

Introduction

Pete Langman

'Books will speake plaine, when *Counsellors* Blanch. Therefore it is good to be conversant in them; Specially the *Bookes* of such, as Themselves have been Actors upon the Stage.'¹ So wrote Francis Bacon in his essay 'Of Counsell', neatly presenting a transparent vision of the book as straight-talking adviser whose words can be taken at (type)face value.² While Bacon may not have extended his metaphor so far as to the ruling of a kingdom, the accession of James I had lent new power to the printed word, with the new monarch as explicit in his desire to rule by the pen and not the pikestaff as he was in his belief in the divine right of kings. James embarked on a bibliographical campaign to assert his intellectual and monarchical authority, and, ever attentive to his posterity, to promote a particular image of both himself and his reign. Evidence of his success remains, though perhaps somewhat counter-intuitively, in the massive canvases commissioned in the late 1620s by Charles I from Peter Paul Rubens and which still adorn the ceilings of Banqueting House in Whitehall.

Completed in 1622, Banqueting House had been the stage for many of the court masques devised by Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones during James's reign, and building, spectacle and decoration combined to provide an awesome display of regal authority and power. The paintings themselves are great iconographical works, showing James as Solomon, as Christ in Judgement, and being guided by Justice up to heaven respectively.³ James's depiction as Solomon, the great biblical judge and lawmaker, derived from his belief that the law was an expression of the divine right, and could be altered at his pleasure: "Kings are properly judges," he was to pronounce, "and judgement properly belongs to them from God."⁴ James actively encouraged his courtiers to think of him as the new Solomon, and they happily acquiesced:

¹ *The Oxford Francis Bacon*, Graham Rees and Lisa Jardine (gen. eds), 15 vols (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1996–), XV, 'Of Counsell', p. 67 (hereafter *OFB*).

² 'Of Counsell' appears in H51, the MS which followed the 1612 edition, and thus may be considered to be a truly Jacobean text rather than an edited Elizabethan one.

³ See Roy Strong, *The Tudor and Stuart Monarchy: Pageantry, Painting, Iconography III. Jacobean and Caroline* (Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1998), pp. 133–48.

⁴ Alan Stewart, *The Cradle King: A Life of James VI & I* (London: Chatto and Windus, 2003), p. 233.

God hath giuen vs a *Solomon*, and *God* about all things gaue *Solomon* Wisedome; Wisedome brought him peace; Peace brought him Riches; Riches gaue him Glory. His wisdome appeared in his wordes and *Workes*.⁵

So wrote Bishop Montague in his preface to James's *Workes* of 1616. While this portrayal of the king as a contemporary Solomon speaks volumes regarding his self-image and his ability to make his inner circle cede to his wishes, the panel showing James as Christ in Judgement, generally called 'The Benefits of the Government of James I', seems to be a direct reflection of his chosen method of self-promotion. In this panel we find an image which, for Roy Strong, 'represents James in his spoken and written pronouncements [...] in exactly the same way James is glorified on the title page of his *Workes*', namely that of Mercury striking down discord.⁶ Strong argues that the central panel, in which James is accompanied to heaven by Justice, is not only the 'climax to the whole ceiling', but that 'in no other part, I believe, is the King's book, the *Basilikon Doron*, followed so closely.'⁷ These conclusions should come as no surprise, however. Where else would an artist and his boss turn when asked to immortalise the late king than James's self-image: a self-image largely created and projected through three texts, his *Basilikon Doron*, his *Workes*, and perhaps his most lasting contribution to the religious and literary sensibilities of his country, the Authorised or King James Bible (KJB).

The use of books to portray a certain image of kingship was nothing new, of course. The Great Bible of 1539 includes as its engraved title a sumptuous image of King Henry VIII, in total command of both sacred and secular. Henry sits, resplendent on his throne, handing the *Verbum Dei* (delivered by a remarkably small God residing in the clouds) to Cranmer and Cromwell, Archbishop and Secretary of State, respectively.⁸ They in turn hand it to their ministers who proceed to preach the word to the people, who, in *their* turn, shout for joy: *vivat rex*. Not praise be to God, but long live the King. As an expression of where the power lies, it could not be more clear, and it asserts Henry's direct line of communication from God, reinforcing his divine right and his headship of the Church. In one image,

⁵ King James, *The Workes of the Most High and Mightie Prince Iames ... King of Great Britaine, France and Ireland, Published by James [Montague] Bishop of Winton and Deane of his Maiesties Chappel Royall* (London: Robert Barker and Iohn Bill, 1616), e2'.

⁶ Strong, p. 145. There are a number of interesting iconographical features of the front matter to James's *Workes*, not least the engraved portrait in which James is pictured sitting by a book inscribed *Verbum Dei* and a sword with *Iusticia* engraved on its scabbard. Both the engraved and letterpress titles boast a quotation from 1 Kings 3.12: 'Loe, I haue giuen thee a wise and an understanding heart'. The image also reflects Jonson's 1615 masque *The Golden Age Restor'd*.

⁷ Strong, p. 148.

⁸ Myles Coverdale (ed.), *The Byble in Englyshe* (London: Richard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch, 1539), engraved title.

Henry sums up the entire focus of his reformation. But where Henry relied on the power of an image, James was more interested in the power of the printed word.⁹

James, this ‘great Solomon’, had been writing since the 1580s, starting with verse and graduating to religious commentary before setting out to buttress his intellectual pretensions with works such as the *Daemonologie* (1591). More importantly, perhaps, he composed two works expressing his views on kingship, *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies* (1598) and *Basilikon Doron* (1598): noting in the former that King David called kings gods, and that ‘their office is, to minister iustice and iudgement to their people’,¹⁰ while in the latter the argument, in sonnet form, began ‘God giues not Kings the style of Gods in vaine, / For on his throne his scepter do they swey’.¹¹

While the canvases at Banqueting House seem to take James at his (printed) word, the reality of James’s textual and bibliographical campaign is somewhat more complex. James’s works found themselves asserting their author in an England in which, as Kevin Sharpe has shown, authority was less a product of coercion than of complicity.¹² Much as James may have rued this fact, his authority did not merely flow from the top down, but was continually adjusted from the bottom up, and his books did not merely assert his authority, but were themselves subject to challenge. It is between the bottom and the top of this Baconian pyramid of authority that the historian of the book can find layer upon layer of textual conflict and negotiation from which not even the king was spared.

The Battlefield of the Printed Page

As John Barnard has noted, ‘print, politics and religion were inextricably linked’,¹³ and the printed page had been a battlefield for as long as it had existed. Skirmishes took several forms, with the pamphlet-based Martin Marprelate affair and the bibliographical spat between Thomas Nashe and Gabriel Harvey being

⁹ This is not to say that James was blind to the value of a good picture, however. The engraving of James which accompanied his *Workes* is a case in point, as is the crown of stars which appears on the engraved title page, let down, it seems, not for an image of James, but for the text of the volume’s title, ‘THE | VVORKES | OF THE MOST HIGH | AND MIGHTY PRINCE | IAMES’.

¹⁰ King James, *The Trew Lawe of Free Monarchies* (Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave, 1598), B3^r.

¹¹ King James, *Basilikon Doron* (Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave, 1599), A3^r.

¹² Kevin Sharpe, ‘Representations and negotiations: texts, images, and authority in Early Modern England’, *The Historical Journal*, 42 (1999): 853–81 (p. 854).

¹³ John Barnard, ‘Introduction’, in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, IV, 1557–1695*, John Barnard and D.F. McKenzie (eds) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 1–28 (p. 2).

merely two examples.¹⁴ James seemed eager to join the fray, and when Cardinal Bellarmine wrote a letter criticising English Catholics for taking the Oath of Allegiance, James's response to the gunpowder plot, the king replied with the nominally anonymous *Triplici nodo, Triplex cuneus, Or An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance*. Bellarmine responded in kind, with the *Responsio*. James did not emerge from this particular tussle entirely victorious, and recruited John Donne to write a defence of his position, *Pseudo-Martyr*, in 1610.¹⁵ It was not only Bellarmine who challenge James, but Donne, his putative defender and subject, also questioned his decision to enter into the debate, suggesting that a king ought not converse with his subjects at all.

Though perhaps a little chastened by his experience with Cardinal Bellarmine, James was not put off from publishing, merely moving from the hurly-burly of print and pamphlet warfare into a new field, effectively inaugurating a literary canonisation of both himself and his reign. By the time of James's argument with Bellarmine, the new translation of the Bible, the KJB, was well under way, and it finally reached the presses in 1611. More than merely an attempt to affect and regularise the way religion was practised in England through the provision of a common, approved source text rather than through simple proclamation, the KJB was a further assertion of James's position as both divinely appointed monarch and head of the Church. Rather than follow Henry's pictorial example, James's authority was asserted in textual fashion, as in their letter to the reader the translators not only referred to the king as possessing 'singular wisdom given unto him by God', and 'rare learning and experience',¹⁶ but consciously reinforced his status as head of the Church:

That we do not deny, nay, we affirm and avow, that the very meanest translation of the Bible in *English*, set forth by men of our profession, (for we have seen none of their's of the whole Bible as yet) containeth the word of God, nay, is the word of God: As the King's speech which he uttered in Parliament, being translated into *French, Dutch, Italian, and Latin*, is still the King's speech, though it be not interpreted by every translator with the like grace, nor peradventure so fitly for phrase, nor so expressly for sense, every where.¹⁷

¹⁴ The Marprelate tracts were challenged by, amongst others, Francis Bacon's privately circulated *An Advertisement Touching the Controversies of the Church of England* (1589), while Nashe published *Have With You to Saffron Walden* (1596) as a retort to Gabriel Harvey's *Four Letters* (1592) (Lorna Hutson, *Thomas Nashe in Context* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), pp. 197–214).

¹⁵ Stewart, pp. 225–31.

¹⁶ Robert Carroll and Stephen Pickett (eds), *The Bible: Authorized King James Version with Apocrypha* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. iv.

¹⁷ *The Bible*, p. lxii.

The word of God and king were thus neatly conflated, as if imitating Henry's visual statement. The KJB, ostensibly intended as an improvement on the available vernacular Bibles such as the Geneva and Bishops' Bibles, was not only produced with a set of politically-influenced guidelines, such as the order that 'the old, Ecclesiastical words to be kept, viz. as the word church not to be translated congregation',¹⁸ but was also, on James's insistence, to have no marginal glosses. James was particularly concerned with two such notes he had found in the Geneva Bible; one which seemed to justify disobedience to kings, and one which encouraged matricide in the case of an idolatrous mother.¹⁹

It is particularly intriguing that, rather than replace these marginal glosses with new, 'authoritative' ones, James chose to excise them completely. It seems that James did not wish to assert a particular interpretation of the Bible *textually* – either that or he was making a statement regarding the clarity of the word of God, particularly apposite considering the position of the Orthodox church and the status of the new translation.²⁰ What is certain is that this action removed any evidence of intercession or negotiation of God's word beyond those of the translators, and the resemblance in this sense of the word of God and the word of the king was firmly established in the preface, as we have seen.

While the KJB was plainly an assertion and conflation of the authority of both God's word and those of his emissary on earth, James, the King's Printers soon embarked on a more earthly mission, namely to promote a specific image of the intellectual and philosophical nature of James's reign, as Graham Rees and Maria Wakely have shown:

James's self-promotion as a wise and learned Solomon, a sacred king and a *Rex pacificus* who ruled by the pen not the pike [...] helped sustain an idea and iconography of kingship supported by a select body of distinguished authors. By accepting the dedications of these texts, and in some cases pressing for their publication, James was forging a link between the folio form, the printed word, and himself as prime mover in the genesis of epoch-making editions.²¹

This bibliographical campaign took the form of nine folio volumes published between 1616 and 1620, showing that James saw the King's Printers as more

¹⁸ *The Bible*, p. xxvi.

¹⁹ Exodus 1.19; 2 Chronicles 15.16. Neither of these was likely to have found favour with James, for perhaps obvious reasons. See Stewart, pp. 201–2.

²⁰ There is a third possibility, however. The lack of marginal gloss allows for particular interpretations to be asserted by members of the clergy as they saw fit – or as proclamation from on high suggested. In this case, the word of God could be more easily interpreted to fit the needs of the kingdom. This interpretation accords neatly with James's somewhat flexible attitude to the relationship between church orthodoxy and political expediency.

²¹ Maria Wakely and Graham Rees, 'Folios Fit for a King: James I, John Bill, and the King's Printers, 1616–1620', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68 (2005): 467–95 (p. 475).

than simply the publishers of proclamations and other pieces of official business, or even just the KJB, but as his greatest organ of textual influence. While the campaign included the English, Latin and Italian editions of Sarpi's *Historie of the Covncel of Trent*, the first edition of Bradwardine's *De Causa Dei*, and Francis Bacon's magnum opus, the *Instauratio magna*, it began with the publication of James's *Workes*, in both English and Latin. The *Workes* provided a concrete set of writings by which the king himself might be judged, while simultaneously confirming him as the author of pamphlets which had long been officially, if not actually, anonymous.²² James's earlier writings were thus subject to a re-negotiation of their status, being represented as elements of a coherent body of work rather than as merely individual pieces. They were accompanied by an eloquent and learned preface, written by Bishop Montague, which did rather more than simply assert their value, utility, and collection into the 'works' format, expending much printer's ink defending the very idea of publishing from what were voices plainly loud enough to merit quotation. 'Little it befitts the maiesty of a King to turne Clerke, and to make a warre with the penne, that were fitte to be fought with the Pike', ran the argument 'And since that Booke-writing is growen into a Trade; It is dishonourable for a King to write bookes'.²³ Montague's discomfort on this subject is made clear by the 'Clowd of Witnesses' he calls to his aid.²⁴ He begins by noting that the Apostles were 'mere' amanuenses, before pointing out that Solomon and Samuel both wrote works other than divinely inspired scripture, before indulging his reader (or his king) with some eight pages of scribbling monarchs, culminating in James's important, immediate forebears, Henry VIII, Queen Elizabeth, and his own parents.²⁵ Even the authority of the collected works of the king, it seems, was subject to negotiation, and it is hard not to see Montague biting his tongue as he wrote of *Basilikon Doron* that it 'made the hearts of all his people as one Man, as much to Honour him for Religion and Learning, as to obey him for Title and Authoritie'.²⁶

It was the image James promoted of himself in his works as an eirenic king of Solomonic wisdom that Inigo Jones and Peter Paul Rubens plundered to produce the ceiling panels in Banqueting House. The image of James left for posterity derived from the textual spin he had indulged in when producing *Basilikon Doron* and the *Workes*, and this is the image projected and reflected onto the ceiling at

²² The contents page makes this plain, with *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*, *A Counter-blast to Tobacco*, and *A Discourse of the Powder Treason* described as anonymous, while *An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance* is described as 'first set out Anonymously, and afterwards published with the *Præmonition* vnder His Maiesties owne name' (King James, *Workes*, e3^v).

²³ King James, *Workes*, b2^v. For John Donne's discomfort with his King's scribblings, see Jane Rickard's essay below, pp. 89–100.

²⁴ King James, *Workes*, c4^r.

²⁵ King James, *Workes*, c2^v–c3^r.

²⁶ King James, *Workes*, d1^v.

Banqueting House. And yet, the image he presented was, it seems, as subject to negotiation as any other textual production of the age, and Montague's efforts in defending James's authorial position give the lie to the slick presentation suggested in Banqueting House. James's removal of the marginal annotations from the KJB suggests a resistance to allowing any sort of textual negotiation of his own image-making, or, at the very least, to admitting that his authority was as subject to negotiation as any other type. But not all authors were resistant to such negotiation. Francis Bacon, it seems, positively encouraged it.

Bacon realised that books do not always 'speak plaine', and his magnum opus, the *Instauratio magna*, though part of the bibliographical presentation of James's version of his reign, in many ways challenged the sort of monolithic, imposed authority favoured by the king. Instead, the paratextual materials which accompanied it were largely taken up with intense negotiations of one sort or another.²⁷ Bacon was obsessed with the legitimacy of authority, and for him knowledge, and especially knowledge as found in books, was not to be viewed as set in stone – it was not only up for negotiation, but positively invited it. The authority of the printed word was developing rather than constant. Indeed, in the preface to the *Instauratio magna*, he wrote, though perhaps a little disingenuously, the following:

For my own part, if I have wrongly given credit to anything, or grown sleepy or inattentive, or become weary on my way and left the investigation unfinished, I nevertheless make the things plain for all to see, so that my mistakes can be spotted and separated out before the body of science is further infected by them, and also so that my labours can be carried on easily and expeditiously.²⁸

Bacon's way of writing knowledge, based around the aphorism, was designed, ostensibly, at least, not to *fix* knowledge, but to allow it to advance:

lastly, aphorisms, representing only portions and as if they were fragments of knowledge, invite others to contribute and add something in their turn; whereas methodical delivery, carrying the show of a total, makes men careless, as if they were already at the end.²⁹

Unlike James, Bacon did not believe that what he wrote was the last word on the subject. Where James sought to shut down, or at least control, debate, Bacon, in principle at least, sought to open it up. Bacon realised that the real knowledge was found in the margins, where negotiations and transactions took place, and

²⁷ See my essay, below, pp. 101–116.

²⁸ *OFB*, XI, p. 21.

²⁹ James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath (eds), *The Works of Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viscount St. Alban and Lord Chancellor of England*, 7 vols (London: Longmans, 1857–64), IV, p. 451.

just as James insisted that marginal annotations be removed, it seems that Bacon positively invited them.

Jacobean books did not speake plain, for if they did there would have been no need for the sorts of prefaces which accompanied both James's *Workes* and Bacon's *Instauratio magna*. These prefaces are designed, for the most part, to direct the reader towards one interpretation, the interpretation favoured by either author or editor (and they need not necessarily concur). Editorial prescription and reader response can, however, happily interact, as seems to occur in the case of a copy of Francis Bacon's *Sylva sylvarum* acquired by James Clitherow in 1638.³⁰ *Sylva* is, in itself, an interesting example of the ways in which books in this period were not only negotiated into being, but were themselves objects of negotiation – *Sylva*'s editor, William Rawley, manipulating Bacon's name and reputation, uses the text to help him gain a new patron after the author's death.

Clitherow's copy of *Sylva sylvarum*, however, provides us with an example not only of reader interaction with the book itself, following Bacon's prescription, but also an interaction with future readers. Clitherow first writes his name and what was presumably the date of acquisition on the engraved title page, surrounding the woodblock ornament in such a way as to imitate the printed word – marginalia, in engaging with the work, becomes part of the work, so it seems as if Clitherow is trying to assert ownership or even some manner of co-authorship. Readers such as Clitherow may even have been aware of this effect, as we can deduce from the engraved title, at the bottom of which we find a 'note to self', though not in Clitherow's hand:

Inquir for Bacons booke de Ventis / Mentioned in the Preface of this dedication
/ [...] / Inquir also for his Abecedarium Naturae³¹

It is difficult to read this note without concluding that it was meant not for the writer himself, but for the casual reader browsing through his library – it's hardly the most convenient place for a shopping list. The volume itself is peppered with marginalia, in five separate hands. Clitherow's own contribution is limited to writing 'what's this!' alongside Experiment 286, but the inquisitive scribbler from the engraved title annotates Experiment 238, which concerns the imitation of the human voice:

No beast can imitate the speech of man, but birds only; for the ape itself, that is so ready to imitate otherwise, attaineth not any degree of imitation of speech. It is true that I have known a dog, that if one howled in his ear, he should fall howling a great while.³²

³⁰ See Francis Bacon, *Sylva sylvarum* (London: J.H. for William Lee, 1627), BL shelfmark 982.f.14.

³¹ BL, *Sylva sylvarum*, 928.f.14, engraved title.

³² BL, *Sylva sylvarum*, 928.f.14, I2'.

It is in the ample margins next to 238 that we discover these words:

I hav tried this
 expt, but the dogg
 must love him
 who doth it³³

The scribbler is simply following Bacon's instruction to try things out, and note where they are deficient. Knowledge, here, is explicitly negotiated, made and re-made, through the combination of author and reader, interacting through the medium of the printed page.

Negotiating the Jacobean Printed Book

Negotiating the Jacobean Printed Book is a collection which seeks to address the complex strategies which surrounded the struggle for production, authority and legitimacy which accompanied the publication of a book in this period. Each essay has, at its core, the desire to detail the ways in which a particular work or group of works interacted with the wider concerns of Jacobean society, investigating what influenced it, and what it influenced. The volume's overriding argument is that the point of conflict or negotiation of every work – whether it be between author and patron, church authorities and parish, paper and print – shines a raking light onto Jacobean society. It exposes the ways in which society was created and, in effect, re-created with every new work: society and book created one another, though not, perhaps, in the manner intended by the greatest, or at least most ambitious, wielder of the book as a socio-cultural weapon, James I. As each book was published, it negotiated its position within Jacobean society, and Jacobean society negotiated its own position relative to the book.

The Jacobean era saw the production of some of the most influential books ever printed, and even accounting for Shakespeare's First Folio of 1623, the KJB, published in 1611, is perhaps unassailable in terms of its influence over the following generations, and of the sensibilities of the English nation. This work was perhaps the ultimate expression of a desire to effect a certain national identity through bibliographical means – this was a work for which James, as king, considered himself 'principal mover and author' – and one which was produced by the most powerful organ of bibliographical authority the Jacobean state had to offer, the King's Printers. Graham Rees's opening essay examines the role of the King's Printers as monopoly producers of Bibles and New Testaments, detailing the effect the printing of the KJB had on the incumbent Robert Barker, who was gradually yet ruthlessly displaced by the more canny pairing of John Bill and Bonham Norton, just as demand for the KJB, especially in the small and cheap

³³ Ibid.

24^{mo} format exploded. Barker's misfortunes with the first edition of the KJB, in effect, did for his business, while his successors took advantage of his misfortunes to acquire a patent which was, as Rees suggests, a 'licence to print money'. What began, in many ways, as a method of imposing a national cultural identity found its production controlled by market forces rather than by official prescription, as demand from the public, and desire for profit on the part of the printers, took hold.

If the story of the KJB is one of propaganda, court cases, market forces and money at the top end of religious publications, then Natalie Mears investigates a phenomenon much closer to the point of delivery, the purchases of 'special Forms' of prayer at the parish level. These ephemeral publications originally hailed from outside of court circles, but the Crown quickly recognised their potential for influencing the hearts and minds of their parishioners, and their production soon involved luminaries such as Grindal, Young and William Cecil. As they were directed towards special events, such as praying for divine intervention in times of plague, or in the affairs of the Elector Palatine, as well as more durable events such as the Gunpowder Plot, their purchase, while technically compulsory, was more erratic than that of the larger works such as the KJB. As Mears shows, the story of their dissemination and purchase has much to teach us regarding the efficiency of ecclesiastical networks, the importance of the text to the Church's ability to impose ideas on its subjects, the manner in which the higher clergy perceived its own role in political matters, and the flexibility of the Church in adopting popular forms for its own ends.

Any discussion of printed books in this period is necessarily dominated by religious texts, and it is the Book of Common Prayer to which we next turn: it was not merely a book designed to unite the Church through presentation of a common liturgy, but was also a script which defined how worship was to be performed, by both clergy and laity. Inherited from the Elizabethan settlement, the Book of Common Prayer was subject to a series of criticisms regarding the actions of the laity during the service, with clerics like Thomas Cartwright suggesting that these were drawn from the 'popish dunghill'.³⁴ The accession of James, however, led to a change in attitude on the part of the episcopate, as it was now made up of men whose formative religious experience had occurred after the Elizabethan Settlement, and whose respect for the Prayer Book was greater than that of their forebears'. The new focus on defending the performance of the liturgy, and especially the actions of the laity, not only marginalised moderate Puritans within the Church, but also prepared the ground for the more radical attempts to redefine English religious identity through 'Prayer Book performance' during the reign of Charles I.

There were, of course, other areas of publication keenly negotiated during this period, and censorship, its successes, failures and foibles, is very much part of the narrative. Political works and their authors were as subject to censorship as religious ones, though it was often hard to separate the two. Cyndia Clegg writes

³⁴ See below, p. 47.

of a work on the subject of the union of Scotland and Ireland written by John Thornborough, Bishop of Bristol, the publication of which attracted the ire of Parliament in 1604. Clegg uses this example to challenge the widely held opinion that print and Parliament didn't mix until the 1640s, when Parliament accrued much of its power. In considering three discrete intersections between print and Parliament in the light of assumptions regarding the nature of Parliament, royal authority and print culture, Clegg demonstrates that while books produced during parliamentary time might have included controversial texts, and while Thornborough may have been taken to task for abusing parliamentary privilege by passing judgement on parliamentary proceedings in print, this same parliamentary privilege did not preclude the printing of a number of texts which served the interests of Parliament, rather than challenged them.

If the mixing of print and Parliament is subject to some disagreement, then the mixing of print, politics and religion is anything but. While the use of biblical exegesis as a method of engagement in political debate was nothing new, Andreas Pečar notes that it increased noticeably in response to James's policy during the beginnings of the Thirty Years War. George Hakewill, Chaplain to Prince Charles, wrote two such works in 1621, *King David's Vow* and *The Wedding Ring*, both of which used biblical exegesis to pass comment on James's policy regarding the Spanish Match, the highly controversial plan to marry Prince Charles to the Spanish Infanta. While each text dealt with the same issue, they were treated very differently: the former being deemed perfectly acceptable; the latter leading to Hakewill's investigation and punishment. Pečar's chapter focuses on James I not merely as the ultimate arbiter of authority but more as a reader, concluding that it is less the subject of the criticism than the particular mode of criticism which would lead the author into trouble. Once published, the fate of these two texts, and their author, hinged more on the manner in which that matter was presented than on the subject matter itself. Censorship in the Jacobean world was not set in stone, it seems, but was the result of a negotiation between text and reader, a negotiation *King David's Vow* carried out successfully, while *The Wedding Ring* did not.

John Donne was perhaps as dismissive of the value of print publication as James I was reliant upon it and yet, as Jane Rickard points out, his career was bound up with the print-obsessed king. Reluctantly conscripted into the print war of words between James and his continental critics which began with the publication of James's *Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance* in 1607 and 1609, Donne was effectively commissioned to write *Pseudo-martyr* as a further defence of James's position in 1610. While James's own needs effectively inaugurated Donne into the world of print publication, it seems as if, rather than open Donne to the possibilities of the printed page, it entrenched his feelings against it. Indeed, Donne wrote in the dedication to *Pseudo-Martyr* that James had 'vouchsafed to descend to a conuersation with your Subjects, by way of your books.'³⁵ For Donne, rather than inspire his readers with reverence, James had put himself in a position

³⁵ See below, pp. 97–98.

whereby his subjects could engage in ‘conversation’ with him. Donne, it seems, did not feel that the king ought to be negotiating with his subjects, and this was exactly what his published writings did.

If Donne felt that James’s published writings allowed his subjects to enter into conversation with him, then Pete Langman argues that Francis Bacon was convinced that the printed book exhibited a conversational quality. Bacon’s magnum opus, the *Instauratio magna*, was accompanied by one of his most masterful dedicatory letters, in which he made a plea for patronage not on behalf of himself, but of his instauration, his planned reinstatement of man’s mastery over nature. Such pleas for patronage are nothing new, but Bacon accompanied James’s handsome presentation copy of the *Instauratio magna* with a second, handwritten letter which cast a subtly different light on the negotiation he presented in public. Beginning by acknowledging the different natures of public and private conversations, he continues to present a second set of negotiations which change the way the recipient of the private letter reads the public. Bacon manipulates the public and private forms expertly, and for his own ends, and in doing so we can see how the negotiation contained within the private letter actively influences the reading of the contents of the publicly available work.

If Bacon’s particular desires and understanding of the differing nature of public and private conversation affected the ways in which the *Instauratio magna* was to be understood, then David Lawrence’s essay shows how the Privy Council’s codification of military drill in 1623 – which resulted in the printing of the *Instructions for Musters and Armes*³⁶ – is to be understood less as the imposition of a standardised military drill than the willing co-option of the reactions of specialists to circumstances. The manuals produced during the years before the Privy Council’s entry into the marketplace resulted from the implicit agreement of networks of printers, booksellers and soldiers, the men at the sharp end of the business of printing and warfare. Drawing heavily from the Dutch engraver Jacob de Gheyn’s *Wapenhandelinge van Roers, Musquetten ende Spiessen* (1607), which had set the standard for drill manuals on the continent, these privately published drill manuals were the result of the soldiers’ own recognition of their needs and the recognition of their commercial value by printers and booksellers, not least after the outbreak of the Thirty Years War in 1618 threatened to draw English armies into the fray.

Epilogue

If this collection has been arguing that the Jacobean printed book was subject to pressure both from the top and from the bottom, that it produced and yet simultaneously was subject to various different claims to authority, then R.

³⁶ Privy Council, *Instructions for Musters and Armes* (London: Bonham Norton and John Bill, 1623).

McGeddon's epilogue provides more than a merely perfect physical metaphor. Just as the text of every book which survived those first, dangerous days immediately following conception was then subject to almost continuous negotiation, of one sort or another, so it was with the physical object which carried these texts. If James I's dream of a state in which he could impose his will through the straightforward application of texts to public is shown by these essays to have been more than three-quarters pipe, then the dream that the inequalities inherent in a pile of print could be easily hammered to a state of bland acquiescence is shown to be equally fanciful.

McGeddon's masterful piece shows how the very materiality of the book was, and is, subject to a veritable battery of influences, conflicting forces and technical confusions. McGeddon traces the effects of the physical imposition of type onto paper, paper in press, and, in the case of one text, the dangers of allowing that most up-to-the-minute of compositors – optical recognition software – loose. He argues forcefully for the need for historians of the book, or, indeed, of practically any hue, to pay great attention to the circumstances in which any particular book was printed, and henceforth produced and published. It is the deformation of information, as he puts it, the revenge of type against paper, which allows us to see with greater clarity how a printed book came into being, and it is this deformation of information that we see in every negotiation. Behind each great book lies a negotiation. Behind each negotiation, lies a book; a book lies.

