It was precisely the failure to gain allowance, or the misuse of copy through the introduction of substantial alterations, that got those concerned into the most trouble. A printer, therefore, might begin work on a book before it had been properly licensed so long as it had been allowed. Nevertheless, before a book was published, those involved made sure that it was licensed, not because of the formal approval, but because it demonstrated that the book was their commercial property. Once these two conditions had been met, a third stage was possible. If the publisher (who might also be, but was not necessarily, the printer) wanted to protect their copy from infringement by others, they might request that it was entered into the Register by the Clerk, for which they paid sixpence. Entry provided a permanent record of the right to copy that the Company could turn to in the event of a dispute but, before the second Star Chamber decree of 1637, it was not a necessity.[24]

In 1606 the method of licensing was altered for plays. From 1586, they had been allowed, like any other book, by the chaplains; but this meant that they were licensed only for the press with the consequence that things might be performed that otherwise would not be allowed. To remedy the situation, the Master of the Revels allowed plays both for performance and the press, and he charged for the privilege. Buc (the first Master to do so) appears to have treated his office more as a sinecure than a means for stricter regulatory oversight. His successor, Sir Henry Herbert, was more active, and sought to double the fees by requiring that plays be licensed separately for the stage and the press.[25]

[24] See, P. W. M. Blayney, 'The Publication of Playbooks', 396–404.
[25] See, A. R. Dutton, *Mastering the Revels* (Basingstoke, 1991); N. D. Bawcutt, *The Control and Censorship of Caroline Drama: The Records of Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, 1623–73* (Oxford, 1996).

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

It is important to realize that manuscript publication was not subject to the same restrictions as print, or the drama, because it could not be monitored in the same way and, therefore, general oversight of the trade was vested with the Scriveners. This does not mean that the authorities were not concerned about what circulated in manuscript; it was rather an implicit admission that it was far more difficult to control, and that its impact was more limited. It was one thing for a manuscript to be copied a dozen times, or even 50, quite another for a book or pamphlet to be issued in anywhere between 500 and 1,500 copies. Furthermore, whilst the Scriveners could oversee the professional trade, private individuals were quite beyond their reach. This does not mean, however, that the ownership and copying of manuscript was without risk.

Censorship

For the early modern authorities, the press was a mixed blessing. It did not take long for it to become an instrument for the projection of power that was used for proclamations, to establish religious orthodoxy, to explain official opinion or policy, and to disseminate official versions of events. The problem was that others equally perceived its usefulness as a vehicle for ideas and beliefs that did not necessarily conform with, or reflect, the values of those who exercised power. Further, the sheer scale of book production and the extent of the growing trade convinced the authorities that some kind of oversight was necessary. After decades of ad hoc measures, the Star Chamber decree of 1586 established a formal system, in which the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London were given the responsibility for ensuring that what was printed conformed to the accepted doctrines of Church and State. This responsibility the bishops immediately shared with the chaplains in their households, who undertook most of the work. The temperament of those at the top played its part as well: Whitgift, Bancroft, and Abbott all took a fairly relaxed view of what might require their intervention; whereas Laud was more prone to the exercise of official discretion, and it proved his downfall.[26]

Censorship is an issue of some textual and historical importance that is commonly misunderstood. Some 90,000 books, pamphlets, and broadsides survive that were printed in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century

[26] For a comprehensive survey and discussion of censorship practices, see C. S. Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge, 1997); —, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, 2001); —, *Press Censorship in Caroline England* (Cambridge, 2008). For Laud and Prynne, see Bland, 'Invisible Dangers', 190–3.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

England. Against that broad swathe of material, much of which would never have exercised a licenser's interest beyond the formal requirements of approval, a few notable examples of official heavy-handedness stand in uneasy contrast. It is all too obvious, as well, that the competing claims of divine right and liberty of conscience ended in a convulsive conflict that broke society apart, and that in its midst Milton wrote some of his most compelling prose to argue against official oversight of the press. These political tensions that, in times of anxiety, sometimes focused around books, or libraries, have led some to argue that censorship shaped intellectual and political values among the elite, and even society as a whole, in such a way as to have become 'the central problem of consciousness and communication'.[27]

The truth is more mundane: those who licensed books ranged across a spectrum of opinion, and some were more tolerant than others; in practice, their primary concern was not political except in so much as matters of religion were in dispute.[28] The chaplains were, in this sense, the protectors of the Elizabethan settlement and, in that cause, they had a vested interest. Later, under the commonwealth, the licensers were the guardians of Presbyterian governance and sought to protect its interests accordingly. It would, in fact, be more surprising if those who held such responsibility did not identify with the government they served.

Of course, certain things were not permitted to circulate in print, including discussions of crown finances, or of the rights of the monarch or the Church; and it was not until the 1640s that news-books dealt with domestic political issues (earlier pamphlets that treated of such matters were usually issued, sometimes covertly, by authority).[29] From time to time, other restrictions were also attempted. After 1599, all domestic historical writing was supposed to be vetted by the Privy Council; in practice this did not happen. Daniel was printed with the allowance of Richard Mockett, and at the 'pleasure' of the Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbott; Camden was printed with the permission of James I; and Bacon was allowed by the Bishop of London, George Montaigne.[30] Similarly, political pamphlets and foreign news were usually licensed by one of the secretaries of state.

[27] A. Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison WI, 1984), 17.
[28] See, S. Lambert, 'Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship', *Past and Present*, 124 (1989), 62 and 65; —, 'State Control of the Press in Theory and Practice: The Role of the Stationers' Company before 1640', *Censorship and the Control of Print in England and France 1600–1910* (Winchester, 1992), 1–32.
[29] Bland, 'Invisible Dangers', 159–63.
[30] W. W. Greg, *Licensers of the Press, &c. to 1640* (Oxford, 1962), 68, 51, and 63.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

Print glittered. Like a magpie, the authorities noticed: they sought to control what they perceived to be most publicly dangerous or, at least, vicariously unstable. Bodily frankness was acceptable, provided it was neither explicitly obscene nor pornographic—one writer recommended copulation as a means of keeping warm in winter in a book dedicated to his sister-in-law.[31] Samuel Harsnett saw nothing wrong with the advice.[32] *Venus and Adonis* was printed with the allowance of Archbishop Whitgift; whilst one of his secretaries, Michael Murgetrode, sanctioned *Hero and Leander*.[33] What mattered was religious doctrine, and what exercised the authorities most were the non-conformist and Catholic publications that were generally not a product of the London trade. Allison and Rogers, for instance, record that 932 Catholic books were printed in English (mainly at Douai) between 1558 and 1640, with another 1619 publications in languages other than English that were either intended to be distributed there, or which engaged in controversial dispute with the Anglican settlement.[34] These books circulated through recusant networks, as well as the booksellers, and they often were much more difficult to trace than the ordinary stock sold by the Stationers.

For those caught with manuscript material of treasonable intent, it was a serious political offence; however, much circulated in manuscript that could not be printed, including parliamentary speeches, accounts of political trials such as that for Essex, and the more scabrous shades of erotic literature. From the viewpoint of the authorities, manuscript was seen as more a form of replication and preservation for texts, rather than as a medium through which copies proliferated, and it recognized that those who gained access to such texts would have an education and background sufficient to read them in an informed and responsible manner. Provided the texts did not cross into print, therefore, a more benign attitude could be taken to the nature of their contents and their transmission through personal networks.

If oversight was deemed necessary, several factors served to make it less effective than the term might suggest. First, those who licensed books, and those who wrote them, were often connected through personal networks such as the universities. An author therefore might approach a chaplain who was known to be sympathetic to their work:

[31] W. Vaughan, *Natural and Artificial Directions for Health* (STC 24612; 1600), D7^v–8^r; see Bland, 'The London Book-Trade in 1600', 455–6.
[32] Greg, *Licensers of the Press, &c. to 1640*, 42.
[33] Greg, *Licensers of the Press, &c. to 1640*, 20 and 70.
[34] A. F. Allison and D. M. Rogers, *The Contemporary Printed Literature of the English Counter-Reformation between 1558 and 1640*, 2 vols. (Aldershot, 1989–94).

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

hence the fact that the same person could have all his work authorized by a single chaplain, regardless of the publisher. Second, the economic insignificance of book production, combined with the proliferation of print, meant that official reaction to problems was often retrospective. Third, authority was frequently subverted by an intelligent response to its concerns, with readers given scope to draw their own conclusions. The willingness with which writers and publishers took political risks—and equally, the frustrations caused when publishers proved financially risk averse, reveals the extent to which the chaplains were arbiters of the tolerable, rather than enforcers of a particular view. It was, in other words, not censorship that proved to be the problem for the author, but the failure of oversight as a means to control the circulation of ideas that was a problem for the political authorities.

A fruitful way of approaching the subject is to look more closely at the chaplains and their work. For instance, Abraham Hartwell is a name that occurs more often than any other during the years of Whitgift and Elizabeth. He was born in the mid-1550s,[35] and first came under the influence of Whitgift at Trinity College, Cambridge, in the late 1560s as an undergraduate. He later became a fellow, and subsequently joined the staff at Lambeth as Whitgift's secretary by 1584. On 10 November 1586, he licensed his first book (Doleta's *Straunge newes out of Calabria*; STC 6992); and, on 3 June 1588, he was listed as a senior member of the panel of correctors.[36] Between November 1586 and October 1607, he allowed at least 45 books (not all entries for licensed books record the name of the chaplain, and not all books were entered in the Register). These included, Allot's *Englands Parnassus*, Carew's Tasso, Drayton's *Idea* and 1606 *Poems*, Florio's Montaigne, Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*, Marston's *The Metamorphosis of Pygmalion's Image* and *The Dutch Courtesan*, as well as works by Greene, Lodge, and Dekker, ballads, and much more. A manuscript on the life of Claudius of Guyse has his imprimatur. He made no alterations to the text.[37] Although Hartwell was collated to the rectory of Toddington in Bedfordshire by Whitgift before 1604, he lived in London and died at Lambeth at the end of 1607.[38]

From 1596 through 1604, Hartwell was joined by William Barlow, later Bishop of Rochester (from 1605) and Lincoln (1608–13); and, from

[35] Hartwell is not to be confused with his namesake, the author of *Regina Literata* (STC 12987; 1564), who matriculated at King's, after attending Eton, in 1559. See, J. Venn and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigiensis*, 4 vols. (Cambridge, 1922), II, 322.
[36] Greg, *Licensers of the Press, &c. to 1640*, 42–5; W. W. Greg and E. Boswell (eds.), *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company 1576 to 1602—from Register B* (London, 1930), 29.
[37] British Library, Royal MS 18 B xxix, f.3^{r}; no printed copy is known to survive.
[38] His will is PROB 11/109, f.47^{v}–9^{v}.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

1600, by Zachariah Pasfield. Barlow went to St John's, Cambridge, and was later a fellow at Trinity Hall, before becoming rector of St Dunstan's in the East between 1597 and 1604, and a prebend of St Paul's from 1601 until 1608, and Westminster from 1601 until his death in 1613. He was a protégé of Richard Cosin, and allowed *Richard III*, *Dr Faustus*, Hall's *Virgidemiarum*, and the anthology *England's Helicon*.[39] Pasfield was even more active. He was Barlow's Cambridge contemporary next door at Trinity College, later a fellow, and then vicar of Trumpington, before moving to East Hanningfield, Asheldam and Bocking in Essex. Like Barlow he was a prebend of St Paul's until his death in 1616. He allowed the *Essaies* of Sir William Cornwallis, *Hamlet*, *The Malcontent*, and Daniel's *Philotas*. Even more tellingly, he was the chaplain preferred by Jonson, approving *Every Man in His Humor*, *Narcissus or the Fountayne of Selfe-Love* (as *Cynthias Revels* was known), *Poetaster*, *King James His Royal Entertainment*, *Sejanus*, and possibly *Hymenaei* although no record for this survives.[40] Only when Sir George Buc took over the regulation of the drama, late in 1606, does Jonson cease to be allowed by Pasfield, whose last book was Donne's *Pseudo-Martyr* in 1609.

In their bare outlines, the careers of these three licensers offer much scope for further research. Pasfield, regrettably, appears not to have written a book, nor do we have any indication of the books that might have been in his library. As with Barlow and Hartwell, however, we have a copy of his will.[41] It shows him to have been a cousin of Dr Timothy Bright, and good friends of several senior ecclesiastics, including Drs Childerley and Dockett, who acted as overseers to his will. Of Barlow, we know rather more. He published a number of sermons, as well as an account of the Hampton Court conference (STC 1446–60, 10321, and 15322). His will shows him to have owned a substantial library of books. To Trinity Hall, he left a complete Plantin Polyglot Bible in eight volumes; the five-volume *Councells* by Binnius and the civil laws in six volumes, as well as a two-volume Plato in Latin and Greek, 'to be placed in their Librarye vppon one deske by them selves and the name of the donor to be set vppon the front of the deske'. The rest of Barlow's books were bequeathed to his sister's son William Johnson 'vppon condition that he be a Scholler at my death' and that he never sell the books.[42]

Hartwell is the most interesting figure of all. As well as his licensing duties, he translated three books out of Italian and one out of French,

[39] Greg, *Licensers of the Press*, 9–10.
[40] Greg, *Licensers of the Press*, 75–6.
[41] PROB 11/128, f.465^{v}–6^{v}.
[42] PROB 11/122, f.349^{v}–51^{v}.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

which perhaps explains why he was the licenser for the translations of Tasso and Montaigne. A few of his entries show him to have exercised some control: a ballad *A Belman for England* was to be printed 'leauing out the two staues that are crossed', and *The history of the last troubles of Fraunce* 'leauing out the discourse touching the Quene of Scotts by him crossed out'.[43] On the other hand, he allowed Marston's *Metamorphosis*, although this was later called in and burnt, as was *Willobie's Avisa*. Yet the fact that the authorities overrode his permission does not appear to have been held against him. The image is one of benign tolerance: two staves of a ballad and an obviously sensitive political narrative represent a light hand over a 21-year period. Of course, it is possible that Hartwell changed more than the records indicate, but there are other signs that he was a minimalist in these matters.

In his dedication to Whitgift of Minadoi's *The History of the Warres between the Turkes and the Persians*, Hartwell admitted that it had taken him three years, off and on, and that 'The houres that I haue employed in writing this translation, were stollen from your Graces grauer businesses whereon I should haue attended'.[44] During that period he licensed at least nine books. Even more telling is a subject to which he turned in his next book, a translation of Pigafetta's *A Report of the Kingdon of Congo*. Here he found something offensive, but his impulse was to temporize. His friends, not least Hakluyt, had asked him to do the translation:

> But within two houres conference, I found him nibling at two most honourable Gentlemen of *England*, whome in plaine tearmes he called *Pirates*: so that I had much adoo to hold my hands from renting of him into many mo peeces, then his *Cozen Lopez* the *Doctor* was quartered. Yet δολίτεραι φροντίδες, *My second wits* stayed me, and advised me, that I should peruse all his *Report*, before I would proceed to execution: which in deede I did. And, because I sawe that in all the rest of his behaviour hee contayned himselfe very well and honestly, and that he vsed this lewd speech, not altogether *ex animo*, but rather *ex vitio gentis*, of the now-inveterate hatred, which the *Spanyard* and *Portingall* beare against our *Nation*, I was so bold as to pardon him, and so taught him to speake the *Englishe toung*.[45]

[43] Greg, *Licensers of the Press*, 43 and 44, summarizing Arber.
[44] G. Minadoi, *The History of the Warres between the Turkes and the Persians* (STC 17943; 1595), A4^{r}.
[45] D. Lopez and F. Pigafetta, *A Report of the Kingdon of Congo* (STC 16805; 1597), *1^{r}.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

It is interesting that what causes Hartwell to react is not a matter of theology, but of national pride. The passage that he appears to refer to is the following:

> But an infortunate end had this *Embassadour*, for he was taken at sea by *Englishmen*, and his shippe also, which being drawen towards *Englande*, when it was neere vnto the Coast, by great misfortune it ranne athwart the shoare, ane there *Don Piedro Antonio* & his sonne were both drowned.[46]

At once, therefore, we can see how Hartwell resolved his difficulty, teaching Pigafetta how 'to speake the *Englishe toung*', while at the same time leaving the original reading present in the work. The text, in effect, remained intact for those who had read the preface.

The example is important because it illustrates how lightly the censor's pen might brush against a text: an offensive word modified, but not the narrative itself: decorum preserved, rather than the story suppressed. In fact, in his preface, Hartwell sets out a very strong claim for preserving the integrity of the original. As a statement, it has significant implications given his work as a licenser:

> I was alwayes of this opinion (and therein do I still dwell) that *Authors* should be published in the same *Order*, in the same *Termes*, & in the same *Stile* which they themselues vsed. For how know I, what moued them to obserue this *Order* or that *Order*, and to make choyce of one word rather then of another? peraduenture the reason of their so doing might proue to be so strong, as I doubt it would not easily be ouerthrowne.[47]

As a defence of the integrity of the original against interference by third parties, this is a quite startling statement from a licenser. Hartwell's first impulse was always, it would seem, to leave well alone; and his second was but to preserve decorum, if absolutely necessary, with the lightest touch. Of course, he may have disagreed with things that he read, but that does not mean that he altered them; and he must have had a considerable knowledge of contemporary literature, which clearly interested him: he owned the copy of Puttenham's *The Arte of English Poesie* (STC 20519.5; 1589) that was subsequently acquired by Jonson.[48]

[46] Lopez and Pigafetta, *A Report of the Kingdom of Congo*, Y4^{v}.
[47] Lopez and Pigafetta, *A Report of the Kingdom of Congo*, *2^{r}.
[48] British Library, shelfmark G.11548.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

In his final work of translation, *The Ottoman of Lazaro Soranzo*, Hartwell reveals another aspect of the way in which the publication of books might be affected by contemporary circumstances. Writing once more to Whitgift, he recalls that 'it pleased your Grace in the beginning of Michaelmas terme last [i.e. September 1602], to demand of me a question touching the Bassaes and Visiers belonging to the Turkish Court'. Hartwell goes on:

> wherein although I did for the present satisfie your Grace to your contentment by the small skill & knowledge which I haue in those Turkish affaires: yet bethinking my selfe of this Discourse which . . . had passed the Print, & had lyen by me these two years not published to the viewe of this English world, vpon some speciall considerations, that moued me for the time to conceale the same. I thought it would bee a very acceptable and pleasing matter now to thrust it forth.[49]

Those 'speciall considerations' from two years before are most likely to have had to do with the Essex Rebellion and the execution of Robert Devereux, matters that had contemporary analogies in Turkish affairs.

The passage, however, is remarkable for a number of other reasons. First, the book had sat in Windet's warehouse for two years: Windet, it would appear, had either been left financially harmless by that decision, or was willing to let the sheets remain unsold for other reasons. Second, although the book was put to one side, Hartwell still had it published and let it circulate with the text unchanged, the political reverberations now muted. Third, Whitgift clearly had every confidence in the abilities and judgment of his secretary, and allowed him to translate politically sensitive material that might from time to time prove embarrassing: Hartwell, as a senior licenser, was as aware as anyone involved with the book-trade as to what was acceptable or otherwise.

Hartwell elsewhere in the dedication described this work, like his translation of Minadoi, as one 'performed by starts and at idle houres'.[50] The image is one that gives an added dimension to his other activities, secretary to the archbishop, licenser of literature, translator of exotic histories, antiquarian,[51] and (it seems so inevitable) bibliophile. Hartwell owned copies of both William Tooker's *Charisma siva Donum Sanationis* (STC 24118; 1597), and Richard Harvey's *A Theologicall*

[49] L. Soranzo, *The Ottoman of Lazaro Soranzo* (STC 22931; 1603), ¶2^{v}.
[50] Soranzo, *The Ottoman of Lazaro Soranzo*, 2¶1^{r}.
[51] See, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 60 vols. (Oxford, 2004), 51: 523–4.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

Discourse of the Lamb of God and his Enemies (STC 12915; 1590), both now in the Bodleian Library.[52] Like all of Hartwell's publications, and several more that he licensed, these two volumes were printed by John Windet. Windet was the cousin of Richard Hooker, and the printer of *Of the Lawes of Eccliasticall Politie* (STC 13712–2.5; 1593, 1597ff.) He also printed for Bancroft, Bridges, Bright, and Barlow. He took over the psalm-book privilege from John Wolfe, and he printed much godly piety in pocket-book formats.

The links between Windet and Lambeth point to the Cross Keys as being the 'unofficial' press of the Church. Windet, for instance, printed Barlow's account of the Hampton Court conference, which has some interesting things to say about the practice of censorship, not least because it is written by one of the clerics responsible for implementing that policy. The puritan, John Reynolds, had objected that 'vnlawfull and seditious bookes, might be suppressed, at least restrained, and imparted to a few' adding that 'for by the liberty of publishing such bookes, so commonly, many young schollers, and vnsetled mindes in both Vniuersities, and through the whole Realme were corrupted, and peruerted'.[53] The claim, in effect, is that licensing as practised did not work and the authorities were too tolerant.

The response, as a whole, makes clear what the authorities' concerns were. First, Richard Bancroft as the bishop most directly responsible for overseeing the licensers denied that there was any 'such licentious diuulging of those books, as he imagined or complained of'; next, he notes that as for imported books only those 'who were supposed, would confute them, had liberty, by authority, to buy them'—itself an interesting statement of privilege. Third, Cecil affirms that Bancroft 'had done therein what might be, for the suppressing of' Catholic books. Then, after an intervention by the king, who admonished Reynolds for his own lack of conformity, Cecil argues that certain imported books are tolerated because their larger argument supports government policy even if some views are less than acceptable; and finally, Bancroft states that all books printed in England are either properly licensed or suppressed, and that the book-trade as a whole is orderly.[54] In other words, the authorities attempted to do what was possible within practicable limits and with due respect to the liberty of the subject to write what they would (and accept the consequences if necessary).

[52] Bodleian Library, Oxford, shelfmarks: 4° Th. T8 Seld; Tanner 898.
[53] W. Barlow, *The summe and substance of the conference . . . at Hampton court* (STC 1456; 1604, et sqq.), G4v.
[54] Barlow, *The summe and substance of the conference*, G4v–H2r.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

There are some examples of how the authorities reacted when faced with a problem that place the more dramatic gestures into a less fraught context. One incident involves the examination of John Peck by the Archbishop of Canterbury on 11 September 1616. Peck was called for an interview to discuss his association with John Traske, a prisoner in Newgate, and a 'scrivener' called Porter.[55] His mistake had been to present a manuscript on Traske's behalf to the king at Bagshot the previous Tuesday (figure 7.1). The archbishop wanted to establish the extent of his involvement and whether he was a non-conformist. The answers reveal a man who is very scared and who is trying to be careful not to implicate himself further. At the end of the interview, Peck is asked to sign a summary of the main points of the conversation, which is then countersigned by the archbishop. In effect, he is given a formal warning.

Peck had met Traske some three years previously, when Traske (who lived nearby at Exminster) had preached a sermon at Hunniton. Over the next few years, Traske began publishing and continued preaching without a licence. He also attended a conventicle, or meeting of non-conformists. For his trouble, he ended up in Newgate, where Peck had visited him some ten times. After considerable evasion, Peck admitted that 'he received the foule Copy at his hands' (i.e. the author's manuscript) and (having first tried to blame the scrivener) that he copied the preface himself, because he did not want the scrivener to see its content. As Peck acknowledged 'hee did dislike it, because the authour dealeth wth the king in so familiar a manner'. In fact, Peck acknowledged that he had asked Traske why he had done this, and Traske had replied that 'the kinge would take no offence at it, because it was the manner of speeche wch was vsed to God himselfe' (Traske had clearly never met James I). With that response, Peck was sufficiently satisfied to present the manuscript to the king.

Peck was a student at the Inner Temple and would have fully realized what the signed document would mean should he ever attempt such folly again. He informed Abbott that he attended divine service at the Temple church, received divine sacrament, and had never been a non-conformist, or sectary. Soon after, Traske would appear to have been moved from Newgate to the Fleet, where he continued to be held until 1620, when he finally published *A treatise of libertie from Iudaisme* (STC 24178), in which he wrote of the reformation of his beliefs. Perhaps, the most striking aspect of his imprisonment was that he was furnished with books to read and paper to write.[56]

[55] Porter is not recorded by Steer; he may have been a writing-master of some kind.
[56] Bland, 'Invisible Dangers', 163.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 7.1 'The examination of John Pecke'. National Library of Scotland, MS Adv. 33.1.6, vol. 20, f.60r.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

What the case of Traske and Peck points up is something that is not usually discussed in the study of censorship: Peck presented a *manuscript* to the king, not a printed book; and the secondary person responsible was a *scrivener*, not a printer. Further, it would appear that the primary issue was not the text, but the *preface*. Because print glittered, modern scholars have focused on the examples that are obvious rather than the broad spectrum of the evidence; and they have focused on the formal processes, not the actual practices. Few now read St Augustine in the Latin, or are seduced by his use of *te* in the *Confessions*; Traske apparently was. His offence was that he used the second-person singular to the king: we no longer differentiate, and so are deaf to the *faux pas*. As a religious writer, Traske would not have been taken seriously: his prose, and his grasp of controversy, would scarcely have given the authorities cause to pause. That he was a non-conformist, that he preached without a licence, and that he lacked a patron to protect him, made him an easy target. Peck was the person who worried the authorities because he ought to have known better; they wanted to make sure that he did.

Occasionally mistakes occured, but they reveal a great deal about the ordinary assumptions with which books were treated. In his Lyell Lecture on censorship, McKenzie cited the example of Thomas Fuller, whose *A Sermon. Of Reformation* (Wing F2461; 1643) had been altered by the examiner and licensed in its changed form. Fuller complained and the licenser apologized:

> *I must confesse, had I but knowne you to have been the Authour . . . I should have endeavoured to have satisfied M.* Saltmarsh *of your good meaning therein, before I had set my hand to his Examination of it. Your other Books made me conceive the Authour some other of your name . . . My licensing the Examination of some passages of your Sermon, was (at most) but on supposition their meaning had been such as some conceited them, and suppositions are no accusations.*[57]

The point here is that the system of personal contacts broke down, as sometimes it must have done. It was, in fact, only those who lacked the contacts, and who were outside of the primary protection of patronage, that were liable to have their texts altered by authority. Yet, despite this, many a book passed unaltered and approved on the commercial reality of the bookstall. Of course, some works of literature did occasionally broach politically sensitive issues (not least those by

[57] D. F. McKenzie, 'Censorship', the third Lyell Lecture, Oxford, May 1988, 22–3. The lecture was not subsequently published; a copy is available on deposit in the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

Shakespeare and Jonson), but the mechanisms of control existed more to assuage official and public concern than to enforce an ideology. The ultimate arbiter of literary success was whether a printer or publisher was willing to finance a subsequent edition; or whether a scrivener was willing to engage in speculative serial copying. In commercial terms, this is what interested the book-trade. It is easy to take something out of context and misrepresent its significance, but a publisher cared little for the meanings and indirections of a text unless it was likely to cost him his livelihood. For such material, there was always unrestricted circulation through manuscript, or publication abroad.

Illicit Books, Piracy, and Surreptitious Printing

There is a particular class of books that poses problems both of material analysis and social history: those that were printed either illicitly or surreptitiously. The incidence of illicit books printed in England is low with the notable exception of the Marprelate tracts which, for a short while, greatly exercised the authorities in their attempt to track down who was responsible. Most illicit books were printed abroad: puritan tracts in the Netherlands, and Catholic books at Douai. They were smuggled into the country and sold under the counter. The authorities did what they could to control this, but only ever with limited success.

From time to time, illegal attempts were made to print books owned by another member of the Company. When this happened, the printing was stayed until the matter had been adjudicated, with any printed sheets reassigned to the person whose copy it was. Usually the material evidence for piracy of this kind is relatively straightforward as there was no conspicuous attempt to hide responsibility—the Pied Bull quartos of Shakespeare, with their false imprints, being an exception. There were, however, occasions when a printer pushed their luck a little too far. One such was Thomas Dawson who, for several months in 1614–15, decided to print 10,000 copies of the Book of Common Prayer. This item was the copy of Robert Barker, the king's printer. In itself, piracy was a serious enough offence, but the indictment makes clear that Dawson printed things that were not

> sett forth or appoynted to be soe reade in the booke of Common prayer, and you intend and have given out That you will add other thing*es* allsoe thereto, to the greate disturbance of the peace of the Church of England and to the evell example of others.[58]

[58] Beinecke Library, Yale University, Osborn MS fb24, item 94. See also *STC*, 3: 51.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

Dawson was duly prosecuted in the ecclesiastical court for his attempt to reform the order of service, and the edition was suppressed. Dawson, however, continued to print until his death in 1620.

A rather different class of books that 'are not what they seem' include those that were either printed surreptitiously, or which were printed by the authorities for the purposes of disinformation. These were not illegal books, but they were printed with the intent to deceive their audience as to their origins. The authorities did this in the 1580s with the treason trials, as they had used torture to extract confessions.[59] The tone of the pamphlets is that of a gentleman who happens to be aware of the details, and is surprised at the conduct of his acquaintance who had got into such trouble. These pamphlets are a very calculated attempt to manage opinion and justify (as well as minimize) the conduct of the authorities in the pursuit of the truth.

The subject of surreptitious printing has been dealt with extensively by Woodfield.[60] Although four foreign-language books had appeared without an imprint in England before the 1580s, the first genuinely surreptitious books were printed in the 1580s by John Wolfe with the approval of the authorities. These imprints deliberately suggested that the book was printed somewhere in Europe and by someone else. Wolfe, who had worked in Italy in the 1570s, began by printing the *Discorsi* and *Il Prencipe* of Machiavelli, and the *Ragionamenti* of Aretino in 1584. The Aretino is without an imprint, but the Machiavelli is identified as from a press in Palermo. Later imprints would include Leiden, Paris, Monaco, Turin, Venice, and Piacenza.[61] The names he adopts as a printer are similarly suggestive. John Charlewood followed immediately in Wolfe's footsteps, printing Giordano Bruno with Parisian and Venetian imprints. Joseph Barnes at Oxford, Richard Field, and slightly later John Windet on Wolfe's behalf, soon did the same.[62] The practice continued through the seventeenth-century and later: a recently discovered edition of the notorious play *Sodom, or The Gentleman's Instruction* (c.1720) claims to have been printed in the Hague, with the date '1000000'.[63]

The reason for surreptitious imprints was usually commercial, and because the authors were notorious. Both Aretino and Machiavelli had been placed on the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* and were banned by the Inquisition. Hence, the implication was that, not only did Wolfe have an

[59] Bland, 'Invisible Dangers', 159–63.
[60] D. B. Woodfield, *Surreptitious Printing in England 1550–1640* (New York, 1973).
[61] Woodfield, *Surreptitious Printing in England*, 5–18.
[62] Woodfield, *Surreptitious Printing in England*, 19–45.
[63] Sotheby's, London, 16 December 2004, lot 54.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

Italian edition, it was one printed illegally. In Catholic Europe, such a book would get its owner into trouble; but in tolerant England, the salaciousness of Aretino and the cynicism of Machiavelli could be bought and read—provided the purchaser had the Italian to do so.

Commerce

In 1500, the English printed book-trade was confined to a very small group of printers, who have been studied in great detail; by 1700, the press had been freed by the Licensing Act of 1695 and was on the verge of a massive expansion through the eighteenth-century.[64] What was most significant about the Act was the removal of constraint on the number of presses and printers, and this affected the Scriveners because, as print-production costs fell, they became uncompetitive except for legal and financial documents. In between, the printed book-trade grew substantially if inconsistently, to the extent that the forms of oversight that were possible in 1600 were quite unmanageable a century later.

Booksellers, of course, hoped to make money from their work, and many did, but the overall size of the trade was, for a long time, quite modest. Hence, in some respects, its social and intellectual importance was greater than its economic significance. It is likely that Southampton, Egerton, Pembroke, and Cecil each had a greater personal net worth than the asset value of the trade as a whole: that places their relationship with Shakespeare, Donne, Daniel, and Jonson, and their ability to protect them, in a rather different perspective.[65] Printers, publishers, and scriveners, must all have been open to opportunities for immediate work, and even the accumulation of small or large profits, but very few made more than an adequate or comfortable living from their business (scriveners rather more so because some of them acted as moneylenders). Most books made small profits or provided sufficient work and income to tide things over until a better opportunity came along; most authors were paid not with coin, but with books.[66]

The economics of publishing and book production in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is difficult to reconstruct in detail, although

[64] See, M. Treadwell, 'The Stationers and the Printing Acts at the End of the Seventeenth Century', *The Book in Britain . . . 1557–1695*, 755–6.

[65] Bland, 'The London Book-Trade in 1600'.

[66] William Prynne received 35–6 copies in lieu of payment for *Histrio-mastix* (STC 20464a; 1633): W. W. Greg, *A Companion to Arber* (Oxford, 1967), 85 and 278; Bp. William Bedel to Dr Samuel Ward (on behalf of Dr Gaspar Despotin; no STC entry recorded), 5 April 1622, Bodleian Library, MS Tanner 73, f.140 records that Despotin wished for 40 copies in lieu of payment.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

we know the outlines of what books cost to produce and the price that could be charged for them. What we do not know, in many cases, are the size of edition runs, the speed with which they sold, or the extent to which they were sold on to other members of the trade at a discount. In the letter to Sibbes referred to in an earlier chapter (p. 167), Jenison specifies that 500 copies of his book were printed.[67] A ream per sheet must have been a very standard arrangement, but it is not one that can be applied with any consistency and predictability.

As well as lists of prices, there are a number of booksellers' bills.[68] Among the Stanhope papers in the Osborn Manuscripts at Yale are two further invoices and a receipt for books and other materials supplied by the king's printer, Robert Barker, from 1604, 1610, and 1614.[69] These documents describe the books supplied, the size of the print-run for two proclamations, and the kinds of book-trade-related products that were supplied by the royal printing-house. The first receipt (f.33v) is endorsed on its recto edge 'Allowanc*es* made to mr | Barker the King*es* Printer'. It records three transactions, the first of which is crossed through.[70]

20º ffeb: 1609; Anno ~~Mj~~ Jacobi Septimo: To Robte Barker his Ma:ties Printer, for sundrie book*es* by him printed for his Ma:ties vse & service, ————————	CCCxli xiiijs viijd
19º Maij 1609. More to him for paper bookes deliūed for the vse of the Parliamt house – lxxli and for printing of privie seales – xxxli – In all	Cli
22º Dec: 1610 Anno ~~Mj~~ Iacobi Octavo. More to him for parchemt, book*es*, &c deliūed for the vse of the vpper house of Parliamt	lxxviijli ijs xd
11 Aprilis 1612. / /	Clxxijli xxd

[67] Bodleian Library, MS Tanner 73, f.29.
[68] See, Johnson, 'Notes on English Retail Book-Prices, 1550–1640', 83–112; McKitterick, '"Ovid with a Littleton" ', 184–234; D. F. McKenzie, 'Two Bills for Printing, 1620–22', *The Library*, v: 15 (1960), 129–32; —; 'Printing and Publishing 1557–1700: Constraints on the London Book Trades', *The Book in Britain . . . 1557–1695*, 553–67.
[69] Beinecke Library, MS Osborn fb159, f.33, f.33, 40 and 41. The Stanhope papers were calendared in HMC, 10th Report, Appendix VI, and were sold at Christies, 23 June 1954, lot 112.
[70] The paper is pot (83 × 22 mm), initials 'PO', chainlines 21 mm.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

The first item is substantial and indicates that the 'sundrie bookes' have been printed by Barker. The other two items appear to be for blank books and binding parchment for use by both Houses of Parliament, as well as the printing of the Privy Seals. They show Barker to be a stationer in the more modern sense: someone who supplied blank books and paper—in this case, for official purposes.

The next invoice dated 'April. 4°. 1614' (f.40^{r}), is endorsed on the verso of its other leaf 'Copia of m^{r} Barker his | bill delivered vnto mee | 28 october 1614'. It is a more substantial document.

Deliuered for his Maties service: by Robt̄ Barker.
His Maties Printer. as followeth.

1.	Booke of Com̃on Prayer and two testam^{ts}	
	Of the largest volume, wth praiers for ye Parl.	– 2 — 10 — 0
1.	Booke of statutes A^{o}. 1° Elz: Regin. et 3° Iacobi	– 6 — 0 — 0
1.	Poultons Abridgem^{ts}, and Rastalls fayre boun	– 2 — 4 — 0
	Paper & Parchm^{t} for the vpp*er* house of Parliam^{t}	– 4 — 16 — 8
1.	Giornall booke fayre bound and gilt	– 0 — 16 — 0
1.	Speed*es* Chronologie of England fayre bound	– 4 — 0 — 0
	Paper & Parchm^{t} for the lower howse	– 2 — 16 — 8
1.	largest Bible faire bound & guilt	– 3 — 0 — 0
1.	Hollinsheads Cronicle. 2. Volumes faire bound	– 3 — 6 — 8
1.	Booke of ~~Marty~~ Martyrs fayre bound	– 2 — 13 — 4
1.	Statuts at large for the Parlim^{t} howse	– 6 — 0 — 0
1	Statute booke. 1°. Elz: 3°. Iacobi, 7°. Iacobi	– 1 — 0 — 0
	Standish and Inkhorne furnisht	– 0 — 8 — 0
	Poulton and Rastall fayre bound	– 2 — 4 — 0
1	large bagg wth Turky leather wth silke stringes	– 2 — 0 — 0
	All the K^{s}. Speeches in sundry book*es* faire bound	– 0 — 6 — 8
6	Proclam. touching the oath of Allegiance	– 0 — 1 — 0
6	Proclam. Concerning Recusant*es*	– 0 — 1 — 0
100	Procl: and bookes of duell*es* more	– 10 — 0 — 0
4	Bibles for the King and Qeene, wherof	
	3. very faire bound and guilt all over	– 20 — 0 — 0
1800.	Proclm. For dying and dressing cloth	– 15 — 0 — 0
600.	Proclam. Touching Recusant*es* in Ireland	– 5 — 0 — 0
1.	Booke of the K^{s}. Maties Bounty	– 0 — 0 — 8
Total		– 94 — 18 — 0

Vera copia. ex̃p*er* me | Henry Elsynge | Richard Rosseter.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

As a list of materials supplied for the Addled Parliament of 1614, and of the books that were deemed appropriate, this is a particularly interesting invoice. Bibles, books of common prayer, statutes, and legal interpreters form the core of the volumes supplied, but it is noteworthy to see Fox, Holinshed, and Speed in addition, given the antiquarian and historical interests of early Stuart politics. Second, Barker is not only supplying books and paper, but turkey leather, silk ties, and an inkhorn. This kind of material is also to be found in the following bill from ten years earlier. Third, Barker supplied 1,800 copies of one proclamation, 600 copies of another, yet only six each of the proclamations to do with recusants and the oath of allegiance. It is difficult to know whether these are the actual print-runs, though it seems likely and the larger numbers are for what one might expect. If that is the case, however, it is notable that the quantity could vary so widely; the small runs must have been printed with a very specific purpose in mind. Finally, the cost of £20 for four bibles 'very faire bound and guilt all over' for James and Anne is very high and it is clear that much more was spent on the binding than the books.

The final bill (f.41ʳ) is endorsed by Barker. It is addressed 'To Sʳ Tho: Smithe Knight: Clarke of yᵉ Vpper Howse of Parliamᵗᵉ', and is dated 'Febr. 10°. 1603' though the context immediately makes clear that the bill is for the first Parliament of James's reign and that legal dating is being used.

Delivered by Robt Barker Printer to the Kings
Matie for his Highnes service viz

One Statuts at large wth severall parliamᵗˢ in 9. Volumes	– 5ˡⁱ — 0 — 0
The Statuts at large from Magna Charta fayre bounde in two severall Volumes	– 3ˡⁱ — 6 — 8
Three paper bookes of Large fine Paper §	– 1 — 10 — 0
Three Realmes of fine Paper §	– 1 — 10 — 0
The Abridgemts of Statuts, Polton and Rastell §	– 1 — 4 — 0
Fiftie skinnes of fine Parchmente §	– 3 — 6 — 8
Two books of Computacõn of yeeres §	– 0 — 3 — 0
Three Almanacks bounde in Velame §	– 0 — 2 — 6
A large bagge of Turkie leather with silke strings, for yᵉ Parliamᵗᵉ bills §	– 1 — 10 — 0
One booke of Common Prayer of ye largest Volume with prayers for yᵉ Parliamᵗᵉ inserted §	– 0 — 10 — 0
Two boxes covered with leather, with lockes & keyes to them. to locke in the bills §	– 1 — 0 — 0
One fayre bible. in folio. ————————	– 1 — 10 — 0

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

Although this invoice is more modest, it helps to clarify some aspects of the previous one. The turkey leather (goatskin) and silk strings are for the parliament bills, and on this occasion Barker supplies two boxes with locks and keys. The fine parchments are presumably intended for the bills, so that they may be permanently preserved. Another interesting item is the three reams of fine paper at £1 10*s*, or 10*s* a ream, which suggests that this was the price for Italian paper compared to 3*s*6*d* for French pot. The 'fayre bible' in folio, at £1 10*s*, is far more modest than the average of £5 for the lavishly bound royal copies ten years later. Further, one might note the special prayers for the parliament for the book of common prayer—a small piece of job printing.

Overall, these three documents give an impression of Barker, not just as the king's printer, but of the printing-house at the centre of a network of related activities: binding, stationery, special document boxes, and other occasional work. Other stationers, if not as lavishly, must have done similar things, and that income would have been an important component of their business: the trade was not just about books. Further, the bills illustrate the way in which Barker supplied material printed by other members of the trade by virtue of his privileged position and interests. Finally, the bills give some sense of the scale and value of these activities and what was involved. In particular, they cast a light on the relations between the book-trade and parliament, including the role of the trade in facilitating the materials for reference, and the means for keeping and preserving records.

As well as printer's bills, some inventories survive including those for the London printer Henry Bynneman, who died in 1583, the York bookseller John Foster from 1616,[71] and for the Cambridge printer Thomas Thomas in 1587.[72] Thomas, for instance had £43 16*s*7½*d* of printing equipment, £12 19*s* of paper and parchment books, as well as other skins and boards, and £147 12*s*10*d* of stock on hand. His stock included 1,381 copies of a book he had recently printed; other quantities ranged widely: 122, 429, 377, 233, 125, 29, 16, 99, and 147.[73] Bynneman's was a much larger business with £113 12*s* of equipment, of which £87 7*s*4*d* was type. He also had £607 0*s*1*d* of stock, mostly valued at cost, of which £258 5*s*9*d* was accounted for by 775 copies of a Greek and Latin dictionary (STC 18101) that he had recently finished printing.[74] The

[71] Barnard and Bell, 'The Inventory of Henry Bynneman', 5–46; —, *The Early Seventeenth-Century York Book Trade and John Foster's Inventory of 1616* (Leeds, 1994).
[72] McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press . . . 1534–1698*, 106–7.
[73] McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press . . . 1534–1698*, 84–5, 106–7.
[74] Barnard and Bell, 'The Inventory of Henry Bynneman', 17 and 8.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

inventory also affords some insight into what sold and what did not: about 25 per cent of his stock dated from 1570–5, whilst 75 per cent was more recent, and of most things he had between 100 and 300 copies. Nevertheless, he still had 435 copies of Guiciardini's *Houres of recreation* (STC 12465; 1576), and 450 copies of Elviden's *Pesistratus and Cantanea* (STC 7624; 1570?). Comparatively, he had 20 copies of Gesner's *New iewell of health* (STC 11798; 1576), 29 copies of Lupton's *A persuasion from papistrie* (STC 16950; 1581), and 100 copies of Stow's *Chronicles* (STC 23333; 1580).[75] The market for literature was not always profitable.

Whilst not all publishers were printers, most printers did publish books on their own account. When a printer worked for a publisher, it was up to the publisher to assess the commercial risk. When a printer worked for themselves, they would assess the balance between continuity of work, commercial return, the size of the project, and the investment involved. The story of Sir Henry Spelman taking his *Archæologus* (STC 23065; 1626), to the press, must have been familiar to many an author:

> After he had made large Collections, and got tolerable knowledge of the Saxon Tongue; he resolv'd to go on with his undertaking: but because he would not depend altogether upon his own Judgement, he Printed a sheet or two for a Specimen, whereby his Friends might be able to give him their opinion of the design . . . . Upon their encouragement, he prepar'd part of it for the Press, and offer'd the whole Copy to Mr. *Bill* the King's Printer. He was very moderate in his demands; desiring only five pound, in consideration of his labour, and that to be paid him in Books. But Mr. *Bill* absolutely refus'd to meddle with it; knowing it to be upon a subject out of the common road, and not likely to prove a saleable work. So that Sir *Henry* was forc'd to carry it on at his own charge; and in the year 1626. publisht the first part of it, to the end of the Letter *L*. Why he went no farther, I cannot tell; . . . . But I believe, the true reason was this: Printing it at his own charge, he must have laid out a considerable summ upon the first part, and having a large Family, there was no reason why he should venture as much more, without the prospect of a quicker return, than either the coldness of the Bookseller, or the nature of the work gave him. It fell out accordingly; for, eleven years after, the greatest part of the Impression remain'd unsold; till in 1637. two of the *London* Booksellers took it off his hands.[76]

[75] Barnard and Bell, 'The Inventory of Henry Bynneman', 26, 27, 30, 35, and 29.
[76] H. Spelman, *Reliquiæ Spelmannianæ* (Wing S4930; 1698), b3^{r-v}.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

Thus, Spelman had 'Printed a sheet or two for a Specimen' and prepared the copy for the press; his initial desire was for £5 'and that to be paid him in Books', but he was prepared to print the first part of the volume at his own expense. It did not sell, and he eventually sold his copies to the trade at, one presumes, a severely discounted price. Although the printing of a specimen sheet may have been unusual, it is testimony to the degree of authorial care that could be taken when the composition was likely to be difficult. In fact, Spelman had been 'busie about the impression of his Glossary' since at least April 1622.[77] It was, therefore, at least four years in pre-production and printing, and he only got to *L*. The second part was not published until 1664, 23 years after Spelman's death.

Coryate was another author who paid for the printing, as a number of the contributors to the prefatory poems of his *Crudities* remarked.[78] Despite the fact that Coryate paid for the costs of the printing, the book was entered by the publishers and booksellers William Barret and Edmund Blount, however only Stansby's initials appear in the imprint. The role of the publishers, and in particular the extent to which they were responsible for decisions concerning typography and format, is not self-evident. Some authors appear to have worked with one printer and a number of publishers and others appear to have worked with only one publisher and a number of printers: more often the situation was more complex, but the implication is that the relationships between authors and the trade depended on individual arrangements. In some cases, books would only be published if privately funded either by the author or with a subvention from a patron.

Large type, generous spacing, larger or better paper, engraved plates, all had a direct impact on the production costs of a book. If the difference in final costs meant a penny or two on the price of the final book or pamphlet, then a publisher might not be particularly concerned for the right author. If the book was large, and special requirements were desired by the author, the more likely it was that the trade would want some assistance with the costs. A 250-sheet folio, printed in 1,000 copies, would require 500 reams of paper. Add in four or five engraved plates (maps perhaps), an engraved frontispiece, large paper for presentation copies, and the cost of composition, and the publisher was making a substantial investment before a single copy had sold. The risk might be shared with other members of the trade, who each would take a portion of the books

[77] R. Parr (ed.), *The Life of . . . James Usher*, Wing P548, 3K4^{v}: Sir Henry Bourgchier to James Ussher, 16 April 1622.

[78] T. Coryate, *Coryats crudities* (STC 5808; 1611), b1^{v}, b4^{r}, e5^{v} and g6^{r}.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

produced, but that was not always possible. Stansby sold 20 per cent of the Jonson edition to Richard Meighen, and clearly hoped to find a purchaser for another 25 per cent, but he was not successful.[79] As the *Workes* were set with a shorter than usual page, one might also wonder whether Pembroke or Aubigny helped with the costs. It is possible.

Continental Books

A trip to one of the better London bookshops of the seventeenth-century might surprise those who now work on English literature. As well as the English books, there would have been a substantial quantity of books in Latin and Greek, with French, Italian, and Spanish also to be found. Approximately 90 per cent of the books owned by Selden and Dee were in languages other than English, and the figures for Jonson and Donne are between 70 and 80 per cent. The Latin trade was an important part of the business for at least some of the booksellers, and of the intellectual life of its customers.[80] These were the kind of people who also tended to acquire political and historical manuscripts: they usually had a university education, and frequently acquired substantial libraries over the course of their lives.

Much of the Latin trade relates to theology, or works of scholarship, some of which now seem arcane, and scholarly editions. A glance at the books in Jonson's library suggests what was available, both new and second-hand: not only did he own editions of the classics by scholars such as Scaliger, Casaubon, Lipsius, and Heinsius, but monographs on a vast range of topics. For instance, his library included the *Tactica* of Claudius Aelianus (Antwerp, 1613),[81] the *Antiquae Tabulae Marmorae* of Girolamo Aleandro (Paris, 1617),[82] the *Commentaria Germaniae* by Andreas Althamer (Nuremberg, 1534),[83] the *Syriados* of Pietro Angelio (Florence, 1616),[84] an edition of the *De Re Culinaria* by Coelius Apicius (Basle, 1541),[85] and a copy of *Pericula Poetica* by Valentinus Arithmaeus (Frankfurt, 1613).[86] These are just some of the items by authors whose surname begins with A. We also know that there are many books that Jonson must have owned, but which either have not survived or have

[79] Bland, 'William Stansby and *The Workes of Beniamin Jonson*', 18–19.
[80] See, R. J. Roberts, 'The Latin Trade', *The Book in Britain . . . 1557–1695*, 141–73.
[81] Cambridge University Library, shelfmark M.10.32.
[82] Folger Shakespeare Library, shelfmark N5763 A3 Cage.
[83] British Library, shelfmark 587 f.24.
[84] British Library, shelfmark 837 g.43.
[85] British Library, shelfmark 453 d.26.
[86] Huntington Library, San Marino, shelfmark RB 611670.

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.

not been located, including such items as the *De Occultis Philosophia* of Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa ab Nettesheim (probably Lyons, 1600), which he used for *The Masque of Queenes*.

Jonson's interests were wide-ranging, and included some religious materials such as Aquinas, but he was not a particular connoisseur of theological controversy. For clerics of the established Church, this was their primary interest and many parochial, as well as cathedral libraries have collections of this kind of material that were once owned by the clergy.[87] What is apparent from these collections is the sheer scale of the Latin trade. Without an understanding that imported books would have constituted a major portion of any bookseller's stock, our sense of the trade is radically incomplete. Often the number of English books commissioned by a publisher, who did not print, in any given year is quite low, and alone they would certainly not have provided a sufficient income to sustain a business, or an attractive variety of material for a customer to browse. One has to situate the production of the London trade, and its domestic concerns, within the broader context of what was sold by the booksellers, and that was European in scope.

Commerce was really the ultimate form of regulation: it dictated what a bookseller could sell, and that dictated what he was prepared to publish. What was printed in England had to compete with what was available from Europe, and it was not until the late seventeenth-century that Oxford and Cambridge began to compete in a serious way with publishers of Antwerp, Amsterdam, Paris, and Frankfurt in the market for scholarly books. As Britain became more of an empire, it changed from being a net importer, to a net exporter of books. That story belongs to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, after licensing had been abolished, and when the commercial and political power of the trade found a consanguinity of interest with the emergence of a new imperial ambition. Such coincidences of time, chance, and power leave their traces most visibly in the book as a witness to that past.

[87] N. R. Ker, rev. M. R. Perkins, *A Directory of the Parochial Libraries of the Church of England and the Church in Wales* (London, 2004)—the Bodleian manuscript with the original report of the parochial holdings is MS Eng misc. c.360; M. S. G. McLeod et al., *The Cathedral Libraries Catalogue: Books Printed before 1701 in the Libraries of the Anglican Cathedrals of England and Wales*, 2 vols. in 3 pts. (London, 1984–8).

(c) 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. All Rights Reserved.