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Abstract

This article examines for the first time the accounts for the newspaper the *London Gazette* from May 1695 to February 1697. These accounts show that the *Gazette*’s circulation in this period was spectacular. I argue that this does not simply represent the triumph of print; the *Gazette* was produced and consumed within the wider context of the exchange and evaluation of manuscript and oral news. Moreover, the *Gazette* does not easily fit the categories employed in some current scholarly debates about seventeenth-century print culture. It was read as much for its foreign political news as for its domestic announcements, it had an afterlife as a journal of record and although profitable in this period it was not simply a commercial enterprise. Furthermore, it had various companion publications: a French translation and various occasional sheets. In many and diverse ways the *London Gazette* was ‘the most universal Intelligencers’.
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The *London Gazette* was established in 1665 and was published twice weekly, and for three years from June 1709 thrice weekly, from the office of the Secretaries of State. Described by modern scholars as a ‘governmental bulletin’ and the ‘official voice of the government’, copies were sold by hawkers and by subscription, and hundreds were given away to government officials and correspondents.[[1]](#footnote-1) This was both an ‘in-house’ publication and a paper for a wider readership. Most issues were a double-sided folio half-sheet divided into two columns, which covered foreign news, shipping news, notices from various government departments and advertisements. Although other periodicals were established in the late seventeenth century, like the *Philosophical Transactions* and the *Account of the* *Proceedings … in the Old-Baily*,the *Gazette* was until 1695, except for the years 1679-1684, the principal printed British newspaper.[[2]](#footnote-2)

In July 1693 John Houghton described his own eclectic serial, *A Collection for Improvement of Husbandry and Trade*, as the *London Gazette*’s ‘first Hand maid’. For Houghton the *Gazette* was the premier newspaper for he was ‘inform’d that seven or eight thousand Gazettes are each time Printed, which makes them the most universal Intelligencers’.[[3]](#footnote-3) Aside from Houghton’s estimate we know very little about the size of the *Gazette*’s circulation in the late seventeenth century as until now discussions have been based on records for two issues in 1666, accounts for a few quarters in 1679-1681 and for a long run from the years 1705-7, as well as some later tax records and accounts. Scholars have tried to join the dots between these scattered figures and, in particular, to understand the impact of the lapsing of the Licensing Act in 1695 on the *Gazette*. This article presents for the first time the *London* *Gazette*’s accounts for 184 issues from May 1695 until February 1697.[[4]](#footnote-4) These accounts cover a longer period than any previously discussed by modern scholars and include the print run, the number of issues sold, given away and unsold for every issue as well as the quarterly reckonings which allow us to see the profits of the *Gazette*. The accounts for the French translation of the *Gazette*, the *Gazette de Londres*, will also be discussed briefly.

I set out to do four things in this article. In the first section I situate these circulation figures within the longer chronological context of what we know about the circulation of the *Gazette* from its beginning in 1665 to around 1720, and also more specifically alongside the lapsing of the Licensing Act in 1695. In the second section I reflect on how the *London Gazette* fitted into the international networks of oral, manuscript and printed news exchange by looking at how it was made and how it was read. Recent work on print culture demands that we look carefully at both what sort of publication the *Gazette* was, as I do in the third section where I explore its companion publications, and at the commercial nature of the *Gazette*, as I do in the fourth section. While the *Gazette*’s circulation in the mid-1690s was spectacular I argue that this does not simply represent the triumph of print because the *Gazette* was produced and consumed within the wider context of the exchange and evaluation of manuscript and oral news.

**The circulation of the *London* *Gazette***

For the period 1666-1721 we can piece together a fragmented picture of the *Gazette*’s print run and circulation from existing scholarship. The print runs for two consecutive issues in October 1666 are estimated to be around 13-15,000 for each issue.[[5]](#footnote-5) Quarterly accounts between September 1678 and July 1681 suggest average sales of each issue ranged from just over 4,000 to just under 7,000.[[6]](#footnote-6) Print runs for individual issues from November 1705 to September 1707 ranged from 9,500 to 15,250 and each issue sold between 6,981 and 11,939 copies but mostly in the 7-9,000 bracket with 950 copies of each issue given away.[[7]](#footnote-7) Six issues in June 1710 had individual print runs of either 8,250 or 8,500 and sales between 5,287 and 5,530, while 1,087 copies of each issue given away.[[8]](#footnote-8) Stamp duty records from after August 1712 suggest an average circulation of 3,500 copies for each issue (with longer issues perhaps having a circulation of around 2,400-3,000 and the shorter issues a circulation of around 4,800 issues).[[9]](#footnote-9) By 1713 the circulation of the *Gazette* was probably 2,400 copies per issue.[[10]](#footnote-10) Accounts of the *Gazette* for April 1717 to September 1719 suggest an average circulation of under 2,000 for each issue and considerably closer to 1,000 for the early months, and an account for one week in February 1721 suggests a similar circulation.[[11]](#footnote-11)

This then is the broader picture of the *Gazette*’s circulation across its first six decades. This article focuses on the *Gazette* accounts from the middle of this period, from issue 3075 (29 April-2 May 1695) to issue 3258 (28 January-1 February 1697).[[12]](#footnote-12) These accounts record the number of copies printed, sold, unsold and given away for every issue. The costs of paper, printing and publishing and the sales revenue were also recorded and reckoned up quarterly; I will discuss these quarterly reckonings and the accompanying *Gazette de Londres* recordslater. The accounts were drawn up by the *Gazette*’s printer Edward Jones and are among the Trumbull papers in the British Library.[[13]](#footnote-13) William Trumbull (1639-1716) was Secretary of State for the Northern Department from 3 May 1695 until 1 December 1697 and in this role he was entitled to half the *Gazette* profits.[[14]](#footnote-14)

Figure 1 shows the print run, the sold and unsold copies as well as the copies given away for May 1695-February 1697 and captures an overall downward trend in the print run and sales. The highest figures were in the summer months of 1695 when the news was coming thick and fast from the King’s Camp outside the beseiged Namur and from other hot spots in the Nine Years War. The course of the war may partly explain the rising and falling sales figures across these years. By any measure the largest print run in the 1695-7 period – 22,750 for issue 3100 (25-29 July 1695) – is impressive. As a printing enterprise this was a significant undertaking requiring multiple settings and press teams working at night.[[15]](#footnote-15) Edward Jones had taken over printing the *Gazette* in July 1688 from Thomas Newcombe Jr and printed it at the Savoy until his death in 1706.[[16]](#footnote-16) As Jones had been managing Newcomb’s print house since around the mid-1680s he was most likely already experienced at printing the *Gazette*.[[17]](#footnote-17) Although Jones probably did not have an interest in the King’s Printing Office patent he was involved in printing documents commissioned by the monarch and parliament: in December 1688 he printed the declaration of support for William by various Lords, in 1690 he printed royal proclamations in Dublin and later he printed a parliamentary report, a House of Lords trial and the Votes of the *House of Commons* among other publications.[[18]](#footnote-18)

Even the lowest print run in these accounts – 9,000 for issues at the end of 1696 and beginning of 1697 – was substantially higher than Houghton’s mid-1693 estimate. Across 1695-7 the average print run was almost 13,000 compared to just over 10,600 for 1705-1707.[[19]](#footnote-19) These averages hide peaks and troughs and are calculated for arbitrary periods but they do capture the contrast between these two runs which Figure 2 shows. Sales figures for 1695-1697 peaked at 18,162, dropped to 6,550 and averaged 9,951 which was well above the average of 7,637 for 1705-1707.[[20]](#footnote-20) From May 1695 until February 1697 900 copies of each issue (except for the first) were given away; in 1705-7 950 copies and in June 1710 1,087 copies were given away.[[21]](#footnote-21) The circulation, calculated as the sales plus giveaways, peaked at 19,062 and dropped to 9,900 and averaged 13,846 across 1695-7. In general, circulation information is scarce and so to get a sense of the magnitude of these figures comparisons have to be drawn from a range of genres across a long period: in the initial weeks following the introduction of the 1712 stamp tax up to 78,000 copies of stamped newspapers, including dailies, were produced each week; in the early 1730sthe *Craftsman* probably had a print run of 10,000.[[22]](#footnote-22) As for non-periodical publications, Henry Sacheverell’s sermon was the best-selling publication of the early eighteenth century with 1710 sales totalling almost 100,000; the most popular early modern almanac sold 50,000 copies in its peak year of 1669.[[23]](#footnote-23) The circulation of the *Gazette* in the 1695-7 period then outstrips any known newspaper or periodical circulation, and still looks very impressive alongside the period’s best-selling books and was, moreover, sustained over a long period. Out of the 184 *Gazette* issues in this run, 118 had a circulation of over 10,000 and 9 issues had a circulation of over 15,000. In the year beginning May 1695 more than one and a half million copies of the *Gazette* were sold or given away. This is a colossal circulation.

For each issue far more *Gazettes* were printed than were sold and given away. On average just over 16% of each print run was left unsold in 1695-7 (compared to around 19% for 1705-7, and around 14% for 1717-19).[[24]](#footnote-24) Snyder was puzzled by this overprinting.[[25]](#footnote-25) While the print run in 1695-7 was adjusted almost from issue to issue (it remained the same for at most four consecutive issues) the proportion left unsold remained relatively constant, although it did drop to 8% and rose to 25%. Printers had earlier been unwilling to bear the costs of unsold copies themselves and the Secretaries of State paid for printing the whole run.[[26]](#footnote-26) While there may have been a modest market for back issues, the majority, if not all, of these unsold copies were probably sold as waste paper; by 1717, when the *Gazette* accounts were arranged differently, unsold copies were not recorded but income from waste paper was.[[27]](#footnote-27) Such overprinting, to a small extent, may have been undertaken in anticipation of the production of some imperfect copies, but perhaps was largely to accommodate unexpected demand.[[28]](#footnote-28)

The Licensing Act lapsed on 3 May 1695 which was between the publication of the first and second issue in this run. It was not a deliberate move to end pre-publication censorship but was the result of a failure to reach agreement and was followed by numerous failed attempts at press regulation.[[29]](#footnote-29) Scholars have enjoyed debating the significance of the lapsing of the act (and its relative significance alongside other seventeenth-century years) not least because 1695 features prominently in the influential accounts by Macaulay and Habermas. For some scholars, like Mark Knights, 1695 marked a turning point: compared to the 1640s, after 1695, there was a ‘greater density’ of periodicals as there were simply more issues.[[30]](#footnote-30) Within a year of the act lapsing three new thrice-weekly newspapers had been established in competition with the *Gazette*. For others 1695 is not so pivotal: Alex Barber stresses the continued importance of ‘scribal news’ after 1695, and Joad Raymond, in an astute critique of Habermas, argues that 1695 ‘was not a watershed in the emergence of a public sphere of popular political opinion’ as it ‘was the 1640s that saw the most rapid development of informed popular debate’.[[31]](#footnote-31) Raymond specifically addresses the *Gazette* to note that the lapsing did not ‘fundamentally change the role of the *Gazette*’ and, that the *Gazette*’s sales did not drop after 1695 but in the 1710s.[[32]](#footnote-32) O’Malley took a different view of the circulation but for him 1695 remained important: when O’Malley wrote about the 1666 print run, the 1680s figures had not been published and he had only the 1705-07 accounts for comparison. This comparison suggested ‘that over a forty-year period, even after the competition provided by the lapse of the licensing law in 1695, the circulation of the *Gazette* was fairly high and constant.’[[33]](#footnote-33)

Figure 2 brings together the available and estimated circulation figures from 1666-1721 and allows us to revise and revisit both Raymond’s and O’Malley’s readings of the *Gazette*’s circulation figures. Principally, figure 2 shows us how much we do not know: we have circulation data for so few years across this whole period. One way to interpret figure 2 would be to locate the beginning of the *Gazette*’s decline in 1695 as the circulation diminished across 1695-7; in this reading circulation continued to decline through 1705 and continued until it reached the 2,000 copies of the late 1710s. But this may be joining the dots too eagerly. Another way to interpret figure 2 would be to suggest an underlying circulation of around 8-9,000 from 1680-1710 with some boom years as in the mid-1690s. With so many gaps and such volatility, though, it is hard to be certain about the general trends in circulation across the period.

**Making and reading the *London* *Gazette***

The mid-1690s *Gazette* circulation was spectacularly high and warrants Houghton’s labelling the paper ‘the most universal intelligencers’. However, I want to resist the urge to celebrate the supremacy of print for to do so would misrepresent both the ways the *Gazette* was produced and the ways it was consumed. Raymond calls for a ‘more nuanced model of popular political opinion founded on the realities of seventeenth-century discussion, on the nature and languages of debate and on the practical economic circumstances that channelled communication.’[[34]](#footnote-34) Jason Peacey, like Raymond, profitably looks across the seventeenth century to make connections and comparisons between the pre and post-Restoration periods. Peacey however, moves away from ‘commercial print and public discourse’ and finds continuities of ‘participatory practices of daily political life’ before and after 1660.[[35]](#footnote-35) What if we try to combine these approaches and put ‘commercial print and public discourse’ back into Peacey’s picture and also attend more carefully to how the *Gazette* was produced and consumed? The *Gazette* is certainly ‘public discourse’ but it does not fit easily into the other categories in these debates.

From its beginning in 1665 the *Gazette* was part of the Secretaries of State’s British and international intelligence networks.[[36]](#footnote-36) In the *Gazette*’s early years Under Secretary of State Joseph Williamson was pivotal.[[37]](#footnote-37) He was a ‘friend’ to those who were ‘carefull and constant’ and, in exchange for regular news, correspondents received ‘a private letter of intelligence & a gazette or two free’.[[38]](#footnote-38) Some of the news received went into the *Gazette* and some into the letters of intelligence which contained ‘Extracts of such common News, as is fit to be communicated to the K[ing]s Ministers abroad [and] to some Country friends and correspondents at home’.[[39]](#footnote-39)

While the *Gazette*’s early history has received the most attention the paper continued to be compiled in similar ways in the late seventeenth century.[[40]](#footnote-40) The large numbers of copies given away in the mid-1690s suggest that *Gazettes* were still being exchanged for news submitted by correspondents. Other aspects of the production and distribution of the *Gazette* also continued. Robert Yard held the post of the *Gazette* writer from 1673 until 1702.[[41]](#footnote-41) In the early 1710s the letters of intelligence from the Secretaries of State office were sent out with the *Gazette* by a clerk, Charles Delafaye.[[42]](#footnote-42) The long-established practices of paying postmasters either partially or fully in *Gazettes*, and allowing the clerks of the road to send *Gazettes* post free continued; William Trumbull, in 1696, for example was concerned about the loss of thousands of pounds of revenue from sending newspapers, including *Gazettes,* for free.[[43]](#footnote-43) Most importantly, Trumbull, the Secretary of State for whom the 1695-7 accounts were drawn up, and who presumably oversaw the *Gazette*’s production, had had first-hand experience of the Secretaries’ intelligence network and presumably drew on this as Secretary. From August 1687 to July 1691 when he was Ambassador in Istanbul Trumbull had been sent the *Gazette* and the official newsletter and had sent his news back to London, some of which was reproduced in the official newsletter or the *Gazette*.[[44]](#footnote-44) Tellingly, as soon as Trumbull became Secretary of State the number of copies given away increased from 800 to 900. While there may have been some discontinuities with the earlier period – for example, the monarch’s direct involvement was not evident in the early years but later William III was involved in deciding what to include in the *Gazette* and what to exclude, according ‘to those rules his Majesty in Council prescribed himself’ – it was probably not until the early eighteenth century that there were significant changes to the way the *Gazette* was produced.[[45]](#footnote-45) By then, incoming news was proving harder to solicit, the *Gazette* was temporarily written by a clerk rather than a ‘writer’, and the printer changed.[[46]](#footnote-46)

The *Gazette* then was threaded through the complex international manuscript, oral and printed news networks. It was produced from manuscript news and was sent to the secretaries’ correspondents alongside the official manuscript newsletters. Numerous letter writers outside government sent the *Gazette* with their letters. For many correspondents, and not just those in government, the *Gazette* was a shared point of reference. Whether or not a letter accompanied a *Gazette* many writers assumed that their readers had access to it: ‘There is no more news but what the Gazettes mention’; ‘pray consult the London Gazette’; ‘the Gazette will give you a more parfect accountt’.[[47]](#footnote-47) The *Gazette* was such a commonplace that Trumbull, six months after his Secretaryship ended, could write to his protégé Henry St. John, that ‘I will not pretend to send you any newes, since it [sic] one ingredient of my beloved solitude to meet with none beside that of a Gazette or the Post man.’[[48]](#footnote-48) Although this is disingenuous – he collected manuscript newsletters until his death – and part of his self-portrayal as an ‘old man’ enjoying ‘ease and quiet, or in plain English Lazynesse,’ it does indicate that he could assume *Gazette* news was known.[[49]](#footnote-49) Throughout the Trumbull-St. John correspondence the *Gazette* was a frequent point of reference.[[50]](#footnote-50)

News, whether oral, in letters, manuscript newsletters or printed, was constantly assessed.[[51]](#footnote-51) What could be trusted? To return to Trumbull’s ambassadorship in Istanbul: as Jean-Paul Ghobrial has shown, his exchange of news with the Secretaries of State during this time was just one pathway in the complex networks of international oral, manuscript and printed news exchange in which Trumbull participated.[[52]](#footnote-52) All this news was continually being weighed up and even the Secretaries of State’s letters of intelligence sent to Trumbull travelled by different routes and were updated and commented upon by the hands they passed through on their way to Istanbul.[[53]](#footnote-53)

The *Gazette* had a particular place in this constant assessment of news. Readers noticed what was left out: in 1687 Roger Morrice described how ‘The Kissing of the Popes Toe &c. is omitted’ among other things ‘in the large account the Gazette … gives of the Pomp of our Ambassadours reception at Rome.’[[54]](#footnote-54) Likewise readers were aware that the *Gazette* provided limited coverage for it was only ‘a pennyworth of news’.[[55]](#footnote-55) Readers noticed what they thought might not be true: Sir John Knight digressed in a 1694 Commons speech to note the ‘sham storm ... we were lately entertained with in the Gazette, which deceived the People, by affirming that many Ships going for France, laden with Corn, were cast away, tho’ those Ships, and many more are since safely arrived’.[[56]](#footnote-56) *Gazette* readers were aware of how up-to-date the *Gazette* was: Henry Sampson wrote to the Yorkshire antiquarian Ralph Thoresby on 15 July 1697 – a day the *Gazette* was published – ‘You will see our gazette, and therein no foreign news. We have had three mails from Holland since that was printed off: there is yet no certain intelligence what is in them; but the general talk is ...’.[[57]](#footnote-57) Sampson assessed the news he had heard contrasting ‘certain intelligence’ with ‘the general talk’ in anticipation of confirmed reports.[[58]](#footnote-58) As Kate Loveman shows, for Samuel Pepys the *Gazette* (and in the early Restoration other government-sponsored newsbooks) had a singular place in the exchange of oral, manuscript and printed news: readers ‘turned to the newsbooks for confirmation or denial of oral reports’ and ‘to identify the government’s official line on an issue’.[[59]](#footnote-59) Not everyone, however, always had enough news to make comparisons and sometimes the *Gazette* was the only news available, and sometimes not even that, as in Kempsford, Gloucestershire in 1672, when it was ‘as rare ... as a black swan’.[[60]](#footnote-60)

The *Gazette* was discussed not only because it contained current and political news. First, the *Gazette*’s content was diverse and far from narrowly political: from reports of shipwrecks, to notifications about shareholders’ meetings, from publication announcements to lists of sheriffs, from advertisements of instrument makers to notices to catch criminals and find runaways. Unlike the main body of the paper, which was dominated by foreign news, these notices and advertisements were full of domestic news.[[61]](#footnote-61) Increasingly legislation demanded notifications be given in the *Gazette* and by the 1710s notices about bankruptcy proceedings and insolvent debtors had virtually replaced the medicine and book advertisements.[[62]](#footnote-62) These bankruptcy announcements were widely read and were sensational; Daniel Defoe read them both in total as a sign of the times and for individual names to reveal the impact of appearing there.[[63]](#footnote-63) Publication announcements generated vibrant exchange which is easy to chart given the preservation and cataloguing of the large correspondence of their readers in the 1690s.[[64]](#footnote-64) While less visible in surviving correspondence, the crime advertisements, both those seeking suspects and those requesting information about crimes, were very effective.[[65]](#footnote-65) The *Gazette* served as an announcement service for government, giving details of dates wages might be paid, taxes owed, new laws, proclamations, and much routine business.[[66]](#footnote-66)

Second, the *Gazette* was read not only on publication day but was also collected and referred back to – it became a journal of record. Pepys, Trumbull and others collected sets, and such sets were auctioned as ‘inclusive compleat’.[[67]](#footnote-67) In Oxford in the early eighteenth century there were attempts to collect a set ‘as of excellent use to those that design to write Memoirs of the times and to give an Account of the Lives and writings of illustrious Persons’.[[68]](#footnote-68) The paper had an offstage role in other chronicles; Roger Morrice and Narcissus Luttrell envisaged that their readers had the *Gazette* to hand.[[69]](#footnote-69) The *Gazette* was also produced as evidence in legal settings. In 1707 merchants petitioned the House of Lords to support their case for more, and more prompt, convoys to protect their ships and in their depositions they referenced *Gazette* issues from the previous six months describing attacks and delays. The *Gazette* itself was said to have caused hardship for ‘the Misrepresentation of their Loss off of Kildine, in *The Gazette* of the 14th of August last ... was very prejudicial to them, with respect to their Insurance.’ The merchants also referred to a *Gazette* from January 1703 in which notice had been given that ‘Her Majesty had resolved to appoint Convoys’ to protect ships taking corn to Lisbon but this had not happened leading to the loss of the trade.[[70]](#footnote-70) Here the *Gazette* was mostly treated as a reliable source but this was not always the case. In a 1675 Commons’ debate about a *Gazette* paragraph from the previous year concerning the law and its operation around excise, various views were expressed. On one hand Thomas Lee argued ‘He thinks this good evidence in the *Gazette*, and published by good authority; else the Council-Table would have corrected it before now’ and Thomas Meres stated ‘The Gazette is published by authority, and may have the effect of a Proclamation in remote parts’; on the other hand Secretary Williamson was more hesitant: ‘What is in the *Gazette* is not schemesfor the interest of the nation. The *Gazette* is, in some measure, under the care of the Secretaries of State, but not wholly of their penning. The Advertisements are the clerks. He sees there is great stress laid upon it, in terms so high “as the King and Council to have declared the law.” But take the thing where it is authentic.’ Williamson then, who was best-placed to know how the *Gazette* was produced, suggested that its content had a rather provisional status.[[71]](#footnote-71)

**The *Gazette de Londres* and the extraordinaries**

The *Gazette* then, was part of the oral, manuscript and printed international news networks. It contained not just political news and it had an afterlife as a journal of record. In rethinking the categories in which the *Gazette* can be put we also need to think carefully about what the *Gazette* actually was, for closely associated with the English newspaper were a French version and numerous extra publications. Looking at these other publications reminds us to be sensitive to the varieties of print in circulation and how they related to each other. The *Gazette de Londres* was the French translation of the *London Gazette* (excluding the advertisements) and had begun soon after the English version.[[72]](#footnote-72) In the first half of 1681 average sales were just under 260 copies per issue and in the early eighteenth century it was taken by some coffee houses.[[73]](#footnote-73) Tucked into the mid-1690s *Gazette* accounts are those for the French translation for four quarters beginning 24 June 1695 and they were set out like those for the *London Gazette*.[[74]](#footnote-74) For the early issues in this year 1,000 copies were printed dropping briefly to 500 and then remaining at 800 for the last months of this year. 150 copies of each issue were given away and sales varied between 300 and 825 copies and averaged just under 520 copies for each issue across June 1695-June 1696. The troughs and peaks of the *Gazette de Londres*’ circulation in 1695-6 paralleled those of the *London Gazette*. The French version had a meagre circulation compared to the English version but it was not insignificant and perhaps not as small as Snyder imagined.[[75]](#footnote-75)

Other publications were also produced under the umbrella of the *Gazette.* Extraordinaries were published between issues and contained news from the posts received since the previous *Gazette* was set and deemed sufficiently important not to wait for the next issue.[[76]](#footnote-76) Extraordinaries had been issued both immediately before and after issue 3100 of the *Gazette* (25-29 July 1695), for example – the issue with the largest print run in 1695-7. These extraordinaries, like most during wartime, reported updates from the battlefields as the mails arrived.[[77]](#footnote-77) The extraordinaries were printed by Edward Jones and, like the *Gazette,* contained the words ‘Published by Authority’ in black letter between two lines and were usually printed on one side of a half sheet. In 1693 there was one extraordinary of this sort, in 1694 none, fifteen in 1695, thirteen in 1696 and fourteen in 1697 and none in 1698 or 1699 and no more than nine were produced in any one year in the first two decades of the eighteenth century. They are not mentioned in the 1695-7 *Gazette* accounts and so we can only guess at their circulation. Some required at least two settings, suggesting substantial print runs, and they were clearly produced under time pressure with an issue from October 1695 mistakenly set as ‘1895’.[[78]](#footnote-78) Occasionally the urgency was announced, as in August 1704: ‘This Afternoon arrived an Express with a Letter from His Grace the Duke of Marlborough to my Lady Dutchess, written on Horseback with a Lead Pencil; a Copy whereof follows.’[[79]](#footnote-79) Although their initial frequency coincides with the Nine Years War, Trumbull may have had a role in the promotion of the extraordinaries. He was aware of the profitability of the occasional, short publication and was described as ‘tugging for the treaty’ of Ryswick ‘for the advantage of printing it’ as it might amount to £30 or £40; he was apparently someone who hated anyone who ‘stood in the way of his profits’.[[80]](#footnote-80)

Jones also published other materials, like lists of the members of each parliament from 1690-1705, and lists of land forces, as well as instructions about mourning; such publications were probably produced quickly in substantial quantities as at least some required multiple settings.[[81]](#footnote-81) While these publications did not share the format of the extraordinaries and were not recently arrived news they fit within the remit of the *Gazette*. For some readers they clearly supplemented the *Gazette* as they were bound into sets of the newspaper. That Jones printed these materials is significant for while modern scholars emphasise the *Gazette* as a product of the Secretaries of State, contemporaries attached importance to the printer as the producer of news. The poetic tribute at Jones’s death described the *Gazette* as ‘great Jones’s Newes’ and the ‘Savoy Paper’ and implied that it was his name that was cried by the hawkers in the streets; the news was ‘Jones’s’.[[82]](#footnote-82) Similarly, his list of the members of the Lords and the Commons in 1702 was described as ‘Mr Jones’s List of the Parliament.’[[83]](#footnote-83) Presumably these supplements, and the extraordinaries, circulated along some of the same routes as the *Gazette.* There were also other publications produced in the 1690s (but not by Jones) for *Gazette* readers which provided biographies of European rulers ‘very useful to all that read the London, Harlem, Amsterdam and Paris Gazette’ and even a short-lived serial offered ‘a brief, historical and geographical explanation of the places and things contain’d in the Gazette, harlem-courant, News-letters, and other papers of intelligence.’[[84]](#footnote-84)

**The Profits of the *London* *Gazette***

Was the *Gazette* ‘commercial print’? Here again the *Gazette* is difficult to categorise. From the 1695-7 accounts it is possible to calculate the printing rates, and the production and wholesale price per issue. The paper, print and publishing was charged at 16*s* a ream which was just under 1/5*d* per copy and this was still the rate in 1705-7 and 1710.[[85]](#footnote-85) This is much more than the 6*s* 6*d* per ream estimated for the paper and printing of almanacs, and was presumably largely because the *Gazette* used good quality paper, was composed, corrected and printed at night, had to be ready for the posts and needed more copy setting for the tightly packed double-columned sheets.[[86]](#footnote-86) Copies were wholesaled at just under ½*d* and retailed for 1*d* in 1695-7, as they were in 1679-1681, 1705-7 and 1710.[[87]](#footnote-87) So there was just over ½*d* per copy to be shared between the mercury women who bought newspapers wholesale and the hawkers who retailed them.[[88]](#footnote-88) After Jones’s death it was said ‘Great Numbers of poor People have been Fed,/ And daily by his News have earn’d their Bread’.[[89]](#footnote-89)

The arrangement of the accounts tells us how the Secretaries of State conceptualised the *Gazette* profits. For each issue the cost of paper and printing was deducted from the income from sales and these ‘Rests’ were totalled up for a quarterly reckoning. Against these quarterly profits were set various quarterly payments – for Mr Yard (the *Gazette* writer) £25, for Mr de la faye (the translator) £13, and for carriage to Whitehall, Judges etc £2 19*s* 6*d*. [[90]](#footnote-90) Except for the first two quarters, losses from the *Gazette de Londres* were also deducted. Only 14 out of 104 issues of the French translation made more from sales of copies than the cost of ‘Paper, Print and Publishing’ which was £1 5*s* regardless of the print run. The quarterly accounts of the French translation record repeated losses (from nearly £2 to over £14) and this did not even include the cost of the translator; as Secretary Middleton had been told in 1688 the *Gazette de Londres* ‘always turned a loss’.[[91]](#footnote-91) Once the costs for the writer, the translator, the carriage expenses, and in most quarters the losses of the *Gazette de Londres,* had been deducted, the remaining sum was divided between the two Secretaries of State. For the first quarter May-August 1695, for example, the profits from the *Gazette* totalled £332 15*s* 4*d*, from which £40 19*s* 6*d* for the writer, translator and carriage were deducted, leaving £291 15*s* 10*d* to be shared. We might say that this sum, nearly £300, was the ‘profit’ from the *Gazette*, and while Trumbull’s half share of this was described as his ‘Profits of the Gazette’, other payments were then set against it: Trumbull paid his chief clerk Mr Stannian £100, the clerks £37 10*s*, the chamber keepers £15 12*s* and Mrs Pope £2 (who was presumably ‘the Woman that Cleans the Office’ in later accounts).[[92]](#footnote-92) After these payments Trumbull was left £9 10*s* 1*d* out of pocket for this quarter, although in subsequent quarters he paid his clerks less and some profits remained. The August-November 1695 quarter left just over £300 – the ‘Profits’ – to be shared between the Secretaries and the following quarters left between around £110 to over £200. For the seven quarters from May 1695 to February 1697 the Secretaries of State shared nearly £1500 between them, and for the first four, the year from May 1695, they shared almost £1000.

In 1705-7 the quarterly profits to be shared by the secretaries ranged from around £300 to over £500 from which secretaries paid their clerks etc as in 1695-7.[[93]](#footnote-93) However, comparisons between the 1705-7 and the 1695-7 accounts are problematic because inexplicably the earlier accounts did not include advertising revenue whereas in 1705-7 this was listed and averaged just over £10 per issue (which at times exceeded sales receipts).[[94]](#footnote-94) Advertisements by government were free but most cost 10*s* each and in the mid-1690s the *Gazette* carried advertisements for books, runaways, lotteries and auctions with on average 16 advertisements per issue.[[95]](#footnote-95) The *Gazette* was booming in 1695-7 with higher sales receipts than in 1705-7, but because the advertising revenue is omitted from the earlier accounts the *Gazette* misleadingly appears to be not as profitable as in 1705-7. Presumably advertising revenue did make its way to the Secretaries in 1695-7.

Trumbull’s careful quarterly reckonings suggest he, like other secretaries, used the *Gazette* profits to pay many of those who worked in his office, who presumably did far more than just their work on the *Gazette*. Questions of commerciality and profit matter not just because ‘commercial print’ is invoked in current scholarly debates about print culture but because it has a particular place in debates around Habermas’s conception of the public sphere. The latter has been brought into sharp focus by J. A. Downie who argues in a challenge to Habermas that most periodicals failed to make significant profits (for Downie the *Gazette* is an exception).[[96]](#footnote-96) In many ways the *Gazette* does not fit a commercial model: not least because as Snyder notes, it had to cover the costs of the free advertisements from government departments and the given away copies.[[97]](#footnote-97) Michael Harris usefully describes the *Gazette* as a ‘hybrid’ combining the elements of ‘commercial enterprise’ (‘run on behalf of individuals ... and sold ... in the same way as other forms of print’) and at the same time being ‘a state-sponsored medium for the circulation of public information of all kinds.’ Crucially Harris notes that this sort of tension was common to other periodical publications: ‘all the printed serials assumed a position in which public service was identified as a primary justification for publication’ but that for the *Gazette* ‘this characteristic ... had a more intense and serious expression’.[[98]](#footnote-98) While I might want to place slightly more emphasis on the *Gazette*’s role in the Secretaries’ attempts to control the flow of information and slightly less emphasis on ‘public service’ as the other hand to the ‘commercial enterprise’, Harris’s conception of the *Gazette* as a hybrid publication is invaluable.

The *Gazette*, then, had a huge circulation in the mid-1690s. However, rather than reading this as part of a narrative that celebrates print’s triumph over manuscript I have argued that we must see the *Gazette* in the context in which it was produced and consumed: that is, as part of a much larger network of largely oral and manuscript news exchange. Many readily glossed the news in the *Gazette*, passed judgement on its reliability and coverage, and referred to it on the assumption that their readers had access to a copy. It was a common point of reference. Not all had access, however. The *Gazette* was a wide-ranging publication and was read as much for its foreign political news as it was for announcements of publications, runaways, and bankrupts, and notification of fasts. It was read eagerly on the day of publication and in the days following as it arrived in the provinces and around the world. It was also collected and referred back to, and continued to be evaluated. It had various companion publications: a French translation, extra issues between usual publication days, and additional publications that provided ‘useful’ information on government and events. It yielded profits for the Secretaries of State but it was not simply a commercial enterprise. In many and diverse ways then, the *London Gazette* was indeed ‘the most universal Intelligencers’.
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**Appendix**

Accounts of the *London Gazette* 1695-1697

This appendix is compiled from the *London* *Gazette*’s accounts in Add 72576, British Library. The accounts are organised by issue number and list the numbers of copies printed, given away, unsold and sold. Alongside the cost of ‘Paper, Print, Publishing’ etc the incomes from sales was listed. Profits (called ‘Rests’ in the accounts) were calculated for each issue and were reckoned quarterly (the quarterly accounts are not presented here). I have not corrected internal inconsistencies.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Issue | Printed | Given | Unsold | Sold | Sales Receipts | | | Paper, Print, Publishing etc | | | Profits | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | *l* | *s* | *d* | *l* | *s* | *d* | *l* | *s* | *d* |
| 29 Apr-2 May 1695 | 3075 | 13000 | 800 | 2082 | 10118 | 20 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 9 |
| 2-6 May 1695 | 3076 | 12750 | 900 | 1994 | 9856 | 19 | 14 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 3 |
| 6-9 May 1695 | 3077 | 13000 | 900 | 1730 | 10370 | 20 | 14 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 10 |
| 9-13 May 1695 | 3078 | 12500 | 900 | 1905 | 9695 | 19 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 10 |
| 13-16 May 1695 | 3079 | 13000 | 900 | 1759 | 10341 | 20 | 13 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 8 |
| 16-20 May 1695 | 3080 | 12750 | 900 | 1234 | 10616 | 21 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 8 |
| 20-23 May 1695 | 3081 | 13250 | 900 | 1900 | 10450 | 20 | 18 | 0 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 0 |
| 23-27 May 1695 | 3082 | 13500 | 900 | 1988 | 10612 | 21 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 6 |
| 27-30 May 1695 | 3083 | 13500 | 900 | 1819 | 10781 | 21 | 11 | 3 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 3 |
| 30 May-3 Jun 1695 | 3084 | 13750 | 900 | 1757 | 11093 | 22 | 3 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 9 |
| 3-6 Jun 1695 | 3085 | 14000 | 900 | 1669 | 11431 | 22 | 17 | 3 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 13 | 3 |
| 6-10 Jun 1695 | 3086 | 13750 | 900 | 1825 | 11025 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 |
| 10-13 Jun 1695 | 3087 | 16250 | 900 | 2363 | 12987 | 25 | 19 | 6 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 19 | 6 |
| 13-17 Jun 1695 | 3088 | 18000 | 900 | 3138 | 13962 | 27 | 18 | 6 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 13 | 10 | 6 |
| 17-20 Jun 1695 | 3089 | 17000 | 900 | 2505 | 13595 | 27 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 13 | 11 | 10 |
| 20-24 Jun 1695 | 3090 | 15000 | 900 | 1550 | 12550 | 25 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 0 |
| 24-27 Jun 1695 | 3091 | 16000 | 900 | 2063 | 13037 | 26 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 16 | 0 | 13 | 5 | 6 |
| 27 Jun-1 Jul 1695 | 3092 | 15500 | 900 | 2194 | 12406 | 24 | 16 | 3 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 3 |
| 1-4 Jul 1695 | 3093 | 15250 | 900 | 1157 | 13193 | 26 | 7 | 9 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 9 |
| 4-8 Jul 1695 | 3094 | 15000 | 900 | 1925 | 12175 | 24 | 7 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 7 | 0 |
| 8-11 Jul 1695 | 3095 | 15500 | 900 | 2073 | 12527 | 25 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 12 | 13 | 1 |
| 11-15 Jul 1695 | 3096 | 18000 | 900 | 2963 | 14137 | 28 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 13 | 17 | 6 |
| 15-18 Jul 1695 | 3097 | 18000 | 900 | 2569 | 14531 | 29 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 14 | 13 | 3 |
| 18-22 Jul 1695 | 3098 | 17500 | 900 | 2494 | 14106 | 28 | 4 | 3 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 4 | 3 |
| 22-25 Jul 1695 | 3099 | 17000 | 900 | 2546 | 13554 | 27 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 13 | 10 | 2 |
| 25-29 Jul 1695 | 3100 | 22750 | 900 | 3688 | 18162 | 36 | 6 | 6 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 2 | 6 |
| 29 Jul-1 Aug 1695 | 3101 | 18500 | 900 | 2938 | 14662 | 29 | 6 | 6 | 14 | 16 | 0 | 14 | 10 | 6 |
| 1-5 Aug 1695 | 3102 | 17500 | 900 | 3042 | 13558 | 27 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 4 |
| 5-8 Aug 1695 | 3103 | 17000 | 900 | 3050 | 13050 | 26 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 0 |
| 8-12 Aug 1695 | 3104 | 15000 | 900 | 1244 | 12856 | 25 | 14 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 14 | 3 |
| 12-15 Aug 1695 | 3105 | 20000 | 900 | 2913 | 16187 | 32 | 7 | 6 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 7 | 6 |
| 15-19 Aug 1695 | 3106 | 18500 | 900 | 3432 | 14168 | 28 | 6 | 9 | 14 | 16 | 0 | 13 | 10 | 9 |
| 19-22 Aug 1695 | 3107 | 18000 | 900 | 3009 | 14091 | 28 | 3 | 8 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 13 | 15 | 8 |
| 22-26 Aug 1695 | 3108 | 17000 | 900 | 2263 | 13837 | 27 | 13 | 6 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 6 |
| 26-29 Aug 1695 | 3109 | 18000 | 900 | 2982 | 14118 | 28 | 4 | 9 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 13 | 16 | 9 |
| 29 Aug-2 Sep 1695 | 3110 | 16500 | 900 | 2763 | 12837 | 25 | 13 | 6 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 9 | 6 |
| 2-5 Sep 1695 | 3111 | 15000 | 900 | 1850 | 12250 | 24 | 10 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 0 |
| 5-9 Sep 1695 | 3112 | 15750 | 900 | 1750 | 13100 | 26 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 13 | 12 | 0 |
| 9-12 Sep 1695 | 3113 | 16000 | 900 | 2450 | 12650 | 25 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 16 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 0 |
| 12-16 Sep 1695 | 3114 | 15000 | 900 | 1688 | 12412 | 24 | 16 | 6 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 16 | 6 |
| 16-19 Sep 1695 | 3115 | 15000 | 900 | 1757 | 12343 | 24 | 13 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 13 | 9 |
| 19-23 Sep 1695 | 3116 | 15000 | 900 | 2548 | 11552 | 23 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 1 |
| 23-26 Sep 1695 | 3117 | 14000 | 900 | 2100 | 11000 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 16 | 0 |
| 26-30 Sep 1695 | 3118 | 13500 | 900 | 1513 | 11087 | 22 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 11 | 7 | 6 |
| 30 Sep-3 Oct 1695 | 3119 | 12500 | 900 | 1094 | 10506 | 21 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 3 |
| 3-7 Oct 1695 | 3120 | 12500 | 900 | 1363 | 10237 | 20 | 9 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 6 |
| 7-10 Oct 1695 | 3121 | 12250 | 900 | 1050 | 10300 | 20 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 0 | 10 | 16 | 0 |
| 10-14 Oct 1695 | 3122 | 12750 | 900 | 1575 | 10275 | 20 | 11 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 0 |
| 14-17 Oct 1695 | 3123 | 12000 | 900 | 1288 | 9812 | 19 | 12 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 6 |
| 17-21 Oct 1695 | 3124 | 12000 | 900 | 1440 | 9660 | 19 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 14 | 5 |
| 21-24 Oct 1695 | 3125 | 11750 | 900 | 1513 | 9337 | 18 | 13 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 6 |
| 24-28 Oct 1695 | 3126 | 12250 | 900 | 2013 | 9337 | 18 | 13 | 6 | 9 | 16 | 0 | 8 | 17 | 6 |
| 28-31 Oct 1695 | 3127 | 11750 | 900 | 1680 | 9170 | 18 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 18 | 10 |
| 31 Oct-4 Nov 1695 | 3128 | 12250 | 900 | 2913 | 8437 | 16 | 17 | 6 | 9 | 16 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 6 |
| 4-7 Nov 1695 | 3129 | 12500 | 900 | 2388 | 9212 | 18 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 6 |
| 7-11 Nov 1695 | 3130 | 12500 | 900 | 3013 | 8587 | 17 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 6 |
| 11-14 Nov 1695 | 3131 | 12000 | 900 | 1613 | 9487 | 18 | 19 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 6 |
| 14-18 Nov 1695 | 3132 | 12000 | 900 | 1563 | 9537 | 19 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 6 |
| 18-22 Nov 1695 | 3133 | 11750 | 900 | 2188 | 8662 | 17 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 18 | 6 |
| 22-25 Nov 1695 | 3134 | 12500 | 900 | 2488 | 9112 | 18 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 6 |
| 25-28 Nov 1695 | 3135 | 11750 | 900 | 2519 | 8331 | 16 | 13 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 3 |
| 28 Nov-2 Dec 1695 | 3136 | 11250 | 900 | 1719 | 8631 | 17 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 3 |
| 2-5 Dec 1695 | 3137 | 11750 | 900 | 2263 | 8587 | 17 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 6 |
| 5-9 Dec 1695 | 3138 | 11500 | 900 | 1713 | 8887 | 17 | 15 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 6 |
| 9-12 Dec 1695 | 3139 | 11500 | 900 | 1869 | 8731 | 17 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 3 |
| 12-16 Dec 1695 | 3140 | 11250 | 900 | 1788 | 8562 | 17 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 6 |
| 16-19 Dec 1695 | 3141 | 11000 | 900 | 1875 | 8225 | 16 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 0 |
| 19-23 Dec 1695 | 3142 | 11000 | 900 | 1794 | 8306 | 16 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 7 | 16 | 3 |
| 23-26 Dec 1695 | 3143 | 11000 | 900 | 1982 | 8118 | 16 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 26-30 Dec 1695 | 3144 | 12000 | 900 | 1988 | 9112 | 18 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 6 |
| 30 Dec 1695-2 Jan 1696 | 3145 | 11250 | 900 | 1863 | 8487 | 16 | 19 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 19 | 6 |
| 2-6 Jan 1696 | 3146 | 11250 | 900 | 1769 | 8581 | 17 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 3 |
| 6-9 Jan 1696 | 3147 | 11000 | 900 | 1850 | 8250 | 16 | 10 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 0 |
| 9-13 Jan 1696 | 3148 | 11250 | 900 | 1692 | 8608 | 17 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 4 |
| 13-16 Jan 1696 | 3149 | 11000 | 900 | 1794 | 8306 | 16 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 7 | 16 | 3 |
| 16-20 Jan 1696 | 3150 | 11000 | 900 | 1832 | 8268 | 16 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 9 |
| 20-23 Jan 1696 | 3151 | 11000 | 900 | 1775 | 8325 | 16 | 13 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 0 |
| 23-27 Jan 1696 | 3152 | 11000 | 900 | 1813 | 8287 | 16 | 11 | 6 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 6 |
| 27-30 Jan 1696 | 3153 | 11250 | 900 | 1450 | 8900 | 17 | 16 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 0 |
| 30 Jan-3 Feb 1696 | 3154 | 11000 | 900 | 1644 | 8456 | 16 | 18 | 3 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 3 |
| 3-6 Feb 1696 | 3155 | 11000 | 900 | 1675 | 8425 | 16 | 17 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| 6-10 Feb 1696 | 3156 | 11500 | 900 | 2219 | 8381 | 16 | 15 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 3 |
| 10-13 Feb 1696 | 3157 | 12250 | 900 | 2438 | 8912 | 17 | 16 | 6 | 9 | 16 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 6 |
| 13-17 Feb 1696 | 3158 | 12500 | 900 | 2782 | 8818 | 17 | 12 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 9 |
| 17-20 Feb 1696 | 3159 | 12500 | 900 | 3082 | 8518 | 17 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 9 |
| 20-24 Feb 1696 | 3160 | 12500 | 900 | 2657 | 8943 | 17 | 17 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 9 |
| 24-27 Feb 1696 | 3161 | 14000 | 900 | 2563 | 10537 | 21 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 17 | 6 |
| 27 Feb-2 Mar 1696 | 3162 | 15750 | 900 | 2913 | 11937 | 23 | 17 | 6 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 6 |
| 2-5 Mar 1696 | 3163 | 16000 | 900 | 2638 | 12462 | 24 | 18 | 6 | 12 | 16 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 6 |
| 5-9 Mar 1696 | 3164 | 16000 | 900 | 2650 | 12450 | 24 | 18 | 0 | 12 | 16 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 0 |
| 9-12 Mar 1696 | 3165 | 16500 | 900 | 2788 | 12812 | 25 | 12 | 6 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 6 |
| 12-16 Mar 1696 | 3166 | 15500 | 900 | 2150 | 12450 | 24 | 18 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 0 |
| 16-19 Mar 1696 | 3167 | 15000 | 900 | 2813 | 11287 | 22 | 11 | 6 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 11 | 6 |
| 19-23 Mar 1696 | 3168 | 15250 | 900 | 3100 | 11250 | 22 | 10 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 0 |
| 23-26 Mar 1696 | 3169 | 15000 | 900 | 2975 | 11125 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 |
| 26-30 Mar 1696 | 3170 | 14500 | 900 | 2580 | 11020 | 22 | 0 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 10 |
| 30 Mar-2 Apr 1696 | 3171 | 14000 | 900 | 2475 | 10625 | 21 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 |
| 2 Apr-6 Apr 1696 | 3172 | 14000 | 900 | 1650 | 11450 | 22 | 18 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 0 |
| 6-9 Apr 1696 | 3173 | 14250 | 900 | 1900 | 11450 | 22 | 18 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 0 | 11 | 10 | 0 |
| 9-13 Apr 1696 | 3174 | 14000 | 900 | 2000 | 11100 | 22 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| 13-16 Apr 1696 | 3175 | 13500 | 900 | 2363 | 10237 | 20 | 9 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 9 | 13 | 6 |
| 16-20 Apr 1696 | 3176 | 14250 | 900 | 2044 | 11306 | 22 | 12 | 3 | 11 | 8 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 3 |
| 20-23 Apr 1696 | 3177 | 13500 | 900 | 1725 | 10875 | 21 | 15 | 0 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 10 | 19 | 0 |
| 23-27 Apr 1696 | 3178 | 14000 | 900 | 2500 | 10600 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| 27-30 Apr 1696 | 3179 | 13500 | 900 | 1738 | 10862 | 21 | 14 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 10 | 18 | 6 |
| 30 Apr-4 May 1696 | 3180 | 13250 | 900 | 2513 | 9837 | 19 | 13 | 6 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 6 |
| 4-7 May 1696 | 3181 | 13250 | 900 | 2263 | 10087 | 20 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 6 |
| 7-11 May 1696 | 3182 | 12750 | 900 | 1757 | 10093 | 20 | 3 | 9 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 19 | 9 |
| 11-14 May 1696 | 3183 | 13250 | 900 | 2125 | 10225 | 20 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 17 | 0 |
| 14-18 May 1696 | 3184 | 13250 | 900 | 1975 | 10375 | 20 | 15 | 0 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 0 |
| 18-21 May 1696 | 3185 | 13000 | 900 | 2069 | 10031 | 20 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 3 |
| 21-25 May 1696 | 3186 | 13250 | 900 | 2057 | 10293 | 20 | 11 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 19 | 9 |
| 25-28 May 1696 | 3187 | 13000 | 900 | 2057 | 10193 | 20 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 19 | 9 |
| 28 May-1 Jun 1696 | 3188 | 12750 | 900 | 1863 | 9987 | 19 | 19 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 6 |
| 1-4 Jun 1696 | 3189 | 13000 | 900 | 1988 | 10112 | 20 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 6 |
| 4-8 Jun 1696 | 3190 | 12750 | 900 | 2225 | 9625 | 19 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 |
| 8-11 Jun 1696 | 3191 | 12500 | 900 | 2025 | 9575 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 |
| 11-15 Jun 1696 | 3192 | 12500 | 900 | 1857 | 9743 | 19 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| 15-18 Jun 1696 | 3193 | 13250 | 900 | 2125 | 10225 | 20 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 17 | 0 |
| 18-22 Jun 1696 | 3194 | 12750 | 900 | 1875 | 9975 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 0 |
| 22-25 Jun 1696 | 3195 | 13000 | 900 | 2400 | 9700 | 19 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| 25-29 Jun 1696 | 3196 | 12750 | 900 | 1538 | 10312 | 20 | 12 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 6 |
| 20 Jun-2 Jul 1696 | 3197 | 13250 | 900 | 1813 | 10537 | 21 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 6 |
| 2-6 Jul 1696 | 3198 | 13750 | 900 | 2438 | 10412 | 20 | 16 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 6 |
| 6-9 Jul 1696 | 3199 | 13250 | 900 | 2292 | 10058 | 20 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 4 |
| 9-13 Jul 1696 | 3200 | 13250 | 900 | 2400 | 9950 | 19 | 18 | 0 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 |
| 13-16 Jul 1696 | 3201 | 14000 | 900 | 2957 | 10143 | 20 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 9 |
| 16-20 Jul 1696 | 3202 | 13000 | 900 | 2338 | 9762 | 19 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 6 |
| 20-23 Jul 1696 | 3203 | 13500 | 900 | 2888 | 9712 | 19 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 6 |
| 23-27 Jul 1696 | 3204 | 13500 | 900 | 2583 | 10017 | 20 | 0 | 8.5 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 8.5 |
| 27-30 Jul 1696 | 3205 | 13000 | 900 | 2132 | 9968 | 19 | 18 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 9 |
| 30 Jul-3 Aug 1696 | 3206 | 14000 | 900 | 2369 | 10731 | 21 | 9 | 3 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 3 |
| 3-6 Aug 1696 | 3207 | 13500 | 900 | 2206 | 10394 | 20 | 15 | 9 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 9 | 19 | 9 |
| 6-10 Aug 1696 | 3208 | 13250 | 900 | 2138 | 10212 | 20 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 6 |
| 10-13 Aug 1696 | 3209 | 13000 | 900 | 2600 | 9500 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 0 |
| 13-17 Aug 1696 | 3210 | 13000 | 900 | 2238 | 9862 | 19 | 14 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 6 |
| 17-20 Aug 1696 | 3211 | 12250 | 900 | 2513 | 8837 | 17 | 13 | 6 | 9 | 16 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 6 |
| 20-24 Aug 1696 | 3212 | 13000 | 900 | 2388 | 9712 | 19 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 6 |
| 24-27 Aug 1696 | 3213 | 12500 | 900 | 2100 | 9500 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| 27-31 Aug 1696 | 3214 | 12250 | 900 | 1913 | 9437 | 18 | 17 | 6 | 9 | 16 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 6 |
| 31 Aug-3 Sep 1696 | 3215 | 12750 | 900 | 1950 | 9900 | 19 | 16 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 0 |
| 3-7 Sep 1696 | 3216 | 12500 | 900 | 2463 | 9137 | 18 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 6 |
| 7-10 Sep 1696 | 3217 | 12500 | 900 | 2032 | 9568 | 19 | 2 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 9 |
| 10-14 Sep 1696 | 3218 | 12500 | 900 | 2025 | 9575 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 |
| 14-17 Sep 1696 | 3219 | 12000 | 900 | 2213 | 8887 | 17 | 15 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 6 |
| 17-21 Sep 1696 | 3220 | 12500 | 900 | 2100 | 9500 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| 21-24 Sep 1696 | 3221 | 12250 | 900 | 1975 | 9375 | 18 | 15 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 0 | 8 | 19 | 0 |
| 24-28 Sep 1696 | 3222 | 12000 | 900 | 2184 | 8916 | 17 | 16 | 8 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 8 |
| 28 Sep-1 Oct 1696 | 3223 | 12000 | 900 | 1875 | 9225 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 17 | 0 |
| 1-5 Oct 1696 | 3224 | 12000 | 900 | 2086 | 9014 | 18 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 7 |
| 5-8 Oct 1696 | 3225 | 11500 | 900 | 2738 | 7862 | 15 | 14 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 6 |
| 8-12 Oct 1696 | 3226 | 11750 | 900 | 2425 | 8425 | 16 | 17 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 0 |
| 12-15 Oct 1696 | 3227 | 11500 | 900 | 2907 | 7693 | 15 | 7 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 15-19 Oct 1696 | 3228 | 11500 | 900 | 2488 | 8112 | 16 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 6 |
| 19-22 Oct 1696 | 3229 | 11500 | 900 | 2613 | 7987 | 15 | 19 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 6 |
| 22-26 Oct 1696 | 3230 | 11250 | 900 | 2363 | 7987 | 15 | 19 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 19 | 6 |
| 26-29 Oct 1696 | 3231 | 10500 | 900 | 2588 | 7012 | 14 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 6 |
| 29 Oct-2 Nov 1696 | 3232 | 10500 | 900 | 2588 | 7012 | 14 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 6 |
| 2-5 Nov 1696 | 3233 | 10500 | 900 | 2638 | 6962 | 13 | 18 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 6 |
| 5-9 Nov 1696 | 3234 | 10500 | 900 | 2200 | 7400 | 14 | 16 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 0 |
| 9-12 Nov 1696 | 3235 | 10000 | 900 | 1875 | 7225 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 0 |
| 12-16 Nov 1696 | 3236 | 10500 | 900 | 2269 | 7331 | 14 | 13 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 3 |
| 16-19 Nov 1696 | 3237 | 10000 | 900 | 1863 | 7237 | 14 | 9 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 6 |
| 19-23 Nov 1696 | 3238 | 10000 | 900 | 1850 | 7250 | 14 | 10 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 0 |
| 13-26 Nov 1696 | 3239 | 10000 | 900 | 1800 | 7300 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 0 |
| 26-30 Nov 1696 | 3240 | 9500 | 900 | 1338 | 7262 | 14 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 6 |
| 30 Nov-3 Dec 1696 | 3241 | 9500 | 900 | 1650 | 6950 | 13 | 18 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 0 |
| 3-7 Dec 1696 | 3242 | 9750 | 900 | 1838 | 7012 | 14 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 6 |
| 7-10 Dec 1696 | 3243 | 10000 | 900 | 1732 | 7368 | 14 | 14 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 14 | 9 |
| 10-14 Dec 1696 | 3244 | 10000 | 900 | 1200 | 7900 | 15 | 16 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 16 | 0 |
| 14-17 Dec 1696 | 3245 | 9750 | 900 | 1900 | 6950 | 13 | 18 | 0 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 |
| 17-21 Dec 1696 | 3246 | 9500 | 900 | 1513 | 7087 | 14 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 6 |
| 21-24 Dec 1696 | 3247 | 9500 | 900 | 1375 | 7225 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 0 |
| 24-28 Dec 1696 | 3248 | 9000 | 900 | 900 | 7200 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 |
| 28-31 Dec 1696 | 3249 | 9250 | 900 | 1325 | 7025 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 0 |
| 31 Dec 1696-4 Jan 1697 | 3250 | 9250 | 900 | 1538 | 6812 | 13 | 12 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 6 |
| 4-7 Jan 1697 | 3251 | 9250 | 900 | 1800 | 6550 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 0 |
| 7-11 Jan 1697 | 3252 | 9000 | 900 | 1438 | 6662 | 13 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 6 |
| 11-14 Jan 1697 | 3253 | 9250 | 900 | 1584 | 6766 | 13 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 8 |
| 14-18 Jan 1697 | 3254 | 9000 | 900 | 1250 | 6850 | 13 | 14 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 0 |
| 18-21 Jan 1697 | 3255 | 9250 | 900 | 1575 | 6775 | 13 | 11 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 |
| 21-25 Jan 1697 | 3256 | 9250 | 900 | 1394 | 6956 | 13 | 18 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 3 |
| 25-28 Jan 1697 | 3257 | 9250 | 900 | 1638 | 6712 | 13 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| 28 Jan-1 Feb 1697 | 3258 | 9250 | 900 | 1488 | 6862 | 13 | 14 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
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Copies of the *London Gazette* printed, sold and given away May 1695-February 1697



Figure 2

Circulation of the *London Gazette*, 1666-1721



Please insert this note to appear under figure 2.

Note for Figure 2

The horizontal axis is plotted by *Gazette* issue number and because the *Gazette* was printed three times a week from June 1709 to August 1712 the scale is not linear by date.

The graph is compiled from the references mentioned in notes 4 to 11. Although stamp data exists for the 1717-1719 period I have chosen to plot the print run and sales data for ease of comparison.
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