Seventeenth-Century Print Culture

Joad Raymond
University of East Anglia

Abstract

Early modern cultural historians hang on to Habermas' phrase 'the public sphere' against their better knowledge. This essay looks at the historiographical background to its reception and use, and proposes an alternative approach.

I

I used to work night shifts in a bread factory. It would have been nice to work in a bakery, but this was a factory, the floor a hangar the size of a football pitch, crossed by conveyor belts carrying mix, dough, loaves; the ovens were furnaces that unevenly warmed the building; the administrative offices overlooked the factory floor. Every break we – the baggers and slicers – would play cards (except one week I read Klaus Theweleit's *Male Fantasies* vol. 1: *Women, Floods, Bodies, History* in the breaks, which provoked some interest). We spoke a distinct way, with intriguing syntax, splitting polysyllabic words with expletives to form a rhythm. My job was at the very end of the conveyor belt. As the slicing and bagging machines rolled out loaves, I would place them on a tray, and when the tray was full, fold over the sides to create a support and place another tray on top. The trays would stack eight high, then I'd roll the stack to the back wall where they'd be fetched by men in brown boiler suits, who would load them onto lorries. The men at the slicing and bagging machines would sing 'heigh-ho' as the drivers passed by, because they were mostly short.

The bread factory had a powerful and coherent workplace culture, which comprehended the rules of the card game, the speech patterns, and the complaints privately confessed at the end of the shift, by men whose masculinity was fragmenting in the wake of twelve-hour night shifts spent away from young families. There was also a culture of work practice, which would instruct the future historian of bread. Half way through a run of bread (the production was interspersed unevenly through the night), we would pause the slicing and bagging machines. The bread would back up on the conveyor belt, and we'd have a few minutes before this would cause it to fall into the overspill area. When this happened we

would have to load the loaves manually back onto the rollers, so at this point everyone, even the most apathetic, would hasten. Someone would change the bags in the machine and reset the printer that printed on the yellow adhesive ties that sealed the bags to change both the price and sell-by date. Then the loaves would roll on. Adjacent, twin-born loaves would go to different supermarkets in different parts of Britain to be sold at a different price by a different date. Also we would 'make up' loaves from halves that had been mangled in the machine, and pick up loaves that had spilled out on the floor, reassemble them and seal the bags ourselves with a yellow tag. These loaves are to be avoided.

The angel lies in the details. These details are all significant to the history of bread in the late twentieth century, and thus to the British diet, and perhaps the economy (the factory was closed soon after). To understand the production speed in that factory, you would need to know about our work habits. To understand distribution, you would want to take a good look at those trays, often left out behind English grocery shops. To understand profit margins and the imperfections of the market, you would want to look at the diversity of prices and destinations assigned to adjacent loaves. An epidemiologist might take interest in the mice droppings. The bread factory would also make a good case study for working-class Welsh culture, the humour, the impact of those shifts, the means by which chronic depression was articulated. Without attending to these details, an historian of British food would be writing not about the sweaty and tired real thing but about bakers of the mind.

And this is my problem with Jürgen Habermas. Not that he never worked in a bread factory in Taffs Well, but that his marvellous and interesting account of the genesis of a public sphere, despite the many cautions and caveats with which is handled, provides the framework within which early modern publicity is understood, contested and rewritten. An ideal-typical approach still haunts the messy and material history of print culture. The work that is being undertaken on the minutiae doesn't seem to be feeding into a reconstructed account of larger-scale models or longer-term changes.

Nothing has been more influential on the way that seventeenth-century British historians think or write about print culture than Habermas's *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*.[1] But from the perspective of the twenty-first century it is manifestly lacking the bread-factory factor. The model, which was founded upon an intelligent engagement with secondary literature, is adapted as the secondary literature changes and develops, but in such a way as to risk occluding the all-but invisible complexities of the book trade and the circuits of opinion- and identity-formation. The effects of the work habits of the compositors of Shakespeare's first folio have been meticulously examined. But the practices which resulted in that volume were shaped by a range of seemingly incidental characteristics of the work place and beyond. It is, frankly, strange to

reflect on the most sophisticated calculations of the speed at which presses would have worked, calculations made on the basis of fragmentary evidence and early modern prescriptions about good or illicit practice, or, occasionally, by the calculator's own experience of work, even working a press. It is doubly strange to think of these predictable, imaginary printers if you've ever finished a hand of cards after the bell's rung, or inserted the time-card of a late fellow-worker into the clocking-in machine. Yet time's arrow seems to run from statistical calculations, through statements about the popularity of certain books, to claims about influence and public opinion, to political revolution. Extensive and detailed work has been undertaken on seventeenth-century print culture and on the history of reading that instead enables us to build a new and coherent account of the culture of print and its relationship with social and political history, the construction and maintenance of those habits of consumption, interpretation and communication, one which would surpass Habermas's in scope, complexity, and in the angels of details.

II

Seventeenth-century historians, books historians and literary historians – except those who adopt the 'no analysis, we're British' philosophy – know we need a new account of what Habermas was writing about, and a number of the historians and critics mentioned below have begun to construct one, but the 'structural transformation' tic lingers. It is mentioned in passing, for the lack of another useful model or piece of shorthand. Reservations and qualifications are attached to the 'public sphere' model, it is appropriated for a 'literary' public sphere, it is suggested that there were multiple and overlapping public spheres, smaller public spheres associated with particular institutions, particular religious congregations and so on. Many of these appropriations seem incompatible with the specific characteristics attributed to the public sphere by Habermas.[2]

   Structural Transformation is a great book: it offers a bold thesis about the growth of public debate and the media in modern Europe, and the way that in the twentieth century the media came to threaten the influential mode of public opinion that it formerly created, by turning it into a forum not of debate but of manipulation. Habermas's primary concern is to explain the destruction of an ideal public sphere – in which private people come together as a public in order to discuss news and opinion, all submitting to the shared notion of critical reason and without respect for social status – at the hands of an instrumental, ideologically focused and commercially oriented mass media. The genesis of a popular sphere of public opinion in late seventeenth-century Britain is certainly important in this story – particularly as a means of outlining the characteristics of the ideal – but it is not intended to provide a stand-alone model. It's symptomatic that the phrase 'structural transformation' continues to be

erroneously applied to the seventeenth-century phase of this long trajectory, and not to the twentieth century, as Habermas uses it.

The book's thesis spans three hundred years and many countries, and it tries to integrate politics, religion, literature and economics into its purview. Written as its author's habilitation thesis and published in German in 1962, soon after its translation into English 1989 it became a central text for thinking about publicity, newspapers and politics. It may say something about twentieth-century British historians' inattention to these things, deemed to be beyond the hard core of history, that the two works most broadly influential in this area were written by a German sociologist and an American political scientist trained in classics, Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (1993). Habermas was perforce reliant upon secondary sources rather than extensive archival research, and the face of British historiography has changed considerably since *c.*1960. Habermas had little or no impact upon this change – his work was discovered belatedly, perhaps because it was translated belatedly – but the interests of historians and literary historians in the past two decades have spoken directly to the issues he raised.

The revisionists of the 1970s were not interested in print culture, nor given to studying the nascent early modern media or reading the pamphlets of the 1620s or 1640s, unlike, for example, Christopher Hill, their pre-eminent bogeymen. Hill's writings, particularly *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (1972) and *Milton and the English Revolution* (1977), offered powerful and imaginative insights into the theological and political dynamism of the print culture of the 1640s and 1650s. Revisionists, bent on making Hill's brushwork seem crude, famously focused on manuscript sources above printed records, local communities above imagined, national ones, high political narratives and the local implications of these, rather than the popular rescripting of these narratives. They emphasized individual human agency, marginalized questions of rhetoric and representation, sought consensus rather than polemics of difference. They were committed to a mode of hermeneutic and political localism to which print culture was largely irrelevant.[3]

The post-revisionist impulse was to consider the ways in which conflict, so underplayed by revisionists, might have been articulated. Accordingly, these historians looked at a broader range of sources, in print and in manuscript, and considered not only what was being said, but also how it was being said. They turned to faultlines, to areas in which the language of compromise and consensus might mask incipient conflict, to forms in which alternative political identities might be expressed or constructed. From high-political narratives, they turned to political culture, and news assumed a significant place in this account.[4] Some of the most interesting and persuasive work in this vein concerned libels, a politically transgressive form associated with manuscript culture, in which could be found

considerable evidence of conflict and political opposition, long before the civil war broke out.[5] An interest in opposition sentiment led to questions not only about its articulation but also about its reception, about the transmission and reading of politics and news. In retrospect, matters of public opinion seem an integral component of the post-revisionist repudiation of revisionist localism. This prepared the field to receive developments in the history of books, discussed below. The development of a notion of political culture as a useful interpretative category, moreover, necessitated an account of representation. It emerged that politics, opinion and representation were entwined in the post-revisionist model of political culture.

Two alien influences were soon brought to bear upon work in this field. First, French historiography, which had long been operating with a more interesting notion of culture than the British, in part owing to the *Annales* school; but which had also been invigorated by historians of the book.[6] Secondly the new bibliography, a transformation in the field of the history of books. This was led in Britain by Don McKenzie, who brought the influence of Michel Foucault to bear upon positivist bibliography, and encouraged his readers and students to consider the relationship between texts and the material book, resulting in a bold sociology of texts founded upon a secure understanding of book production and circulation.[7] These influences offered questions, sources and tools for re-examining the relationship between political history and print culture.

To this mixture – a post-revisionist account of early modern culture, which considered the role of representation, performance and rhetoric in the practice of politics, with an approach to the history of books that considered books as objects and their social circulation and uses as well as the history of reading[8] – was added a third strand. This was a mode of literary historicism concerned with non-canonical writing, and with broadening the canon for historical and ethical (rather than high-theoretical) reasons. These literary historians rejected the narrow and anachronistic definition of 'literary' that derives more from the formation of literature as a university subject than seventeenth-century aesthetics or rhetorical theory. Like post-revisionist historians they turned to polemical writings and articulations of political dissent, later, news, and brought to these non-canonical writings a sensitivity to texts.[9] In contrast to the New Historicism this literary historicism was committed to archival scholarship, and was itself informed by the linguistic turn in the history of political thought, in particular the work of John Pocock. The influence of Pocock in part explains why these literary critics were interested in the republican tradition, but there is also an internal logic to this: this approach to the politics of language and the languages of politics proved to be particularly illuminating when used to explore the 'explosion' of print in the 1640s. During the civil war decades political languages fractured and fissured, enabling and creating the expression of new political identities in cheap print. Alongside these literary historians engaged with print were another

cohort who turned to manuscripts – poetic satires and miscellanies of poetry – as a means of broadening their understanding of literary history, and supplemented the post-revisionist interest in libels with a focus on questions of form and genre.[10]

The conjunction between post-revisionist historians, new bibliographers, and the literary-cultural critics has not been an unequivocally happy one. Historians continue to complain of the deficiencies – the inadequate historical training, the clumsy use of sources, the tendency to advocate positions rather than interrogate problems – that allegedly characterize literary scholars. Literary scholars complain of historians searching for the facts concealed in representations. Yet where these three fields intersect it becomes possible to write a rich and, I would argue, profoundly *new* account of print culture and political history, one that in effect could take into account the bread factory, working-class culture and the economy, all together.

III

The sheer scope of this project perhaps represents the main obstacle. This is suggested by the capaciousness and ambiguity of the phrase 'print culture' itself. The advantages and disadvantages of the term 'culture' lie in its fungibility. It can mean everything and very little: from the specific definition of the beliefs, institutions and relationships that give meaning to social practices, to that which isn't religion or politics (or other things which might bring with them certain presuppositions of diligent and systematic study). We now have cultural histories of books, various insects, drinking, breaking wind, and 'culture' itself. Cultural history has come to denote not a challenge to the restrictive methodologies of political or social or economic history, but an unrigorous approach to popular history: accessible, lacking in analysis, illustrated. Print is a metonymy too, as when we study print, we are usually studying something else: the book trade, political opinion, a selection of 'popular' books. In contrast to McKenzie and his followers, too frequently those who write about the history of 'print' are little concerned with printing, about printshop practices, multiple compositors, typefaces, spilled seed, furniture. Some who are thus concerned recoil from the implications of 'culture'. The place of manuscripts and their relationship to print has become a fetish, the subject of repeated formulations of the persistence of manuscripts in the certainly misnamed age of print. And when brought together into the overwhelmingly useful but disturbing and imprecise collocation 'print culture' the ambiguities and multiplicities propagate. 'Print culture' can mean the specific impact that printing had upon the organization of society; or it can mean the whole cloth of seventeenth-century intellectual life and an increasingly large and significant part of popular culture.

It is a small wonder, then, that the easiest way to designate the relationship between printed books and pamphlets and newspapers and their readers,

and the conduct of politics in society at large, while trying to retain some grip on reality, on the factory floor, is to reach for a phrase like 'public sphere'. I like Habermas, and think *Structural Transformation* is a great book. I particularly like the later Habermas, and the way he has been able to combine idealism with a post-Frankfurt school critique of systematically distorted communication. Habermas's work explains to me, for example, why I spent so much of 2003 writing documents about my university's robust procedures for assuring the quality of our teaching, and how much value we add to students; and it helps explain why *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix* (2003) performed so much better in the bestseller charts than my *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (2003).

But for the purposes of understanding the genesis of 'popularity' or the 'public sphere' or whatever it should be called, we need to put aside this ideal type and to start listening much more closely to what contemporaries – i.e. seventeenth-century writers, MPs and public figures, those engaged in creating and directing popularity – said about the ways in which print was influential. Their categories, the words and the concepts they used to explain to themselves and others the significance of books and debates, are in some ways more honed, more nuanced, more accurate than modern ones. They are also potentially more informed by the practical and commercial infrastructure of these books and debates. As historical and critical work has brilliantly reconstructed particular moments and debates, institutional contexts and spaces, forms of communication in manuscript and print, mediation between localities and centre, relationships and practices, it should build towards a more particular account of the larger-scale, longer-term model, which is just what Habermas was endeavouring to do in his work, albeit with his eye on a different outcome. In this context the Habermasian gloss is redundant (the substance is another matter).[11]

The language is important for the concessions it makes and for the critical opportunities it represents. This is not simply a matter of nouns or discourse. Take a figure like John Milton, who abandoned a promising career as a poet to write pamphlets for two decades and more, in the middle of which he took a post as a minor civil servant whose remit included writing and assisting in the publication of propaganda. In his prose writings we find accounts of the decorum of printed political argument and a speech (a mock-parliamentary speech, in imitation of what was then a well-known pamphlet genre) in favour of liberty of speaking, and against the practice of pre-publication licensing. Or William Prynne, a Presbyterian divine who published dozens of pamphlets over four decades, some published in London, some overseas, pamphlets that repeatedly fell afoul of the authorities. Or Marchamont Nedham, surely the father of British journalism, editor of several weekly news publications and a pioneer of advertising and editorials, whose *Mercurius Politicus* was published weekly for a whole decade, and who was probably the most widely read author of mid-seventeenth-century Britain. Or Henry Robinson and

William Walwyn who advocated liberty of the press as a necessary con-comitant to religious toleration on the grounds that this was the surest means of allowing Truth to flourish. Or, from a quite different ideological background, Roger L'Estrange who wrote fiercely against religious toler-ation and the liberty of the press, and propounded means of controlling speech based on his extensive and intimate knowledge of book produc-tion and distribution and of the reception of books in forums of debate. These men were intimately familiar with both politics and book produc-tion, with history and letters, and wrote copiously on political matters in order to persuade an audience. They understood political stereotyping and name-calling; they knew what the inside of a coffee-house or an inn looked like, and how debates there were conducted. What have they to say about print culture, about publicity or popularity, about the way books influenced their readers?

   This is not the place to construct a model on the basis of what they have to say, but here are some reflections on the direction it might take. First, there is a complex set of nouns that overlap and intersect in descrip-tions of news and opinion: intelligence, information, news, opinion, discourse, licence and popularity. It is easy to skim over these words, but my sense is that they were often used quite precisely, with a sense of the distinctions between them. These distinctions are inscribed in their social functions, in the places where they are used, in the attitudes of the speaker, and also in the relationship between the speaker and auditor, and in the social functions to which news, information or opinion is being put. When we can savour these words in greater detail, others, such as 'propaganda', seem unhelpful. Creating a glossary of these words – perhaps in the style of Raymond Williams' *Keywords* (1976) – will enable us to see the various kinds of transactions that take place in the public exchange of news and opinion.[12] Secondly, returning to what contemporaries both said about and did with printed and manuscript texts will enable us to understand how oral, printed and manuscript communication was mutually reinforcing and sustaining, and take us away from debates about relative influence, and the 'survival' or 'triumph' of one or other mode. Something similar could happen with geography: rather than asserting the existence of local and national public spheres, we could begin to develop a sense of where the various communicative networks that contemporaries saw around them began and ended, and how they understood those networks to function. The fact that Edinburgh seemed much closer to Paris and Leiden than London is worth reflecting upon. Talk of 'spheres' does not help us here. By using the words and concepts of Milton, L'Estrange, Robinson, Nedham, Prynne and others we might become more receptive to the factory-floor factor, the material underpinnings of opinion, publicity, popularity, hard to view at this distance but nonethe-less inscribed or embedded in a writer's words, the material object of a book, the reading practices with which words are consumed. Could

we not extract from their writings and practices a better model – for the seventeenth century, not for the twentieth – than Habermas's 'public sphere'?

Notes

[1] J. Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. T. Burger with the assistance of F. Lawrence (Cambridge MA., 1989).

[2] For a more extended critique, see J. Raymond, 'The newspaper, public opinion, and the public sphere in the seventeenth century' in *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain*, ed. J. Raymond (London, 1999), pp. 109–140; Raymond, 'Describing publicity in early modern England', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 67, 2004, pp. 101–29.

[3] R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds.), *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603–1642* (London, 1989); J. S. Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution* (London, 1993); P. Lake, 'Retrospective: Wentworth's political world in revisionist and post-revisionist perspective', in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford*, ed. J. F. Merritt (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 252–83; K. Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge, 2000).

[4] R. Cust, 'News and politics in early seventeenth-century England', *Past & Present*, 112, 1986, pp. 60–90; T. Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621–1624* (Cambridge, 1989).

[5] P. Croft, 'The reputation of Robert Cecil: libels, political opinion and popular awareness in the early seventeenth century', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6(1), 1991, pp. 43–69; J. Holstun, '"God Bless thee, Little David!": John Felton and his Allies', *ELR*, 59, 1992, pp. 513–52; A. Bellany, '"Rayling rymes and vaunting verse": libellous politics in early stuart England, 1603–1628', in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. K. Sharpe and P. Lake (London, 1994), pp. 285–310; T. Cogswell, 'Underground verse and the transformation of early Stuart political culture', in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early-Modern England: Essays Presented to David Underdown*, ed. S. D. Amussen and M. A. Kishlansky (Manchester, 1995), pp. 277–300; A. Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture in England 1500–1700* (Oxford, 2000); D. Colclough, '"The muses recreation": John Hoskyns and the manuscript culture of the seventeenth century', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 61, 2000, pp. 369–400; A. McRae, *Literature, Satire and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge, 2004).

[6] For example: writings by Roger Chartier, including: *The Cultural Uses of Print in Early Modern France*, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Princeton NJ., 1987); *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Cambridge, 1988); (ed.) *The Culture of Print: Power and the Uses of Print in Early Modern Europe*, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Cambridge, 1989); *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution*, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Durham NC./London, 1991); *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Cambridge, 1994); H.-J. Martin and R. Chartier (eds.), *Histoire de l'édition Français*, tome I: *Le livre conquérant* (Paris, 1982). Also R. Darnton, *The Literary Underground of the Old Regime* (Cambridge MA., 1982); *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History* (New York, 1985 [1984]); *The Kiss of Lamourette: Reflections in Cultural History* (New York, 1990); *The Forbidden Best-Sellers of Pre-Revolutionary France* (London, 1996). And E. Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1979).

[7] D. F. McKenzie's manifesto was *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge, 1999 [1986]); his most substantial study *The Cambridge University Press 1696–1712*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1966); his influential essays were posthumously collected in *Making Meaning: 'Printers of the Mind' and other Essays*, ed. P. D. McDonald and M. F. Suarez, S.J. (Amherst MA., 2002). McKenzie's influence can be clearly seen in *A History of the Book in Britain*, vol. 4: *1557–1695*, eds. J. Barnard and D. F. McKenzie (Cambridge, 2002).

[8] Itself a substantial field. For particularly useful interventions, see: L. Jardine and A. Grafton, '"Studied for action": how Gabriel Harvey read his Livy', *Past and Present*, 129, 199), pp. 30–78; W. A. Sherman, *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance*

(Amherst MA., 1995); J. Raven, H. Small and N. Tadmor (eds.), *The Practice and Representation of Reading in England* (Cambridge, 1996); K. Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven/London, 2000); K. Sharpe and S. N. Zwicker (eds.), *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2003).

[9] Again, this is a large field, but some of the most significant and influential books include: M. Heinemann, *Puritanism and Theatre: Thomas Middleton and Opposition Drama under the Early Stuarts* (Cambridge, 1982 [1980]); D. Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (London, 1984) and *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics 1627–1660* (Cambridge, 1999); A. Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation* (Madison WI., 1984); M. Wilding, *Dragons Teeth: Literature in the English Revolution* (Oxford, 1987); L. Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge, 1989); N. Smith, *Perfection Proclaimed: Language and English Radical Religion 1640–1660* (Oxford, 1989) and *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640–1660* (New Haven/London, 1994); T. Healy and J. Sawday (eds.), *Literature and the English Civil War* (Cambridge, 1990); S. N. Zwicker, *Lines of Authority: Politics and Literary Culture, 1649–1689* (Ithaca/London, 1993); S. Achinstein, *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader* (Princeton NJ., 1994).

[10] For example, A. F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca/London, 1995); H. Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1993).

[11] D. Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England* (Princeton NJ., 2000); P. Lake with M. Questier, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven, 2002); A. Bellany, *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603–1660* (Cambridge, 2002); P. Lake, T. Cogswell and R. Cust (eds.), *Politics, Religion, and Popularity: Early Stuart Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge, 2002); L. H. Newcomb, *Reading Popular Romance in Early Modern England* (New York, 2002); S. Achinstein, *Literature and Dissent in Milton's England* (Cambridge, 2003); J. Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2004); B. Cowan, 'The rise of the coffeehouse reconsidered', *Historical Journal*, 47, 2004, pp. 21–46; and the various essays in the issue of 'Print, Propaganda, Royalism', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 67(1), 2004.

[12] See my introduction and the essays collected in J. Raymond (ed.), *News Networks in Early Modern Britain and Europe* (Routledge, forthcoming).

Bibliography

Achinstein, S., *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader* (Princeton NJ., 1994)

Achinstein, S., *Literature and Dissent in Milton's England* (Cambridge, 2003)

Barnard, J., and McKenzie, D. F. (ed.), *A History of the Book in Britain*, vol. 4: *1557–1695* (Cambridge, 2002)

Bellany, A., '"Rayling rymes and vaunting verse": libellous politics in early Stuart England, 1603–1628', in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. K. Sharpe and P. Lake (London, 1994), pp. 285–310

Bellany, A., *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603–1660* (Cambridge, 2002)

Calhoun, C. (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge MA., 1992)

Chartier, R., *The Cultural Uses of Print in Early Modern France*, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Princeton NJ., 1987)

Chartier, R., *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Cambridge, 1988)

Chartier, R. (ed.), *The Culture of Print: Power and the Uses of Print in Early Modern Europe*, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Cambridge, 1989)

Chartier, R., *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution*, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Durham NC./London, 1991)

Chartier, R., *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, trans. L. G. Cochrane (Cambridge, 1994)

Clegg, C. S., *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, 2001)

Cogswell, T., *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621–1624* (Cambridge, 1989)

Cogswell, T., 'The politics of propaganda: Charles I and the people in the 1620s', *Journal of British Studies*, 29, 1990, pp. 187–215

Cogswell, T., 'Underground verse and the transformation of early Stuart political culture', in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early-Modern England: Essays Presented to David Underdown*, ed. S. D. Amussen and M. A. Kishlansky (Manchester, 1995), pp. 277–300

Colclough, D., '"The muses recreation": John Hoskyns and the manuscript culture of the seventeenth century', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 61, 2000, pp. 369–400

Cowan, B., 'The rise of the coffeehouse reconsidered', *Historical Journal*, 47, 2004, pp. 21–46

Cust, R., 'News and politics in early seventeenth-century England', *Past & Present*, 112, 1986, pp. 60–90

Darnton, R., *The Literary Underground of the Old Regime* (Cambridge MA., 1982)

Darnton, R., *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History* (New York, 1985 [1984])

Darnton, R., *The Kiss of Lamourette: Reflections in Cultural History* (New York, 1990)

Darnton, R., *The Forbidden Best-Sellers of Pre-Revolutionary France* (London, 1996)

Dobranski, S. B., *Milton, Authorship, and the Book Trade* (Cambridge, 1999)

Eisenstein, E., *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1979)

Fox, A., *Oral and Literate Culture in England 1500–1700* (Oxford, 2000)

Halasz, A., *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1997)

Healy, T., and Sawday, J. (ed.), *Literature and the English Civil War* (Cambridge, 1990)

Heinemann, M., *Puritanism and Theatre: Thomas Middleton and Opposition Drama under the Early Stuarts* (Cambridge, 1982 [1980])

Holstun, J., '"God Bless thee, Little David!": John Felton and his Allies', *ELR*, 59, 1992, pp. 513–52

Holstun, J., *Ehud's Dagger: Class Struggle in the English Revolution* (London, 2000)

Jardine, L., and Grafton, A., '"Studied for action": how Gabriel Harvey read his Livy', *Past and Present*, 129, 1990, pp. 30–78

Knights, M., *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678–81* (Cambridge, 1994)

Lake, P., Cogswell, T., and Cust, R. (eds.), *Politics, Religion, and Popularity: Early Stuart Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge, 2002)

Lake, P. with M. Questier, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven, 2002)

Levy, F. J., 'How information spread among the gentry, 1550–1640', *Journal of British Studies*, 21, 1982, pp. 11–34

Love, H., *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1993)

McDowell, P., *The Women of Grub Street: Press, Politics, and Gender in the London Literary Marketplace* (Oxford, 1998)

McKenzie, D. F., *The Cambridge University Press 1696–1712*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1966)

McKenzie, D. F., *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge, 1999 [1986])

McKenzie, D. F., *Making Meaning: 'Printers of the Mind' and other Essays*, ed. P. D. McDonald and M. F. Suarez, S.J. (Amherst MA., 2002)

McRae, A., *Literature, Satire and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge, 2004)

Marotti, A. F., *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca/London, 1995)

Martin, H.-J., and Chartier, R. (ed.), *Histoire de l'édition Français*, tome I: *Le livre conquérant* (Paris, 1982)

Newcomb, L. H., *Reading Popular Romance in Early Modern England* (New York, 2002)

Norbrook, D., *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (London, 1984)

Norbrook, D., *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics 1627–1660* (Cambridge, 1999)

Patterson, A., *Censorship and Interpretation* (Madison WI., 1984)

Peacey, J., *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2004)

Pincus, S., '"Coffee politicians does create": coffeehouses and restoration political culture', *Journal of Modern History*, 67, 1995, pp. 807–34

Potter, L., *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge, 1989)

Raven, J., Small, H., and Tadmor, N. (ed.), *The Practice and Representation of Reading in England* (Cambridge, 1996)

Raymond, J., *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks, 1641–1660* (Oxford, 1996)

Raymond, J. (ed.), *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain* (London, 1999)

Raymond, J., *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 2003)

Raymond, J., 'Describing publicity in early modern England', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 67, 2004, pp. 101–29

Scott, J., *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis, 1677–1683* (Cambridge, 1991)

Sharpe, K., *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge, 2000)

Sharpe, K., and Lake, P. (ed.), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (London, 1994)

Sharpe, K., and Zwicker, S. N. (ed.), *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2003)

Sharpe, K., *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven/London, 2000)

Sherman, W. A., *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance* (Amherst MA., 1995)

Smith, N., *Perfection Proclaimed: Language and English Radical Religion 1640–1660* (Oxford, 1989)

Smith, N., *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640–1660* (New Haven/London, 1994)

Smuts, R. M., *Culture and Power in England, 1585–1685* (New York, 1999)

Watt, T., *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550–1640* (Cambridge, 1991)

Wheale, N., *Writing and Society: Literacy, Print and Politics in Britain, 1590–1660* (London, 1999)

Wilding, M., *Dragons Teeth: Literature in the English Revolution* (Oxford, 1987)

Williams, R., *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (London, 1976)

Zaret, S. D., *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England* (Princeton, 2000)

Zwicker, S. N., *Lines of Authority: Politics and Literary Culture, 1649–1689* (Ithaca/London, 1993)