

LITERACY AND BOOK OWNERSHIP IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY FAVERSHAM

LINDA TAYLOR

In 1977 Cressy stated that the only type of literacy ‘directly measurable’ is the ‘ability or inability to write a signature’. Whilst accepting that this is not an entirely satisfactory criterion, he recommended it as a ‘fruitful starting place’.¹ Writing seventeen years later, he conceded that quantitative data relating to measurable levels of attainment ‘tell only part of the story’ and that qualitative issues need also to be addressed in order to make sense of the ‘social and cultural significance of literacy in early modern England’.² The titles of the two articles also indicate a shift in approach developed over time with the first referring to ‘illiteracy’, lack of ability, and the second to ‘literacy’, evidence of ability. By contrast, Spufford argued that, if literacy is predicated on the only quantifiable skill of being able to sign, then the possibility is lost of discovering the range of people who had developed the more ‘socially diffused’ skill of reading.³ That is to say, the distinction between literacy and illiteracy was not defined by a finite line but rather represented points along a journey or spectrum of literacy.

In the Tudor and Stuart period reading and writing were seen as discrete skills with the teaching of reading taking place approximately three or four years before the child moved on to develop writing skills. By the age of seven many children, who had been fortunate enough to have received some elementary education, were required to work to supplement the family income, thus precluding the opportunity to proceed to written work. However, despite the lack of writing skills, the ability to read would remain.⁴

The market town and port of Faversham was fortunate in having a Free Grammar School, re-founded in 1576 by charter in the reign of Elizabeth I. However, whilst the school brought prestige to the town, it is unlikely that it had any great bearing on the overall literacy pertaining as, between 1647-1717, no more than 26 pupils and often as few as 14 pupils were recorded at any time.⁵ Also, the ability to read and write was a prerequisite

to entry. Therefore, further education provision within the town needs to be examined when assessing access to literacy.

During the period 1581-1699, a total of 32 diocese licences was granted to Faversham schoolteachers. Of these 9 related to the position of master or assistant master of the Grammar School leaving 23 others teaching elsewhere in the town.⁶ On this evidence, it is thought that Faversham had five or six private schools at any given time during the seventeenth century and was well served when compared with other towns within the county.⁷

Based solely on subscriptional literacy, i.e. the ability to provide a written signature, it is estimated that by 1642 there were one million readers in England. In that year it is known that approximately 4,000 works were printed in English. Therefore, with an average print run of 1,000 for each work, these figures have been extrapolated to produce an average of four books purchased for every literate man. Or, considering the known higher literacy rate in London, ten books for every Londoner and just under two books for every three literate inhabitants across the rest of Britain.⁸ However, in view of Faversham's trading connections with London (see below), it is probable that book ownership in the town was higher than the national average calculated by Raymond.

In the early part of the seventeenth century access to books was limited although every parish church was expected to have a small collection of books including the Bible, the Common Prayer Book, and Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*. Unfortunately, in reality this was not always the case as often 'incumbents and wealthy parishioners purloined them'. Parish libraries generally did not thrive until the last part of the century and therefore the most usual way to have access to a book was to own it.⁹ However, the more important townspeople of Faversham probably had use of the burgeoning contents of the Grammar School library. Founded in 1613 with a donation of 48 books by the will of William Rawleigh, Master of the School from 1605 to 1613, the library continued to flourish throughout the century with regular donations from leading townspeople and others.¹⁰ Furthermore, sums of money were granted by the town council for additions to the library collection as noted in the Wardmote minutes in 1668.¹¹

Clark states that, whilst not on the scale of the vast collection of Sir Edward Dering, Member of Parliament for Hythe, 'evidence would suggest that almost every county landowner of note [in Kent] had several shelves of books at home'.¹² For townspeople, however, the evidence is less easy to establish but, by examining the probate inventories of personal goods written shortly after the decease of the owner, a picture of book ownership across the town begins to emerge. To this end, all existing paper inventories for Faversham Parish for the years 1640-1649; 1660-1669; 1670-1679 and 1690-1699 have been examined. Paper inventories have been chosen in preference to the inventories engrossed into the official

registers as the former provide examples of local handwriting, signatures and subsequent literacy. Inventories from earlier decades of the century have not been included in the sample as these are covered by Clark in *The Ownership of Books in England, 1560-1640*, in which he covers the towns of Canterbury, Faversham and Maidstone. Clark's results have been used, where appropriate, as comparison to the later Faversham data. Unfortunately, no Faversham paper inventories remain for 1650-1659. Inventories for 1690-1699 have been included in the sample to provide a contrast as the town emerged from the religious and political turbulences of the Stuart era. Whilst a total of 512 inventories have been examined, it must be borne in mind that these are socially selective and represent only those households which had possessions to leave.

TABLE 1. PERCENTAGE OF FAVERSHAM INVENTORIES RECORDING BOOK OWNERSHIP

	1640s	1660s	1670s	1690s
Percentage	27	22	18	13
(Sample size)	(106)	(157)	(134)	(115)

From **Table 1** it can be seen that the incidence of book ownership was declining across the decades with a marked decrease in the 1690s. This decline is further emphasised when compared with Clark's results for 1600-1640 which indicate a 49 per cent average incidence of book ownership across the first four decades of the century.¹³ However, the total sample used by Clark for each decade was considerably smaller and this may contribute towards the marked difference between the earlier decades and post 1640 ownership percentages. A further reason for the decline in recorded book ownership in the inventories may have been affected by the abundance of printed material available from the 1640s onwards and associated ubiquity deeming them not worthy of note.

Possession of a book does not inevitably mean that it was read; it might have been inherited by a non-reader. The high incidence of female ownership in **Table 2** may be due to this factor as 93 of the 97 females were widows and the books in the house, which were of no interest to others, were probably simply passed on to the widow after the death of the husband. Only four spinsters or virgins are included, of whom only one left books. Clark's results for female ownership are an amalgam of the three towns studied and are listed by inventorial wealth so are difficult to compare with the later Faversham results. However, they average 39 per cent ownership across the early decades and, when compared with the Faversham post 1640 sample, echo the same starting point for decline from 1640.¹⁴

TABLE 2. INCIDENCE OF BOOK OWNERSHIP IN FAVERSHAM BY GENDER (PER CENT)

1640s		1660s		1670s		1690s	
Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
25	37	21	24	18	18	11	23
(87)	(19)	(123)	(34)	(112)	(22)	(93)	(22)

Note. Sample size numbers in parentheses.

Establishing female book ownership, and consequent reading ability, can be problematic as, during marriage, all women's books were owned by their husbands. This does not mean that women did not have access to their husbands' books. Indeed, when Thomas Mendfield, governor of the Free Grammar School and twice Mayor of Faversham, died in 1614 he donated his books to the school library 'except such English books as his wife should please to use'.¹⁵

Undoubtedly, the incidence of book ownership is under-represented in the inventories. Book values varied with some worth no more than pence. This could easily have led to a significant number of cheaper ones being included in the catch-all phrase 'some lumber and other things'. The inventories examined were, in the most part, appraised by at least two persons. The status of the appraiser is not constant across the sample with some being family members whilst others appear to be leading townsmen who appraise on more than one occasion. No fewer than 47 appraisers were involved with the 106 inventories for 1640-1649. This must have led to a disparity in standard of assessment with some appraisers itemising each book carefully whilst others simply listed 'some bookes'.

The small number of named books, as indicated in **Table 3**, affords little insight into what the townspeople were reading; particularly in view of the lack of secular titles. Inevitably, the Bible features largely and,

TABLE 3. INDIVIDUALLY NAMED BOOKS

1640s	25 Bibles including two Great Bibles; one sermon book, one Testament; 'books for scholars'; <i>A History of the Romans</i> ; <i>An Abridgement of Statutes at Large</i> by Justice Rastall
1660s	27 Bibles including two Great Bibles; French books; one sermon book
1670s	15 Bibles including one Great Bible; one prayer book; 'certaine lawe books'
1690s	14 Bibles

when only one book is listed, the Bible is the named book in nine cases out of ten. The contents of the four collections listed as libraries were not individually itemised, but would probably have contained both religious and secular works. Clark questioned the absence of ‘occupation books, histories, ballads and almanacs’ and suggested that they may ‘lie hidden among partial library lists’.¹⁶ Indeed, such descriptions as a ‘parcell of bokes’, ‘certaine bookes’, and ‘other bookes’, in all likelihood, contained some of the more popular secular titles of the day but no evidence of this remains. However, even during the last four decades of the century ‘divinity accounted for 30 per cent of all (published) titles and 42 per cent of new titles’.¹⁷

The lack of named educational material, such as ABCs is not surprising as such books were generally very inexpensive and would not necessarily be deemed worthy of individual note. One inventory mentions such material and provides an interesting insight into the possible education of young girls. John Wood, who died in 1640, left ‘Some Bokes for Schollers’ to the value of 3s. 4d.¹⁸ John’s wife, Zutphania, had died in childbirth five years earlier and ‘left issue one only daughter, named Zutphania’.¹⁹ There is no indication from his inventory that John was engaged in teaching. In all probability he had been involved in the jewellery trade as the inventory lists a large collection of jewellery and one of the appraisers was John Elliot, ‘Citizen of London & Goldsmythe’. Therefore, it could be assumed that the books were for the education of his daughter. This supposition is strengthened by examination of John Wood’s will in which he appoints his brother Stephen Hylward, gent, and Boys Owre, gent, as guardians to Zutphania. The will mentions her education and schooling on three occasions with a generous allowance of £30 per annum for education and clothing up to the age of ten followed by an increased amount of £40 per annum up to the age of eighteen or her marriage.²⁰ John Wood’s other books included the work by Rastell concerning the law and ‘Divers Sundry other bookes’ to the value of £4.

The other named book which warrants further exploration is *The History of the Romans* owned by Henry Wreight, woollen draper. Wreight left an inventorial wealth of £1,000 11s. 8d., and this substantial book, containing 486 pages in the 1658 edition,²¹ together with his two Bibles, other books and maps of London, Venice and Faversham, indicate that he was a cultured and probably well travelled man.²²

The French books were owned by John Sack (LeSecq?), flaxman, who was likely part of the Huguenot community in Faversham at this time. No books in English were included in his inventory.²³ His will was nuncupative so there is no record as to whether he was able to sign his name.²⁴

It is difficult to quantify the value of individual books expressed as multiple units in the sample. Study of the inventories show that the value

of books varied with a Bible averaging around 3-4*s.* in the 1640s whilst the 1690s valuation was as low as 2*s.* or even 1*s.* 6*d.* However, Bibles were generally at the more expensive end of the book range. Therefore, in 1640 a plural amount of 'bookes' with a value of £2 10*s.* 6*d.*, and without specific reference to the inclusion of a Bible, may have represented a significant collection. In 1623 Sir Edward Dering purchased a total of 41 books for almost £4.²⁵ This equates to an average price of less than 2*s.* per book. Four decades later, in 1664, Charles Tyus, a London chapbook publisher, left 90,000 small books 'almost all priced under 6*d.*, with two-thirds priced under 4*d.*'.²⁶ In both cases the books referred to would have been stitched but unbound with subsequent binding, if considered appropriate, adding value to the item.

Although the trend was for books to become more expensive in the closing decades of the century, this did not apply to Bibles with the London Bible Partners operating from Oxford in open competition with the King's Printers. Due to the rivalry prices dipped dramatically with the price of folio or Great Bibles dropping to £1 10*s.* and small or octavo Bibles selling for as little as 2*s.* 8*d.*²⁷

The inventories present another problem when ascertaining book value. On many occasions the books are included in a total figure for a group of items. For the purpose of this survey, the value of each individual item in the group has been calculated by comparison with other inventories and thus the value of the book or books has been assessed. Notwithstanding these problems, **Table 4** indicates that there were some considerable book collections in Faversham during the seventeenth century.

TABLE 4. BOOK COLLECTION VALUE*

	1640s	1660s	1670s	1690s	Total
£20-£50		1	1		2
£10-£19	1	1	1		3
£5-£9			1		1
£2 10 <i>s.</i> -£4	4	2	5		11
£1-£2 9 <i>s.</i>	3	6	3		12
10-19 <i>s.</i>	5	9	6	3	23
5-9 <i>s.</i>	7	5	4	6	22
<5 <i>s.</i>	9	10	3	6	28

*The term book collection is used even if the inventory lists only one book.

In his survey of the three towns, Clark found that 'there was no precise or straightforward relationship between wealth and book ownership',²⁸ and the same conclusion can be reached for the later decades in

Faversham. Of the four wealthiest inhabitants, as indicated by inventory value, only William Knight, grocer, had a collection of any substance. His shop contents included cards, tape, laces, combs and thread together with the usual victuals. In addition, items stored about the house, such as the soap, salt, butter, cheese and tobacco in the cellar, appear also to be part of his stock. The same might apply to the books located in the 'further Chamber' together with paper, more tobacco and boxes of other things,²⁹ thus providing an example of a retail outlet for books in Faversham.

At the other extreme, Nicholas Wright left no more than four small items of furniture and a pair of sheets with a total inventory value of £14 13s. However, he did have 'seaven Bokes'.³⁰ With an even lower total inventorial wealth of £4 4s. 6d., John Halle left only his clothes and ready money besides his '3 bookes'.³¹ With such a small amount of material wealth, it is plausible that both were servants who had previously had the earlier opportunity of some elementary education and, if so, supports Spufford's contention that reading skills, 'which unfortunately by their nature are not capable of measurement' was not simply the preserve of the middling sort and gentry.³²

In the cases of significant book collections, it is interesting to probe further to find out what happened to the books after the death of the owner. John Dyer's collection of books valued at £2 8s. 0d. is referred to as 'his library' in his will written in his own hand. His son, John, had not been heard of for some time at sea and, therefore, John's 'deske whereon I used to write' and 'all my library or books whatsoever' were left to his grandson, Robert, together with his 'Coate of armes with mantle and crest which hangeth in a frame'.³³ Thus, the significance of family continuity and the importance of passing on one's education and culture to the next generation is emphasised.

Conversely, John Upton's substantial library, worth £40, located in his study does not even get a mention in his will.³⁴ Similarly, there is no reference in Thomas Southouse's will to his impressive library valued at £50 (Fig. 1).³⁵ However, his son, Filmer, who continued his father's research into the history of the town and whose notes were used in Edward Jacob's *History of Faversham* left his books to the Free Grammar School Library in 1708 and this could well have included his father's books.³⁶ Of the twelve inventories containing a substantial quantity of books for which associated wills exist, only John Dyer, mentioned above, specified a destination for his books. The question remains as to whether the books were merely included in a collection of items such as 'all my implements and household stufte within my house wherein I now dwell' as willed by John Trowts to his wife,³⁷ or whether books were seen as items that could be distributed amongst friends and relatives without any specific instruction.

Appraisers often listed books in a group at the end of the inventory

	280.
Inventory His runs and ready money -	16:00-00
From His wearing apparel Linen & woollen	06-00-00
From In Debt - - - - -	12-05-00
From His Library of Books. - - - - -	50-00-00
In y ^e Hall	
From Three Spanish tables four other Chairs } 01-14-00	
Two green Chairs repair of Arm chairs & Bedsteads.	

Fig. 1 Inventory of Thomas Southouse (PRC 11/40/279 - 1676).

so it is not always possible to pinpoint a location. Clark suggests that this probably indicated the 'book's mobility about the home'.³⁸ Indeed, James Oxinden, cleric, kept books in his study and also about the house indicating that his books were used items and not just for show in the glass case.³⁹ At the other extreme, the Great Bibles listed were almost certainly kept in one place either on a stand or shelf as in the case of Robert Hayes whose Great Bible was kept in the 'Great Chamber' together with his coat of arms.⁴⁰ Location can denote some level of personal value placed upon the books and, hence, those kept in the garret and cellar do not, on the face of it, appear to be highly prized.

Table 5 also indicates a trend with books moving away from public display in the hall to more private use in the chamber or the parlour. The kitchen does not initially appear to be a relevant location other than, perhaps, for books on food preparation. However, John Greenham, a wealthy yeoman, left a total inventorial wealth of £1,339 4s. 1d. The only book listed was a Bible worth 8s. and, therefore, a Great or Folio Bible.⁴¹ This was kept in the kitchen and was, doubtless, used for regular Bible readings to the whole household including servants.

TABLE 5. LOCATION OF BOOKS AT THE TIME OF THE INVENTORY

	Hall	Chamber	Parlour	Kitchen	Study	Closet	Other
1640s	12	2	1	2	1		Buttery; garret
1660s	11	3	2	3	2	2	
1670s	2	2	3	3	1	1	Cellar
1690s	5	5	2				Fire[-place] room
Total	30	12	8	8	4	3	4

Only 249 out of the total of 512 inventories specified the occupation of the deceased. Consequently, statistical analysis regarding occupational groups within the whole sample is not possible; a problem also encountered by Clark. Clark identified book ownership amongst the gentry as averaging 57 per cent during the years 1600-1639, whilst the above data shows a slightly higher ownership percentage of 60 per cent, or 61 per cent if the jurats are included in this group. On the other hand, the distributive trades with only 42 per cent ownership in **Table 6** show a decrease when compared with the average of 53 per cent for the earlier decades. However, it is when considering the non-yeoman status agricultural workers that the greatest increase can be seen with nil ownership of books prior to 1640 (as found by Clark) rising to 43 per cent over the second half of the century. Despite the smallness of the sample size, this has to be seen as considerable step forward in the importance of books to this occupational

TABLE 6. ANALYSIS OF BOOK OWNERSHIP BY OCCUPATION 1640-1700

Category	Total listed	With books	%
Gentry	35	21	60
Jurats*	6	4	67
Church and clerical	2	1	50
Husbandmen, fruiterer and marsher	7	3	43
Distributive trades – grocers, butchers, woollen drapers	19	8	42
Yeomen	13	4	31
Skilled trades – currier, flaxman, bricklayer, cordwainer, tailor, weaver, shipwright, carpenter, blacksmith	52	15	29
Maritime trades – sailors, seamen, hoymen, dredgers and fishermen	31	8	26
Innholders, victuallers and beer brewers	18	2	11

*Town councillor and usually leading tradesman or gentry.

group.⁴² Invariably anomalies arise. John Phillips, vicar of Faversham, died in 1640 and his inventory did not include a single book.⁴³ Whether he had made provision to donate his books before he died is not known but it is inconceivable that he did not own any, particularly as he was the author of two published volumes.

The paper inventories are a source of information about the literacy levels of the appraisers as they were required to leave a signature or a mark under the sum total. These indicate a very high level of subscriptional literacy with 93 per cent of the appraisers – 129 names in total – able to sign their names. A further six appraisers were able to form at least one initial and only three simply left their mark. This high literacy level is unsurprising as the appraisers were often drawn from the town's elite and were either jurats or past mayors and, in many cases, had also been appointed as executor by the deceased. Members of the Knowler family acted as appraisers on 14 occasions across the sample survey. Brothers John and Thomas, together with John's son, Robert, had each been mayor on two occasions.⁴⁴ Furthermore, many of the inventories were written in the hand of one of the appraisers. However, this was not always the case. In 1670 Robert Greenaway, who was only able to leave the mark of a cross, was the only appraiser for John Downe's inventory.⁴⁵ There are only two female appraisers in the sample and both occur during the last decade of the century. John Tucker, yeoman, left three Bibles and other

books. His wife, Mary, signed with a clear outline of the letter M.⁴⁶ As there were books in the house, it is not inconceivable that she also had probably been able to read. The inventory of widow Margaret Gorley, haberdasher, was signed in full by Ann Wilmott in a confident hand and, therefore, an indication of someone with full active literacy.

In order to construct a more representative examination of the literacy spectrum in Faversham during the second half of the seventeenth century, the parish overseers' accounts relating to the Poor Law apprenticeships for 1640-1690 have been analysed. Such apprenticeships were often seen as a way of avoiding the parish's responsibility for poor children with scant attention to the value of the training provided. In many cases the apprenticeships were made with masters from outside the parish thus removing any possible future liability. However, in Faversham, this does not appear to have been the case and the trades listed in the accounts not only reflect the activities of the town at this time, they also provide evidence of subscriptional literacy across a wide range of occupations. Of the 88 individual apprenticeship entries examined, 51 per cent of masters were able to sign their name in full, a further 23 per cent could produce at least one initial and 26 per cent left only a mark.⁴⁷ It is probable that the ability to leave at least one initial is an indication of some literacy skills, albeit modest. Without question, more people could read than could sign their names and a ratio of 3:2 has been suggested.⁴⁸ Therefore, with a total of 74 per cent of apprenticeship masters situated somewhere along the literacy spectrum, a picture emerges of a fairly literate community amongst not only the gentry but also agricultural workers, artisans and trades people.

Inventories can only produce a partial picture of book ownership and the associated ability to read. Many books were frequently not listed either individually or as a group. Popular chap books, ballads, broadsheets and almanacs were regarded as ephemera and 'if they had not perished as lavatory paper, or stops for mustard pots, were never considered worth listing'.⁴⁹ Notwithstanding this, the quantitative data obtained from the inventories provides a basis from which to seek out further confirmation of a literate society.

With the centre of the book and print trade in London, it is worth investigating how Faversham accessed this market. Wealthier inhabitants were able to visit the booksellers in St Paul's Churchyard or on London Bridge to buy their books but most people had to settle for local supplies. Initially, there was great reliance on London booksellers bringing their merchandise to the two annual fairs. However, over time other opportunities arose. Although there were no dedicated booksellers in Faversham until the end of the seventeenth century, this was not the case with nearby Canterbury which had a brisk book trade supporting at least two booksellers.⁵⁰ It is probable that the books arrived from London via Faversham on one of the many returning hoys and were then transported by cart to Canterbury.⁵¹

Attempts in 1637 to regulate the book trade by the Star Chamber and to limit retail possibilities only to those shopkeepers who had previously served an apprenticeship to a London stationer did not succeed and it was common for ordinary town shopkeepers to maintain a stock of basic texts for children and adults, as in the case of William Knight, grocer, mentioned above.⁵² Such opportunities meant that some of the print supplies arriving in the port of Faversham remained within the town.

There is evidence that Faversham had also become a distribution point for books and stationers' wares. John Noy's inventory dated 1679, apart from the regular household items, listed haberdashery items such as ribbons, lace, hoods and scarves, together with remnants of various types of cloth, thirty-six small 'lookinge glasses, a parcel of toys and small wares'. Amongst these, was listed 'a parcel of books and stationers ware'. However, it is the final lines in John Noy's inventory referring to hampers, two 'sadles one pillion and pillion cloth bridle and wantey [rope used to fasten a pack saddle]',⁵³ that indicate he was a chapman and probably served the rural parishes within the wider Faversham Hundred or further afield.

One London bookseller linked with Faversham in the second half of the century was Thomas Passinger, who regularly attended Faversham Fairs,⁵⁴ and traded at the sign of the Three Bibles on the middle of London Bridge. He married, Sarah, the widow of Charles Tyus, and took over Tyus's business in 1664. According to Raven, London Bridge booksellers specialised in the cheaper end of the market such as chapbooks, primers, hornbooks, ballads and packs of cards.⁵⁵ Under Passinger's stewardship, the shop's output, whilst continuing to cater for the more frivolous end of the market, also dealt with more serious subjects. Thomas Southouse's *Monasticon Favershamiense* was printed for Passinger and John Gadbury's *Thesaurus astrologiae*, was not only printed for Passinger in 1674, a copy was also donated by Passinger to the Free Grammar School library.⁵⁶ His association and obvious interest in the town indicates that Passinger was one of the leading book suppliers to Faversham. As such, examination of his range of printed titles would provide a plausible indication of what people in Faversham had the opportunity to read.

In conclusion, seventeenth-century Faversham was a fairly literate society with 74 per cent of those masters taking on apprentices featuring somewhere along the literacy spectrum. Book ownership, as revealed from the inventories, was not insubstantial with several townspeople having considerable collections. The town not only had access to, it also participated in, the book market. Furthermore, it was well served educationally with a grammar school and five or six other schools providing elementary education, together with one of the earliest school libraries in the county.

In stark contrast, the residents of the village of Hernhill, just three miles away, had no such advantages. In a collection of assorted papers relating to the Kent Quarter Sessions, dated to the early seventeenth century, Hernhill petitioned the judge regarding the excessive number of ‘widdows and fatherless children’ within the parish and asked for them to be relieved elsewhere. It was written and signed by the vicar. However, of the remaining nine named petitioners, eight were unable to sign or even leave an initial including the office holders (two churchwardens and two overseers).⁵⁷ Whilst geographically close, so great is the disparity in the development of literacy between the town and village that it throws into question the validity of using blanket percentages when relating to a nation’s literacy level.

Degrees of literacy in past times are difficult to gauge even where there is a significant volume of evidence from different sources available for analysis, as in the case of Faversham. As this paper shows, it is also necessary to examine the broader picture of the town’s economy, its social structure and the provision of schooling to ascertain its literacy needs and uses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Primary Sources

- CCA-U3/146/14 Faversham Parish Overseers’ Accounts.
 CKS- Fa/AC4 Faversham Wardmote Book 1633-1750.
 CKS-QM/SB/1366 Documents relating to jury list for Faversham Hundred [early seventeenth century].
 CKS PRC 11/2-41 and 54-61 – Faversham Inventories.
 CKS PRC 26 and 32-33 – Faversham Inventories.
 CKS PRC 17/71-78 – Faversham Wills.
 CKS PRC 32/42 and 54 – Faversham Wills.

Printed Primary Sources

- Florus Lucius, 1658, *The History of the Romans. Done into English; corrected, amended and with annotations illustrated by M. Causabon, D.D.* (London).
 Southouse, T., 1671, *Monasticon Favershamiense* (London).
Secondary Sources
 Clark, P. and Slack, P., 1976, *English Towns in Transition 1500-1700*, London: OUP.
 Clark, P., 1976, ‘The Ownership of Books in England, 1560-1640: the Example of Some Kentish Townsfolk’, in Stone, L. (ed.), *Schooling and Society*, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 95-111.
 Cressy, D., 2003, *Society and Culture in Early Modern England*, Aldershot, Ashgate Variorum.

- Giraud, F.G., 1865, *A Catalogue of the Books preserved in the Library of the Free Grammar School, Faversham*, James Higham.
- Jacob, E., 1774, *The History of the Town and Port of Faversham, in the County of Kent*, London.
- Munden, A.F., 1970, *Eight Centuries of Education in Faversham*, Faversham, The Faversham Society.
- Plomer, H.R., 1922, *A dictionary of the printers and booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland, 1668-1725*, OUP.
- Raymond, J., 2003, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern England*, CUP.
- Raven, J., 2007, *The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade 1480-1850*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press.
- Spufford, M., 1979, 'First Steps in Literacy: the Reading and Writing Experience of the Humblest Seventeenth Century Spiritual Autobiographers', *Social History*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (October), pp. 407-435.
- Watt, T., 1991, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640*, CUP.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ D. Cressy, 'Illiteracy in England, 1530-1730' in *Society and Culture in Early Modern England*, p. 2.
- ² D. Cressy, 'Literacy in context: meaning and measurement in early modern England', in *Society and Culture in early Modern England*, p. 1.
- ³ M. Spufford, p. 434.
- ⁴ M. Spufford, pp. 408-409.
- ⁵ A. Munden, Education in Faversham, p. 21.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 126-128.
- ⁷ P. Clark and P. Slack, 1976, p. 153; *pers. comm.*, P. Clark 27-28 May 2012.
- ⁸ J. Raymond, 2003, pp. 90-91.
- ⁹ P. Clark, 1976, p. 96.
- ¹⁰ F.G. Giraud, 1865.
- ¹¹ CKS-Fa/AC4 f.162v.
- ¹² P. Clark, 1976, p. 97.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 99.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 100.
- ¹⁵ F.G. Giraud, 1865, p. 5.
- ¹⁶ P. Clark, 1976, p. 103.
- ¹⁷ J. Raven, 2007, *The Business of Books*, p. 92.
- ¹⁸ PRC 11/6/181 1640.
- ¹⁹ Grave stone in south aisle of nave of Faversham Parish Church.
- ²⁰ PRC 16/23 – 1640.
- ²¹ Lucius Florus, *The History of the Romans. Done into English; corrected, amended and with annotations illustrated by M. Causabon, D.D.*
- ²² PRC 11/15/191 – 1647.
- ²³ PRC 11/31/217 – 1669.
- ²⁴ PRC 16/283 – 1669.
- ²⁵ P. Clark, p. 97.

- ²⁶ J. Raven, p. 93.
²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 92.
²⁸ P. Clark, p. 100.
²⁹ PRC 11/37/159 – 1674.
³⁰ PRC 11/6/90 – 1640.
³¹ PRC 11/4/6 – 1640.
³² M. Spufford, p. 414.
³³ PRC 17/22/139 – 1665.
³⁴ PRC 17/72/195 – 1663.
³⁵ PRC 16/318 – 1676.
³⁶ E. Jacob, 1774, p. x.
³⁷ PRC 31/144 – 1675.
³⁸ P. Clark, 1976, p. 103.
³⁹ PRC 11/1761 – 1660.
⁴⁰ PRC 11/41/82 – 1669.
⁴¹ PRC 11/9/83 – 1642.
⁴² P. Clark, 1976, p. 101.
⁴³ PRC 11/7/115 – 1640.
⁴⁴ E. Jacob, 1774, pp. 123-126.
⁴⁵ PRC 11/32/88 – 1670.
⁴⁶ PRC 11/60/97 – 1697.
⁴⁷ CCA U3/146/14 Overseers' Accounts.
⁴⁸ R.S. Schofield, 'The Measurement of Literacy in Pre-Industrial England', in J. Goody (ed.) *Literacy in Traditional Societies*, p. 324.
⁴⁹ T. Watt, 1991, pp. 260-261.
⁵⁰ H.R. Plomer, 1922, p. 325.
⁵¹ J. Raven, 2007, p. 61.
⁵² PRC 11/37/159 – 1674.
⁵³ PRC 11/46/61 – 1679.
⁵⁴ F.G. Giraud, 1865, p. 6.
⁵⁵ J. Raven, 2007, p. 84.
⁵⁶ F.G. Giraud, 1865, p. 26.
⁵⁷ QM/SB/1366.

LINDA TAYLOR