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ABSTRACT

This thesis represents the first urban case study of public houses at all levels of the victualling hierarchy (inns, taverns and alehouses) in an early modern English context. Moving beyond representational economies, and emphasising social practice, the study mobilises the administrative, judicial and fiscal records of the borough and port of Southampton to reconstruct a 'landscape of drink' in all its institutional variety: its geographical and physical dispositions; the agents who made livelihoods and joined company in it; a full range of social, economic and political functions; and its relationship to public order and urban stability. The study emphasises the local particularity of the topographical, socio-economic and jurisdictional frameworks that structured public drinking spaces and cultures, and, drawing on interdisciplinary impulses from cultural geography and architectural theory, pays particular attention to the constitutive role of the material and spatial properties of early modern public houses in determining the range and meaning of the activities which they enclosed. Far from being regarded as problematic or marginal spatial constituents of the early modern port, these distinctive urban locales emerge as central to the imaginative, economic and social worlds of early modern town-dwellers and visitors as well as to the governing strategies of the corporation itself.
1.1 The 1878 'Drink Map of Southampton' 2
1.2 Artist's impression of Southampton in 1650 8
1.3 John Speed's 1611 street plan of Southampton 10
1.4 Southampton's parish/ward structure 11
2.1.1 1814 engraving depicting the southern Watergate with The Globe inn 21
2.1.2 Detail from John Ogilby's 1675 road map 22
2.1.3 The Hampshire bedding hierarchy in 1686 23
2.1.4 Tipplers in the stall and art rolls for 1603 24
2.1.5 Alehouse-keepers in Southampton 1559-1658 25
2.2.1 Location of Southampton's public houses c. 1620 31
2.2.2 Sightline taken through the Westgate depicting the site of The Ship alehouse 33
2.2.3 Engraving depicting the site of The George inn 34
2.2.4 Engraving of the Westgate with The Man in the Moon tavern 35
2.2.5 Tracks leading from the rear gates of The Dolphin and The Star inns 37
2.2.6 The close proximity of inn, tavern, church and marketplace 39
2.2.7 Locations of problematic institutions Above Bar 40
2.3.1 Engraving depicting the free-standing sign of The George inn 46
2.3.2 Engraving depicting the signboard of The Man in the Moon tavern 47
2.4.1 The Star and The Dolphin inns in 2007 53
2.4.2 The surviving stone cellars of Hercules Audley's alehouse 54
2.4.3 The surviving undercroft at Simnel Street 56
2.4.4 The right-hand tower of the Watergate which housed The Globe inn 57
2.4.5 The courtyards of The Star and The Dauphin inns 61
3.1.1 Primary occupations of Southampton alehouse-keepers 1619-24 79
4.1.1 The price of ordinary and double beer in Southampton 1540-1640 115
4.2.1 The Guildhall over the Bargate 139
4.2.2 Official and unofficial gaming sites east of the walls 141
4.3.1 The legitimate sites of economic exchange in early modern Southampton 152
4.3.2 The Linen Hall/Tin House on its post-1634 site 153
4.4.1 Recognizances with details of alehouse-keepers' payments to the poor 170
4.4.2 Recognizances with details of alehouse-keepers' receipt of poor children 172
5.2.1 The washing site at God's House conduit 190
6.1.1 The leet jurors' breakdown of Southampton's tippling population in 1603 220
6.1.2 Ward breakdown of 'fit' and 'unfit' tipplers presented by the leet jurors 220
6.1.3 Publicans within weights and measures offences 228
6.2.1 The locations of Southampton's five parish churches 236
6.2.1 The close spatial proximity between The Dolphin inn and Holy Rood church 237
7.1 The suburb Above Bar where an attempted arrest took place 271
ABBREVIATIONS


BRO  Buckinghamshire Record Office, Aylesbury

CLI-III  F. J. C. Hearnshaw & D. M. Hearnshaw (eds), *Court Leet Records* (3 vols), SRSoc. 1, 2, 4 (Southampton, 1905-7).

CSPD  Calendar of State Papers Domestic


HLRO  House of Lords Record Office, London

HRO  Hampshire Record Office, Winchester

HRS  Hampshire Records Society


NA  National Archives, Kew


SRO  Southampton Record Office, Southampton

SRS  Southampton Records Series (post-1951).

SRSoC  Southampton Records Society (pre-1951).

1 Introduction:
LANDSCAPES OF DRINK

According to a pamphlet published by the St Mary's Church of England Temperance Society in 1878 Southampton was 'one of the most intemperate towns in England'. To visualise this point for 'the inhabitants', they dedicated the reverse to the first known 'Drink Map of Southampton' (Fig. 1.1). The key was simple: 'Each Full-licensed House is represented by a RED SPOT; a Beer House by a STAR; Breweries by a SQUARE BLOCK; Wine Merchants, Grocers, and others who sell Wines and Spirits by a TRIANGLE'. The exercise disclosed a landscape of drink. In full colour, 522 public houses were depicted swarming over an area of just eight square miles, with particular concentrations at the docks (whose new arrivals, in a spectacular backfiring for the Society, were apparently keen to acquire this handy portable resource to aid the construction of their drinking itineraries). Indeed, according to the historian of Southampton's modern establishments, 'it seems that every other house had a license to sell drink'. This, we are assured, was emphatically a modern development; in the early modern period, when the town was in the 'doldrums', not only are records 'sketchy' but provision itself was at a minimum; it was only with the town's development as a spa town 'that many of the fashionable coaching inns were established and Southampton's reputation as a drinker's city improved'. It is a verdict with which Southampton's early modern inhabitants would surely have disagreed. For as early as 1531, although they did not accompany their comments with a map (as Daniel Smail has reminded us, medieval and early modern administrators were above all 'linguistic cartographers' disinclined to represent the space of their towns graphically), the corporation complained that 'every other house is a brewer or tapper'. It is their story with which this thesis is concerned.

Historiographical and Theoretical Orientations

Over the past three decades, public drinking has emerged as an important subject both in its own right and as a means of interrogating the wider identities, practices and processes

---

1 SRO D/Z 186. Temperance societies often deployed cartographic techniques to depict the ubiquity of drinking houses within their jurisdictions.
2 T. Gallagher, Southampton's Inns and Taverns (Southampton, 1995), p. 3.
that define early modern studies as a field. As such, a wide variety of themes and methods have been canvassed. While early twentieth-century accounts were predominantly antiquarian or architectural in scope, a valuable tradition that continues to flourish within English local history, the first systematic approaches to public drinking places developed out of the insights and accomplishments of the social history moment of the 1970s; Alan Everitt’s pioneering account of the functions of provincial inns, John Chartres’ analyses of the relationship between inns and the transport network in the long eighteenth century and, from the other end of the institutional spectrum, path-breaking

---


renderings of the functions and development of the English alehouse from Keith Wrightson and, with special regard to urban history, Peter Clark. From the late 1980s, new cultural history frameworks have authorised and promoted a more self-conscious bibulous turn, manifested in a wave of important studies that, framed within the broader coordinates of cultural history, integrate public houses into a full range of affective, economic and political relationships within local communities. Thomas Brennan, Anne Tlusty and Beat Kümin, for the well-documented case studies of Paris, Augsburg and Bern/Bavaria respectively, have displaced the disorder paradigms to which the first generation of scholarship subscribed and resited/resighted the public house in the middle ground; while aware of the ambiguities and tensions that structured public drinking practices, they emerge as centres for affirmative social action that participated in as well as complicated the authorities' quest for order in urban contexts. Yet another significant set of recent interpretations has focussed on the figuring of public drinking practices and behaviours within the representational economies of early modern print.

As early modern studies might already be said to be in its cups, another full-length study requires some justification, especially one that reproduces the institutional focus of much existing work. Case studies have an impressive precedent as a mode of public house history; according to a recent collection, most of the scholar's currently


working on public houses are involved in 'in-depth local studies that make the best use of archival evidence'. The tendency has methodological and conceptual motivations beyond the self-evident value of presenting new material or the practical imperatives of assembling a manageable body of information. Since the records do not always clearly distinguish publicans, especially at the lower end of the victualling hierarchy, we must often rely on the correlation of sources or careful inference from context if they are to be distinguished and their activities brought to light; this is best achieved in the context of the intensive source analysis and record linkages permitted by a local study. Secondly, in light of the still intense localism of early modern English society, there is an increasing contextualism that is wary of the 'scatter[ing] of examples from divers periods and territories' and acknowledges the superior potential of microhistorical terrains for coming to grips with public houses in the highly specific socio-economic, topographical and jurisdictional environments in which they were operated, used and regulated. However, despite the efflorescence of European and North American examples, it is a format that has been little-exploited for the English context beyond of Alan Everitt's early work on Northampton and Janet Pennington's recent analysis of public houses in early modern West Sussex, neither of which are institutionally comprehensive (focussing on inns and eliding alehouses respectively) or presented within a cultural history idiom.

10 Kümín & Tlusty, 'Introduction', in idem, World of the Tavern, p. 6.
12 As Andy Wood has noted, 'social history must describe and analyse historical situations within contexts which were meaningful to their subject'. Idem, The Politics of Social Conflict: The Peak Country 1520-1770 (Cambridge & New York, 1999), p. 26. For a more recent emphasis on the continued localism of many communities see the contributions to N. L. Jones & D. Woolf (eds), Local Identities in Late Medieval and Early Modern England (Basingstoke, 2007).
15 J. Pennington, 'The Inns and Taverns of West Sussex 1500-1700: A Regional Study of their Architectural and Social History' (PhD thesis, University of Southampton, 2002); idem, 'Inns and
Firstly, then, this study aims to offer the first English case study of public houses of all legislative categories in the particularly congenial setting of a port town. The unassuming borough of Southampton on the English south coast was selected for various reasons. A town represents the natural locus for a public house study because of their greater density of drinking sites than rural contexts; a port community in particular would have had its provision heightened still further by the widespread presence of transitory groups such as mariners and soldiers. Not only does Southampton boast varied and abundant sources on which little serious work has been undertaken, but its circumscribed physical and demographic status as a medium-sized town (it consistently contained less than 5000 souls throughout our period) has enabled me to develop intimate acquaintances with the town’s public houses and the people who ran, patronised and attempted to control them in ways that would not have been possible in a larger town, and that are hitherto lacking from our understanding of drinking cultures at ground level from the perspective of early modern England.

Secondly, and in close relation, the study emphasises the spatial attributes of public drinking environments; if the consumption of alcohol was indeed built into the fabric of English society in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it was primarily via the architectonic media of public houses, and the focus here is not so much on drinking products and practices per se as on the alehouse, tavern and inn as ‘particularly significant and culturally patterned’ manifestations of urban space.16 They might literally seem well-charted territories, especially given the institutional emphasis of much existing work; however, notwithstanding the basic insight that publicans were (in Thomas Brennan’s phrase) ‘selling space... as well as the drink’, in a particularly vivid example of what geographer Ed Soja has termed the ‘illusion of transparency’ there is a tendency to abstract public houses into networks of agents and social relations devoid of material or

---

spatial referents. Most recently, for example, Phil Withington has self-consciously attempted to de-couple tavern-based interactional orders from ‘social and material realities’ in his description of free-floating ‘companies’ lacking any sort of institutional purchase: ‘[S]ociability was framed not so much by physical setting and place... as the grouping – the ‘company’ – which they themselves formed within that setting’. Literary approaches, meanwhile, reproducing well-trodden notions of language as the sole agent of social meaning and effecting a familiar collapsing of methodology and experience (we mainly approach early modern social action linguistically therefore contemporaries experienced it as such), have threatened to submerge the landscape of drink altogether beneath an occluding sphere of representation by authorising claims that the public house ‘was as much a textual space as a lived space’.

This study aims to restore some emphasis to the second part of this formulation. While recognising that ‘to consider the physical and territorial context to drinking... alone is incomplete’, it has been broadly shaped within what might be called ‘the spatial turn’, a theoretical and interpretative manoeuvre within the humanities and social sciences that has upgraded space, both imagined and real, from an inert platform to a socio-cultural product with an ‘agentic’ role in social action. Early modern people, like those in other times and places, were ‘embedded in spatiality’, both via representations and more literally at a range of material locales – the actually lived space of sites – distributed in messy abundance across their villages and towns. We now have a fuller understanding of how a wide range of quotidian and architecturally-defined ‘microspaces’ – dwelling houses, parish churches, streets and marketplaces – were not passive backdrops but were instead constitutive arenas

---

of social and cultural meaning through which identities, hierarchies and relationships within local society in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were perennially reified, reproduced and negotiated. Space in all of these recent excavations is never constraining; while the tangible orderings and configurations of buildings exerted a degree of influence on social action and experience, ‘space’ (unlike its more static correlate ‘place’) is activated by regimes of use and therefore represents an engagement between agency and structure with temporal attributes. It is, in Michel de Certeau’s well-known formulation, ‘practiced place’; it is what happens to the latter when it is peopled and set in motion.

The public house, by far the most ubiquitous components of the ‘English urban marketplace’ in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, has so far evaded analysis in these dynamic and invigorating terms, and in part I attempt to bring some of these insights and perspectives to the inn, tavern and alehouse doors of early modern Southampton. Although recent calls for the closer examination of the aspatial ‘dynamics of co-presence’ are welcome, we misrepresent the world of the tavern if we disaggregate these altogether from material and spatial circumstances. Inns, taverns and alehouses were not texts but, in Chris Philo’s evocative phrase ‘substantive geographies’, whose signboards jutted out into the streetspace and furnished geographical resources for townspeople. Although often operating out of domestic houses, and while never ‘closed boxes’, they offered services, provided types of employment, contained genres of.

---


sociability and were targeted by modes of regulation that we do simply not witness in other settings to the same degree or in the same combinations. Their physical constellations, while never dictating social practice, made for particular conjunctions of bodies and things, and offered symbolic and highly visible resources for the expression and reproduction of those power relations that we would be ill-advised to eliminate altogether from the ale-bench, tavern table or inn hall. We will now introduce the wider urban space within which these assertions will be substantiated.

Southampton: A Case Study

Southampton enables us to fulfil an analytical imperative to, in Michel Foucault’s formulation, ‘make the space in question precise’, and it is to a brief accounting of the various histories of this seaside town that we must now turn. Located on the southern

---

coast of Hampshire, a predominantly agricultural county consisting mainly of open pasture, Southampton was a 'lesser provincial centre' that occupied the south-western portion of the peninsula created by the confluence of the rivers Test and Itchen (which came together in the Southampton Water [Fig 1.2]). The town contained 4,200 souls in 1596, although severe outbreaks of plague in 1604 and 1665 retarded demographic growth in the seventeenth century; its inhabitants have been numbered at 2600 in 1665 and 3200 in 1676. They plied trades typical for any small market town, as officeholders, professionals, craftsmen, retailers and labourers, but with particular concentrations in the coopering, textile, shipbuilding and maritime sectors.

Their lives were organised around some enduring cartographic features, the dispositions of which are most clearly disclosed in John Speed's street plan of 1611 (Fig. 1.3). While its liberties encompassed three miles of rural hinterland (taking in manor of Portswood and the small fishing villages of Northam and Hill), with the exception of two suburbs the early modern town remained confined to the civilising parallelogram described by its ancient walls. Rising to thirty feet high in parts, the ramparts were punctuated by twenty-nine towers and pierced by seven gates, the most important of which was the northern Bargate, flanked by wooden lions and festooned with heraldry as well as with portraits of Bevis and Ascupart (visualising the local legend that, at the dawn of Albion, the town had been founded by giants). Passing through this imposing channel, the visitor was deposited upon English Street. Extending the full 420 paces to the southern Watergate on a gentle incline, it was described by John Leland as 'one of the fairest streets in all England' and, like all the town's thoroughfares, was lined with timber-framed structures. It formed the central axis of a 'grid' or 'ladder' pattern, paralleled by French Street and Bull Street and linked by a latticework of lanes. Four of the town parishes (Holy Rood to the southeast, St Michael's/St John's to the southwest and St Lawrence to the north) were intramural; All Saints contained the northern portion of the walled town as well as the northern suburb (technically called All Saints Extra/Without, but more commonly referred to as

---


'Above Bar' in the 'linguistic cartography' of townspeople; while St Mary's was wholly extramural and consisted of the eastern suburb (FIG. 1.4). Two town quays to the south and east provided entry points for waterborne people and goods, the town fields (Houndwell, Hogland and The Marlands) fell to the north, while to the east there was a network of orchards, the town’s official bowling green and a large salt marsh.

Like its physical frameworks, Southampton’s political and institutional structures were inherited from the medieval period and remained remarkably static over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Southampton’s formal incorporation in 1445 devolved power to the mayor, bailiffs and some fifty burgesses, based on the medieval merchant guild and consisting mainly of the mercantile elite (but also including grocers, drapers and leading craftsmen), who gained a typical range of privileges including those of the common seal, perpetual succession, owning land, and suing and being sued. Its achievement of county status two years later conferred additional privileges onto the town, the most important of which was the ability to hold its own quarter sessions, and

---

32 Smail, ‘Linguistic Cartography’.
33 SRO SC3/1/1-2.
gave its governors administrative and regulatory powers far more extensive than those experienced by their equivalents in other jurisdictions. While the civic community was technically composed of all burgesses, municipal government and real legislative power was increasingly concentrated into the hands of a much smaller group consisting of the mayor, high-ranking town officers (sheriff, bailiff and recorder) and some hand-picked aldermen (former mayors or those being groomed for the office) who controlled their own succession via the practice of private nominations. First acknowledged as the 'Common Council' in a reissued charter of 1640, this oligarchic inner ring of somewhere between twelve and fifteen men 'controlled the affairs of the town... appointing its

---

officials, managing its property and finances, conducting its external relations and exercising over its inhabitants a wide if ill-defined summary jurisdiction'.

They also monopolised control of the town’s four main judicial instruments, which (with the exception of the court leet) met in the Guildhall over the northern Bargate (pictured in Fig. 4.2.1). They served as the Justices of the Peace who heard criminal cases at quarter sessions; they heard civil pleas at the town or common court; they adjudicated in maritime disputes at the admiralty court; and they heard and acted upon the presentments by the jurors of the court leet, an ancient manorial jurisdiction geared towards the detection and punishment of public nuisances. Indeed, such was the concentration of judicial authority that much of the business of all of these courts was in practice despatched at the council’s weekly Friday meetings, known as the assembly, which took place in the specially constructed Audit House halfway down (and built into) English Street which, rather than the Guildhall, represented the real architectural signifier of civic governance. For the implementation of decisions taken the council depended upon formalised police institutions in the form of two annually elected constables, twelve beadles (two for each ward), a night watch of twelve, as well as four sergeants-at-mace who attended the council in body but who also had wider powers of supervision and arrest in case of need.

Southampton’s economic fortunes were far more variable. Situated on a land-protected promontory and visited twice daily by a double tide, Southampton was the best natural harbour on the English south coast whose medieval prosperity was based almost entirely on its status as an entrepôt for wine, woad and luxury items from southern Europe and the East. However, with improvements in the navigability of the Thames in the 1530s and the larger changes of emphasis within the European economic system that resulted from the rise of Antwerp, the London merchants who had utilised the town as the outport for their Mediterranean trading activities withdrew to the capital. This devastating commercial reversal meant that Southampton and its inhabitants entered the period covered by this dissertation during a phase of crisis and restructuring; the fee farm (an annual rent paid to the king) was reduced from £226 to £226.

37 Temple Patterson, Southampton: A Biography, p. 65.
39 The best analysis of these complex processes remains A. A. Ruddock, Italian Merchants and Shipping in Southampton 1270-1600, SRS 1 (Southampton, 1951), pp. 255-72.
£50 in 1552, while the departure of the capital’s mercantile elite as well as a substantial colony of Genoese, Florentine and Venetian agents provided vivid daily evidence of the town’s reduction from the chief centre of Italian shipping in England to ‘a mere provincial port’ or ‘quiet seaside town and market centre’. 40

However, earlier accounts of the town’s catastrophic decline in the late-sixteenth and seventeenth-centuries have been revised in more recent studies that have tended to argue for the adaptability of its urban population and a reconceptualisation of its early modern economic development in terms of a ‘succession of depressions and recoveries’. 41 While Southampton no longer maintained links with the Mediterranean, and (unlike Exeter or Bristol) did not cultivate any with New England, Virginia or the West Indies, it was ‘far from... a decayed and neglected backwater’. Readjusting to the requirements of a regional port, the town’s merchants continued to import wine and vinegar from France, linen and canvas from the Channel Islands, deal planks for shipbuilding from London and the occasional consignment of coal from Newcastle, which were redistributed and remarked within the Hampshire basin and, in the case of more specialised items, over a wider area of southern England; 42 Southampton was the only town in Hampshire to have three market days per week, and held four annual fairs. 43 Italian merchants were replaced by the Dutch shipmasters and crew who bore foodstuffs, dyes and earthenware to the town in ships from the United Provinces. 44 In terms of industry, the Walloon refugee community who settled the town in 1567 were skilled clothiers who introduced the large-scale manufacture of ‘new draperies’ (employing large numbers of townspeople in spinning, weaving and woolcombing), 45 while privateering in the 1590s, the routine maintenance of merchant ships and the construction of military vessels during the Commonwealth ensured that the shipyards which lined the West Quay were usually hives of activity.

40 Temple Patterson, Southampton: A Biography, p. 36; Rance, An Illustrated History, p. 58.
Sources & Methodology

Befitting an emphasis on space and social practice, and in common with other microhistorical approaches, my study moves beyond literary evidence as a means of reconstructing Southampton's highly specific landscape of drink and instead exploits the superior potential offered by an "intensive study of the documentary material." 46 As well as victualling records themselves (recognizances of alehousekeepers taken locally, vintner's fines taken nationally and those surveys of guest beds and stabling occasionally prepared by the war office), 47 the administrative and judicial records of the town council form the principal sources on which this study is based. Indeed, Southampton offers a remarkable (if not entirely representative) interpretative opportunity in this regard because of the relative independence and autonomy of its legislative and bureaucratic culture. Public drinking and related matters often dominated the agenda at the weekly meetings of the assembly in the Audit House; the minutes of their discussions, which survive in almost unbroken sequence from the early sixteenth century down to the 1800s, enable us to reconstruct the evolving attitudes of town governors towards public houses in great detail. 48 Of the town's four judicial venues, records generated by the court leet and quarter sessions in particular represent treasure troves of relevant information. The minor misdeeds presented by leet jurors at an annual Law Day held at a wooded clearing a few miles to the north of the town (known as the "Cuthorn"), recorded in designated folios of which over sixty are extant for the period 1550-1700, include countless examples of public minor affrays, encroachments and weights and measures offences that disclose the quotidian contours of the landscape of drink at an extraordinary level of detail and suggest a prominent role for leet jurors themselves in their regulation. 49 In addition, the jurors' de facto identification of all alehouse-keepers in the stall and art lists

47 On these specific types of record see W. Branch-Johnson, 'Some Sources of Inn History', Amateur Historian 6 (1963), pp. 18-21; and especially J. Gibson & J. Hunter, Victuallers' Licenses: Records for Family and Local Historians (Bury, 2000 [2nd ed.]).
48 These have been published to a high standard and without omissions by the Southampton Records Society/Series for the period covering 1514 to 1616. See RBI-IV; MB; ABI-IV.
49 These records have been published for the period 1550 to 1624 by F. J. C. and D. N. Hearnshaw under the auspices of the original Southampton Records Society, who have also prepared a useful extended essay on the nature of leet jurisdiction. However, while transcribed accurately and without censoriousness, the Hearnshaws condensed and sometimes omitted altogether material and presentments they regarded as repetitious (including the stall and art rolls, where they were apparently missed the full significance of 'tip' in the margins, and the details of weights and measures offences/offenders). Thus, both published and manuscript versions of the leet material up to 1624 will be cited. See CLI-III; and idem, Leet Jurisdiction in England, Especially as Illustrated by the Records of the Leet Court of Southampton (Southampton, 1908). On courts leet see p. 213 n18.
with which they preceded their formal presentments has thrown unusual light on the notorious dark figure of unlicensed selling and has enabled the reconstruction of something approaching real totals over a 100 year period. The records of quarter sessions reveal regulatory priorities and throw light on the intersections between the public house network and more serious categories of offences; unfortunately only two order books (covering the periods 1609-35 and 1694-7) and a handful of rolls have survived for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

What have survived, however, are some fourteen books of examinations and depositions taken at the very outset of trials by the mayor and aldermen in their capacity as Justices between the years 1570 to 1679 (with the only significant omission covering the period between 1602 and 1622). While extant for other jurisdictions, the fact that the ability to hold its own sessions was one of Southampton’s privileges means that we are in the almost unique position of having all of these testimonies converge on the inhabitants of a single urban locale. They have been supplemented by all twelve extant books of depositions from the ecclesiastical court at Winchester (for 1561-1603 and 1631), before which Southampton people often appeared as litigants, defendants and witnesses, but which also provide comparative glimpses into the other villages and market towns scattered throughout Hampshire. While structured slightly differently (interrogations in the ecclesiastical context, for example, were far more ‘directed’ by the probing questions of proctors), as Withington has recently noted these socially comprehensive narratives of behaviour teem with privileged points of access to the world of the tavern. While public drinking itself was seldom central to the main charges and counter-charges (emerging most commonly in relation to instances of theft, rape or murder in the sessions material, or to cases of defamation or marital disputes in the church courts), ordinary people often refer to their use and experience of public houses to lend detail to their accounts, and were indeed encouraged to do so; moreover, as

50 On quarter sessions examinations see J. A. Sharpe, *Crime in Early Modern England 1550-1750* (London & New York, 1999 [2nd ed.]), p. 53. Those for the periods 1601-2 and 1622-44 have been published accurately and (with only a single exception) without censorship by R. C. Anderson under the auspices of the Southampton Records Society (E&D, E&DI-IV). An earlier volume containing depositions for the period 1570-94 has also been published; however, given the inaccuracy of transcriptions, frequent censorship and omission of an entire deposition book these earlier records are quoted from the relevant manuscripts. See G. H. Hamilton (ed.), *Books of Examinations and Depositions 1570-1594*, SR Soc. 16 (Southampton, 1914).


recently demonstrated by Amanda Flather, such testimonies can yield a particularly sensitive and dynamic picture of spatial relations.\textsuperscript{53}

As is now sufficiently known, we must handle these accounts with care. Those same legal procedures which have preserved these voices in the tavern imposed their own multiple filters of mediation; witnesses responded to the highly pointed queries of legal professionals, which were then recorded by a clerk in specialist terminology and according to judicial principles of selection. More seriously, we are now aware that deponents were not only prey to lapses of memory but also self-consciously shaped their oral testimony in ways designed to secure legal advantage.\textsuperscript{54} However, a limitation to mere discourse analyses seems unwise; the study resists ‘the reduction of the historian’s work to a purely rhetorical activity which interprets texts and not events themselves’, and assumes that the townspeople who appeared before the courts were attempting to refer their interlocutors back to actual events in public house contexts, albeit in ways calculated to present their behaviour or that of their associates in as good a light as possible.\textsuperscript{55} In relation to the first point, censorship is not thought to have been widespread, while frequent confusion and repetitiousness in the accounts and evidence of hurried scribal practices (especially on the part of Southampton’s busy clerks) suggests that testimonies were often delivered as coherent narratives and taken pretty much verbatim. The inevitability of ‘fiction in the archives’, meanwhile, should not be regarded as an interpretative booby trap but can be instead used to reconstruct the social and cultural norms that structured the use and understanding of public houses. For example, when Edward Fowler described how in 1626 he heard William Smith promise marriage to his sister Mary in the chamber of The Star inn in St Lawrence’s parish it matters not so much whether the exchange took place here or not (although the corroborating testimony of three other witnesses suggests that on this occasion it did) as that he knew that emphasising the public setting of the betrothal would lend authority to Mary’s complaint in the eyes of the court.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{53} Flather, \textit{Gender and Space}.


\textsuperscript{56} HRO 21M65 C3/12, Fo. 64.
These administrative and judicial findings have been enriched by other categories of records, in particular probate inventories. Essentially lists and valuations of a testator's movable possessions prepared on their death by friends and neighbours, they 'survive in bulk for Winchester diocese from the early sixteenth century' at an unusual level of social depth, and over seventy prepared on behalf of Southampton's alehouse-keepers, taverners, innholders and brewers have been identified, several with wills attached; rather than rely on the contents of inventories to determine their occupations, a tried and tested methodology but one highly inappropriate for the diagnosis of victuallers given the lack of specialised materials and equipment required to set up an alehouse, they were all determined via record linkage. While, as is well-known, their exclusive focus on movable goods and disregard of freehold and copyhold tenures means they cannot confidently be used to assess overall wealth, they almost literally furnish graphic insights into the lifestyles enjoyed by publicans and, with certain caveats, into the functions, spatial configurations and likely appearance of their premises. These records have been contextualised still further by information gleaned from other miscellaneous data sources that offer more fleeting soundings from the landscape of drink: visitation returns, parish documents, taxation records, civic accounts, leases of town property, topographical engravings and, not least, the material remains of the institutions themselves (two of Southampton's early modern inns, The Star and The Dolphin on the High Street, are still very much open for business under their original signs, albeit in heavily Georgianised variants).

Although quantitative approaches to this rich body of material have occasionally been possible, by and large the study makes no pretence to statistical investigation for both practical and philosophical reasons. Even the most consistent run of Southampton sources, the minutes of the weekly meetings of the Assembly, contains

---


60 For an extended discussion of these issues see M. Todd, The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland (New Haven & London, 2002), pp. 16-18.
significant gaps, while all of the borough records are unusually prone to those erratic scribal practices, inconsistent recording conventions and jurisdictional overlaps and repetitions that place attempts at numerical analysis on uncertain ground. There is also something incompletely (micro)historical about reducing the multiplication of voices to be heard echoing across the landscape of drink to statistical aggregates which, as Giovanni Levi has noted, in their illusion of concreteness can actually circumvent ‘the concrete facts... of transactions themselves’. The study, then, proceeds by the telling example rather than the data cell and ‘attempt[s] to demonstrate... the true functioning of certain aspects of society which would be distorted by generalisation and quantitative formalisation used on their own’. I attach names to protagonists more than is usual, and wherever possible they speak in their own voice.

The study employs a variation on a ‘long seventeenth century’ chronology, covering the years from around 1550 to around 1700. This periodisation was reasoned on a number of levels. In thematic terms, it provides a ‘distinct and coherent time span for the study of public houses’, post-dating the reformation and coinciding with the first licensing act of 1552, but largely predating provincial coffeehouses (the first reference to which in Southampton occurs in an information from 1745) and the turnpike trusts that revolutionised overland communications and, in turn, the inn network that sustained them. From a more local perspective, it coincides with the intelligible socio-economic period between Southampton’s late medieval heyday and its development as a popular spa resort in the early 1700s, which was attended by the rebuilding of its leading inns, the introduction of regularised stagecoach services and the flowering of new species of social space such as assembly rooms and bathhouses. And in terms of methodology, it encompasses Southampton’s sources at the height of their detail and richness. The court leet jurors of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, like those in other jurisdictions, were not as painstaking or effusive as those of earlier generations, and were increasingly content to provide rosters of offenders’ names under thematic subheadings

---

of misdemeanours which are seldom glossed ('Weights and Measures', 'For Having Shuffleboards' etc). The Assembly, meanwhile, was increasingly concerned with granting or renewing leases on town property and the administration of charities, and occasionally failed to materialise altogether. As the incumbent mayor recorded in his own hand in 1713: 'This day I came to the [Audit] House a little after ten of the clock in the forenoon and continued here until after Holy Rood clock struck twelve and not one of the Town Council attended, which I believe is without precedent'.

However, some vivid depositions for the post-1700 period which survive among the loose files of both the quarter sessions and the Winchester consistory have been included in the analysis.

Southampton's landscape of drink is explored across five thematic chapters. Chapter two establishes inns, taverns and alehouses as 'substantive geographies', disclosing typological and numerical variations, distribution, signifying mechanisms as well as the size and configuration of premises. Chapter three attempts to 'people the public house' and offers a profile of the three main groups that inhabited it (publicans, servants and patrons), while chapter four analyses the very wide range of functions and services that comprised 'victualling regimes in action'. Chapter five addresses public houses as venues of urban sociability, while chapter six excavates the local mechanisms that regulated public houses and considers their wider relationship to urban stability.

---

65 SRO SC2/1/9, Fo. 139v.
Lining Southampton's streets and scattered in its suburbs were a variety of houses in which both visitors and townsmen could legitimately drink alcohol, and sometimes obtain meals and lodge. They were internally differentiated by important divergences in modes of licensing, services provided, size and social profiles, although all exhibited the generic affiliation of serving alcoholic beverages to paying customers within fixed architectural settings; this distinguished them from coffeehouses, cookshops such as the 'ordinary' licensed to Richard Hardy and his wife in 1650,\(^1\) or temporary premises like the impermanent 'booth' in which two deponents described drinking during Trinity Fair in the same year.\(^2\) Indeed, by the eighteenth century these distinctive establishments were quite literally woven into the urban fabric; property leases and a surviving engraving reveal *The Globe* inn to have been trading from the left flank of the southern Water Gate (FIG. 2.1.1). From this pleasing architectonic metaphor, this first chapter addresses necessary first questions about inns, taverns and alehouses as 'substantive geographies',\(^3\) and offers an analysis of the physical make-up of the landscape of drink within the wider urban setting. How many public houses were there in early modern Southampton and how did contemporaries categorise them? Where were they located, and what were their modes of signification? How large were premises, how were they configured, and how might they be related to the problem of public and private space?

### 2.1 Typology and Numbers

Southampton would have entered the period covered by this dissertation with an extensive hospitality infrastructure already intact. A large and literal floating population of merchants and mariners who poured through the West and Water gates from the galleys and carracks associated with the town's Italian trade all required victuals, lodging and entertainment during stays in the town that could last from a few days to three or four months if ships were harboured over the winter months. While it was common practice for merchants and high-ranking seamen to rent properties in the maritime

---

\(^1\) SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 60v.
\(^2\) SRO SC9/3/12, Fos. 49v-50r.
\(^3\) The phrase is from Philo, 'Foucault's Geography', pp. 221-30.
parishes of St Michael’s and St John’s, to lodge with leading townspeople or to maintain sumptuous cabins aboard vessels, the rank and file enjoyed none of these amenities and provided ‘a comfortable livelihood... to artisans, victuallers, taverners and small shopkeepers’. As well as these nautical connections, the town also formed the hub of a radial overland transport network that would have regularly channelled visitors through its North and East gates and to the doors of its public houses. Most of southern Hampshire’s major arteries intersected with Southampton; while its peninsular position meant that east-west journeys necessitated a ferry journey over the Test and Itchen rivers, according to John Oilby’s road atlas from 1675, generally regarded as accurate for the county, Southampton was linked to London via a ‘very good road’, and connected directly with Winchester and Salisbury via secondary routes in slightly poorer condition.

4 Platt, Medieval Southampton, p. 162; Ruddock, Italian Merchants, pp. 130, 148-9.
The slightly later road book of William Morden (1695) delineated a further branch road to Chichester and a ferry service across the Southampton Water.\(^6\)

General numerical impressions of resulting public house densities within the town can be gained from national censuses of guest beds and stabling undertaken by the war office in connection with the musters in 1577 and 1686 (a later 1756 census falls beyond the temporal scope of this study). The 1577 survey is of little value in the reconstruction of urban provision because its hundredal organisational scheme means it is impossible to ascertain numbers within particular towns.\(^7\) The 1686 survey, arranged by settlement, represents a more useful set of returns and reveals Southampton to have had accommodation for 179 footmen and 287 horses at this time, placing it third in the county hierarchy behind Winchester and Andover (both growing exchange centres), but still just ahead of its expanding south coast neighbour Portsmouth and the market towns of Newport (on the Isle of Wight) and Basingstoke (FIG. 2.1.3).\(^8\) However, it still cannot be used to determine accurate totals at the institutional level. Inns and alehouses are amalgamated, taverns (which generally offered no accommodation) are ignored altogether, while figures refer to overall provision for lodgers and animals rather than to the number of drinking houses understood as distinct spatial units. For a more accurate picture of the landscape of drink we must home in on different types of source and distinguish more carefully between different types of establishment.

---

\(^7\) NA SP 12/96.

\(^8\) NA WO/30/48, Fo. 75.
Within the overarching and somewhat later rubric of 'public houses' (first used by several deponents before the Winchester consistory in the early eighteenth century)\textsuperscript{9} or 'bars' (first used by a soldier in 1741),\textsuperscript{10} Southampton's inhabitants and visitors would have experienced a variety of places characterised by important social, economic, legal and physical particularities. As is now almost axiomatic, the early modern victualling hierarchy comprised alehouses, taverns and inns, and estimations of numbers must proceed within this three-fold institutional taxonomy.\textsuperscript{11} Alehouses, for which 'tippling' or 'victualling' houses served locally as synonyms, formed the broad base of the pyramid; run, in Peter Clark's influential if overly generalising slogan, 'for the poor, by the poor', they offered cold food, ale and beer, and lodging for pedestrians but not travellers on horseback. The fact that under the terms of the 1552 act their operators (alehouse-keepers) had to be formally licensed by local justices (in Southampton's case the common council in their guise as magistrates) who maintained careful records of their decisions means that the number of legitimate premises can be accurately deduced for years where recognizances of keepers survive;\textsuperscript{12} they are extant among the borough's

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure2.1.3.png}
\caption{The Hampshire town bedding hierarchy in 1686. NA WO/30/48, Fo. 75.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{9} HRO 21 M65 C7/1/22, 93, C7/2/108-9.
\textsuperscript{10} SRO SC9/4/214.
\textsuperscript{11} See Clark, \textit{Alehouse}, pp. 4-14; J. Hunter, 'Legislation, Royal Proclamations and other National Directives Affecting Inns, Taverns, Alehouses, Brandy Shops and Punch Houses 1552-1757' (PhD, University of Reading, 1994), pp. 14-9, 151-65.
\textsuperscript{12} 5/6 Edward VI, c.25.
FIG. 2.1.4 Five individuals from the ward of St Michael's and St John's are identified as tipplers in the stall and art rolls for 1603. SRO SC6/1/27, Fo. 12v (detail).

sessions papers for the periods 1619 to 1624,\textsuperscript{13} and in a later run for 1661 to 1668.\textsuperscript{14} For the earlier period there was an annual average of twenty-three licensed alehouses (with a range of twenty-one to twenty-six), while for the later period there was a lower annual average of sixteen sanctioned establishments (with a range of ten to twenty), although the coincidence of this run of recognizances with the plague outbreak of 1665 probably explains this reduction.

A major problem with these official registers preserved in judicial contexts is their inherent bypassing of the dark figure of unlicensed establishments, a particular handicap to a tidy totting up of alehouses given the extent of illicit selling at this level of the hierarchy. Occasional citations of unlicensed keepers throw some light on these houses (such as the ten unlicensed sellers named and committed to the Counter in 1619),\textsuperscript{15} although even these only embrace those individuals whose illegal activities came to light or were prosecuted. Here, an unusual interpretative lifeline has been extended across the centuries by the court leet jury; in the lengthy lists of stall and art payers with which their formal presentments were preceded up until 1658, after which the practice inexplicably ceases, they strove to label all alehouse-keepers with a 'tip' (i.e. tippler) in the margin next to their names whether they were licensed or not (FIG. 2.1.4). Of course, problems remain; these substantial householders were probably not as au courant with the lower reaches of the landscape of drink as they thought they were, individual juries varied in their thoroughness, and in consequence certain individuals still evaded detection (for

\textsuperscript{13} SRO SC9/2/1.
\textsuperscript{14} SRO SC9/2/11.
\textsuperscript{15} SRO SC9/2/1, Fo. 41r.
example, in a 1586 examination a cobbler described drinking at 'Simon Brock's house a tippler in St Michael's parish' who appears nowhere in the leet records). However, such omissions seem to have been rare, and the jury's de facto labelling of all alehouse-keepers has permitted the reconstruction of something approaching real totals for the period 1559 to 1658 (FIG. 2.1.5). The picture reveals wide fluctuations in line with economic, military and especially epidemiological vicissitudes (the town suffered devastating plague visitations in 1604 and 1665), although a high-point was reached in 1603 when sixty-nine institutions were identified at a time when the total population has been estimated at 4200; this made for an alehouse to inhabitant ratio of 1:61, or 1:13 if only male household heads are included. This ratio is somewhat less than those speculated by Peter Clark for the important market centre of Shrewsbury (1:29) or the university town

---

16 SRO SC9/3/7, Fo. 31r.
19 I arrived at the number of male household heads by dividing 4200 by an estimated average household size of 4.75. See P. Laslett, 'Mean Household Size in England since the Sixteenth Century', in idem & R. Wall (eds), Household and Family in Past Time (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 125-58.
of Cambridge (1:52), but is the same as that he posits for the northern Kent port of Faversham (1:61).20

Such startling frequencies were not reproduced at the upper levels of the hierarchy. Taverns formed the middle and narrowest band of the hospitality pyramid; they offered a range of wines as well as hot food, although offered no accommodation for travellers. Their operation confined in Southampton to burgesses by an 'ancient custom' (reiterated as a byelaw in 1551),21 unlike alehouse-keepers these 'taverners' were licensed by the central authority under the terms of a 1553 act where the privilege was farmed out to favourites and patentees.22 The act made it illegal to keep a tavern in contexts outside of cities, corporate towns, boroughs, ports and market centres, where numbers were limited to two or otherwise closely specified; Southampton was one of twenty-two major towns named in the act and was granted three taverns (significantly less than the forty allocated to London or the eight assigned to York, but the same number enjoyed by, inter alia, Oxford, Salisbury and Westminster). Evidence suggests that this limit was observed in the sixteenth century: in 1564 the council confirmed licenses for three individuals 'to endure during their pleasure' (the act devolved the nomination and appointment of taverners to urban authorities);23 of six wine licenses granted to Southampton inhabitants in 1575 only three were for standalone taverns;24 while a local schedule attached to a chandler's contract from 1577 outlining the requirements of 'innholders, taverners and tippling houses' identified three taverners.25

However, the prominence of wine within Southampton's trading portfolio means that more was probably sold by retail on an unofficial basis by merchants involved in its import (English vintners, unlike their central European equivalents, enjoyed no automatic right to retail the wine they handled).26 In 1585 three Southampton merchants paid indentures to the exchequer to discharge them from fines for selling wines by retail,27 in 1587 a deponent described 'drinking wine' at the dwelling house of a merchant,28 while merchant Dennis Rowse was identified as a 'vintner' in the stall and art

20 Clark, Alehouse, pp. 47-50.
21 P. Studer (ed. ), The Oak Book of Southampton I, SRSoc. 10 (Southampton, 1910), p. 121; CLI, p. 28.
22 7 Edward VI, c.5.
23 RBII, pp. 93-4.
24 NA E351/3153.
25 RBIII, p. 83. Southampton's implementation of the act is referenced in Hunter, 'Legislation'. p. 92.
26 This is also speculated in Lamb, 'The Seaborne Trade of Southampton', p. 133. On these privileges and some resulting controversies in early modern Bern see B. Kümin, 'Public Houses and Civic Tensions in Early Modern Bern', Urban History 34 (2007), pp. 89-101.
27 NA E176/1/175.
28 HRO 21 M65 C3/9, Fo. 463.
rolls for 1594 and had been fined for a defective wine quart in 1589.\textsuperscript{29} As elsewhere, central records disclose a multiplication of Southampton fines and licenses in the seventeenth century; nine individuals paid fines in 1614, as did ten more in 1625.\textsuperscript{32} In addition, from the mid-seventeenth century the governing assembly themselves started to confer tavern licenses in exchange for annual rents (a total of ten individuals were granted retail privileges between 1644 and 1661);\textsuperscript{31} in 1665, when the council hit upon the ruse of selling 'the three wine licenses which were formerly granted unto this town by Act of Parliament' to Richard Richbell for a flat fee of £30 for a seven year lease, it is hardly surprising that the offer was flatly refused.\textsuperscript{32} 

At the apex of the victualling hierarchy were the inns; operated by burgesses, merchants and substantial craftsmen in their capacity as (in local parlance) 'inholders', and occupying large and often purpose-built sites, they offered a full range of alcoholic beverages, diversified menus and could lodge both pedestrians and horses. Unlike alehouses and taverns they were not targeted by systematic licensing initiatives, although there were various contexts in which they could be formally authorised. They occasionally (but by no means always) acquired wine licenses,\textsuperscript{33} while individual houses were sometimes sanctioned on an occasional basis by the assembly (in 1584, wheelwright Thomas Broker paid 20s to the council 'for our good will to set up his sign, and keep an inn').\textsuperscript{34} Inns also had briefly to be licensed under the auspices of Giles Mompesson's monopoly between 1617 and 1621, which generated two new Southampton establishments: The Black Talbot, a suppressed alehouse which had been implicated in the theft and consumption of a sheep in 1592 and which was apparently short-lived;\textsuperscript{35} and The Bear, a large establishment in the northern suburb which would become the town's foremost carrying inn.\textsuperscript{36} While these sporadic attempts at regulation provide glimpses into overall provision, the absence of thoroughgoing practices of registration and recording at this level of the hierarchy means numbers for inns cannot be reconstructed with the same confidence as those for alehouses and taverns. However, the

\textsuperscript{29} SRO SC6/1/22, Fos. 7r-13v; SC6/1/20, Fo. 19v. 
\textsuperscript{30} E163/17/22. On the proliferation of taverns in other urban contexts in the seventeenth century see Hunter, 'Legislation', pp. 113-8. 
\textsuperscript{31} SC2/1/8, Fos. 11v, 18v, 26r, 37v, 54r-v, 59v, 100v, 113r, 171v. 
\textsuperscript{32} SC2/1/8, Fo. 209v. 
\textsuperscript{33} For example SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 12v. 
\textsuperscript{34} SRO SC5/3/1, Fo. 141r. This payment was evidently commuted from the 50s originally charged. See RBIII, p. 3-4. 
\textsuperscript{35} SRO SC9/3/9, Fo. 16v. 
\textsuperscript{36} BRO D/X 648; NA 351/3155 (The Black Talbot); 3156 (The Bear); HLRO 3341, Box 2a. On the Mompesson scheme see Hunter, 'Legislation', pp. 126-37.
aforementioned chandler's contract from 1577 names seven innholders then open for business within the town; they almost certainly held The Crown, The Greyhound, The Dolphin, The Star, all ancient establishments within the walls, and The George, The White Horse and The Katherine Wheel (Thomas Broker's recently established inn) Above Bar. If we add The Bear, we arrive at a total of eight establishments for the period around 1620, a number which remained stable throughout the seventeenth century. Adding the three 'official' taverns and eight inns to the sixty-nine alehouses already mentioned, we arrive at as total of eighty drinking establishments for 4200 people in 1603, a ratio of 1:53 (or 1:11 male household heads).

Although these ideal typologies of drinking houses furnish a useful organising principle, and while not wishing to elide some very real legislative, linguistic and practical variations, a central theme of the study is the way in which such tidy theoretical distinctions were contested and reworked in practice as institutions intersected in complex ways across the landscape of drink; this requires special emphasis, as the study converges on public houses of all categories in ways that is unusual for early modern England. Peter Clark has argued that confusion 'was particularly the case in country districts where the differences between kinds of premises were less marked than in towns', and that in urban settings it was possible to 'distinguish with reasonable confidence' between types of establishment (it is unfortunate for this argument that he himself describes Southampton's The White Horse, an inn in the town's agricultural suburb Above Bar, as a 'city alehouse'). Things were not so straightforward in Southampton, where institutions regularly migrated across legal boundaries. Alehouses became inns (The Black Talbot under Mompesson, while Thomas Broker was operating as a 'tippler' long before his house gained full privileges as The White Horse in 1584), while taverns reverted back to alehouses; gentleman Grafton Jackson was granted a tavern licence in 1649 for an annual rent of £12 per year, although he was an alehouse-keeper by 1663 (his inventory discloses a two-room establishment with goods worth a mere £10). Inns in particular were not coherent entities, and the boundaries between them and lesser houses were blurred by their susceptibility to legal and spatial subdivisions; according to a detailed deposition from 1592, The George inn Above Bar also comprised a tap house and

37 RBIII, p. 83.
38 Although see Smyth, 'Introduction', in idem, Pleasing Sinne, p. xxii.
39 Clark, Alehouse, p. 5; idem, 'Alternative Society', p. 57.
40 SRO SC5/3/1, Fo. 104r.
41 SRO SC2/1/8, Fos. 54r-v; SC9/2/11, Fos. 5v-6v; HRO 1674 A063/1-2.
a wine tavern under the same sign and the same roof. Physical and functional inconsistencies further complicated clear-cut distinctions. According to the 1577 chandler's contract the largest alehouse required a greater 'stint' of candles than the smallest inn, while we will encounter alehouses with a full complement of wine quarts or taverns with guest chambers (in 1577 Alice Knight described 'living at Romsey at the tavern there').

These dissonances led to perceptual and linguistic slippages, and references to the landscape of drink on the part of townspeople as well as visitors often disclose confusion about the precise status of its institutional constituents. A boatman described Hythe alehouse-keeper John Wall as an 'innholder' in 1629, while a tailor from Oxford made the same mistake regarding alehouse-keeper Francis Dobey in 1671. The inventory of mariner and alehouse-keeper Jenkin Hewes reveals that as far as he was concerned he was an 'innholder', while even the council and the town clerk were not immune; in 1624 they apparently thought that they were licensing 'taverns' rather than alehouses. This fluidity carried over into practice, where institutions were used far more promiscuously than has hitherto been fully grasped. Time and again we will witness servants and itinerant labourers at inns, gentleman on the alebench, and companies combining all three levels of the hierarchy indiscriminately in the course of their drinking and lodging circuits. We must now turn to their location within the urban landscape.

---

42 SRO SC9/3/9, Fos. 23v-27r.
43 RBIII, p. 83.
44 SRO SC9/3/3, Fo. 18r.
45 E&DII, pp. 42-3.
46 SRO SC9/3/14, Fo. 10v.
47 HRO 1676 AD056. Hewes was last licensed as an alehouse-keeper in 1667 and there is no evidence that his house was upgraded. SRO SC9/2/11, Fo. 12r-13r.
48 SRO SC9/2/1, Fos. 104-6v.
2.2 DISTRIBUTION

Cartographic renderings of early modern landscapes of drink, as Thomas Brennan has noted, are 'very difficult to draw'.¹ Official registers of recognizances and other licensing materials seldom enclose geographical information, while magisterial and manorial complaints about certain clusters of disorderly premises, while vivid and highly meaningful (see below), do not furnish an accurate guide to overall distributions.² We also search in vain among borough records for a preindustrial equivalent of the 1878 'drink map'; as we have seen, late medieval and early modern administrators were 'linguistic cartographers' who would not have thought to accompany their complaints about the sheer weight of public houses with graphic representations.³ However, an ideal starting point for such an exercise for Southampton is provided by a comprehensive street directory, prepared by city archivists on the basis of rate rolls, the 1617 terrier and other miscellaneous sources, for the walled town and its suburbs c. 1620.⁴ This unusual and valuable resource does not represent a ready-made atlas of drinking. Very few alehouses or taverns are indicated, while some of the information about inns is inaccurate; a tenement called The Rose in All Saints Within, identified as an inn operated by neighbouring brewer Christopher Cornelius, was actually a chantry property that was no longer known by the name by 1617.⁵ However, cross-referencing the directory with victualling sources not consulted during its preparation (especially the recognizances of licensed alehouse-keepers taken for 1619-24 and the stall and art rolls for surrounding years) has permitted a detailed pin-pointing of drinking houses at the medieval burghage plots on which they actually operated (reconstructed on the basis of the 1837 Ordnance Survey map [FIG. 2.2.1].)

The plan discloses all eight inns, three taverns, and some thirty-three of the alehouses that were trading at around this point. The former were confined to English Street within walled Southampton and the main road which bisected its northern suburb; moving north, we encounter The Crown, The Greyhound, The Dolphin, The Star and (exiting

¹ Brennan, Public Drinking, p. 89.
² Clark, Alehouse, p. 70.
³ Smail, Imaginary Cartographies; idem, 'Linguistic Cartography'.
⁴ S. D. Thomson (ed.), Southampton in 1620 (Southampton, 1970), and the accompanying 'Supplement to the Exhibition Catalogue' (unpublished pamphlet in the SRO). The directory was prepared for an exhibition celebrating the 350th anniversary of the sailing of the Mayflower.
⁵ Thomson, Southampton in 1620, p. 32. In 1617 a corporation lease references 'a tenement once called The Rose, being chantry land'. SRO SC4/3/162. See also D PM 87/1, SC4/3/73, SC4 3/111. SC4/3/295. There are also no incidental references to an establishment called The Rose in other categories of data, whereas all of the other inns feature regularly.
FIG. 2.2.1 Location of Southampton's public houses c. 1620; inns are indicated in blue, taverns in green and alehouses in red. Moving from south to north, the signboards of the inns are The Greyhound (a), The Crown (b), The Dolphin (c), The Star (d), The George (e), The White Horse (f), The Katherine Wheel (g) and The Bear (h).
the Bargate) *The George, The White Horse, The Katherine Wheel* and *The Bear* (a-e). Taverns traded from corner sites within the parishes of St Lawrence's, Holy Rood and St Michael's while, confirming Peter Clark's findings regarding the wide geographical spread of alehouses in early seventeenth-century Shrewsbury, the latter were by no means 'energy at the edges' but instead manifested throughout the town. Naturally, the vision is partial and incomplete; detailed information for the smaller properties which traded in the extramural suburbs of All Saints Without and especially St Mary's is lacking, severely underestimating the numbers of alehouses which traded in these parishes (estimated at seven by the leet jurors in 1620), while the map reveals nothing about those outlying institutions which operated within the liberties of the town (the smattering of alehouses in the small fishing communities of Portswood and Hill, the 'inn by the Itchen ferry', or the inn at a nearby junction called the Four Posts which had become a popular tavern by the eighteenth century). It is also a snapshot, frozen in time; the lack of other surviving terriers for the period has precluded the comparative reconstruction of earlier or later geographies, while any endeavour to 'map' implies a degree of spatial and temporal fixity unreflective of both high levels of urban mobility and significant fluctuations in the numbers of alehouses as revealed by the stall and art rolls. However, it refines previous efforts to reconstruct the geography of urban provision, especially for the elusive base of the hierarchy (Peter Clark concedes in a footnote that in his own map of Shrewsbury 'the precise location of premises within streets is somewhat speculative'), and furnishes a sound basis for interpretations.

At one level the distribution disclosed was economically constituted. Locations on the main urban access routes, especially near or even within town apertures and on corner sites, coincided with the spatial itineraries of tired and thirsty travellers on which publicans at all levels of the trade depended. Alehouses sprouted immediately within the Watergate and the Bargate, while there was a significant cluster of alehouses and a tavern within close proximity to the Westgate which opened onto the the West Quay; one of these institutions, *The Ship* alehouse operated by mariner Richard Harvey (now trading as *The Duke of Wellington* within rebuilt premises), would have been directly on the sightline

---

8 SRO SC6/1/37, Fo. 5r-10r.
9 Two inventories survive for keepers of this institution. See HRO 1614 B63/1-2; 1627 B57/1-2.
10 Temple Patterson, *Southampton: A Biography*, p. 76. It was trading as *The Turk's Head* according to an examinate in 1741. SRO SC9/4/246.
of alighting mariners (FIG. 2.2.2). Alehouses and inns located on the main inward-bound thoroughfare Above Bar would have represented first ports of call for most landside arrivals, and indeed represented the only institutional option for those who arrived at the town after the locking of the northern Bargate and its inset wicket at ten o’clock; The George inn traded on a substantial site immediately to the left of the entry structure and later variants are partially visible in surviving engravings (FIG. 2.2.3), while The Lion inn had traded on the opposite site for much of the late medieval period (although, in a reminder of the dynamic quality of locations even at the top of the hierarchy, it had been subdivided into tenements by 1617).

Public house geographies also catered to and reflected the needs and ambits of the resident population. The inns and taverns which traded on English Street, within striking distance of the parish churches, town markets and merchant households, were privileged in the chain of everyday life and offered ready access to urban elites, while
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11 Clark, Alehouse, p. 89, n21.
12 A Richard Harvey ‘at the sign of The Ship’ successfully petitioned against his suppression in 1622. SRO SC9/1/1, Fos. 27, 34.
13 See SRO SC9/3/7, Fos. 37v-38r; SC9/3/9, Fos. 1r, 25r. The value of this service is emphasised in J. Verdon, Travel in the Middle Ages (Notre Dame, 2003 [trans.]), p. 111.
14 Thomson, Southampton in 1620, p. 94.
concentrations of alehouses in the densely populated poorer parishes of St Michael's and St John's catered to the mariners, lesser craftsmen and labourers who maintained workshops, dwelling houses and tenements there. Premises clustered at the West Quay in particular served not only non-resident sailors but also those shipwrights who plied their trade in its complex of timber yards (indeed, this quay was increasingly given over to construction activities rather than the movement of people). Some premises actually traded on the quay itself; mariner Peter Hendrick had a small and controversial alehouse there in 1602 (his surviving inventory discloses a 'little chamber next to the sea' as well as 'some old apparel for the sea'), while an engraving from 1804 depicting a sightline out of the Westgate and onto the quay shows a tavern called *The Man in the Moon* to have been open for business there (this is possibly the tavern of the same name where William Freeman and John Gilbert were fined for weights and measures violations in the 1650s [FIG. 2.2.4]). As we will see, premises in Holy Rood parish in the south west portion of the walled town meanwhile, many of them French-operated, exhibited strong

15 CLII, p. 367; HRO A38/1-2.
16 SRO SC6/1/57, Fo. 34; SC6/1/59, Fo. 12v.
connections with the stranger community which lived and worshipped there (at St Julian's chapel just within God's House Gate).

As this example suggests, the boundary between economic and social geographies collapses altogether in the case of alehouses, whose mainly poor operators did not strategically select sites according to their economic potential but were instead licensed, tolerated or took up alehouse-keeping illicitly to supplement meagre incomes in their own pre-existing dwelling houses. High concentrations within the less prosperous residential wards of St Michael’s and St John’s can be read in these terms, especially a significant knot of premises at New Corner by the ruinous castle (which consisted largely of tenements). However, it can also account for significant interpenetration into the wealthier parishes of Holy Rood, St Lawrence’s and All Saints in a period in which urban social topography resembled (in Clark’s gastronomic metaphor) a ‘rather soft fruit trifle’ and it was not uncommon for poor labourers to live next to urban magnates within
central parishes. However, the extent and character of such interpenetration should not be exagerrated; many of these establishments, such as the small alehouse operated by Thomas Cook visible in the bottom-right corner of Fig. 2.2.1, inhabited small back courts, and while sixteen alehouses have been located on the eastern side of English street, only four were discovered for the more prosperous right (one of which, the institution cradled between The Dolphin and The Star inns, was uncharacteristically operated by a goldsmith).

Public house siting was also shaped by logistical considerations, especially at the higher levels of the hierarchy where there was more latitude in the choice of locations and core functions were attended by complex choreographies. The spacious sites enjoyed by the four inns which traded in the northern suburb permitted the development of elaborate networks of orchards, gardens and outbuildings, while they were ideally placed for the community of carriers, carters and drovers who conveyed goods to and from the town; away from the tortuous streets of the walled town, they were contiguous to town fields (Houndwell and Hoglands) where animals could be pastured, offered ready access to the town smithy (located between The George and The White Horse), and could be configured in ways that enabled horse-drawn vehicles to enter and leave their yards without having to perform the awkward routine of turning or ‘backing’. The Bear, as we have seen, was specially constructed here as a carrying inn by John Warren in 1617, and is revealed by a detailed examination from 1631 to have exploited a system of double openings onto Above Bar road and Windmill Lane. Within the walls, where inns were confined to the straitjacket of their burghage plots, such manoeuvres were possible where inns backed onto parallel roads; John Speed’s street plan reveals the yards of both The Star and The Dolphin inns to have been connected to a road called ‘back of the walls’ by a narrow track (Fig. 2.2.5). Geographies also reflected a logistics of supply, especially for tavern-keepers; whereas alehouse-keepers brewed their own product or took it from the common brewers who operated at sites throughout the town (although with particular concentrations on East Street), taverners were dependent on seaborne wine, Clark, Alehouse, p. 69. See also C. Phythian-Adams, Desolation of a City: Coventry and the Urban Crisis of the Late Middle Ages (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 163-6; J. Langton, ‘Residential Patterns in Pre-Industrial Cities: Some Case Studies from Seventeenth-Century London’, in J. Barry (ed.), The Tudor and Stuart Town: A Reader in English Urban History 1530-1688 (Harlow, 1990), pp. 166-205; J. Boulton, ‘The Poor Among the Rich: Paupers and the Parish in the West End 1600-1724’, in Griffiths & Jenner, Londinopolis, pp. 197-225; and J. Marriott, ‘The Spatiality of the Poor in Eighteenth-Century London’, in T. Hitchcock & H. Shore (eds), The Streets of London: From the Great Fire to the Great Sink (London & Sydney, 2003), pp. 119-134.

explaining their predominant location in close proximity to the two town quays which furnished the only sites where it might legitimately be landed.\textsuperscript{19}

Yet to simply describe the areal distribution of public houses, and to posit some reasons for the configurations, is (in Chris Philo’s phrase) to ‘close [our]selves around the arrangement of objects in the physical world’; the cultural geography movement, in particular its branches concerned with ‘subjective’ approaches to landscape, has taught us to attach as much significance to the perceptions of and meanings attached to historic environments as to their tangible features.\textsuperscript{20} Such perceptions are most readily recovered from the spatial pronouncements of town magistrates and leet jurors, who were bound (in the words of a 1600 proclamation) to ensure that all alehouses within their jurisdiction traded from ‘fit and needful places’ and whose understandings of the (un)suitability or lack thereof of particular victualling locales can be read as a highly

\textsuperscript{19} It was also landed illegally elsewhere; see SRO SC9/3/3, Fo. 49r; SC5/3/1, Fo. 159v.

contextualised 'moral geography'. James Kneale has employed the phrase to describe nineteenth-century attempts to modify and regulate the internal configurations of public houses; however, for the early modern period, it is in the wider topographical context that we can most clearly see how issues of space and siting entered into discourses about morality and licensing. The relationship, always worked in specific settings, was inflected by both the negative cultural and symbolic connotations of particular environments as well as more practically coded objections.

The moral geography to which Southampton's governors subscribed exhibited both positive and negative contours, and encapsulated sites that were endorsed as well as those that were demonised. English Street was an exalted location. Described by John Leland as 'one of the fairest streets that is in any town in England', a Lieutenant Hammond was even more fulsome in his praise in 1635: 'O]ne street especially, transcends any other town street in England, that runs right on near a quarter of a mile, through the midst of her, from north to south gate, w[hose] buildings... are fair, neat, beautiful, straight and handsome'. This description is idealised, but Southampton's residents were proud of their major north-south axis, and leet jurors pursued those individuals whose nuisances compromised its 'sweetness' with a doggedness not evident for other arteries; the butchers and fishmongers of All Saints parish whose industrial by-products 'do very much annoy the same street with very unwholesome smells', the retailers who disrupted its lines with encroaching stalls and windows, and those residents who failed to maintain the pavements before their doors or who obscured them with piles of dung and lumber. The alehouses, taverns and inns which traded here fell in line with the trajectories of legitimate travellers who were deposited onto English Street via the gates with which it was book-ended, and sat cheek by jowl with the dwelling houses of burgesses and other structures of civic and ecclesiastical significance by which they would have been upgraded by association; at the very heart of the landscape of drink in 1620 we can determine an especially validating conjunction of The Dolphin inn

23 Douch, Visitors' Descriptions, p. 11.
24 SRO SC6/1/42, Fo. 18r.
25 SRO SC6/1/52, Fo. 15v.
FIG. 2.2.6 Detail from John Speed’s 1611 street plan showing The Dolphin inn (a) and John Pitt’s tavern (b) trading on English Street within close spatial proximity to Holy Rood church (c), the covered marketplace (d) and the Audit House (e).

and John Pitt’s tavern with Holy Rood church, the covered marketplace and the Audit House (FIG. 2.2.6a-e). 27

Other locations were understood more negatively. Southampton’s magistrates and leet jurors exhibited no preoccupation with public houses in the back streets of French Street and Bugle Street (still ‘but lanes’ in 1743 according to one observer) and the honeycomb of alleys which intersected them, 28 although a range of venues beyond the town walls did invade their civic consciousness. Literally at the margins, suburbs have been characterised as liminal environments in early modern England; according to Steven Mullaney in his study of public performance in Elizabethan London, they were widely regarded as the zone ‘where established authority reached and manifested... the limits of its power to control and maintain’ and in which ‘forms of moral incontinence and pollution... exist[ed] beyond the bounds of the community’. 29 Moralising perceptions of early modern suburbia should not be exaggerated, and more recent work has tended to argue for their subjection to the same kinds of authority as intramural environments and

26 CLI, pp. 86, 122; SRO SC6/1/52, Fo. 15r.
28 Douch, Visitors’ Descriptions, p. 11.
their functioning as an extension of, rather than exception to, walled communities. However, moral geographies were worked in specific settings, and Southampton’s governors could have adduced additional evidence to support an unfavourable perception of All Saints Without and St Mary’s; they were punctuated by sites of punishment and disease (stocks, cucking stool, pesthouses and a former leper hospital), played host to an agglomeration of polluting industries (the blacksmith on Above Bar Street and a cluster of breweries on East Street), and were apparently filthy, with suburban residents routinely using the town ditches which formerly contained the moat as a fly-tip for domestic and industrial refuse. More practically, drinking establishments located here, especially if they happened to stand remote from the road, were less accessible to both legitimate custom and the regulatory gaze of police agencies in the form of beadles, constables and the watch, and were adjacent to a mosaic of fielden and wooded areas which were figured negatively in the early modern spatial imaginary as natural repositories of illicit activity.

Thus, what the leet jurors discursively fashioned as suburban ‘corner houses’ (a local variant on the ‘blind alehouses’ of other contexts) were some of the most
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31 For example CLI, p. 156.
complained about in early modern Southampton. An unlicensed alehouse operated by
town pavior on the willow beds 'behind The George by the seaside' was categorised by leet
jurers as 'a very ready receptacle for malefactors' in 1596 (FIG. 2.2.7a), while in 1589
they had claimed that 'two alehouses over-right the church litten [probably operated by
an East Street brewer]... are very unfit for evil disposed persons which haunt and resort
there' (b). In 1601, some 'tipplers above the bar, who have their back doors towards
Houndwell fields' more self-consciously exploited the location and configuration of their
premises to frustrate the scopic regime of authority figures (c); not only did they
themselves 'commonly go out that way', but they 'many times convey[ed] many evil
persons of very lewd condition from the constables searching for them' (this was
especially 'inconvenient' in the summer season, when these 'disordered persons' trampled
grass and herbage). Likewise, in 1581 they had complained about the rear entries
employed by a constellation of alehouses in St Mary's parish which traded on sites
contiguous to the complex of green spaces (the 'pleasant gardens, orchards, cherry
grounds and walks' eulogised by Hammond) which lay immediately beyond the eastern
circuit of walls (d). '[T]he King's Orchard and Cockerel's Orchard have back doors out
of their orchards into the fields which... now being turned and used for tippling houses
and maintenance of unlawful games, are not to be suffered for the conveyance of idle
persons'. Even inns could fall under suspicion if they inhabited this particular portion
of moral geography, and leet jurors waged a running battle against The White Horse Above
Bar in the late sixteenth century (e). Like city-edge innholders elsewhere, its landlord
John Simons stood accused of 'keeping resort of lewd people both of men and also
women' in his house 'above the bar'. His 'house was presented the last year for like
disorder which is not amended but given to greater disorder and more like a den of
whores and thieves than a house of civil government'.

Premises which traded out of the small dwelling houses or 'skeelings' which
dotted the two the town quays were also regarded with trepidation; obscured by
substantial entry structures and near-constant movements of people and goods, they
offered the necessary space for expansive games of skittles, bowls and quoits and
threatened to keep mariners and shipwrights away from their legitimate callings. In 1602,
leat jurors presented and nominated for suppression 'Peter Hendrick upon the West Quay for keeping tippling and lodging being very unfit to be allowed in that place'; they alleged that he took advantage of his location by 'receiv[ing] men's servants into his house when they should be keeping of their master's ships at all hours of the night, whereby many men have lost much of their ship provision, and [it is] thought that much of it is conveyed that way'. The following year jurors complained that, despite their complaints, Hendrick was 'not yet removed' from a site deemed 'very unfit'. As late as 1670 the Assembly ordered that William West, who lived 'over Watergate', should be dismissed from tippling and his dwelling house 'never more licensed by this house'.

Jurors also complained regularly about those illegal houses which mushroomed within the liberties, especially in the small fishing villages of Northam, Portswood and Hill, although as we will see in a later chapter their complaints here represented an attempt to reify the extent of the town's jurisdiction rather than an extrusion of a moral geography organised around fears of disorderly conduct.

39 CLI, p. 137.
40 CLII, p. 367; CLIII, p. 381. Hendrick's inventory survives at HRO 1613 A38/1-2.
41 SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 266r.
42 See CLII, pp. 200, 214; SRO SC6/1.56, Fo. 53.
2.3 PRESENCES

As Michel de Certeau has noted, maps offer an abstracted and aloof projection of the landscape of drink that, while useful for orientating purposes, brings us no closer to its reality for those ‘ordinary practitioners of the city... down below’; this section shifts our angle of vision, exploring how Southampton’s inhabitants and visitors would have identified its public houses at ‘ground level’ and the ways in which they participated in their ‘mental maps’ of the town. While inns were often purpose-built or extensively remodelled structures whose architectural conventions reflected their function, taverns and especially alehouses were run out of domestic environments (the ‘several houses... wherein they now dwell’ in the terms of the Assembly in 1613) that, while internally reconfigured, rarely underwent extensive external modifications. Moreover, many did not front the street directly but occupied back courts, multi-occupancy tenements, underground cellars or were otherwise tucked behind workshops or retail spaces. While townspeople could have drawn upon local knowledge to construct their institutional choices and movements, visitors and newcomers would not have had access to this or, of course, to the kind of totalising ‘drink map’ furnished by the Temperance Society for their nineteenth-century successors. However, notwithstanding this potential for urban obscurity, Southampton’s inhabitants and visitors would have experienced the landscape of drink as a series of ‘presences’, including but not limited to the signboard, that rendered public houses (in Kevin Lynch’s terminology) ‘legible’ within street corner geographies and assumed a large role in the geographical imagination and languages of contemporaries.

Signboards were not universal, even by the end of our period; unlicensed keepers especially would have been disinclined to advertise their institutional presence so vividly, while as late as 1670 an itinerant labourer described lodging at an alehouse without Bargate ‘which had no sign at all’. In light of the recent somatic turn that has emphasised the role of sensory fields above and beyond sight in the making of environmental experiences, especially within urban contexts, it is no longer fanciful to suggest that even in the absence of such visual mechanisms Southampton’s public houses
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3 ABIII, p. 77.
5 SRO SC9/3/14, Fo. 6r.
would have appealed to nasal and aural epistemologies. Practices of stabling, urban smallholding, slaughtering, cooking, smoking and bodily expulsion coalesced within and around hostelries and generated a distinctive and volatile set of 'mise-en-scents' that wafted over the urban 'smellscape' and would have been important in a culture that, as Mark Jenner has recently noted, attached special significance to all things olfactory. Indeed, for the leet jurors, public houses at all levels of the hierarchy were some of the most 'noisome' constituents of the urban scene; the holders of The George inn Above Bar were especially notorious for casting manure and other waste generated by its stables and slaughterhouse into a ditch behind the premises and, by 1618, onto a dunghill beneath the signboard itself.

Potential patrons might also have tuned their ears. One of the responsibilities of the town crier was to 'proclaim victuals', while enterprising alehouse-keepers sometimes adopted the vocal strategies of street vendors; in 1609 John James of Holy Rood parish was fined 2s for 'sitting at his door all the time of sermon and... calling in the barber to drink'. Even in the absence of such verbal interventions, public houses were characterised by distinctive 'soundmarks' or 'aural cues' in the form of loud conversation, clinking pewter vessels and especially music or song that could escape institutions via poorly glazed windows or open doors and could give away victualling activity; in 1615 the beadle of St Michael's parish was drawn to an inharmonious alehouse operated by musician John Brown in his New Corner tenement after 'hearing a great noise there', while in 1637 they were again alerted by 'a great disorder and revelling in the house of Thomas Loney an alehouse-keeper... to the disturbance of the neighbours'.
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8 CLI, pp. 152, 154-5; CLII, pp. 268, 308, 348; CLIII, pp. 427, 539, 534.
9 CLII, p. 183.
10 SRO SC5/3/12, Fo. 2.
12 CLIII, p. 485; Thomson, Southampton in 1620, p. 65.
13 SRO SC2/1/6 Fo. 298r.
Public houses could also be distinguished by visual characteristics other than that of the signboard itself. Intramural inns were architecturally marked out by the gate complexes which gave access to their courtyards, while their suburban equivalents were surrounded by an extensive curtilage of barns, brewhouses, servants' accommodation, stables and other service buildings that rendered them 'easily identifiable in their urban settings'.' Further down the hierarchy a profusion of candles thickening through ground floor windows during the hours of darkness could suggest an alehouse (the chandler's contract from 1577 reveals them to have been the town's most voracious consumers of wax candlesticks), while they might also be distinguished by the by-products of their trade; in 1672, six alehouse-keepers were presented by the their 'fumes' for having several hogsheads in the street before their door?' which must have been a regular occurrence given the limited size of many establishments.36

However, such multisensory whirls of insight should not obscure the fact that signboards, where they existed, were the most reliable diagnostic of victualling activity within the port.37 By the Elizabethan period the simply denotative ale-stakes and vine bushes which had indicated that alcohol was on sale within medieval premises had been superseded by a lively iconographical economy of pictorial signs at all levels of the hierarchy. These might be painted directly onto the front of structures, although could also be painted onto canvas, wood or copper and mounted at right angles from premises with wrought iron or wooden brackets, or might even be set on an independent post (visual evidence reveals The George inn to have been trading under a free-standing sign by the late eighteenth century [see Fig 2.3.1]).38 These more elaborate hangings were expensive and were sometimes enumerated separately in inventories; assessors estimated 'the table the sign of The George' at 30s in 1615 (it had probably been commissioned during a refurbishment overseen by its deceased innholder, Nicholas Bulbeck),39 while the 'hornbeam for the sign and the sign' belonging to Edwin Daniel's inn were together valued at £1 in 1690 (hornbeam is a species of birch which is hard and resilient but
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14 Pennington, 'Inns and Taverns', p. 126.
16 SRO SC6/1/65, Fo. 13r.
18 Richardson & Eberlein, English Inn, p. 195.
19 HRO 1615 AD09.
difficult and costly to work).\textsuperscript{20} Such devices represented the name of the house, and functioned as metonyms for it in interrogations, especially in cases where patrons did not know the identities of their hosts. Examinations of suspected vagrants in particular are a flurry of signs; in 1584 an itinerant shoemaker lodged in Portsmouth with a tailor `who had at his door the sign of The Swan',\textsuperscript{21} while in 1670 Charles West, a `butcher' from Kent, stayed at `the sign of The Red Lion' in Bagshot, `the sign of The Swan (as he supposes)’ in Alton (this representation obviously left scope for interpretation), and `the sign of The Sun' in Salisbury before arriving at Southampton `and staying at the sign of The Spread Eagle'.\textsuperscript{22}

Large claims have been made for signboards in transmitting classes of drinking establishment, with Judith Hunter in particular claiming that `each of the different types of establishment could be recognised by their trade sign'.\textsuperscript{23} However, while useful for distinguishing public houses from the borough's other businesses (which, unlike in London and Bristol, did not trade under signs),\textsuperscript{24} in Southampton they could not alone have formed the basis for street-level arbitrations between alehouses, taverns and inns. While some signs included additional visual symbols indicating the types of alcohol available (The Man in the Moon tavern on West quay, visible in the early nineteenth-century

\textsuperscript{20} HRO 1690 AD043.
\textsuperscript{21} SRO SC9/3/6, Fo. 3v.
\textsuperscript{22} SRO SC9/3/14, Fo. 6r.
\textsuperscript{23} Hunter, 'Legislation', p. 163.
engraving, is identifiable as such because of the metal or wooden likeness of grapes suspended on a stalk [FIG. 2.3.2], and although signboards and especially their modes of suspension grew in cost and complexity towards the top of the hierarchy, there were no additional emblematic devices, especially for alehouses, that enabled the precise status of a public house to be read as in other urban settings. Town records yield no references to ale-stakes, while their was no local equivalent of the carved wooden 'hands', metal lanterns or painted red lattices that communicated alehouse functioning in Manchester, Coventry and London respectively. Such a semiotic instrument was briefly on the Audit House agenda in 1574, when one of a raft of reforming ordinances stipulated that so footmen and mariners could 'have the better knowledge at any time they come where they may lodge... every tippler that is, or hereafter shall be, appointed by the order of the town... shall have at his door a sign painted with the town’s arms'. However, the order was cancelled before it could be implemented.

Signboards undertook a wide variety of interrelated political and economic work for both publicans and town governors. They literally materialised an individual’s licence to trade and inscribed their official status in the street-space; in 1584, as we have seen, Thomas Broker was authorised ‘to set up his sign, and keep an inn’ at The Katharine Wheel, while when privileges at the same establishment were reconfirmed under Francis Bartur in 1613 he was entitled to ‘set out the post of his inn’ (the wording suggests that
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25 On the hierarchy of early modern inn brackets see Pennington, ‘Inns and Taverns’, p. 133.
26 Clark, Alehouse, pp. 67-8.
27 RBII, p. 151.
28 SRO SC5/3/1, Fo. 141r.
his sign also was free-standing, which may have been the norm for the recessed inns Above Bar). Such reifications identified potential trouble spots for beadles and watchmen, while most crucially they were a core constituent of commercial viability. The removal of signs which accompanied suppressions was a powerful economic as well as legal sanction; in 1648, John Blake was warned by the assembly that if he did not evict a newcomer from his alehouse then ‘he is to bring in his licence which is to be taken from him and his sign to be pulled down’, while in 1654 court leet jurors followed a listing of unlicensed alehouse-keepers with a recommendation to ‘pull down their several signs’. In 1638, the assembly licensed wealthy goldsmith William Lyle to keep an alehouse, with the unusual caveat that ‘he is not to set up any sign before his door’. This intriguing prohibition might have been aesthetically motivated; Lyle lived in St Lawrence’s parish on the right hand side of English Street where, as we have seen, there were relatively few public houses, and the council might have wished it to remain free of ocular reminders of victualling activity. However, it can also be interpreted as a business ‘handicap’ that would permit Lyle a trickle of custom (perhaps from servants of guests lodged at The Dolphin and The Star) but would prevent him from becoming too parasitic on the trade of those whose alehouse-keeping was dictated by economic necessity.

Much taxonomic energy has been devoted to the symbolic repertoires of signboards, and Southampton’s institutions certainly yielded the usual religious, royal, mythological, animal and cosmological suspects. However, recent work has tended to emphasise the contextual and contingent nature of such imagery; in particular, Michael Camille has shown how the jokes and puns encoded by the shop signs of medieval Paris became a sort of ‘public fantasy’, and how their locally meaningful visual system formed an ‘imaginary urban landscape’. Public house signs were the carriers of such a landscape in Southampton. Many were particular to the marine environment; we have encountered The Dolphin inn, while in 1590 three sailors from Poole described staying at The Three

30 SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 44r.
31 SRO SC6/1/56, Fo. 53.
32 SRO SC2/1/6, Fo. 306r.
Mariners alehouse.\textsuperscript{35} Others mapped patterns of politics and trade; Anna Lile's alehouse sign depicting \textit{The Grey Mouse} was probably engineered to appeal to the Puritan sympathies of the council,\textsuperscript{36} while an alehouse (and later tavern) called \textit{The Virginia} adumbrated the port's strong ideological and economic links with the colony.\textsuperscript{37} \textit{The Virginia} traded 'within Watergate',\textsuperscript{38} aperture for the southern quay, and it was not the only establishment to take its cues from siting and topography; an alehouse which traded next to the ruinous fortification which dominated the northwest of the town was called \textit{The Castle},\textsuperscript{39} while an alehouse a few plots up from St John's church and immediately to the south of the vicarage house traded under the sign of \textit{The Angel}.\textsuperscript{40} In a polymorphous encapsulation of local surroundings and wider networks, as we have seen, an inn which traded from the curvilinear left tower of the Watergate from 1704 was called \textit{The Globe} (see FIG. 2.1.1);\textsuperscript{41} in 1760 it was joined by an alehouse in the east tower called \textit{The Sioz}.\textsuperscript{42}

Other public house signs traded on still more local knowledge. Many referenced the primary or former trade of the keeper; musician William Martin was operating as an alehouse-keeper at \textit{The Trumpet} in 1656,\textsuperscript{43} while incapacitated mariner Richard Harvey set up 'the sign of \textit{The Ship}' at his dwelling house in St Michael's parish in 1622.\textsuperscript{44} When Thomas Broker designated his new inn \textit{The Katherine Wheel} in 1574 he was not only making classical reference to the Knights of St Catherine of Mount Sinai but indulging in a rather more knockabout and specific play on his own vocation; Broker was a wheelwright, whose premises on his death comprised a 'workhouse' containing three pairs of wheels, some 200 spokes and a range of 'tools belonging to a wheeler's occupation'.\textsuperscript{45} Other signs hinted wittily at inter-institutional rivalries; an alehouse which traded Above Bar as \textit{The Green Dragon} in the mid-seventeenth century was surely a sly slur on \textit{The George}, that suburb's most ancient inn.\textsuperscript{46}

However, Southampton's public house signs did not just constitute an 'imaginary landscape' of shared visual meanings but, jutting out into the street-space, were

\textsuperscript{35} SRO SC9/4/13.  
\textsuperscript{36} E&DII, p. 9.  
\textsuperscript{37} SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 18v; SC9/3/12, Fo. 120r. On the town's seventeenth-century trading links with the Virginia colony see Lamb, 'Seaborne Trade', pp. 84-5.  
\textsuperscript{38} SRO SC6/1/59, Fo. 16v.  
\textsuperscript{39} SRO SC9/3/6, Fo. 4v; SC9/4/419.  
\textsuperscript{40} SRO SC4/3/241; SC2/1/8, Fo. 152r; SC6/1/64, Fo. 9r.  
\textsuperscript{41} SRO SC4/3/366a.  
\textsuperscript{42} SRO SC4/3/615.  
\textsuperscript{43} SRO SC6/1/59, Fo. 12v.  
\textsuperscript{44} SRO SC9/1/1, Fo. 27.  
\textsuperscript{45} Larwood & Hotten, \textit{Signboards}, PP. 298-9; RBIII, pp. 3-4; HRO 1583 A09/1-2.  
\textsuperscript{46} SRO SC6/1/59, Fo. 13r; SC9/3/13, Fo. 16v; HRO 1693 A059/1-2.
themselves physical constituents of an actual landscape; the point was not lost on court leet jurors in 1611, when they presented Barnard Searle ‘for an encroachment by setting a sign post at The Katherine Wheel ten feet into the kings highway Above the Bar’. Indeed, we need to supplement abstract decodings of sign imagery with an appreciation of how they functioned materially and spatially as, in David Garrioch’s terms, ‘significant topographical landmarks’. Geographers Diane and Tim Watson have argued convincingly for nineteenth-century pub signs as a geographical resource, but this attribute was also much in evidence in early modern Southampton, not so much in the narrow sense of navigation, but as a means by which inhabitants and visitors imparted geographical information and referred to the physical space of the town. Such expedients were necessary given the alarming flexibility of contemporary street names, where there was considerable scope for slippage; in 1420 the lane bisecting English Street and French Street was referred to by no fewer than four different names, while a road Above Bar was simultaneously known as Canshut Lane and Windmill Lane. Even when the names of arteries was fixed, the lack of what Cynthia Wall has termed a cultural sense of ‘streetness’ meant that there was a reluctance to use them as spatial descriptors when there were topographical alternatives readily to hand. House numbers, necessary for precision within arteries which could be (in the case of English Street) half a mile long, were only introduced under the auspices of the pavement commissioners in the late eighteenth century.

In the absence of such devices, along with the parish churches, town gates, the perimeter towers and naturally-occurring features such as trees, public house signs seem to have been the landmark of choice. Extant court leet books disclose manifold examples of jurors locating nuisance areas requiring remedial action with reference to surrounding signs: the overflowing ditches adjoining The Lion; the blocked watercourse between The White Horse and The George; the ruinous house ‘next The Crown on the south side’; the

---

47 SRO SC6/1/53, Fo. 14v.
50 These were ‘Halfknyghtslane’, ‘Cockerewlane’, ‘Braggeryslane’ and ‘Smalelane’. Platt, Medieval Southampton, p. 47.
51 SRO SC4/1/2, Fo. 3r; SC4/1/3, Fo. 1v.
53 Temple Patterson, Southampton: A Biography, p. 77.
refuse under the Bargate near The George; the decayed tower and dangerous ditch behind The Star garden; or the breach in the town wall 'near the backside of The Crown'.

Examinates, informants and deponents before quarter sessions also regularly used signboards to organise their testimonies and to imbue their movements in urban time-space with the specificity required by interrogating justices. In 1576 mariner William Beckwith claimed to have found a length rope 'upon the ground... at the corner of the lane over-right The Crown', while in 1578 John Biggs (himself a tavern-keeper) described how he was 'coming down homeward between The George and the Bargate' when he was asked to adjudicate in a dispute. In 1628 Joan Hurst explained that at 'eight of the clock' she was 'in her chamber near the sign of The King's Head (an alehouse in All Saints parish) when she was summoned to attend to a sick child, while the following year servant Eleanor Beeston described how she was returning to her lodgings in Holy Rood parish after collecting herbs for an apothecary when 'near The Crown gate one Henry Barlowe met her and took her candle from her and had the carnal knowledge of her body'. In a 1678 affidavit, plumber Thomas Jarrett described how he was working in a house 'next The Dolphin'. The names of public houses or their proprietors were often superimposed onto or merged with topographical features in the imaginative geographies of inhabitants; the junction of Above Bar Street with Windmill/Canshut Lane was known simply as 'Bear corner', while the narrow alley connecting English Street with French Street on which Morgan Emott's inn The Greyhound traded was sometimes referred to as 'Emott's lane' in the 1620s.
2.4 PREMISES

Having established the typology, number, distribution and presencing strategies of Southampton's public houses, we must now try and enter the premises themselves. As Thomas Brennan has noted, publicans were 'selling space - a mise-en-scène - as well as the drink'; this insight notwithstanding, inn, tavern and alehouse settings - the physical embodiment of the landscape of drink - have shown a particular proneness to recede into the interpretative background beyond the general tendency for historians of social life to 'reduce practices that unfold through concrete sites of the lifeworld into generic unit acts that are merely formal and relational... not embedded in space by their material and corporeal features [and] rendered independent of the lived topography of any place'.

Unlike nearly every other feature of early modern drinking cultures, the built fabric of drinking houses was at no point the subject of legislative intervention during the early modern period. If inns and taverns were sometimes large and premeditated vernacular building types that are often extant (and have attracted some antiquarian and architectural attention as a result), alehouses were improvised environments which emerged out of ordinary dwellings that have left few material footprints within existing urban landscapes. This study attempts to remedy the resulting occlusions; with specific reference to buildings, and in a development of Anthony Giddens' analysis of the embedded character of engagements between agency and structure at a range of architectural 'locales', Thomas Gieryn encapsulates an emerging consensus that 'the physical milieus of action are not just uninteresting boundaries of social life, but [are] inherently involved in its... reproduction'. Thus, this section addresses necessary first questions about the appearance and size of drinking places, their internal configuration and material culture, and how they mapped onto early modern understandings and experiences of 'public' and 'private' space.

---

1 Brennan, Public Drinking, p. 112.
Exteriors and Size

Extant buildings represent an obvious starting point for an investigation of the structural conventions of public houses. Unfortunately, urban redevelopment of Southampton's town centre in the mid-twentieth century has eradicated most sixteenth- and seventeenth-century properties and closed off an approach to the physical dispositions of the landscape of drink that would systematically correlate a multitude of standing buildings with documentary evidence. Among a scattering of other surviving medieval structures (which include two church sites, the merchant's hall, the wool house, three town gates and a substantial circuit of walls), traces of only three public houses remain; The Dolphin and The Star inns in the High Street are still trading on their original sites under the same signs (Fig. 2.4.1), although they were refronted and internally remodelled in the eighteenth century and are now 'of chief interest as... fine example[s]

---

6 For advocates and examples of this methodology see R. J. Lawrence, 'Integrating Architectural, Social and Housing History', Urban History 19 (1992), pp. 39-63; N. W. Alcock, People at Home: Living in a Warwickshire Village 1500-1800 (Chichester, 1993); and in a public house context Pennington, 'Inns and Taverns'.

of... Georgian coaching inn[s]' than of preindustrial public houses. More unusually, archaeological excavations of properties in Holy Rood parish during the 1960s exposed a complex of two stone cellars that source linkage for this study has confirmed at one stage formed the foundations of an alehouse operated by town cook Hercules Audley under the sign of *The Queen's Arms* between 1613 and 1638 (with his widow Avice taking over operations from 1620 [FIG. 2.4.2]). However, beyond these glimpses, it is necessary to risk the 'linguistic despair' of any textualised spatial practice and infer building form and materials from other sources.

Most of the town's public houses, from alehouses to inns, would have traded out of timber-framed medieval structures on stone foundations that comprised the town's most common building type; although there was a fleeting vogue for stone among burgesses and merchants in the thirteenth century, this had to be shipped from the Isle

---

of Wight, Dorset or Normandy and in consequence was both impractical and costly. John Leland described the town as ‘well builded for timber building’ in 1535, and most information relating to specific drinking houses suggests timber construction. The surviving rear range of The Dolphin contains timberwork, while The Lion, a corporation-owned inn occupying a corner site Above Bar that had ceased trading by the mid-sixteenth-century, is revealed to have been timber-framed by the number of payments made by the town for carpentry about it. Peter Quoite’s All Saints alehouse The King’s Head was evidently wooden given the umbrage he took to a chimney erected next to its gable-end by a baker in 1603, while John Pitt’s tavern, which occupied a corner site between Broad Lane and English Street in Holy Rood parish, had a rear wall which according to the leet jurors in 1615 was ‘much decayed in the timberwork’. Some establishments traded out of more unorthodox environments. A proliferation of drinking houses operating out of cellars seems to have been a distinctive feature of Southampton’s landscape of drink. As a port town with special requirements for storage, many of its medieval properties were constructed on stone vaults and basements. Many, such as that belonging to Hercules and Avice Audley, were simple affairs, while others were more elaborate ‘undercrofts’ with vaulted ceilings, fireplaces, windows, mouldings and independent access from the street, a well-preserved example of which survives on Simnel Street (FIG. 2.4.3). P. A. Faulkner has argued that these were designed as self-contained retail spaces and workshops as well as mere depositories, although a more recent analysis of early town inventories concludes that ‘there is no... evidence that cellars were workshops or selling spaces’. However, Faulkner’s interpretation is supported by the fact that many of them were clearly made over as subterranean drinking establishments in the early modern period. In 1602 two Dutch mariners described how they were ‘drinking together in a cellar near unto the custom

---

11 Platt, Medieval Southampton, pp. 39-41.
12 Douch, Visitors’ Descriptions, p. 11.
14 CLIII, pp. 389-90.
15 Ibid., p. 488. John Pitt is identified as a taverner in 1622 and as a vintner in warnings and recognizances against the killing of flesh in lent in 1619. SRO SC9/1/1 Fo. 28; SC9/2/1 Fo. 36r; NA E180/55.
16 VCH, p. 491; see also E. M. Sandell, ‘Some Notes on the Wine Vaults of Southampton’ [unpublished document in the SRO].
18 Likewise, Pantin has found a 1381 tavern lease for the undercroft beneath Tackley’s Inn in Oxford. See W. A. Pantin, Oxoniensia 7 (1942), p. 80.
house' by the Watergate,\textsuperscript{19} while three years later court leet jurors complained of ‘divers tippling houses kept in cellars very unfitting’ by Matthew Mollard, William Foster and the Widow Painton.\textsuperscript{20} However, while underground drinking places were clearly regarded with trepidation, not all alcohol retailing below street level was illicit; in 1588 Thomas Windlow paid 6s 8d to the mayor ‘for licensing him to sell beer in his cellar’.\textsuperscript{21}

As we have seen, public houses also found natural homes in the town gatehouses.\textsuperscript{22} From the early eighteenth century The Globe inn traded out of the cylindrical left-hand tower of the southern Watergate (\textbf{F}\textit{ig. 2.4.4}). A wide, deep structure, adorned (like the northern Bargate) with two wooden lions and the royal arms, the Watergate furnished the only entry point from the southern quay and enclosed the old custom house as well as a suite of rooms in its towers and over the iron portcullis that were owned and rented by the town, allowing us to reconstruct its inception and evolution as a public house in some detail from corporation leases.\textsuperscript{23} Although referred to in 1600 as

\textsuperscript{19} E&D, pp. 22-3.
\textsuperscript{20} Foster was fined 12d the following year for ignoring the commandment. CLIII, pp. 415, 431.
\textsuperscript{21} SRO SC5/3/1 Fo. 216v.
\textsuperscript{22} Likewise, in early modern Bristol, an alehouse was located in one of the towers belonging to Lawford’s Gate. See C. B. Estabrook, \textit{Urbane and Rustic England: Cultural Ties and Social Spheres in the Provinces 1660-1780} (Manchester, 1998), p. 42.
\textsuperscript{23} Davies, \textit{History of Southampton}, pp. 96-7.
'the Brewer’s Tower, with the upper and lower rooms therein’, it was first leased to ‘innholder’ Thomas Cole in 1706. He originally rented the whole structure, although from 1718 merchant John Ayres occupied the right-hand tower with its ground floor custom house. The first full reference to a sign occurs in 1739, when Ayres’s lease granted him access the stairs on the wall leading to the tower ‘in common with the tenants of The Globe inn’. In 1744, victualler William Manners leased the ‘tower with the messuage (or inn) therein erected (called The Globe) lying over and on the west side of the Water Gate… together with the room or rooms over the old custom house hereinafter mentioned, and the room or rooms adjoining to and behind such rooms over the old custom house as the said tower and premises’. A surviving engraving, already reproduced as Fig. 2.1.1, depicts the inn from the south side; it discloses a quayside entry, although there would also have been ingress from English Street into the northern portion of the structure where the windowed living areas would have been concentrated.

---

24 The maintenance of the towers that flanked the town gates and punctuated the walls was customarily allocated to occupational groups. See VCH, p. 503.

By the time of Manners' tenancy the custom house in the east tower was also occupied by a victualler, and by 1760 was apparently trading as The Sun alehouse; a continuation of the cosmological theme established by The Globe, and perhaps also a reference to the sundial affixed to that tower.  

The size of more quotidian premises, in a microcosm of early modern Europe as a whole, ranged from alehouses operating out of cellars or single rooms in cramped tenements to large inns with a multiplication of chambers as well as extensive land holdings and service buildings. The attachment to the 1577 tallow-chandler's contract listing the weekly 'stints' of candles required by individual public houses furnishes a useful if unusual starting point for comparative estimations of capacity; it distinguishes between alehouses, taverns and inns, and expresses a weekly consumption of candles in pounds of weight from which relative sizes of establishments can be extrapolated. The seven innholders listed consumed an average of five pounds per week, the three taverners an average of 3.6 pounds, and the thirty-four alehouse-keepers an average of just over two pounds. While these ratios conform broadly to the received picture, there is striking variety within the institutional categories; thus, while The Dolphin is confirmed as Southampton's largest inn with a weekly consumption of eight pounds of candles, innkeeper John Elliot required a mere three pounds, suggesting his premises were smaller than two of the three wine taverns as well as one alehouse.

These findings can be pursued further with an analysis of the rooms enumerated in some fifty-five probate inventories that can be attributed to alehouse-keepers, taverners or innholders for the period 1550-1700. As well as general caveats about a source that 'radically under-represent[s]' the domestic circumstances of the lower orders, the dangers attached to inferring the overall scope of structures from inventorial testimony, surveys of goods rather than real estate, are well known. Although Southampton assessors enumerated on a room-by-room basis in nearly every inventory consulted (rather than providing a 'despatialised' list of goods), even in the absence of a legal compulsion to do so, no proportions are recorded, and it should not be assumed that where rooms are mentioned that the roster is complete; there was a tendency to
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26 SRO SC4/3/517/1; SC4/3/615. The east tower was still trading as the Sun Hotel in the late nineteenth century. Davies, History of Southampton, p. 95.

27 RBIII, pp. 81-4. On the consumption of candles see Cockayne, Hubbub, p. 146-7.


29 In only one inventory consulted, that for vintner and taverner John Biggs of Holy Rood parish, did appraisers simply list items. HRO 1611 A11/1-2.
'lump' smaller rooms together in large premises (assessors at The George, for example, listed items contained in 'divers odd rooms' in 1615),\(^\text{30}\) while interior spaces which did not contain any movables would obviously evade detection. Even where all rooms in town properties are accounted for, it is unclear from the form of inventories if they comprised all or merely part of a structure given the ubiquity of under-tenancy and subdivision into smaller occupancy units. However, they can still form the basis for tentative impressions.

Starting at the bottom of the victualling hierarchy, in thirty-three alehouse-keepers inventories that I have been able to locate for the early modern period, the average number of rooms per property is 5.8 (including lofts, cellars and any outbuildings, but not counting gardens or backsides). This is slightly larger than the figure of five rooms arrived at by Peter Clark on the basis of Canterbury inventories, but below the seven room average deduced for Southampton as a whole.\(^\text{31}\) While most of Southampton's alehouse-keepers (twenty-one of the sample) traded out of premises with somewhere between four and seven rooms,\(^\text{32}\) there was considerable variation between houses. Only one individual, French shoemaker John Enough of St Lawrence's parish, traded out of a single room, while in the late seventeenth century William Bound, Grafton Jackson and William Tompkins operated out of two-room premises.\(^\text{33}\) At the other end of the spectrum, clothier William Daniel's alehouse had eleven rooms (including a brewhouse and a 'cheese house'), while cooper John Manfield (whose weekly consumption of candles exceeded that of one inn and equalled that of three others) traded from premises with no fewer than twelve rooms up to his death in 1596.\(^\text{34}\) In terms of spatial dispositions, the prevalence of terms such as 'forechamber', 'chamber next the street', 'inner chamber' and 'back chamber' in the language of the inventories suggests that most alehouses conformed to the so-called 'right-angle' plan that represented the early modern standard of urban architectural design for smaller dwellings from the fifteenth century down to the eighteenth.\(^\text{35}\) This described narrow but deep

---

\(^{30}\) The assessors of Nicholas Bulbeck at The George, for example, listed items contained in 'divers odd rooms'. HRO 1615 AD09.

\(^{31}\) Clark, Alehouse, pp. 64-5; PInv. I, p. xv.


\(^{33}\) HRO 1613 AD032; 1674 AD016; 1674 AO63/1-2.

\(^{34}\) HRO 1698 AD12; 1596 AO80/1-2; RBIII, p. 83. The largest alehouse in the Canterbury sample comprised nine rooms. Clark, Alehouse, pp. 64-5.

rectangular properties built 'end-on' to the street, the shape of which can be discerned from Fig 2.4.2; they were only one room in width, but had rooms extending to the rear and over upper floors. The hall/parlour/kitchen complex generally occupied the ground floor, with other rooms organised vertically over several storeys (normally referred to as chambers). Surviving corporation leases bear out the prevalence of this plan; one for The Black Dog alehouse in French Street from 1704 describes a structure sixty-one feet deep by a mere twelve feet six inches wide (this institution had been trading since at least 1656 when Widow Lee was presented there by the leet jurors for serving beer in flagons).36

Southampton's taverns, for which eight surviving probate inventories have been identified, were more substantial structures averaging ten rooms, with a range from four (Jasper Keire's modest establishment in All Saints parish) to fourteen (the expansive premises operated by merchant Reginald House in the late sixteenth century, which had a proliferation of chambers as well as a cellar, stable and designated 'larder house').37 Again, the language of the inventories suggests that most taverns, in common with alehouses, were multi-level 'column dwellings' extending upwards and to the rear; that for Henry Gold, for example, makes reference to an upper and lower chamber 'next the street'.38 However, a 1646 inventory of the goods of taverner Thomas Pitt makes reference to chambers next to and over 'the gatehouse' as well as a 'stable', strongly suggesting that the thirteen rooms that comprised his premises were not vertically organised but were instead disposed more expansively around a central courtyard.39

To borrow a metaphor from Carl Estabrook, if Southampton's alehouses (and to a lesser extent its taverns) resembled fence-posts, then its inns were more akin to fields.40 In fourteen innholder's inventories that I have located for the town, the average number of rooms was sixteen, somewhat smaller than figures noted for elsewhere, but still making them the most substantial structures of this particular urban community. At the apex of the spatial hierarchy, The Dolphin and The George Above Bar each had at least twenty-two rooms, while bringing up the rear were the small inn next to the Itchen Ferry and Thomas Broker's new establishment The Katherine Wheel, which possessed ten and eleven rooms respectively. The lack of surviving fabrics means that few of Southampton's inns cannot be mapped with confidence onto William Pantin's seminal

36 SRO SC4/3/358a-b; SC6/1/59, Fo. 12v.
38 PInv. I, pp. 112-16.
39 HRO 1646 AD/69.
40 Estabrook, Urbane and Rustic England, p. 129.
bipartite inn typology, predicated on a subtle distinction between ‘block-type’ premises (with major rooms concentrated within one cuboid zone) and ‘courtyard-type’ premises (quadrangular complexes disposed around one or more central areas). However, both The Star and The Dolphin still exhibit the characteristic morphology of courtyard-style structures, with former service ranges extending back around yards that are now used for shops and outdoor dining, and which in the case of the latter was originally galleried (FIG. 2.4.5). The Bear Above Bar, of which no material traces survive, can also be inferred as a courtyard-style establishment from two detailed depositions from 1627 and 1631 which make reference to its courtyard as well as a system of dual entries (onto Above Bar Street and Windmill Lane) characteristic of the type. The precise disposition of the town’s other inns is more elusive, although they can be confirmed as either of the block or gatehouse variety because of occasional reference in town records to their gates.

43 In 1664 a deponent referred to ‘the gate of The White Horse’, while the gate of The Crown was referenced in the terrier of 1454, by a deponent in 1629 and in connection with a case of illegal merchandising in 1670. SRO SC9/3/13 Fo. 17r; Burgess, Terrier of 1454, p. 57; E&DII, p. 51; SRO SC2/1/8 Fo. 267v.
Inns were also characterised by the outbuildings, service structures and additional land holdings by which they were surrounded. As well as the obligatory stables, inventories make reference to barns, millhouses, brewhouses, coal houses, bushel houses, wash houses, and in the case of The George inn as well as that of Richard Vibert (who combined innholding with a complementary career in butchery), a slaughterhouse. Many inns incorporated the extensive greenbelt that still surrounded and suffused urban landscapes in this period. Vibert could dress his slaughtered hogs with apples grown in his own orchard, while all of the Above Bar inns exploited the green spaces that distinguished this agricultural suburb. The Katherine Wheel and The Bear had large gardens (the latter had an 'arbor' equipped with 'tables and benches'), while other innholders rented the open land contiguous to their premises from the corporation; in 1576 John Simons of The White Horse supplemented the garden and one acre meadow attached to the rear of the inn by leasing a 'plot of void ground' towards the sea, while from the late sixteenth century it was customary for the holders of The George inn to consolidate their premises by leasing large swathes of land on the west side of Above Bar Street. Rentals recorded include a plot of ground called 'Little Hampton', the ditches from the Bargate on the east to the high water mark on the west (which were lined with cherry trees by the late seventeenth century), a garden, as well as a vacant plot upon which the pound used to stand (deducing likely dimensions from a lease of adjoining lands from 1673, these would together have constituted an area 50 feet wide by 400 feet deep). Some intramural establishments were also adjacent to green space; The Star inn contained both a garden and a small orchard in its backside.

Public house structures, as such accretions suggest, were not static givens but were subject to continual and dynamic processes of spatial and architectural remaking. New outbuildings sprouted like mushrooms; the inn by the Itchen Ferry only had a stable at the death of Andrew Shackley in 1614, but acquired both a washhouse and a brewhouse during the subsequent tenancy of Henry Osborne.

---

44 CLII, p. 308; HRO 1648 A82/1-2.
45 See the contributions to P. Clark (ed.), The European City and Green Space: London, Stockholm, Helsinki and St Petersburg 1850-2000 (Aldershot, 2006).
46 HRO 1648 A82/1-2.
47 HRO 1583 AO9/1-2; Anderson, E&DIII, pp. 17-8; SC4/3/267; HRO 1647 AD104/1-2.
48 NA E214/1223; SC4/3/68.
50 SRO SC9/3/7, Fos. 17r-18r; SC6/1/59 Fo. 10r.
51 HRO 1614 B63/1-2; HRO 1627 B57/1-2.
George inn, first erected by Peter Spryng in 1478, was extended and remodelled during the tenancy of Nicholas Bulbeck in the early seventeenth century; the inventory taken on Bulbeck’s death contains reference to the ‘new parlour’, a ‘new chamber’ and a ‘new forechamber’. Thomas Broker went one better in 1587, taking the unusual step of demolishing The Katherine Wheel and rebuilding it from the ground up in an enlarged variant some fifteen years after her was first licensed to set up the sign. However, the project did not go smoothly for the enterprising wheelwright; according to the ever-vigilant court leet jurors, during the enlargement ‘he hath encroached upon the highway into the street [Above Bar Street] two foot or more’. As the trespass could not be ameliorated ‘without pulling down the house’, it was their pragmatic and entirely typical recommendation that ‘he should pay a knowledge to the town yearly for it’.

Indeed, this tendency towards spatial aggrandisement within shared urban space meant that innholders were more likely than other types of householder to commit acts of purpresture (encroachment at ground level onto land subject to common rights), the persecution of which took up much of the judicial business of Southampton’s court leet in a period in which ‘street blockages were the equivalent of an urban heart attack or stroke’. As we have seen, signboards loomed into thoroughfares; we have witnessed Bernard Searle’s ten-foot encroachment at The Katherine Wheel in 1611, while in 1601 Richard Singleton was presented for ‘a pole newly erected behind the garden or background of The Star’ which had ‘encroached into the highway behind the town wall the breadth of three foot or thereabouts’, a breach in which he had ‘obstinately and most indirectly persevered’. However, Above Bar inns were the main offenders, transgressing the suburban access road as well as other rights of way that crisscrossed their holdings between the highway and the sea. John Simons of The White Horse was presented in 1587 for ‘building out’ his house on the south side of its gate, while in 1611 the aggrandising Nicholas Bulbeck

52 Thick, Steward’s Book of 1492-93, p. 3n.
53 HRO 1615 AD/09.
56 SRO SC6/1/53, Fo. 14v.
57 CLII, p. 349.
58 CLII, p. 252.
'now tenant of The George was presented 'for encroaching the highway... towards
Arundel Tower and the seaside by setting of a hedge there which is an annoyance to
such as pass by that way'.59 Later in the century, its tenant Henry Henstridge was
repeatedly presented for another hedge as well as for 'building his stables and other
houses' beyond the town ditches.60 Publicans also infringed the private property of
others with their trade-specific building projects; Simons originally came to the
attention of the court leet in 1574 because a chimney attached to his new brewhouse
was deemed four feet two short and thus a hazard to neighbouring properties as well
as his own.61

Decaying public houses were an equally problematic spatial constituent. The
Crown, a venerable establishment in Holy Rood parish, had fallen into partial disrepair
by the middle of the seventeenth century. A chancery court case from 1651 refers to
'the said decayed inn and premises',62 while in 1666 and 1670 leet jurors presented its
owners 'for not repairing the house, the back part being very dangerous for the
children that play there' and for failing to maintain the fences which distinguished it
from surrounding properties.63 As we have seen, The Lion inn Above Bar was entirely
reabsorbed into the (sub)urban sprawl when it was subdivided into tenements which,
at the compilation of the 1617 terrier, were in the 'several tenures' of a ropemaker, a
carpenter, a butcher and a weaver.64 In cases of spatial conflicts and nuisances,
Southampton's innholders might have claimed their houses were more sinned against
than sinning, especially if they operated within the cramped, knockabout three-
dimensional jumble of the walled town with its manifold potential for spatial
violations. The Star in St Lawrence's parish seems to have been especially unfortunate
in this respect. In 1577 its holder Peter Janverin complained about John Harrison's
'fishy water' in the High Street (three years previously fishmongers had been warned
not to 'water' or wash their fish in the High Street but to confine such activity to the
designated fish market outside St Michael's church) and also bemoaned the 'noisome
and filthy... savour' created by Robert Gross's disposal of fish from his back door at
the Castle Butts.65 In 1601 the same inn had an 'ancient light' into its cellar blocked
up by a neighbour, while, as we have seen, in 1603 baker John Ellery built a chimney

59 CLIII, p. 436.
60 SRO SC6/1/54, Fo. 17v; SC6/1/55, Fo. 17r; SC6/1/57, Fo. 26r.
61 CLI, p. 130.
62 NA C 10/30/52.
63 SRO SC6/1/62, Fo. 23; SC6/1/65, Fo. 12v.
64 SRO SC4/1/2, Fos. 9r-v.
65 CLI, pp. 154, 122, 157.
hazardously close to the timber-framed gable of The King's Head. In 1665, The Angel alehouse was bothered by a ‘very noisome slaughterhouse’.

Interiors
So far, Southampton’s public houses remain ‘black boxes’; is it possible to gaze upon their interiors, and the patterns of spatial use and meaning that they enclosed? Here, evidence from the archaeological record must be corroborated with other categories of data; while fabrics are indispensable in the reconstruction of the structural typology of public houses, they are ‘silent witnesses’ to the social spaces they once contained and convey only a static and prescriptive picture of spatial relations. Although no ground plans have been located for early modern establishments (the earliest I have found depicts ‘The Fishy Kettle Public House’ on French Street in the nineteenth century), post-mortem inventories in combination with narratives of spatial experience as recorded in informations, examinations and depositions offer rich prospects for the recovery of use and meaning in these contexts. The dynamic spatial information provided incidentally by deponents in court cases centring on public houses furnish invaluable clues about the functions of particular rooms as well as a highly differentiated range of social meanings attached to them. Likewise, although a problematic basis for the extrapolation of size, the material assets listed (usually comprehensively) in inventories were engendered by discrete and emplaced forms of social activity and can thus be used more appropriately to characterise, often with great clarity, the roles and likely appearance of specific rooms. Although the notion of space is ‘implied in the stories of ‘stuff’... told by historians of material culture’, the following discussion mobilises objects as an optic on spatial/environmental conventions rather than in and of themselves.

66 CLIII, pp. 389-90.
67 SRO SC6/1/61, Fo. 16.
68 Giddens, Constitution of Society, p. 135.
70 HRO Top 286/2/344(1).
Southampton’s public houses contained a wide variety of interior spaces that, while not conforming to Matthew Johnson’s overarching narrative of ‘closure’, did exhibit loose functional differentiation. Halls, parlours and sometimes fore chambers represented the areas where company was most likely to have been joined. These rooms, situated towards the front of structures, are identifiable by a proliferation of material culture for the accommodation of guests. John James’s alehouse in Holy Rood parish had a ground floor complex of parlour, hall and ‘little hall’ containing in total six tables with frames and forms, a pair of playing tables, eight stools, three chairs and an unspecified number of wainscot benches. Customers entering The Green Dragon alehouse Above Bar in 1693 could choose from a table board, five joined stools, a settle or a green rush chair in the ‘fore room below’, while the hall of Olive Addison’s alehouse at her death in 1611 contained three tables, two pairs of playing tables and a startling sixty yards of wainscot benches. In 1674, widow and alehouse-keeper Anne Filleter could seat seventeen people in her fore chamber. Taverns could apparently accommodate even larger numbers in their principal rooms; the ‘fore chamber’ of John Pitt’s tavern contained three tables and could seat no fewer than twenty-nine patrons on a combination of joined stools, low stools and joined chairs. Inns also possessed modest halls (in 1570 The Dolphin’s ‘new hall’ contained two tables, a round wainscot chair, a Spanish chair and stool and eight joined stools), and increasingly designated tap rooms. The George inn contained a ‘tap house’ filled with tables and forms in 1615 (this had been in existence since at least 1593), The Bear inn possessed a ‘drink house’ strewn with benches in 1647, while The Dolphin had followed suit with a ‘tap house’ by 1678. Somewhat adventurously, in 1649 an alehouse operated by William Chaplin was also boasting a ‘tap house’. Taverns and inns increasingly provided designated games rooms; Thomas Pitt’s tavern had a ‘shuffleboard room’ in 1646, as did inns operated by John Luffe in 1692 and Thomas Heath in 1693.

74 HRO 1615 AD40; 1693 AO59/1-2; 1612 B002/1-2; 1674 A039-1-2.
75 HRO 1628 A58/1-2.
76 PlnV.II, pp. 282-3; HRO 1615 AD09; 1647 AD104/1-2; 1678 B23/1-2; 1647 AD024. That these tap rooms were consumption spaces rather than storage areas is confirmed by other sources. In 1593 a deponent referred to drinking in ‘the tap house’ of The George, while in 1616 court leet jurors complained that ‘Thomas Oddams at The Dolphin, Thomas Winter at The Star and Thomas Dadu at The George do all of them... pay good sums of money to the innholder for drawing their beer’. SRO SC9/3/9, Fos. 23v-25r; CLIII, p. 514.
77 HRO 1646 AD69; 1692 AD11: 1693 AO55/1-3.
Sleeping chambers proliferated on the upper floors of establishments (although not necessarily taverns, which were not bound to lodge travellers). Chambers, which might vary from one for a small alehouse up to the eleven enumerated for *The Dolphin* in 1678,78 typically contained three beds with their accoutrements (feather, flock as well as ubiquitous sliding 'truckles'), as well as a variety of chests and coffers, often with locks, for the storage of guests' belongings. Chambers belonging to publicans were most usually those 'fore chambers' located at the front of premises. Thomas Broker of *The Katherine Wheel* articulated a typical arrangement in his will in 1583 when he left to his wife Elizabeth 'the place where I now lay next the street, with convenient bedding and all the things necessary to the furnishing of... my said house of *The Katherine Wheel*.79 As his bequest suggests, publicans' chambers, which are identifiable in inventories from the presence of wearing apparel, looking glasses or weapons, were not just used for sleeping but constituted the primary storage zone for valuable household linens. Broker's contained five sheets, five pillow-ties, four napkins and eleven table cloths, while that of Henry Osborne who held the inn by the Itchen ferry contained thirty-six napkins as well as thirteen table cloths and twelve pairs of 'sheets of all sorts'.80 Alehouse-keeper John Grundy shared his chamber with three coffers overflowing with sheets, table cloths, napkins, pillow-ties and 'other small linens', while William Chaplin's contained sixteen canvas sheets, nineteen hand towels and no fewer than three dozen canvas napkins.81

Public houses also had a proliferation of service areas. Many establishments had underground cellars for the storage of beverages and foodstuffs; inns commonly had two, organised by type of intoxicant,82 while alehouses were likely to possess them if they were sited, like those of Peter Hendrick, John Mullins, and Hercules Audley, on or in the vicinity of the two town quays.83 As well as being used as repositories for full and used casks, widespread references to 'stands' confirms received wisdom that drinks would have been 'drawn' from this area before being taken up to customers; the tapsters at Andrew Shackley's inn by Itchen Ferry had the

78 HRO 1678 B23/1-2.
79 HRO 1583 A09/1-2.
80 HRO 1627 B57/1-2.
81 HRO 1616 B046/1-2; 1647 AD024.
82 The George had a 'wine cellar' as well as a 'street cellar', while the inn by the Itchen Ferry had both a 'wine cellar' and a 'beer cellar'. HRO 1615 AD09; 1614 B63/1-2.
83 Hendrick and Mullins both had premises on the West Quay. HRO 1613 A38/1-2; 1628 B53/1-5.
additional convenience of ‘pouring tables’.\textsuperscript{84} In smaller alehouses lacking cellars other rooms would be used for the purpose; shoemaker John Grundy stored his beer in a back chamber, Thomas Cook in ‘the room where the beer stands’ and feltmaker Stephen Rolf in his shop.\textsuperscript{85} Other internal service zones, generally sited at the rear of the ground floors of premises, included kitchens for the preparation of food and in many cases butteries geared towards the storage of eating and drinking utensils; in an entirely typical example, that belonging to alehouse-keeper William Pitt contained, \textit{inter alia}, three pint pots, four wine quarts, a half pint pot, a quarter pint pot, nine platters, four salt sellers and two dozen trenchers.\textsuperscript{86} Inns had many more specific service spaces, such as pantries, larders, cocklofts, haylofts, drying lofts, counting houses, linen rooms and, in a telling example of increased specialisation, ‘the room used to put the tobacco pipes in’ listed in Thomas Heath’s 1693 inventory (it also held forty-eight glass quart bottles).\textsuperscript{87}

However, regularised functional ‘regionalisation’ was complicated by patterns of use, and should be understood in terms of the ‘zoning of time-space’ as well as ‘localisation in space’.\textsuperscript{88} Beds migrated into halls and parlours, especially in smaller premises, while cellars, kitchens and especially chambers were frequently the settings for social interaction when not in use for dormitory purposes. This is especially true of inns. Although the insignificance of inn halls should not be exaggerated (two mariners ‘set upon drinking in the hall’ at The White Horse in 1578, while two deponents were ‘in the hall of The Katherine Wheel’ in 1591),\textsuperscript{89} their small size and impoverished material culture is striking.\textsuperscript{90} This compares with the often extensive seating provided in their chambers; the ‘new chamber’ in The George inn, for example, contained six joined stools, a basket chair, a turner’s chair and ‘the benches’ as well its bed and truckle.\textsuperscript{91} Depositions yield many examples of drinking and sociability taking place in the inn chambers of the town. In 1623 a Wiltshire upholsterer and his company took supper and played a game of cards in one of the well-appointed

\textsuperscript{84} HRO 1614 B63/1-2.
\textsuperscript{85} HRO 1616 BO46/1-2; 1619 AD24; 1626 A108/1-4.
\textsuperscript{86} HRO 1604 AD42.
\textsuperscript{87} HRO 1693 AO55/1-3.
\textsuperscript{89} SC9/3/4, Fo. 8v; HRO 21 M65 C3/10, Fo. 507.
\textsuperscript{90} Pantin, ‘Medieval Inns’, p. 186.
\textsuperscript{91} HRO 1615 AD09.
chambers at *The George*, while in 1631 a betrothal between local people and related social exchanges took place `in a chamber at *The Star*'. Even alehouses, in which halls tended to be more prominent and secondary rooms less numerous or well equipped, can be seen as offering a multiplication of separate drinking spaces. Kitchens offered spill-over zones (Anne Filleter's contained two tables, four joined stools, a settle and three old chairs as well as cooking vessels), while in the St Michael's alehouse operated by shipwright Stephen Todey the hall was complemented by a chamber containing two tables, four stools, three forms, a settle, two joined chairs and one `old leather chair'.

Taverners and innholders augmented the visual richness of their premises through the addition of wainscot, pictures, hangings, ornaments, and colourful or exotic soft furnishings done out of new materials or fashionable techniques. In 1573 tavern-keeper and merchant Reginald House decked out his fore chamber with tapestry blankets, five curtains of red and green say (a modish serge-like cloth), painted hangings and a rod and curtain for the window, while all the rooms of the remodelled *George* inn contained wainscoting, hangings, rugs, calico carpets and curtains in green and yellow (including in the window in the fore chamber). The most ostentatious interior was of course that of *The Dolphin* inn. By 1570 innholder and merchant adventurer Edward Wilmott had secured for his `great chamber' say window curtains, a red coverlet, a white rug, an English carpet and a `great looking glass', while fifty years later its forechamber contained six turkey-worked cushions, embroidered stools, two green serge carpets, a green window curtain and a globe. Display cases in the hall and parlour contained a variety of drinking vessels of china and glass. An expected feature of the inventories is reference to the wall paintings with biblical or biographical themes that commonly festooned the walls of inns and taverns; guests at Henry Gold's tavern in 1558 would have come face to face with a sobering likeness of `the Emperor' (presumably Charles V), while a chamber of *The Dolphin* in 1624 contained `one new picture of Adam and Eve'. More surprising are references to the window curtains that according to most accounts did not appear at
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93 HRO 1665 AD100; 1674 AO39/1-2.
94 PInv. II, pp. 371-83; HRO 1615 AD09.
95 PInv. II, pp. 280-89; HRO 1624 A41/1-2.
97 PInv. I, p. 113; HRO 1624 A41/1-2.
the windows of houses until the late seventeenth-century; however, Southampton dwellings seem to have been generally precocious in this respect. 98

Alehouses also offered highly variegated environments for their patrons. Indeed, from the late sixteenth century, we encounter many ad hoc embellishments that problematise images of denuded interiors and absent decorative features that characterise the received picture of alehouse decor (even an over-determined ‘improvement’ paradigm interpretatively quarantines pre-Restoration institutions within four bare walls). 99 Visual flourishes were all about in the alehouses of the town, if not throughout the premises then at least in their principal rooms. The hall of mariner William Pitt’s alehouse in 1604 contained nine yards of wainscot, a fashionable porthole door, two painted cloths and two pictures, while John James’s alehouse boasted a hall with no fewer than seven framed pictures of unspecified theme and a wainscoted parlour with ‘painted cloths’ in 1615; 100 even where a subject is not mentioned in connection with these ‘poor man’s pictures’ painted directly onto canvas (and there was no reason for assessors to do so), it is highly likely that such hangings were not purely functional but depicted ornamental patterns or even narratives. 101 Soft furnishings completed the picture; Pitt’s fore chamber contained a ‘turkey carpet’ and was overlooked by a gallery draped with say, while even the single room establishment operated by French shoemaker John Enough was enlivened by two rugs in green and blue. 102 However, cooper John Manfield, whose twelve-room alehouse is the largest in the sample, represented the high water mark for the visual deluxe in early modern Southampton. In 1596, his parlour contained wainscoting, painted cloths and two silk curtains at the windows, as well as a looking glass and a presentation ‘glass case’ (John James’s parlour also had a ‘glass cupboard’ containing ten glass bottles and six chargers, while by 1693 The Green Dragon [which also contained a ‘green rug’ and a ‘green chair’] had a display of ‘white Dutch earthenware’). 103

The fantastical dimensions of public house interiors were augmented by the tendency of proprietors to enliven interior geographies via words and images. This practice, common to taverns and inns but not alehouses, may also have served the
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100 HRO 1604 AD/02; 1615 AD/40.
102 HRO 1604 AD/02; 1613 AD032.
103 HRO 1596 A080/1-2; 1615 AD/40; 1693 A059 1-2.
practical function of rendering rooms more identifiable to tapsters when being used for drinking and sociability. The names affixed to rooms, like the inn signs which they internally reproduced, exhibited a variety of resonances. In taverns and smaller establishments the cue was normally taken from a physical component of the space in question; ‘the little paved chamber’ and ‘the red chamber’ in John Elyn’s tavern, the ‘matted chamber’ in *The George* or the ‘yellow chamber’ in Thomas Heath’s inn. Others referenced Hampshire towns from which guests might have plausibly originated, evoking their physical orientation or perhaps more institutionalised links with networks of carriers and carters; the ‘Andover chamber’, the ‘Salisbury chamber’ or the ‘Cowes chamber’. Still more evoked cosmological, heraldic or animal themes, no doubt denoted visually inside rooms on hangings and painted cloths and perhaps also painted on their doors. Once again, *The Dolphin* ran the gamut in this respect. In 1570 it contained a ‘dragon chamber’ a ‘lion chamber’ and a ‘star chamber’, to which was added a ‘half moon chamber’ in 1624. *The Star* contained five named chambers in 1678 (including ‘the sun’, ‘the globe’, ‘the squirrel’ and ‘the crown’).

Public or Private?

Public houses raise the issue of public and private in particularly acute form, and the ways in which complex understandings and experience of these perceptual dimensions intersected their spatial conventions is a major preoccupation in current research. Broadly, public houses were sites particularly redolent of the ‘remarkable interpenetration of public and private’ that characterised architectural environments throughout the period. While private residences, during opening hours and on a recurring basis inns, taverns and alehouses participated in early modern Southampton’s ‘public landscape’. Drinking practices transgressed architectural borders and spilled out into surrounding outdoor areas that sometimes formed part of the tenement (the aforementioned ‘arbor’ in *The Bear* garden) but could be wholly within the public domain; in 1619 magistrates complained that townsmen ‘repair to
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the grate of the prison of the Bargate and do there continue tippling and drinking with the prisoners’, presumably with intoxicants purchased from the alehouses which clustered within the northern entry point.\textsuperscript{109} Public houses were bound to offer general access and were characterised by greater permeability than that to which all urban dwellings were prone. Sharon McSheffrey has recently argued that these public attributes made drinking houses popular venues for the contracting of marriage in medieval London, and the people of Southampton and Hampshire in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries also exposed their formalised spousals to the proliferation of witnesses offered by alehouses, taverns and inns.\textsuperscript{110}

Such legitimising public attributes pooled with variable intensities within public house micro-geographies. Main drinking rooms such as halls, what Bill Hillier and Julienne would term ‘shallow’ spaces situated at the street-front of premises or immediately behind workshops,\textsuperscript{111} were for the most part publicly connoted, and the lack of internal dividers would have enhanced these characteristics; with the exception of the two-room alehouse of William Bound (a chamber of which contained ‘table board partitions’), appraisers did not note any of the aural/visual screens that have been noted for the London context and could have been used in the creation of secluded zones.\textsuperscript{112} Litigants and witnesses in marital cases appealed to the relative publicity of the hall to reinforce the binding nature of disputed contracts; in the 1569 dispute between Thomas Wale and alehouse servant Ellen Ride, a witness and friend of the plaintiff claimed that a formalised promise had been made in the ‘entry hall’ while Ride herself, in what seems like the more likely version of events, claimed that she had been ‘sitting in the back door... a working’ (a location at the deepest and, in theory, least accessible portion of the alehouse) when Wale had merely ‘cast a penny into her lap’.\textsuperscript{113} In cases of defamation, the location of an insult in the hall of a drinking house added gravity to the offence (‘it was a little before night in the hall... and the said words were spoken before them all’),\textsuperscript{114} while defendants and examinates often used their consistent presence in the hall as a spatial guarantor of the probity of their conduct; in 1624, for example, labourer Gilbert

\textsuperscript{109} SRO SC9/2/1, Fo. 43r.
\textsuperscript{110} S. McSheffrey, ‘Place, Space, and Situation: Public and Private in the Making of Marriage in Late-Medieval London’, \textit{Speculum} 79 (October, 2004), pp. 982-6. See HRO 21 M65 C3/4, Fos. 417; 608, 618; 713, 715, 698; C3/9, Fos. 49-51; 368; C3/10, Fos. 178, 180, 197; 444-6, 449; C3/12, Fos. 62, 64.
\textsuperscript{111} B. Hillier & J. Hanson, \textit{The Social Logic of Space} (Cambridge & New York, 1984), pp. 143-75.
\textsuperscript{112} HRO 1674 ADO16.
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Brickleton claimed that he could not have begotten widow Elizabeth Tompkins with child because, while he and a friend were indeed present at her alehouse in St Michael's parish one April in 1624, 'during their abode at the house... she was in company with them in the hall in orderly manner'.

However, other rooms within the structure could also have public associations, at a time when publicity was situationally determined and different locations within drinking establishments oscillated between public or private depending on context and those present. Chambers, while deemed 'private and suspicious' if occupied by unmarried couples, could be publicly connoted under different social circumstances. In particular, unlike in medieval London there is little evidence that contracts made in the bedchambers of public houses 'always carried a taint'. In 1631, four witnesses testifying in the case of Mary Fowler versus William Smith claimed to have heard Smith promise to marry Fowler and give her a piece of gold 'in the chamber of The Star at about seven of the clock at night', while servant Elizabeth Allen and labourer John Colbrook contracted marriage before an innholder, a barber-surgeon and a merchant in a chamber of the same inn in 1573. Even alehouse chambers, so often implicated in 'private' (and therefore illicit) activities, were often referred to as settings for marriage contracts with no sense on the part of witnesses that a spatial impropriety had been committed: in 1583, alehouse-keeper Alice Norris and her son Richard described how Thomas Comes and Susanna Trill contracted marriage and pledged each other in a chamber of Norris's establishment at Carisbrooke on the Isle of Wight.

As well as these positive associations of publicity, there is a sense in which public houses must have effaced privacy for those who lived in and used them, and questions about whether seclusion was ever possible in early modern town houses have particular traction in inns, taverns and alehouses. Publicans and their families generally lived at their premises, even at the top of the hierarchy (even Edward Wilmott, innholder, merchant and one of Southampton's wealthiest men, was living
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in a well-appointed chamber of The Dolphin at his death in 1570), 123 and the maintenance of their private lives must have been extremely precarious, especially in alehouses where the impedimenta of drink work migrated promiscuously throughout premises; we have witnessed the encroachment of hospitality-related linens into bed chambers and barrels of beer in shops (likewise, at The Greyhound inn in 1625, court leet jurors perceived six beer jugs in the shop which were 'esteemed to be in use being some beer found in them'). 124 Intimate daily encounters with customers would have been an inescapable feature of life for alehouse-keepers and their households (with particular implications for female servants, as we will see), while even the ambit of hosts in larger premises coincided closely with those of their guests; in a detailed deposition from 1593, keeper of The George inn Leonard Mills described how at ten o'clock one Saturday night after attending Winchester Fair 'he was at supper in one of his chambers with some guests which came from Winchester'. 125 There were even fewer architectural guarantors for the privacy of customers. As we will see, conversations in main drinking areas were exposed to aural scrutiny, while overnight lodgers were especially exposed in alehouses. Passage rooms were a common side effect of their spatial configuration down to the late seventeenth century (in 1649 a long-term lodger in Steven Griffin's alehouse described how she would not let some rowdy drinkers 'have passage through her room'), 126 while even if this were not the case overnight guests were expected to share beds or to inhabit spaces imperfectly demarcated from adjacent rooms and premises by cracked plaster walls and torn hangings; in 1576, Jean Guffin, servant to alehouse-keeper Ralph Robins of St. Michael's parish, described pulling aside a painted cloth in his 'guest chamber' and discovering a hole into the neighbouring bedchamber of Michael Favour and his wife 'as big as a man's fist'. 127

However, the image of public houses as peculiarly permeable should not be overstated. For alehouse-keepers, the presence of customers would have merged with those long-term patterns of lodging and undertenancy that made for shared stairways, kitchens and yards, especially in tenements and courtyard dwellings, that characterised urban existence regardless of the presence of hospitality functions.

124 SRO SC6/1/40, Fo. 22r.
125 SRO SC9/3/9, Fos. 26r-27r.
126 SRO SC9/1/7, Fo. 12.
127 SRO SC9/3/3, Fos. 4r-5r. Robins is not explicitly named as an alehouse-keeper in Guffin's testimony, although he was identified as such in the stall and art rolls for the same year. SC6/1/10, Fo. 4v-8v.
They also enclosed opportunities for privacy. Public houses were not accessible around the clock and cannot have functioned as (in Peter Borsay’s phrase) an ‘annexe of the street’ if front doors remained firmly shut; in 1576 three Frenchmen were fined 6s each for breaking the peace at eleven o’clock at night ‘outside of Widow Slater’s door’, while in 1753 a sailor described how he and his company ‘knocked at The Castle alehouse [but] could not get in’. If they did gain admittance, depending on availability individual drinking companies could secure an exclusive private room that offered a degree of seclusion for their sociability; we have seen the use of inn chambers for this purpose, while even alehouse patrons expected one to be available (in 1650, for example, two local men arrived at the Holy Rood alehouse of gentleman Walter Bradley and, in telling order, ‘called for a room and a jug of beer’). Indeed, as we will see, it was the very ‘privacy’ offered and represented by such spaces within an ostensibly public arena that rendered them such charged locales in adultery and fornication suits, especially if doors had been shut, locked or otherwise ‘made fast’.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Southampton’s landscape of drink was comprised of inns, taverns and alehouses, although legal distinctions between these institutions were not hard and fast and could become blurred in social practice. Institutions were widely diffused throughout urban geography; locations were economically and logistically constituted and (especially for alehouses) highly reflective of social topography, although also exhibited moral, sensorial and imaginative dimensions. In particular, public house signs, locally specific in their themes and functioning, became part of the mental framework through which Southampton people organised and made sense of the space of the town. Premises generally increased in size throughout the hierarchy, although with physical exceptions (such as John Manfield’s substantial alehouse in St Michael’s parish) that would have complicated attempts to read off types of establishment from architectural media alone. Moreover, they were not static givens; indeed, a pronounced tendency for victualling environments (especially inns) to contract and expand often brought their proprietors into conflict with urban authorities keen to sustain patterns of access and mobility. Interiors exhibited loose and variable functional differentiation, and at all levels of the hierarchy were both
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visually rich and were saturated with meaning. In particular, internal micro-
geographies were an important terrain for the working and negotiation of early
modern conceptions of public and private; however, these were not inherent to
particular spaces but were defined situationally according to circumstances and
combinations of agents. It is to them to which we must now turn.
In 1627, a deponent described how when seeking his acquaintance Samuel Brown 'at The George an inn at Southampton... the people of the inn denied the said Samuel Brown to be there'; in 1649, a London tanner lodged at The Crown inn spoke of 'the people of the house'.1 Who were these people? Having delineated the physical constituents of Southampton's landscape of drink, this section moves the discussion to an analysis of the three main groups of agents that inhabited it: publicans, servants and patrons.

3.1 PUBLICANS

We must first turn to the cast of individuals who set out signs and opened for business in early modern Southampton; 'alehouse-keepers' (sometimes 'tipplers' or 'victuallers'), 'taverners' (or 'vintners') and 'innholders' (or 'hosts'), who differed substantially in life-paths and prospects, but all of whom can be analytically encapsulated as publicans who made or supplemented their livings through varieties of 'drink work'.2 It has been estimated that between 15% and 20% of urban workers were involved in the victualling sectors (which encompassed a larger cadre of bakers, brewers, butchers, fishmongers and town cooks as well as publicans),3 and in Southampton as in early modern Havering and Westminster the retailing of food and drink and the lodging of guests was 'a mainstay of the local economy' that offered manifold opportunities.4 This section moves beyond negative literary portrayals of pauperised, criminally-inclined tipplers and greedy, swindling hosts to offer an overview of a diverse range of individuals who actually plied
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their trades at the coalface of the landscape of drink. A first section looks at the economic, social and cultural capital enjoyed by publicans across the hierarchy, while a second section addresses the extent and perception of female participation in the trade.

**Economic and Social Capital**

Alehouse-keepers, the lowliest members of the sector, represent a suitable starting point. Peter Clark has described the 'massed ranks of urban victuallers' as 'coming mainly from the poorer trades', a subtler variation on his earlier slogan that alehouses were run 'by the poor, for the poor', and there was clearly an assumption on the part of magistrates that the town's licensed alehouse-keepers, most of whom sold ale and beer to supplement their principal incomes, should be poor if such an expedient were to be sanctioned (we have already seen how, in 1638, the intervention into the trade of a goldsmith was subject to a business handicap). Prospective licensees were quick to appeal to this vital component of their eligibility in their petitions to justices. In 1622 Richard Harvey, a mariner who had been selling ale on an illegitimate basis from 'the sign of The Ship' in St Michael's parish since at least 1601, fashioned himself as a 'very poor man aged threescore and twelve years' in his appeal against his suppression the previous year. He went on to explain that 'a most desperate and dangerous wound' sustained while 'in service at sea for his prince and country' had left him 'not able to labour, nor having any other means to maintain his wife and children [so] he did sell and utter beer and ale'. He was formally licensed, and his goods were valued at a mere £11 8s 8d upon his death the following year. Some of those prosecuted for unlicensed tippling were substantial individuals from whom such justifications for their transgression would have surely seemed hollow; a surgeon in 1613, or merchant John Biggs in 1619 with whom Harvey himself was briefly imprisoned. In a telling reversal from 1619 Thomas Malzard, a
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Fig. 3.1.1 Recorded primary occupations of Southampton alehouse-keepers 1619-24.

wealthy brewer, was fined 15s by the assembly for his unlicensed tippling which was discursively redirected ‘to the poor alehouse-keepers’.¹¹

Discursive strategies and isolated cases notwithstanding, licensing, tax and inventorial data allows us to reconstruct the economic profile of Southampton’s community of alehouse-keepers more comprehensively. As tippling was nearly always a by-employment, the enumeration of the alehouse-keeper’s primary trade in licensing recognizances, which survive for the period 1619-24 and in less detail for 1661-68, allows us to recover suggestive occupational backgrounds (bearing in mind the imprecision and fluidity of contemporary designations). A breakdown of the main trades of the forty-three individuals licensed for the earlier period can be seen in Fig. 3.1.1. Behind widows, a characteristically poor group deemed especially worthy of economic assistance by urban authorities (discussed below), most alehouse-keepers were recruited from the town’s poorer vocational cohorts; they were cooper, turners and mariners, toiled in the lower reaches of the town’s cloth industry as felt-makers, tailors and especially serge-weavers (introduced into the town by the Walloon settlers in 1567), or were husbandmen and day

¹¹ SRO SC2/1/6, Fo. 187r.
labourers. The dominant pattern was largely reproduced in the 1660s. Of fifteen individuals licensed in 1668, four were widows, six were mariners and four worked in the clothing trades. Of the latter group, tailor William Bound had goods valued at £12 4s 8d and occupied a tenement with only two rooms, as did Grafton Jackson; licensed successively as a ‘victualler’ between 1662 and 1665, and clearly still trading as such upon his death in 1675, his inventory describes him as a ‘gentleman’. However, he had clearly fallen on hard times, as his movable goods (which included nine stools and six drinking vessels) were valued at just £10 8s 11d.

A minority of alehouse-keepers were drawn from more affluent occupational sectors. Most strikingly, no fewer than six urban yeomen were licensed in the earlier period (yeomen in town contexts often had little connection with agriculture but were instead commercial actors who invested in property, provided loans and served as middlemen in market transactions). Many of these individuals, such as Henry Padgett from St Michael’s parish, were clearly embarked on the downward economic trajectories to which such figures were always vulnerable; although licensed as a ‘yeoman’ in 1619, he was trying his hand as a ‘mariner’ in 1620 and was eking out a living as a ‘labourer’ by 1624. However, many were and remained more substantial figures who successfully exploited the synergies between alehouse-keeping and the world of local finance; yeoman John Jordan, who operated an alehouse Above Bar, possessed goods on his death valued at £117 6s 8d. Those whose alehouse-keeping was a by-product of life-cyclical poverty had also often been substantial figures within the mercantile sector; Walter Earle an ‘ancient burgess’ licensed to tipple by the assembly ‘upon his petition’ in 1615, was a former merchant who had served as a court leet juror as far back as 1575. Others evidently continued to operate alehouses despite improvements in their economic circumstances. Thomas Nutley was licensed as a ‘weaver’ in 1619, but had become a ‘clothier’ by 1624. Moreover, many members of the wealthier victualling trades added alehouse-keeping to their existing portfolio; baker John Ellery, and official town cook Edward Philleter of St Michael’s parish in the 1620s (who occupied a nine room alehouse and whose goods on his death were valued at £140 3s).

---

12 SRO SC9/2/1, Fos. 38r-39v, 55r-56v, 70r-71v, 80v-82v, 95r-96v, 104v-106v.
13 SRO SC9/2/11, Fo. 12r-13r.
14 HRO 1674 AD 016.
15 SRO SC9/2/11, Fos. 3v-4v, 5v-6v, 7r-8r. HRO 1674 AO 63/1-2.
16 See McIntosh, Havering, pp. 139-40.
17 He had been trading here since at least 1611. See SC6/1/30, Fos. 6r-10v.
18 HRO 1627 A27/1-2.
19 ABIV, p. 4; CLI, p. 108.
A similar impression of alehouse-keeper's economic circumstances emerges from tax data. An enumeration of all licensed and unlicensed tipplers for each ward prepared by the leet jurors in 1603 coincides with a fully surviving subsidy assessment taken the previous year and entered into the town's assembly books, permitting an unusually comprehensive comparison. Assessments for the fifty-seven alehouse-keepers I have been able to cross-reference averaged 1s 8d (slightly above the average for the town as a whole), with a range of 4d up to 8s 4d for widow Olive Addison, whose goods were valued at £60 13s upon her death in 1612 and whose alehouse in Holy Rood parish, as we have seen, boasted a hall with sixty yards of wainscot benches. While Addison's situation was unusual (68% of the sample were assessed at a shilling or less), she was by no means alone; two other alehouse-keepers from this wealthy parish were assessed at over 4s, including John James, another urban yeoman whose alehouse contained at least eight rooms. For the later period, licensed individuals named in recognizances between 1662 and 1668 can be pursued in the borough hearth tax assessments of 1662 and 1665. While excluding the very poorest alehouse-keepers (those holding property worth less than £1 were exempted from payment), the eighteen licensed alehouse-keepers encompassed by the assessment possessed an average number of 4.7 hearths, with a range of one up to fifteen for widow Ann Filleter, whose alehouse upon her death contained goods worth £233 7s. This is slightly above the average for the town of 4.3 hearths, although the high assessment for Filleter has distorted the sample; 56% of alehouse-keepers were assessed for four hearths or less.

Southampton's taverners and especially innholders moved in different economic orbits, and indeed numbered among early modern Southampton's wealthiest citizens. Especially in the sixteenth century, many innholders combined their management of public houses with other trades from which their economic profiles can be extrapolated. Prestige High Street inns The Dolphin and The Star passed between members of the mercantile elite in the later 1500s; Peter Janverin, who originated from St Brelade in Jersey and who continued to trade in cloth and canvas with the Channel Islands, acquired
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20 SRO SC6/1/27, Fos. 17r-18r; SC2/1/6, Fos. 7r-15v.
21 HRO 1612 B002/1-2.
22 HRO 1615 AD40.
23 SRO SC9/2/11 Fos. 2r-v, 3v-4v, 5v-6v, 7r-8r, 8v-9v, 10r-v, 11r-v, 12r-13r; E. Hughes & P. White (eds), *The Hampshire Hearth Tax Assessment 1665*, HRS 11 (Winchester, 1991), pp. 287-304.
24 HRO 1674 A039/1-2.
25 This was also true of Havering and the other market towns of early modern Hampshire. See McIntosh, *Havering*, pp. 132-3; Roberts, 'Population, Disease and Family Structure', pp. 210-11.
an interest in *The Star* in 1566 after marrying the widow of its former keeper,\(^26\) while *The Dolphin* was held by merchant Edward Wilmott and, from 1576, by his former apprentice and merchant in his own right John Sedgwick (Sedgwick married Wilmott’s daughter Averine, who had distrained on the tenement, although their claim to the inn was disputed in the early 1580s),\(^27\) who jointly purchased a ship with another innholder in 1583.\(^28\) In the 1630s, merchant and clothier Edward Tatenell occupied *The Crown*, a small but venerable inn in Holy Rood parish.\(^29\) Southampton’s humbler droving and carrying inns Above Bar were seldom in the hands of merchants but were often occupied by individuals engaged in substantial trades from which innholding would have represented a logical extension. A miller and then a butcher leased *The Lion* from the town in the mid sixteenth century,\(^30\) while in 1573, as we have seen, prosperous wheelwright Thomas Broker was authorised to ‘set up his sign, and keep an inn’ Above Bar (Broker had been admitted as a burgess upon payment of £5 in 1563).\(^31\)

By the later decades of the sixteenth century, while smaller inns might remain part of an individual’s by-employment (Morgan Emott, keeper of *The Greyhound* on the High Street in the 1620s and 30s, was also an urban yeoman),\(^32\) in a sign of increased professionalisation larger establishments tended to be in the occupancy of fulltime innholders. As in early modern Northampton, many of these publicans initiated their professional lives in small establishments before graduating to larger and more prestigious houses within the local hierarchy.\(^33\) *The George* inn Above Bar seems to have represented a first rung on Southampton’s innholding ladder. After starting what was to be a long victualling career as an alehouse-keeper in the nearby village of St Mary Bourne (where his house was involved in a scandal in 1580), Leonard Mills first appeared as holder *The George* in connection with a weights and measures offence in 1589, and was still there four years later according to a series of depositions. However, the following year in 1594 a ‘Leonard Mills at *The Crown*’ was presented by the leet jurors, where he

\(^{26}\) RBIII, p. 109.
\(^{27}\) Wilmott is identified as a ‘merchant’ by his will and inventory of 1570. See Plnv.II, p. 280; RBIII, pp. 105-106.
\(^{28}\) SRO SC5/3/1, Fo. 186r.
\(^{29}\) SRO SC2/1/6, Fo. 255v.
\(^{30}\) RBI, p. 62a4; A. B. Wallis Chapman, *The Black Book of Southampton 1388-1620* III, SR Soc. 17 (Southampton, 1915), p. 88; RBII, pp. 79n5, 127n3. Richard Vibert, who held a modest inn in St Mary’s parish, is also identified as a ‘butcher’ in his will and inventory of 1648, which includes reference to a ‘slaughterhouse’. HRO 1648 A82/1-2.
\(^{31}\) SRO SC5/3/1, Fos. 141r, 110r.
\(^{32}\) SRO SC9/2/1 Fos. 36r-37v.
apparently remained until his death in 1624. Likewise, Nicholas Hockley occupied *The George* in 1618 after the death of the widow of the previous tenant, Nicholas Bulbeck. However, on the death of William Home in 1624 he took over the leases at *The Dolphin*, where he remained until 1634.

Fiscal and inventorial data can again be used in conjunction with occupational profiles to demonstrate the economic capital of these elite drink workers. In the 16C2 subsidy assessment, of five innholders I have been able to identify the average assessment was 5s 5d (compared to the 1s 8d average for alehouse-keepers), with a range of 3s 4d (for John Grist at *The Katherine Wheel* and Thomas Beale at *The George*) up to a large 8s 4d for Richard Singleton, tenant of *The Star*; this placed him on a par with John Jeffrey, a merchant adventurer who was at that point Southampton’s richest resident, and above Dennis Rowse, the wealthy merchant who owned but did not occupy the hostelries (assessed at 4s 2d). Leonard Mills at *The Crown* and John Sedgwick at *The Dolphin* were both assessed at 6s. The hearth tax assessment of 1665 reveals a similar picture. Of five innholders encompassed by the assessment, the average number of hearths recorded is 11.8 (compared to the 4.7 average for alehouse-keepers), with a range of six (Ellis Antram at *The White Horse*) up to twenty-one for John Speering at *The Dolphin*, the largest number of hearths recorded for the town. Valuations of innholder’s movable goods during probate were invariably extremely high. While proprietors of smaller institutions might be assessed at below £100 (Leonard Mills at *The Crown* (£54 6s 10d), Thomas Broker at *The Katherine Wheel* (£94 18s 11d), or Henry Osborne who held the small inn within the liberties that serviced the Itchen Ferry (£54 7s 8d)), holders of larger inns were well into three figures; Nicholas Bulbeck at *The George* in 1615 (£207 8s 8d), William Home at *The Dolphin* in 1624 (£231 3s 9d), or John Warren at *The Bear* in 1647 (£230 4s 2d). By the end of the seventeenth century sums mentioned could be enormous; innholder George Allen had goods to the value of £427 7s 7d in 1708, while those of Thomas Hawker at *The Star* were held to be worth £524 7s 8d in 1678.

What other forms of social and cultural capital did Southampton’s publicans gain from their involvement in victualling? Although sometimes referred to as ‘Goodman’ (an

---

35 SRO SC6/1/35 11v, 21r; Hockley’s wife Susan first appears in a deposition relating to a theft at *The Dolphin* in 1624, the same year in which William Home’s will and inventory was proved at Winchester. See E&DI, pp. 51-2; HRO 1624 A41/1-2.
36 SRO SC2/1/6 Fos. 7r-15v.
38 HRO 1624 A53/1-2; 1583 AO9/1-2; 1627 B57/1-2; 1615 AD09; 1624 A41/1-2; 1647 AD104/1-2; 1708 AO02/1-2; 1678 B23/1-2.
affective term used for social peers who were seen as performing a community service), it is unlikely that alehouse-keeping, even of the licensed variety, conferred any social prestige or benefits onto those who participated in it; while accepted by the authorities as a means by which poor townspeople might augment their incomes, its very association with economic marginality and unskilled character meant that it was deemed inappropriate for people of locally high status. In a telling example from 1571, leet jurors presented Hugh Emery for selling beer without licence. They insisted that 'he being a personable young man should not be licensed for that will be a hindrance to his living and make him grow to live idly, which were pity, and likewise John Manfield'. While Emery seems to have heeded the warning, Manfield appears in the stall and art rolls as a tippler from 1575 until his death in 1596, when the goods in his untypically expansive alehouse in St Michael’s parish were valued at £361 (including an extensive wardrobe which comprised ‘a jacket lined with fur’). Alehouse-keepers maintained few servants, did not infiltrate patterns of local office-holding (although alehouse-keeper Ferdinand Knapton briefly served as town clerk in 1668), and seldom hosted town officials or civic ceremonial within their houses; although Ann Filleter’s alehouse was chosen as the venue for the Grand Jury’s dinner in 1658, over and above the English Street inns that were the usual choice for the occasion, as we have seen, neither her economic nor spatial situation was typical. Of thirty-two individuals who provided sureties for sixteen alehouse-keepers in the 1661, from which their social networks can be reconstructed, nearly all were drawn from the lower reaches of the textile sector.

Innholders and taverners, on the other hand, had far deeper reserves of social capital to draw on. Many alehouse-keepers attempted to tap into this by styling themselves as innholders; we have witnessed Jenkin Hewes’ attempt to upgrade himself in 1676, while in 1616 John Grundy also fashioned himself as an ‘innholder’ (Grundy was a shoemaker whose alehouse in St Lawrence’s parish, which he had kept since at

39 In 1593, for example, a visitor described how ‘at their first coming to the town they came to an alehouse the Goodman’s name French Nick’, while in 1652 a chandler from Kent described Above Bar alehouse-keeper Abigail Knight as ‘Goody Knight’. SRO SRO SC9/3/9, Fo. 30r; SC9/3/12, Fo. 92v. On the use of ‘Goodman’ and ‘Goody’ see D. Postles, ‘The Politics of Address in Early Modern England’, Journal of Historical Sociology 18 (2005), pp. 111-12.
40 See McIntosh, Havering, pp. 133-4.
41 CLI, p. 72; SRO SC6/1/11-23; HRO 1596 AO80/1-2.
42 SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 243r.
43 SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 139r.
44 SRO SC9/2/11, Fos. 2r-v.
45 HRO 1676 AD056.
least 1596, had only six rooms). The recognition that the successful management of a tavern or inn required specialised skills and knowledge would have enhanced the prestige of the calling; adolescents were apprenticed to Southampton innholders on six occasions in the seventeenth century, in one case explicitly to be instructed ‘in the art, trade or science of a vintner’ (with James Mason at The Dolphin in 1638). Taverners and innholders occupied key ideological locales as providers of hospitality for corporation events and visiting elites, of vital symbolic and material importance in a town that depended in large part on trade for its economic survival. While the most esteemed guests were often entertained in the private houses of the gentry this was not exclusively the case; the Moroccan ambassador lodged at The Dolphin incognito in 1638, and ‘Mr James Mason [the innholder] living nearby heard’ and mobilised a procession before hosting a banquet and reception. The lustre that the provision of hospitality as a generous host could impart to innholders’ credit and reputations is strongly suggested by a deposition from 1650. Henry Henstridge, who acquired The George Above Bar in 1645, sold a stolen horse to John Wray, an innholder from Wells in Somerset. Asked why he had participated in the transaction, Wray told magistrates that ‘he had not any suspicion at all that the said horse was stolen, but took the said Henstridge for an honest man and of good estate, because he was so esteemed by divers persons in Wells that had... laid in his house at Southampton’. Likewise, Richard Long, who died at The Dolphin in 1581, bequeathed ‘his two gold rings to his hostess Averine Sedgwick’ and ‘his best cloak unto his host John Sedgwick’. Asked why he did not leave the goods to his wife, Long answered that ‘my wife is gone away with another man and although I have other kin... I will give all the rest of my goods unto my said host and hostess because I... have found great friendship of them’.

Innholders and taverners were generally decked with the trappings of social prestige. Their houses, as we have seen, were the largest of the community, while extant muster books show them to have been attended by impressive retinues of servants and staff; John Sedgwick at The Dolphin was attended by six male servants of military age in

46 HRO 1616 B046/1-2; ABIII, p. 77; SRO SC6/1/23, Fos. 5r-10v.
50 SRO SC/2/1/8, Fo. 26r.
51 SRO SC9/3/12 Fo. 44r.
52 HRO 1581 B070.
1583, while Peter Janverin at The Star had four in the same year.\textsuperscript{53} They also participated in civic government.\textsuperscript{54} As we have seen, an ancient ordinance limited the acquisition of wine licenses to burgesses,\textsuperscript{55} while some infiltrated the charmed circle of the common council; in the late sixteenth century two innholders and one taverner served as mayor (Edward Wilmott of The Dolphin in 1559, John Errington of The Crown in 1585 and Reginald House in 1570), while Peter Janverin of The Star and Edward Tatenell of The Crown attained the shrievalty in 1581 and 1638 respectively.\textsuperscript{56} As we will see, innkeepers could use these influential offices to pursue policies that were in their commercial interests; Wilmott personally fined fourteen individuals the high sum of 7s 6d each for unlicensed tippling during his mayoralty, the highest for any mayor 1550-92.\textsuperscript{57} They might additionally assume churchwardens' duties within the parishes where their inns and taverns were located; Peter Janverin and Edward Tatenell served for St Lawrence in 1567 and 1624, William Horne of The Dolphin for Holy Rood in 1607, and John Winter for St Michael's in 1687.\textsuperscript{58} Many innholders exhibited keenly felt senses of their placement within Southampton's chain of being. In 1584, when his wife Mary was summoned by the mayor for insulting a woollen-draper, Peter Janverin from The Star made the short journey from his inn to the Audit House and 'openly declared... that his wife will not come hither for that but few honest women come to the Audit House' and that she was 'none of their Audit House bawds'.\textsuperscript{59} In 1648 butcher and innholder Richard Vibert felt he qualified for privileged and costly funereal placement inside St Mary's church when he requested that he be buried 'next the wall at the inner end of the seat, where I used to sit', while Morgan Emott of The Greyhound asked that he be buried within the chancel of Holy Rood church in 1632.\textsuperscript{60}

Of course, many keepers of inns and taverns could squander the resources of symbolic capital that the trade conferred on them if they failed to fulfil their social and vocational roles in a certain way. A case in point is represented by Peter Greenaway, holder of the small inn at the nearby Four Posts (a crossroads within the western liberties

\textsuperscript{53} SRO SC13/2/7, Fos. 3r, 10r. On servants as indices of social prestige see Frank, 'Publicans', p. 23.
\textsuperscript{54} Thustly, \textit{Bacchus}, p. 44.
\textsuperscript{55} Studer, \textit{Oak Book}, p. 121.
\textsuperscript{56} Davies, \textit{History of Southampton}, pp. 176-8.
\textsuperscript{57} SRO SC5/3/1, Fo. 104r.
\textsuperscript{58} SRO PR4/2/1 Fos. 7r, 89r; MB, p. 82; SRO PR7/5/1 Fo. 3r. On the prestige conferred by the office of churchwarden see E. Carlson, 'The Origins, Function and Status of the Office of Churchwarden', in M. Spufford (ed.), \textit{The World of Rural Dissenters} (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 164-207.
\textsuperscript{59} RBIII, p. 110.
\textsuperscript{60} HRO 1648 A82/1-2; NA PROB 11/161. On these sought after interior positions see D. Cressy, \textit{Birth, Marriage and Death: Ritual, Religion and the Lifecycle in Tudor and Stuart England} (Oxford & New York, 1997), pp. 460-65.
of the town) since 1605 and a regular fixture before various borough tribunals down to his death in 1620.61 He was presented by court leet jurors in 1604 for having the plague in his house and being a 'common drunkard', and again in 1615 for selling canvas in his house and offering irreverent speeches to the jury when they attempted to inspect his weights and measures.62 In the same year he was indicted at quarter sessions for drunkenness (on which occasion he was imprisoned for his 'ill behaviour and speeches in court'), while he made his final appearance before justices in 1619 for beating widow Agnes Quoite.63 Nor does Edward Wilmott of The Dolphin appear to have been a particularly popular resident of mid-Tudor Southampton; according to his mayoral accounts he fined all eleven members of the common council for failing to materialise at his proclamation in St Michael's church.64

Female Publicans

Women's roles in the operation of the town's public houses must be considered separately, not least as it is very much a live issue both in tavern studies and within the wider historiography of women's work where the closely supervised nature of drink work has rendered women's contributions to it more traceable than their involvement in other sectors. Current assessments are generally negative. The most tenacious interpretative paradigm, initiated by Judith Bennett in 1996 and recently endorsed and extended by Marjorie McIntosh, situates the gradual exclusion of women from the alcohol trades within a larger narrative of the decline of women's economic opportunities from 1300 to around 1600. While Bennett focuses on women's marginalisation from the brewing trades as they grew in size and prestige, McIntosh extends her thesis to the retailing of ale and beer; while, in the medieval period, 'alesellers were nearly all women', the rising size and complexity of drinking houses in combination with increasing opposition to female retailers on economic, sexual and practical grounds throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries meant that 'by around 1600, women rarely functioned as proprietresses of drinking houses'.65 In those cases where women did work in public houses, it is argued, their presence 'implied tainted womanhood', promoting a slew of

61 His inventory survives at HRO A034/1-2. He had been operating as a 'tippler' in All Saints parish for the four years preceding his acquisition of the inn. SRO SC6/1/25-8.
62 CLI, pp. 412, 473
63 SRO SC9/2/1, Fos. 20v-21r, 35v. See also ABIV, p. 20.
64 SRO SC5/3/1, Fo. 103v.
negative cultural representations and leaving female drink workers extremely vulnerable
to violence and sexual assault.66 Does the Southampton evidence conform to this story?

Starting at the bottom of the hierarchy, while always outnumbered by males, women comprised a substantial minority of Southampton’s alehouse-keepers throughout the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, during and beyond the period of their alleged marginalisation.67 The number of women as a percentage of the total number of tipplers, both licensed and unlicensed, mentioned within the stall and art rolls between 1559 and 1658 averaged 13.9%, with some striking variations that do not conform to narratives of decline or displacement; while none of the forty-one tipplers operating in 1590 were women, they accounted for seventeen of forty-four tipplers (38.6%) in 1628. Contrary to a received impression that women predominated in the illegal sector,68 they made up an even higher proportion of legitimate sellers; between 27.3% and 47.8% of licensees in any one year were women for the period 1619-24, while between 22.2% and 46.1% were for the period 1661-68.69 The vast majority of these women, as we have seen, were widowed householders who almost certainly had licenses or toleration extended to them to prevent them from falling on publicly financed poor relief.70 Many succeeded their spouses; twenty-eight widows who paid stall and art as tipplers between 1559 and 1658 had husbands who had also participated in the trade. However, a minority were married or even single, surprisingly given the restrictions placed by urban authorities on singlewomen’s trading activities and the fact that they were seldom included among those deserving of economic assistance; while Amy Froide has claimed that Mary Smith became Southampton’s first never-married woman licensed to keep an alehouse in 1739 (Smith and her sisters ran an establishment that was popular for its billiards table), the

66 The classic statement remains Hanawalt, ‘Medieval London Taverns’, p. 108. See also Bennett, Ale, Beer and Brewsters, pp. 122-44; Martin, Alcohol, Sex and Gender, pp. 70-3.
69 SRO SC9/2/1 Fos. 38r-39v, 55r-56v, 80v-82v, 95r – 96v, 104v – 106v.
distinction actually belongs to Margaret Prowse, a 'spinster' who received her license in 1620.\textsuperscript{71}

Women made fewer formal inroads into the higher reaches of Southampton's victualling hierarchy. Only one female received a license to retail wine in the town during the early modern period,\textsuperscript{72} while increases in the size, complexity and expense of inns in combination with women's handicaps in marshalling credit meant that McIntosh is correct in stating that certainly larger establishments 'were almost always operated by men'.\textsuperscript{73} Most of the women who ran inns in Southampton were the widows of innkeepers who, in a common manoeuvre, had made their wives the principal beneficiaries of their estates.\textsuperscript{74} Edward Wilmott bequeathed \textit{The Dolphin} to his wife Margaret in 1570, Andrew Shackley bequeathed the small inn by the Itchen Ferry to his wife Anne in 1614, while Thomas Breame bequeathed 'unto Abigail my wife the leases of \textit{The Katherine Wheel} with the goods and implements thereunto belonging during her natural life' in 1642.\textsuperscript{75} Nicholas Bulbeck, who left no will on his death in 1616, evidently left the inn to his wife; court leet jurors presented 'Roberta Bulbeck at \textit{The George}' for faulty hay bottles and drinking vessels in the same year and in 1617 (however, Nicholas Hockley had taken over the inn by 1618).\textsuperscript{76} A 'Widow Joan Warner at \textit{The Bear}' was presented for her bottles of hay in 1627 (John Warner had obtained a license for this large carrying inn under the Mompesson scheme in 1619), and kept the establishment until at least 1639.\textsuperscript{77} Other women gained control of inns under more unusual circumstances. In 1650, after previous incumbent Henry Henstridge had been convicted of horse stealing and hanged, both his wine licences and his lease of \textit{The George} were escheated to the town where, in a curious arrangement, they were rented between a married couple. A 'Mr Faulkner' was granted the wine licence for a yearly rent of £6, while his wife Bridget acquired the lease to the inn at an annual rent of £24, taking over the annexed wine license as well in 1652. However, Mrs Faulkner's consolidation was

\textsuperscript{72} Joan Hevewish in 1661. SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 171v.
\textsuperscript{73} McIntosh, \textit{Working Women}, p. 206.
\textsuperscript{75} PInv.II, p. 280; HRO 1614 B63/1-2; HRO 1642 A09.
\textsuperscript{76} SRO SC6/1/33, Fo. 26r; SC6/1/34, Fo. 19r. In 1619 Nicholas Hockley was presented for 'a filthy dung mixon under the sign of \textit{The George}'. SC6/1/35, Fo. 21r.
\textsuperscript{77} SRO SC6/1/42, Fo. 15v; BRO D/X 648. Likewise, in an enumeration of 'innkeepers, alehouses and hucksters' prepared in 1632 for quarter sessions a 'Widow Hockley' and a 'Widow Emott' are mentioned, meaning that they were presumably running \textit{The Dolphin} and \textit{The Greyhound} at this point. SRO SC9/1/2, Fo. 11.
short-lived; upon the petition of Widow Henstridge the inn was restored to her on the same conditions enjoyed by her husband for a one-off payment of £45 in 1654.78

However, the formalised evidence of licences and leases severely underrepresents the real extent of female involvement in the operation of the town's public houses. As well as the contributions of female servants (see below), where named publicans pursued a primary trade it was their wives who managed establishments on a day-to-day basis; this would have been especially true in a port context where many publicans (six out of sixteen in 1668) were mariners who spent significant portions of their working lives at sea.79 Alehouse-keepers, who were particularly likely to retail drink as a by-employment, were especially reliant on their spouses, and town officials who intervened in the daily life of alehouses routinely encountered women robustly holding the fort, leading to some charged encounters on doorsteps and thresholds.80 In 1611 ‘the wife of John Jordan in the absence of her husband’ refused leet jurors access to their weights and measures, while in 1654 a defective pint pot in Grafton Jackson’s All Saints alehouse ‘was carried away by force of his wife she being great with child’.81 In 1615, when the beadle of St Michael’s arrived at John Brown’s alehouse ‘hearing a great noise there’, it was Brown’s wife who ‘reviled’ him and said ‘that she would thrust her knife in him’.82 When male alehouse-keepers were fetched to the Audit House on disciplinary grounds their wives often appeared to answer the charges. In 1609, when Christopher Ubbley was ‘sent for but not at home to be questioned with about his selling of beer without licence’, his wife Dorothy duly appeared ‘and excused her husband and herself of these crimes as well as she could’. In the same year, John James was sent for to answer for four men who tipped ‘inordinately in his house. He was ‘not at home, and his wife [Alice] humbly craveth the favour of this house promising that when her husband comes home he shall present himself to Mr Mayor’.83 Richard Harvey, the sailor who retailed from the sign of The Ship in St Michael’s parish, was called before the mayor in 1618 to explain his unlicensed selling, but because he was at sea ‘warning was given to his wife’.84

The partners of innholders and taverners also participated in daily operations, making them more suitable candidates than male offspring to take over the business.
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78 SRO SC2/1/8, Fos. 59v, 61r, 71v, 76r, 93v-94r, 97v-98r.
79 SRO SC9/2/11, Fos. 12r-13r.
80 On the symbolic importance of household boundaries for early modern women see Gowing, ‘Freedom of the Streets’, p. 137; and Flather, Gender and Space, pp. 44-5.
81 SRO SC6/1/57, Fo. 33. Likewise, when two faulty wine measures were discovered in John Harrison’s alehouse in 1579, ‘his wife said to have borrowed [them] of John Wattis’. SC6/1/14. Fo. 43.
82 CLIII, p. 485.
83 ABII, pp. 42, 46-7.
84 SRO SC2/1/6, Fo. 188r.
upon their deaths (in only one will, that of Thomas Broker of The Katherine Wheel, does a Southampton innkeeper bequeath his leases to a son rather than a spouse). As we have seen, some innkeepers also pursued another employment in the mercantile, clothing or metalworking sectors that would necessarily take them away from their establishments. When the weights and measures inspectorate called at The Crown in 1577 it was Mrs Elliott and not merchant John who was there to give them 'evil language', while when a brawl broke out at The Dolphin in 1670 it was Elizabeth Speering who was present to provide the deposition. Large and complex operations, inns required two pairs of hands, with wives typically overseeing their domestic attributes: provisioning, cleaning, and linens, as well as the female employees connected with these areas. In 1624 Susan Hockley provided justices with information about the theft of a 'large fine sheet' from The Dolphin, identifying Joan Randall as the culprit, a maid who she 'had lately retained in service'. Likewise, when Matthew James's wife was offered some linen that she suspected had recently been stolen from Edward Dale's victualling house in 1697, she 'sent for the said Edward Dale's wife who immediately came and avowed the... sheet to be hers'. And although Thomas Broker bequeathed the leases of The Katherine Wheel to his son John in 1583, it was to his wife Elizabeth that he bequeathed the 'convenient bedding and all things necessary to the furnishing of the said place'.

To what extent did negative cultural representations of women involved in the alcohol trades as ugly, unhygienic, unable to maintain order and uniquely disposed to vice, embodied for most scholars in the much-discussed figure of Eleanour Rumming, impact upon perceptions and treatment of female drink workers on the ground in the provincial port? At the level of female proprietors, the short answer would seem to be hardly at all. Unlike in Chester, where a prohibitory order of 1540 claimed that the practice of female alehouse-keeping was 'otherwise than is used in any other places of this realm', town governors placed no prohibitions on women's tippling, while gendered biases seem marginal in or absent from official presentments of female alehouse-keepers or the wives of male ones; they harboured 'rogues' (like the tippler wives of Richard Jennings and Robert Strugnell in the East Street in 1608), sold by false

85 John Broker, who inherited the inn from his father, had worked as a servant at the inn so would have had a thorough knowledge of its workings. HRO 1583 A09/1-2.
86 SRO SC9/3/14, Fo. 4r-v.
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90 See Clark, Alehouse, p. 83; Martin, Alcohol, Sex and Gender, pp. 97-103.
91 McIntosh, Working Women, p. 159.
measures and maintained other disorders, but then so did many more male ones. In particular, for Southampton’s governors, female-run alehouses exhibited no special relationship with illicit sex. The only presentment that could be tenuously construed in these terms occurred in 1613, when court leet jurors claimed that Dorothy Ubbley ‘lewdly entertains by way of brocaridge’ (scurrilous, slanderous speech).

Nor do female proprietors seem to have been especially vulnerable to sexual abuse in terms of speech acts or violence. While Alice James called Mary Janverin of The Star a ‘whore, common whore, with many other shameful and reproachful terms’ in 1609, the language of sexual insult was highly unlikely to have been inspired by her trade because, as we have seen, Alice herself ran an alehouse with her husband John. Records disclose only two examples of female publicans being subjected to physical assault, and the circumstances in both cases are complex and resistant to interpretation within simplistic ‘misogyny’ paradigms. In 1650, gentleman George Tompson was accused of acting ‘uncleanly’ towards John Perin’s wife in an ale-booth she operated with her husband during Trinity Fair after a candle illuminating the scene was dropped. However, the incident took place when the booth was full of company (including John Perin and a JP from Poole), and two witnesses strongly denied the charge. More seriously, at a ‘public house’ on Portsmouth Common in 1710, witnesses described how Joseph Bagshaw dragged proprietor Anne Hopkins around the premises and accused her of being ‘Jack Robinson’s whore and he has fucked you as often as he has fingers and toes’. However, the assault was apparently related to a long-running financial dispute (Hopkins ‘desired [Bagshaw] to be quiet and told him she had taken none of his money’), and other patrons (including two shipwrights) assisted Hopkins both at the time and during her subsequent legal action.

Instead, it seems more plausible that the management of a public house at all levels of the hierarchy, even in the knockabout and potentially hostile environment of a port community, could be a route to ‘social recognition’ for many women; it is hard to imagine that Averine Sedgwick felt ‘tainted’ when Richard Long bequeathed her his two gold rings, or that Anne Filleter did when the Grand Jury held their annual dinner at her
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The running of an inn, tavern or even alehouse enabled many widows to resist and renegotiate exile to the social margins, and even where women assisted their husbands the operation of public houses offered considerable scope for agency as women bartered in the marketplace (tippler Nicholas Rich's wife 'misuse[d] the market of eggs' in 1571) and defended the interests of their businesses in the absence of male leaseholders and licencees. In 1628, asked why she had reported the murder of a sailor in *The Ship* alehouse to his captain 'and not any magistrate', Sarah Harvey (singlewoman and daughter of deceased alehouse-keeper Richard) described how 'she did it by her sister's direction... to get some money of him towards his charges'. Likewise, the following year mariner's wife Sybil Wall described how she was looking after their alehouse at nearby Hythe (across Southampton Water) when five mariners from 'a ship of Mr Elzey's' arrived at the premises. The men stayed from two o'clock until eleven at night without incident, when they 'went then forth to the waterside to procure a boat... to go to their ship'. Believing the men were attempting to evade 'their reckoning at her house the same being unpaid', Sybil commandeered 'a small boat of her own' and, assisted by two male servants, pursued them out of the harbour, 'thinking to get money' (an ambition in which she was successful). It is hard to find a place for such women within victim frameworks.

---
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Publicans and their spouses were not the town's only drink workers, but were supported by a far larger range of individuals who staffed and sustained the landscape of drink; when George Latus entered John French's tavern one Monday evening in 1630 and drank a pint of wine in the kitchen, he dealt not with French himself (who had to be 'asked for') but with his maidservant, a singlewoman called Mary Guillett. According to the most recent survey of public house history, 'we know next to nothing about the[se] armies of servants, cooks and waitresses who provided patrons with the desired services'. This is a strange occlusion, especially given an increasing interest in practices of servitude within related fields; not only do a wide variety of sources throw light on the composition of and challenges facing those who worked in public houses below the level of proprietors, but to focus on keepers alone is to reproduce within the field history from above and to sideline the vocational experiences of those individuals who were in a very real sense at the frontline of early modern hospitality services, occupying a structural position between employer and patron that was arguably more delicate than that of the publican him or herself.

A large variety of supporting roles could be found within the town's public houses, most connected directly with the delivery of alcohol. Even the smallest alehouses sometimes employed drawers to fetch beer and ale from the barrels, especially if their keepers were aged or suffering from a disability; when 'ancient burgess' Walter Earle was licensed in 1615, it was upon the condition that 'he shall procure such person as shall be of honest behaviour, and well liked of by the justices to draw his beer'. Taverns and inns required a larger retinue of tapsters to collect beer and wine from dedicated cellars and deliver them to a multitude of halls, parlours and named chambers. Indeed, in Southampton's larger inns, many of these tapsters consolidated themselves spatially by gaining control of the tap rooms or drink houses which catered predominantly to the attendants of wealthy guests as well as poorer townsmen. In 1616 court leet jurors reported that 'Thomas Oddams at The Dolphin, Thomas Winter at The Star and Thomas

1 E&DII, p. 63.
2 B. Kümin & B. A. Thusty, 'The World of the Tavern: An Introduction', in idem, World of the Tavern, p. 23. Peter Clark devotes a single page to the experiences of servants, while Brennan and Thusty do not mention them at all. See Clark, Alcouse, pp. 84-5.
3 Most recently see T. Meldrum, Domestic Service and Gender 1660-1750: Life and Work in the London Household (Harlow, 2000); D. Hay & P. Craven (eds), Masters, Servants and Magistrates in Britain and the Empire 1562-1955 (Chapel Hill, 2004); and for a slightly later period C. Steedman, Master and Servant: Love and Labour in the English Industrial Age (Cambridge, 2007).
4 ABIV, p. 4.
Dadu at The George do all of them pay good sums of money to the innholder for drawing their beer, and these individuals were often presented individually for weights and measures offences; in 1618, when Nicholas Hockley was himself fined for a range of faulty quart pots at The George inn, a further eight vessels were 'taken from Thomas Oddams, tapster', while two years later 'the widow of Thomas Oddams' was fined 2s for six stone pots. Later in the seventeenth century, such individuals might add wine as well as beer to their repertoires and be fashioned in official sources as 'vintners'; in 1628 Robert Cluff 'vintner at The George' was presented for a faulty pint pot, as was John Batson, 'vintner at The Star' and Walter Demasy, 'vintner at The Dolphin'. These relatively exalted positions were often farmed out to relatives of the innholder; in a deposition from 1593, 'tapster of The George' Nicholas Evererd referred to 'his master's brother who draws the wine in the said house'.

Inns offered a variety of additional employments connected with their other core functions. Ostlers maintained the stables and looked after the horses of guests, and might additionally pursue unauthorised sidelines in horse hiring (in 1581 the leet jurors complained that 'the ostlers of the inns be horse hirers'). The role was especially important in large carrying inns such as The Bear Above Bar with their near constant traffic of carts and wagons. William Mason, a husbandman who was also serving as its ostler in 1631, provided rare insights into his routine in a deposition relating to the theft of some linen; he locked both sets of inn gates at eleven o'clock before going to bed (leaving 'his master and Mrs Warner by the fire in the hall' with 'some of the carters'), but was woken at two by the arrival of Henry Clark that 'used to help the Salisbury carrier... dress his horses'. He re-pinned the gates and returned to bed, but was woken again at four 'to help the carriers away, loading the carts and joining the search when it was realised two packs of linen were missing.' John Hawkins, another husbandman 'retained in service by Richard Biscombe... as ostler of his inn called The Crown' described his receipt of three horses into the stable in 1652, which he put to grass at Padwell Field beyond the town walls. As well as ostlers, chamberlains took care of the chambers as
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10 For intersections between the inn network and the early modern carrying trades see Chartres, 'The English Inn and Road Transport', pp. 153-76; and idem, 'The Eighteenth-Century English Inn: A Transient 'Golden Age'?', in Kümin & Tlusty, World of the Tavern, pp. 216-17.
12 SRO SC9/3/12, Fos. 95v-96v.
well as portering duties, while, as we have seen, general housekeeping chores were undertaken by female maids and charwomen. Other supporting roles were connected with catering functions; an anonymous team of 'waiters' attended the consumption of bucks sent by the Earl of Southampton at The Dolphin in 1616 (they were to be paid '8d a piece'), while one of the individuals who attempted to rescue a sawyer from arrest in 1746 was 'cook at The Star'.

Apprentices would have enacted some of these roles; in the seventeenth century, for which complete registers of indentures survive, eight adolescents were apprenticed to innholders, five to vintners and six to 'victuallers' (most likely keepers of alehouses). In inns and taverns the apprentices were either the sons of the publican (Hugh Hawker was apprenticed to his father at Thomas at The Star in 1671) or of tradesmen from the town or other parts of Hampshire, and in four cases were to be explicitly educated in 'the trade of a vintner'. Those bound to alehouse-keepers, as we will see, were predominantly poor orphans bound to victuallers in recognizance of, or in exchange for, toleration or licences. Many might not have been directly involved in victualling functions; Jane Willis aged ten, bound to alehouse-keeper Stephen Todey in 1652, was to be instructed in 'knitting, spinning... and good housewifery'. However, in other cases they were clearly expected to assist in the running of the alehouse, most probably as tapsters. In 1671 'poor parish child' John Hooper aged eight was bound to Christopher Wells in exchange for his right to victual. However, nine years later Wells complained to the assembly that Hooper had 'of long time been sick and lame and his feet rotted off to [his] great charge'. Larger establishments also retained adult servants; as we have seen, John Sedgwick of The Dolphin had six male servants of military age in 1583, while Thomas Broker at smaller inn The Katherine Wheel had two in 1573 (which included his son John). Larger alehouses might also have full-time servants; while it was rare for them to have had more than one, tippler John Manfield was attended by no fewer than four male servants of military age in 1579.

However, much of the work offered in public houses was casual in nature and unfolded beyond the approved terms of these contractual relationships. As the above examples suggest, many laboured in public houses as a by-employment (the tapster at The

---

13 ABIV, p. 49.
15 Willis & Merson, Southampton Apprenticeship Registers, pp. 18, 28, 34, 39, 48, 58, 79 (innholders), 51, 57, 78, 80, 96 (vintners), 79, 80, 85, 97, 104 (victuallers).
16 Ibid., p. 97; SC2/1/9, Fo. 30.
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Crown inn in 1652 was also a 'yeoman'), while newcomers, unsurprisingly, gravitated to drink work; as well as its existence outside formal contracts, work in alehouses or inns enclosed the possibility of diet and lodgings that could be paid for in kind with their labours. Town authorities complained about the phenomenon routinely, especially when concern about undertenants reached their shrill peak in the early years of the seventeenth century. William Umory, 'tapster at Richard Archers' was a tailor from the nearby village of Millbrook in 1607, while in 1608 George Giles, a shoemaker from Stockbridge with a wife and child, was 'draw[ing] beer at the Widow Armstrongs' (in the same year the 'tapster at The White Horse', the 'tapster... in the Broad Lane under Thomas Northey' and the 'tapster... at the house of Michael Edmonds' were also all newcomers). Young women who undertook irregular domestic duties in public houses also came to the attention of the authorities; in 1608 Richard Jennings' tippler wife in East Street kept 'a sister of hers as a charmaid', while in 1633 Mary Tabbott 'being a newcomer and living as a charwoman at The Bear was this day sent for to this house and warned to get her into service... or else depart the town'. Responsibility for the removal of such informal staff was characteristically delegated to publicans themselves. In 1648, James Fiford who 'draws beer as a tapster in the house of John Blake' was ordered to depart the town with his wife and child. It was further ordered that Blake 'shall remove... Fiford and his goods out of his house before that time or else he shall bring in his licence which is to be taken from him and his sign to be pulled down'.

As this example suggests, most servants and employees lived on the premises themselves, essential given that alehouses and inns (especially of the carrying variety) were twenty-four hour operations. In 1570 the rear stables of The Dolphin contained 'a bed for the brewers with an old coverlet', while later inventories typically enumerate chambers dedicated to the sleeping and working practices of servants. In 1615 The George inn had a 'maid's chamber' that contained a single bedstead, The Bear in 1647 had an 'ostler's chamber' with a bedstead and two horse harnesses, while The Star in 1678 had a 'maid's chamber' that contained beds and a linen press. At George Allen's inn in 1708
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servants were divided between three garrets that contained nine beds. Arrangements within such quarters could be cozy, and servants as well as guests were expected to share beds; in 1593 James Hide, an ostler at The Dolphin, recalled that he lay in a chamber ‘where also lay his fellow Jeffrey and Tyler the tapster... in one bed’. William Mason, ostler at The Bear, enjoyed a chamber in the ‘dwelling house’ with a fire and chimney in which he shared a bed with the son of the innholder.

The lot of such employees was not an easy one. On the one hand, the informal nature of many public house roles and the slippery mobility of those who worked in the sector meant that the town’s amorphous populace of tapsters, ostlers, chamberlains and maids were fixed on by town governors as vectors of disorder. Accusations of theft seem to have been an occupational hazard; maid Joan Randall confessed to stealing sheets from The Dolphin, while William Mason, the ostler at The Bear who provided information about a theft of linen, was himself bound to appear at sessions to answer for the crime. Many were accused of handling or disposing of stolen goods or consorting with felons, and were highly susceptible to accusations of a moral or sexual cast. In 1659 witnesses reported seeing Joan Inglefield, servant of Ellis Antram at The Katherine Wheel, fornicating with a billeted soldier in a ditch behind the inn ‘twice after one another’, while male staff were often accused of bastard-bearing and adultery. Gilbert Brickleton, a labourer ‘who draws beer for the Widow King’, was accused of leaving alehouse-keeper Widow Tompkins with child in 1624, an ostler at The Bear was alleged to have left widow May Webb with child in 1626, while in the early eighteenth century both William Scott (ostler at The Dolphin) and James Dolman, a ‘servant at The Star’, were accused of bastard-bearing.
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26 Mason and others had named William Nutley as the probable culprit in their informations. However, Nutley successfully petitioned justices with a claim that Mason and his own servant had paid a ‘cunning man’ to name him and that Mason himself was ‘the last up in the house that night’. SRO SC9/1/2, Fo. 18; Mason is bound to appear at sessions at SC9/2/10, Fo. 4r.
27 In 1623 Dorothy Palmer, spinster and servant of Morgan Emmott at The Greyhound, was accused of receiving a silver ring and a red silk girdle stolen from a dwelling house at Brockenhurst. E&DI, pp. 20-1. In 1636 stolen goods were pawned at the behest of an inmate at Bargate prison ‘to one James Morton a tapster at The Crown’. E&DIII, p. 25. In 1645 ostler Robert Grubb was bound to appear at sessions ‘for associating with one upon suspicion of a felony’. SRO SC9/2/10, Fo. 65v.
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inn, an encounter that was now 'common fame in Southampton'. Another case of
defamation that came before the same tribunal centred upon an allegation that Dorothy
Carter was a whore for 'the blue-coated ostler at the sign of The Sun in Winchester'.

Relations with customers, with whom servants (especially tapsters and drawers)
had a much more direct relationship than the publican him or herself, could also be
fraught with difficulty. The fact that drinking vessels were not filled in front of the
purchaser left drawers and tapsters highly vulnerable to allegations of short measure.
Robert Cluff, the 'vintner at The George', was accused by no less than the assembled
members of the leet jury of cheating them by passing off a flagon as a pottle in 1628 (he
was personally fined the sum of 2s 6d), while insults flew between tapster John Lambert
and customer Richard Showring in the hall of The Katherine Wheel in 1582 after the latter
'found fault with the littleness of the pot'. Expectations that tapsters should if need be
make up the numbers during gaming activities also exposed them to conflict. In 1652
Thomas Hawker, tapster at The Crown, was 'persuaded to go to play at tables' with
felmaker Edward Bear. During the course of the game there 'arose some difference'
between the two men 'in their play', leading Bear to strike Hawker on the head with a
jug, wounding him 'so dangerously that he was in despair of his life'. And if anyone was
simply in the wrong place at the wrong time, it was the luckless tapster. In 1576 William
Thwaites was fined 2s 6d 'for a bloodshed upon a tapster at The Dolphin inn', while at
the same institution in 1670, in what all witnesses described as an unprovoked assault,
Captain Henry Herbert beat tapster Edwin Daniel to the ground with his cane and
bludgeoned him with the handle of his sword as he illuminated the soldier's path across
the hall at two o'clock in the morning.

For female staff sexual instrumentalisation and even assault was the main risk, far
more so than for female proprietors (who, as we have seen, were rarely made targets of
sexual violence). Laura Gowing has described how the power structures and physical
conditions of domestic service 'were apt to make [all] young women's bodies public
property', a tendency that was dramatically amplified in public house contexts where
female servants attended to a much wider range of male agents from beyond the
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household itself. In 1607, in a suit heard before Winchester's commissioners for ecclesiastical causes, Southampton mariner Andrew Shackley was accused of defaming Thomas Perry's wife by claiming that 'he could command [her] as much as he could command his own wife'. In a peerlessly telling elision, Shackley claimed that 'if ever he spoke those words he meant them of her when she was in a victualling house before she was Perry's wife meaning thereby that he might command her to let him have beer or victuals when he called for it there and... no other meaning'.37 Such cognitive slippages were widespread, and for many female servants in drinking houses attempts on their virtue seem to have gone with the territory. In 1599 Marjory Verden, the daughter of a victualler called 'Old Hockey' from nearby Alton, told Winchester's consistory how John Butler had stayed in her father's house for three days during which time she 'could not shift myself from him but he was always tempting of me and I pray you... ask him whether he has forgotten it'; the element of choice implied by the clerkly convention of 'tempting' is here surely illusory.38 In 1577, twelve year-old Margaret Smith reported a terrifying experience in an alehouse operated by 'Magdalen', a French woman dwelling in St Michael's parish. She described how at 'sunset' she was 'making of beds in the chamber' when 'a French man being a comber of wool having a crooked leg... came where [she] was... and there would have had carnally to do with her'. She was able to resist his advances (which included 'offerr[ing] her a groat' and 'pulling up her clothes') and summon her mistress, who ejected the woolcomber.39

On other occasions proprietors seem to have colluded in the sexual exploitation of their female employees, even if such arrangements probably stopped short of systematic pimping.40 In 1587 Jacqueline Corbin, a young woman from the Channel Islands retained in service by vintner and tippler Dennis Rowse of St Lawrence parish, described how she had been molested by Rowse's son (who subsequently accused her of giving him a venereal disease) and how on another occasion Mrs Rowse (who had 'a very evil name in Guernsey') led her 'up into one of her chambers where divers Flemings

37 HRO 21 M65 C1/28, Fos. 32r-33r. His ingenious explanation did not convince the court, however; Shackley was ordered to 'submit himself before the mayor and the alderman in the Audit House, and... heartily to ask forgiveness of them both', which he duly performed in 1607. MB, pp. 101-2.

38 HRO 21 M65 C3/11, Fo. 301.

39 SRO SC9/3/3, Fo. 74v.

were drinking at night and presently went her way and shut the door'. 41 The experience of seventeen year-old Alice Armstrong at an unlicensed alehouse operated by baker George Pigeon in 1650 was far worse. Babysitting for Pigeon’s grandchild, after a round of enforced pledging in a back room with Pigeon and a customer, bearer John Busgrave (during which ‘if she did not drink a good draught they would hold the pot to her mouth’), the former left the room to serve his customers with bread ‘and said he [Busgrave] should do what he would’. Armstrong resisted Busgrave’s advances, only to be raped by Pigeon himself later that evening. 42

However, other servants experienced more congenial relationships with their employers and could even expect positive prospects within the trade if they persevered with drink work. Peter Janverin of The Star behaved in a particularly benevolent manner towards his maidservant Elizabeth Allen in 1573. He defended her from John Mills’ allegation, possibly related to her vocation, that she was ‘not honest of her body’ (telling Mills that he ‘should look to his speeches’), and carefully supervised each stage of her courtship with Mills’ tenant John Colbrook; he interviewed Colbrook about his intentions, intervened on Allen’s behalf when Colbrook’s parents arrived at the inn to dispute the match, and was the chief architect of the spousals which took place, as we have seen, in a chamber of his inn. 43 Publicans also remembered their staff in their wills; brewer and innholder William Christmas left money to nine of his servants in 1564 (including 7s earmarked for ‘George my ostler’), Andrew Shackley divided 20s between his three servants upon his death in 1614, while taverner John Bigg bequeathed 10s to his maidservant Rebecca Ayles in 1621. 44 In 1632 Morgan Emmott, innholder at The Greyhound, left no less than 40s to each of his ‘maidservants and manservants’. 45

Apprentices could reasonably expect to take over the running of a public house. John Sedgwick, as we have seen, acquired the leases to The Dolphin when he married Edward Wilmot’s daughter, while ‘innholder’ Giles Barnes was admitted burgess in 1646 as ‘late apprentice to James Mason’, also of The Dolphin. 46 Even casual workers sometimes made good and ended up applying their skills and experience within the context of their own establishments. Thomas Grist, who was drawing beer at The Star inn in 1609, gained

42 SRO SC9/3/12, Fos. 51v-54r.
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his own alehouse license in 1615, while both Thomas Hawker and Edwin Daniel, the
tapsters beaten by the soldier and over a game of tables respectively, recovered from
their experiences to rise to the very top of the victualling hierarchy; Daniel was operating
a small inn upon his death in 1690, while more impressively Hawker was managing *The
Star* when he died in 1678. Yet the most extraordinary achievement is perhaps that of
Francis Barter, a poor town child bound to alehouse-keeper John South in 1629 ‘in
regard of his licence to sell beer’. Barter next makes his appearance in the records as
purchaser of the leases to established inn *The Katherine Wheel*.
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The need to turn profits within Southampton’s highly competitive environment required the proprietors of public houses to open their doors to a broad range of customers. Historiographical statements on the social composition of early modern public house patrons, often by-products of other grand theses, have tended towards sweeping generalisation and large-scale transitions. In particular, Peter Clark has claimed that alehouses were operated ‘by the poor, for the poor’, endorsed in a different context by Robert Muchembled in his influential account of French taverns as ‘mass schools for crime’ that appealed mainly to the lower orders and increasingly excluded social elites. Where multiplicity is acknowledged, there has been a tendency to segregate categories of user within individual types of establishment that ‘catered to their own select clientele’. The Southampton material stresses the limitations of these closed models and others predicated on a false shift from medieval heterogeneity to seventeenth-century exclusiveness; continuity and diversity seems to have been the overriding characteristic of the town’s public drinkers, with localised situational factors (especially its status as a port) playing a more important role than temporal variables in determining the constitution of clients and evidence of considerable overlaps in institutional engagement.

Although, as Beat Kümin has noted, many categories of evidence ‘throw light on the composition of patrons’, recovering a social profile of public house users presents acute methodological difficulties. Convenient guest lists do not survive for this period, while official complaints about or rosters of certain categories of user tend to target abnormal drinking agents or occasions. Evidence of overall attendance gleaned from depositions, an approach employed by Thomas Brennan and more recently Amanda Flather, must be handled with care. Defendants, plaintiffs and witnesses to incidents which took place in public houses would not enumerate everyone present in an establishment, and often had partial or inaccurate recollection of who comprised their own companies if (as was highly likely) they were drunk at the time or if their testimonies were recorded long after their visits had taken place; in 1641 for example, testifying to an alehouse incident which had occurred at some point the previous month, during a re-


examination mercer Henry Leavet confessed that ‘at the time of his first examination he
was distempered... and now remembers that Richard Skinner had not been in their
company’. The social status or occupations of those present were not always recorded,
especially if individuals are only referred to in passing rather than called upon to testify
themselves, while as depositions were always taken in connection with activity that was
figured as deviant they do not offer an unproblematic vista on non-contentious varieties
of presence. However, while the volume and quality of data does not permit
quantification, depositional reference to individuals in combination with other categories
of data has permitted a partial reconstruction of Southampton’s public house users
(women’s use and experience of the landscape of drink is addressed in a later chapter).

Locals

While according to strict law Southampton’s publicans (especially its alehouse-keepers)
were not permitted to ‘entertain’ anyone ‘from within that town, or one mile [from] the
same’ to drink or ‘tipple’ within their houses, in social practice town governors
permitted the attendance of a wide variety of early modern ‘locals’ from all levels of the
social hierarchy, who tended to visit in the evening or at weekends. As elsewhere, small
tradesmen, petty craftsmen and day labourers from the lowest depths of the amorphous
middling sort formed the ‘basic core’ of locally-resident public house users, individuals
who for the most part lacked the space and resources required to drink socially within
their own domestic contexts and who were reliant, in Patricia Fumerton’s phrase, on the
‘spacious camaraderie’ represented by the alehouse, tavern or inn. Day labourers
represented the humblest frequenters, and often funded their visits via credit
mechanisms or by paying for them in kind; in 1637 labourer John Ralles confessed that,
when he discovered a deal board left in the backside of a house on which he had been
working, he urged his colleague to ‘let alone that board, because it should serve for
drinking money for them’. They are frequently glimpsed across the landscape of drink.
Gilbert Brickleton, who (as we have seen) also plied his trade as a drawer at an alehouse
Above Bar, was drinking at Elizabeth Tompkins’ alehouse one evening at nine o’clock in

5 Hunter, ‘Legislation’, pp. 29-30; tipplers are fined for suffering ‘townsmen’ to drink in their houses
against the statute at SRO SC5/3/13, Fo. 4r; SC5/3/18, Fos. 2v, 3v, 4r.
7 E&DIII, pp. 51-2.
1624, John Emery was at an alehouse operated by mariner Elias Bodin between eight and nine o'clock in 1628, labourer John Pee was at 'Old Kingston's' unlicensed alehouse in 1656, while, in another complication of stereotypes about customer profiles, labourer Henry Smith was drinking in no less salubrious an environment than The Dolphin inn at two o'clock one Sunday morning in 1670.

Locally resident young people, servants and apprentices, were also a frequent fixture in the town's public houses. It is well known from the work of Peter Clark, Illana Krausman Ben-Amos and Paul Griffiths that youth formed, in Clark's phrase, 'a vital component of alehouse demand', although in Southampton the young seem to have ranged more widely across and between the institutional constituents of the landscape of drink. In 1574 one of the complaints against John Simons at The White Horse inn was that he entertained 'men's servants [in] his house... and had them dicing there all night', while in an extraordinary confession from 1577, William Cheeseman, the servant of a merchant stranger, described how he had 'played at dice at The Dolphin [inn]... and there played almost all the night at which time [he] lost seven pounds in money... and about Candlemas before that he played at The Crown [inn]... at which time [he] lost four or five pounds'. In the 1630s, when the drinking behaviours of the young seem to have been a particular concern for the civic authorities, three taverners (Humphrey Watson, Giles Clements and Hugo Davis) were bound in recognizance for entertaining servants and apprentices in their houses.

Small independent craftsmen - those 'artificers' whose excessive drinking behaviours were reported by the court leet jurors in 1579, or the 'handycraftsmen' illegally entertained by taverner Robert Stote in 1654 - also negotiated all levels of the victualling hierarchy, many drawn from Southampton's important textiles sector. Tailor Stephen Langmier was at The Dolphin inn at eight o'clock on an August evening in 1627.

---

8 E&DI, pp. 30-1. She was probably the wife or widow of the Thomas Tompkins identified as a 'tippler' Above Bar in the stall and art rolls for 1619. SRO SC6/1/36, Fos. 6r-11v.  
9 E&DII, p. 25.  
10 SRO SC9/3/12, Fo. 119r; SC6/1/58, Fo. 38.  
11 SRO SC9/3/14, Fos. 4r-v.  
13 CLI, p. 119.  
14 SRO SC9/3/3, Fos. 51v-52r.  
15 SRO SC9/2/10, Fos. 11r, 13r, 14v.  
16 CLII, p. 182.  
17 SRO SC5/3/21, Fo. 2v.  
a sergeweaver and a tailor were drinking at an alehouse operated by tailor Richard Pye in St Michael's parish in 1628,19 a weaver was at The Bear inn in 1639,20 while a feltmaker spent a Tuesday afternoon in company with a barber at The Crown inn in May 1652.21 Other trades were also represented; a shoemaker gained The Castle alehouse one morning in 1584,22 while a group of cobblers interspersed their working day with a visit to Simon Brock's St Michael's tippling house at four o'clock one Wednesday afternoon in 1586.23 Lathmaker Richard Masey was at Thomas Loney's St Michael's alehouse in 1652,24 while a cordwainer, a labourer and a fisherman from the nearby village of Millbrook were at The Crown inn one evening between six and seven o'clock in 1654.25 A tanner, also from Millbrook, was at a succession of town alehouses one Saturday evening in 1656,26 a gunsmith was at the inn by the Four Posts in 1664,27 while in the same year a hatter was drinking in a chamber at The Star inn.28

We also encounter more substantial craftsmen who operated more squarely within the respectable middling ranks of Southampton society, whose public house visits were less likely to be motivated by limited economic or spatial resources than for their opportunities for social exchange and conspicuous consumption.29 One Thursday evening in 1586, inter alia, a baker, a butcher and a brewer visited several local alehouses in the course of an extended drinking circuit that began with supper and a game of bowls at an East Street alehouse operated by the town cook.30 Butcher John Knott was at Thomas Dally's St Michael's alehouse in 1637,31 while one evening in 1641 town brewer Christopher Benbury and butcher William Warford were in conversation before the fire in the kitchen of Dorothy Batson's tavern.32

We also witness individuals drawn from distributive, professional and even gentry backgrounds who represented early modern Southampton's civic elite, evidence of whose public house-going from throughout the period casts doubt on assumptions that resident
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19 E&DII, pp. 20-1.
20 SRO SC6/1/43, Fos. 6r-10r.
21 SRO SC9/3/12, Fo. 93v.
22 SRO SC9/3/6, Fo. 5r.
23 SRO SC6/3/7, Fos. 31r-v.
24 SRO SC9/3/12, Fo. 97r; SC6/1/56, Fos. 13-20.
25 SRO SC9/3/12, Fo. 115v.
26 SRO SC9/3/12, Fo. Fo. 120v.
27 SRO SC9/3/13, Fo. 14r.
28 SRO SC9/3/13, Fo. 17v.
29 Tlusty, Bacchus, pp. 132-3, 149-52.
30 SRO SC9/3/7, Fos. 19r-20r.
31 E&DIII, p. 51.
32 E&DIV, p. 18. Dorothy Batson was almost certainly the widow of taverner John Batson who was presented by the court leet jurors for some defective wine quarts in 1630. SRO SC6/1/45, Fo. 23r.
social superiors increasingly withdrew from these spaces (and had always been, in Peter Clark's phrase, 'conspicuous by their absence' from urban alehouses). A surgeon and a merchant were in a chamber of *The Crown* inn in 1573, clothier John Percher was at the Holy Rood alehouse operated by Roger Morse (who was, perhaps significantly, himself a clothier) in 1624, while urban yeoman James Fowler, butcher Ralph Wimple and clothier William Israel attended *The Star* inn one evening in 1631. Such elite presences continued well into the seventeenth century, and at every level of drinking establishment. Two surgeons were drinking at *The Star* in 1645, mercer Henry Leavet (who we encountered above) was at the St Michael's alehouse operated by shoemaker John Pratt in 1641, while Poole JP William Scott and Southampton gentleman William Scott were present in a temporary drinking booth set up by John Perin and his wife during Trinity Fair in 1650. Merchants and aldermen John Loverig and Peter Guillum were drinking in the Crown Chamber of *The Dolphin* inn at two o'clock one morning in 1670, while the following year a gentleman from nearby Ringwood formed part of a large group drinking in Francis Dobey's unlicensed alehouse by the ruined castle. Two local individuals fined by mayors for 'drunkenness and swearing' in 1639 and 1660 were addressed as 'Mr', an honorific title usually reserved for local elites (although it is possible that they achieved their states of inebriation within domestic contexts).

**Visitors**

As well as these categories of 'local' user, Southampton's public houses were also populated by a wide range of itinerant individuals from beyond the urban entity; indeed, recent portrayals of early modern England's fluid culture of mobility from David Rollison and Patricia Fumerton have particular resonance in this port context. Again starting at the bottom of the hierarchy, a wide range of itinerant labourers, on the tramp in search of work or relief but officially figured as vagrant, comprised the largest mobile
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35 E&DI, pp. 54-5; SRO SC6/1/39, Fos. 6r-15r.
37 SRO SC9/1/5, Fo. 2.
38 E&DIV, pp. 25-6; SRO SC6/5/1, Fos. 7r-12r.
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Southampton was an especially popular destination for those seeking passage to the continent or the New World, or attempting to secure a career as a mariner in naval or merchant shipping. While such individuals engaged a wide range of public houses while on the highways (according to A. L. Beier, public houses accounted for 41% of vagrant accommodation), they also represented 'safe ports of call' after their arrival in the town. Their full range of attractions will be investigated in a later section, although the following itineraries, elicited by the probing questions of an urban magistracy keen to foreclose such patronage, are typical: Manass Harwood, a sailor from Norwich who in 1637 'being destitute of employment... came to this town to seek employment in a voyage to sea, and hath lodged since that time at the [ale]house of Morgan Ollas near unto the Watergate'; John Bodle, a Sussex bricklayer who arrived at Southampton in 1639 to 'see fashions' and 'has ever since lay at the sign of The Crown'; Christopher Andrew, a 'butcher' from Shaftsbury who arrived in Southampton in 1679 'to go to Newfoundland in one of the merchant ships fitting out and lay the first night [at the] sign of The Buck's Horn... and the next night at one Robert Fuller's... and the next night being Sunday night at one Palmer's at The Bell'. Intriguing about Bodle’s account is his apparent utilisation of a venerable inn (The Crown) rather than an alehouse, an arrangement which seems to have been common in Southampton. The George inn Above Bar was especially popular, probably because of its suburban location; a yeoman and a schoolboy from London seeking a career at sea stayed there in 1590, as did a 'locksmith' from Andover in 1593.

These itinerants were joined by, and often imaginatively overlapped with, other smallholders and rural craftsmen whose business within the town, often connected to its fair and marketing functions, was more readily defensible. A glover from Romsey described how he stayed at 'Lovell's' alehouse while attending Trinity Fair in 1575, after attending 'Romsey fair' in 1583 a Hampshire husbandman 'stayed at the house of John

44 On 'poor men at sea' see ibid., pp. 84-107. On the enduring appeal of ports for mobile individuals see R. Humphreys, No Fixed Abode: A History of Responses to the Roofless and Rootless in Britain (Basingstoke & London, 1999), p. 64.
46 E&DIV, p. 21.
47 E&DIV, p. 1.
48 SRO SC9/3/14, Fos. 33r-v.
49 SRO SC9/3/4, Fo. 9r; SC9/3/5, Fo. 11v
50 SRO SC9/3/2, Fo. 5r.
Wall... a tippling house and came to the house about ten of the clock at night',\textsuperscript{51} while Hugh Pawlett described staying at The Green Dragon alehouse while 'in the market' in 1631.\textsuperscript{52} In 1623 James Heely, an upholsterer from Salisbury, stayed at The George inn while in the town 'about some business'.\textsuperscript{53} To these 'legitimate' commercial wayfarers were a large floating community of carriers and carters, who we will encounter in a later section.

Other categories of traveller were still more characteristic of Southampton's topographical status as a port.\textsuperscript{54} Mariners of various nationalities thronged its public houses, lending them a cosmopolitan atmosphere not replicated in inland centres; although, as we have seen, little remained of Southampton's southern Mediterranean trade, it maintained strong commercial links with northern Europe and the Low Countries.\textsuperscript{55} While seamen often lodged on their vessels (a mariner described lodging in a series of ships in 1586),\textsuperscript{56} as Bernard Capp has noted, regardless of their lodging arrangements mariners were generally keen to escape cramped quarters, purulent victuals, low pay and the constant spectre of disease or shipwreck by 'drinking heavily in alehouses';\textsuperscript{57} many of which in Southampton were themselves operated by mariners or expressed nautical motifs on their signboards. They were ubiquitous denizens of the landscape of drink throughout our period. Two sailors from 'the bark Bullins', one of whom introduced himself as 'Black Ralph', were drinking in the hall of The White Horse inn in 1578,\textsuperscript{58} three northern European seamen (two 'Flemings' and one Norwegian) were pledging healths in 'a cellar near unto the custom house' in 1601,\textsuperscript{59} while mariner Richard Peacock drank at The Graze Maurice alehouse in 1627.\textsuperscript{60} In 1628 Sarah Harvey, daughter of mariner Richard Harvey (whose alehouse at the sign of The Ship we have already encountered), described the arrival of 'six Flemings or Dutchmen' into the alehouse one Wednesday morning at eight o'clock,\textsuperscript{61} while the following year, in an example to which we will return, five mariners from a commercial vessel owned by

\textsuperscript{51} SRO SC9/3/5, Fo. 35.
\textsuperscript{52} E&DII, pp. 85-6.
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\textsuperscript{59} E&D, p. 22.
\textsuperscript{60} E&DII, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., pp. 27-8.
Southampton merchant John Elzey descended on the Hythe alehouse operated by mariner John Wall at two o'clock in the afternoon. The 'certain western men and Irishmen' sharing eels for breakfast in 1577 at the St Michael's alehouse operated by fishmonger Robert Cross were almost certainly mariners.

Soldiers were another group of thirsty outsiders who regularly descended on Southampton as they waited to put to sea or in the context of garrisons. Like those of other strategically and logistically important Solent towns, and unlike their equivalents in inland boroughs, the civilians of Southampton would have 'experienced a military presence on a day-to-day basis'. Field units were a fixture in the town throughout the period (with particular build-ups during the European campaigns of the late 1620s), while the town was garrisoned in 1644. In December 1653 local diarist Joseph de Lamotte recorded the arrival of no fewer than ten companies. Like most early modern towns Southampton had no designated barracks, and while the quartering of soldiers was sometimes farmed out to ordinary householders, especially if they were of high military rank (de Lamotte himself lodged Captains Hind and Peters), public houses were a natural venue for billets. In 1592 a visitor described how he could find lodgings in any victualling house because all the beds were 'full with soldiers'; some troops were billeted at The Talbot alehouse 'Above the Bar at the land's end' the following year, while in 1627 soldier Henry Wheatley, almost certainly one of fifty footmen sent to the town in preparation for the Ile de Rhe campaign, described leaving The Falcon alehouse 'to go to his own lodging where he is billeted at one Richard Sperman's' (Sperman was tagged as a tippler Above Bar by the court leet jurors in the same year). As Wheatley's trajectory suggests, even if not billeted on publicans directly, in Southampton as in early modern Augsburg soldiers were 'hearty drinkers' who ranged widely over the landscape of drink. A trooper based at nearby Romsey arrived at Walter Bradley's Holy Rood
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65 See CSPD 1625-6, p. 292; 1626-8, pp. 167, 181, 290, 329; 1628-9, pp. 92, 112, 122, 234.
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68 SRO SC9/3/3, Fos. 3r-v.
69 SRO SC9/3/9, Fo. 16v.
70 CSPD, pp. 290, 329.
alehouse in 1650,73 soldiers from two companies were drinking heavily in a clutch of alehouses and inns Above Bar in 1664,74 while in the same year a soldier was drinking in The Star inn.75

Other visitors were from further up the social spectrum. As well as the small craftsmen already mentioned, prosperous merchants frequently arrived in Southampton, many involved with the town’s important cloth trade; in 1583 Edward Elyford, a London merchant overseeing a delivery from Flanders, came ‘riding to The Dolphin [inn] on a dun gelding’,76 while in 1602 Richard Whittaker, a Somerset clothier, stayed at The White Horse inn en route to London.77 Inns were also regularly used by a small cohort of legal professionals who regularly made the journey from London to advise the town council on their conduct of judicial affairs, foremost of which was the town ‘recorder’. A person ‘skilled in the law’ with an annual stipend of £5, the recorder was technically supposed to reside in the town, although civic account books reveal that they were mostly based in London and lodged with extensive retinues of men and horses in leading inns, most commonly The Dolphin, for the duration of the Sessions; in 1642 its keeper James Mason presented £5 11s 2d ‘for Mr Recorder’s bill for his men and horses’.78 We occasionally encounter non-resident gentlemen, who on two occasions stayed in alehouses. In 1592 Richard Neale, a gentleman from nearby Beaulieu, arrived at The Dolphin inn with his brother; failing to secure accommodation there, he was led by two locals ‘to one Roger’s house a victualling house’.79 In 1602, Denbighshire gentleman Richard Jones drank, and then attempted to lodge, at a tippling house operated by sailor Gilbert Lambert.80 Other elite visitors arrived at the town’s public houses under less quotidian sets of circumstances. We have encountered the Moroccan ambassador at The Dolphin,81 while William Schellinks, a wealthy young artist from the Low Countries, described in his travel journal how he arrived at The Dolphin, ‘the largest inn’, during his brief stay in the town in

73 SRO SC9/3/12, Fo. 48v; SRO SC6/1/55, Fos. 7r-11v.
74 SRO SC9/3/13, Fos. 16r-17r.
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77 E&D, p. 32.
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80 SC6/1/27, Fos. 8r-14v.
81 Quantrell, ‘The de Lamotte Diary’, p. 41.
1663; however, he experienced ‘such bad service there’ that he transferred his custom to
*The Star.*

**CONCLUSIONS**

The landscape of drink provided livelihoods for a wide range of individuals. While alehouse-keepers were generally drawn from the poorer sectors of Southampton society (although included a small smattering of urban yeomen), taverners and innholders were among the town’s wealthiest citizens and enjoyed considerable cultural capital provided they fulfilled their roles in a certain way. Moreover, women enjoyed far more substantial opportunities within Southampton’s drink sector than is allowed for by existing accounts; they formed a substantial portion of named alehouse-keepers, and even where they did not gain full formal control of their businesses they still operated as de facto managers during working hours in cases where the official licensee pursued a primary trade. Public houses also contained significant concentrations of servants who attended to their core functions; these roles needed to be negotiated carefully in terms of relations with customers, employers and the urban authorities, although support staff could enjoy positive prospects within the trade (even gaining control of their own elite establishments) if they chose to persevere with drink work. Customer profiles, while glimpsed hazily, were diverse, cosmopolitan and highly reflective of the town’s port status; locally resident labourers, craftsmen and professionals were joined by high proportions of mariners and soldiers. Resident and non-resident elites remained a staple component of the landscape of drink, while individuals of all statuses seem to have used institutions far more promiscuously than has hitherto been suggested. Of what services did they partake?

---

Having introduced the geographical, physical and social properties of Southampton's landscape of drink, we must now turn to the diverse range of functions and services offered by its institutional constituents that did most to distinguish these locales from other urban environments. While increasingly figured as 'drinking houses', and although closely associated with sociability (the mechanisms of which are explored in the following chapter), this interpretative synecdoche elides a far wider range of attributes within the urban community. A first section explores drink, food and lodging, while a second section argues for the town's public houses as local centres of entertainments and news. Broadening the perspective to the wider urban economy, a third section delineates public houses as centres of trade and commerce, while a final section explores how the urban authorities targeted them as a means of funding poor relief.

4.1 DRINK, FOOD & LODGING

The provision of drink, food and lodgings represented the core constituents of the victualling triad. Starting with the former, as is by now well known, early modern England was what anthropologists would term an 'alcohol culture' in which varieties of intoxicating beverages formed a staple component of daily diets and alcohol constituted 'part of everyday life'. As well as its self-evident psychotropic benefits, it exhibited two practically constituted advantages. On the one hand, alcoholic beverages served as a substitute for water. Securing an adequate supply of this scarce and valuable resource was a perennial problem for many early modern towns, and the water history of Southampton is no exception. Its restricted catchment area, arising from its situation on a gravel plateau, meant a small run-off and minimised underground supplies for domestic
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1 See, for example, Flather, Gender and Space, p. 10.
3 See Jack, Towns, pp. 81-2; on water supply in the early modern capital see M. S. R. Jenner, 'From Conduit Community to Commercial Network? Water in London 1500-1725', in Griffiths & idem, Londinopolis, pp. 250-72.
From 1310, down to extensive remodelling in 1836, the town received its water from several natural springs or ‘water heads’ to the north of the town, which were connected to four public conduits along English Street, as well as to a designated well and ‘water house’ in Houndwell Field, via a network of lead pipes and courses. However, this system was far from reliable. The pipes ran to decay in the fifteenth century, the courses suffered near-constant blockages, while the whole tended to dry up altogether during drought years. A full-scale waterworks assessment in 1547 suggests the magnitude of the problem, while in 1594, in acknowledgment of the continued inadequacy of existing arrangements, enterprising yeoman Roger Pedley was granted permission to supplement them by diverting ‘any stream within ten miles of the town’ under the Bargate to a specially-constructed lead cistern at the east end of St. Michael’s church ‘whence water should flow for all, day and night’. However, this too proved something of a noble dream (the cistern was finally dismantled in 1675, after a steady diminution in rents). As part of the town’s Restoration festivities, with the conduits once again standing empty, they became receptacles for £18 of wine and sack.

Alcohol, especially ale and beer, was also an important energy source, and featured in dietary regimens as a relatively cheap way of imbibing cereal grains during periods of harvest crises and escalating grain prices; the corporation were firm subscribers to ‘cereal substitution’ (in 1550 the town brewers were actually forbidden from ‘leaving off brewing’ during periods of dearth upon pain of a crippling £10), and subjected the supply of these beverages, like that of bread, to close supervision via regularly stated assize orders which aimed to stabilise price and quality (these are reconstructed in Fig. 4.1.1). As the graph indicates, ordinary beer, ‘good and wholesome for men’s bodies’, was the beverage of choice; as the assembly complained in 1608, not only did the more potent double beer consume twice the amount of malt, but it was ‘not for use, but for drunkenness and excess’. Town brewers, regularly summoned from their premises to the Audit House, were commanded to ensure that their ordinary beer was of sufficient quality (regulatory agents in the form of tasters were appointed in 1571, while there were complaints about, variously, its ‘weakness’, ‘smallness’ and ‘badness’ in
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FIG. 4.1.1 The price of ordinary and double beer in Southampton 1540-1640, as dictated by assize. RBI-IV; MB; ABI-IV; SC2/1/6.

1596, 1598 and 1600), and the maximum price per barrel was dictated annually in line with the cost of malt. In 1570 court leet jurors insisted that these set prices were enforced to avoid a ‘great robbery to the inhabitants’, while in the November of 1598 they were reduced sharply because the price of malt ‘God be thanked, is now fallen’.

Public houses represented the foremost institutional mechanism for the delivery of alcohol to Southampton’s residents and visitors. It should be stated at the outset that not all consumption would have taken place on the premises; the importance of alcoholic beverages rendered any such institutional and spatial confinement unlikely. However, even when consumption manifested in other spatial contexts, the high cost of procuring wine or beer by the barrel, local prohibitions on the combination of brewing and retailing activity (see below) and the relative inaccessibility of the suburban breweries for intramural dwellers meant that for most inhabitants beverages would not have been obtained wholesale but in small quantities on an ad hoc basis from local public houses.

Indeed, in 1594 the court leet jurors actually mandated off-sales when they warned

\[ ...\]

11 CLI, p. 68; RBIV, pp. 30, 48, 42-3.
12 RBIV, pp. 42-3.
13 On the ‘take away’ facilities of early modern public houses see especially B. Kümin, ‘Eat In or Take Away: Food and Drink in Central European Public Houses around 1800’, in M. Hietala and T. Vahtikari (eds), The Landscape of Food: The Food Relationship of Town and Country in Modern Times (Helsinki, 2003), pp. 73-82.
publicans that 'if they shall deny to sell any beer out of their doors... then shall it not be lawful for any of them to sell within their houses'. Depositions provide glimpses of these takeaway processes. In 1623, Mary Callaway described how, when Thomas Hamon entered the dwelling house of her friend Alice Andrews, they 'asked for a pot of beer' which he fetched from an unspecified English Street alehouse, while in 1619 the corporation complained that townspeople were purchasing drink from alehouses, presumably those at the top of English Street, and 'repairing] to the grate of the prison of the Bargate and do there continue tippling and drinking with the prisoners... often times making themselves and the prisoners also drunken'. Town accounts reveal that, during construction and maintenance projects, refreshing take-outs from nearby public houses were a necessary aspect of 'keeping them [workmen] at their work'. In 1596 William Foster, who kept an alehouse in St Michael's parish, was paid 6s for beer delivered to workers repainting Beavis and Ascupart on the Bargate, while Peter Whale (of The Three Crows inn) distributed 4s 6d worth of beer to the 'masons and carpenters on the quay and walls' in 1679. Even civic governors sometimes needed such liquid inducements, as in 1578 when 5d was 'paid at The George when Mr Wodall was sent away [by] the council for a pint of Muscadel'.

Southampton's highly localised drink culture was made up of various liquid constituents. While traditionally-brewed ale was still available in the town in 1615 (when six individuals, including three widows, were 'warned to brew no more ale in their houses'), as in other southern centres such as Canterbury hopped beer, characterised by its superior storage qualities and cleaner taste, appears to have been available from the early decades of the sixteenth century, and the arrival of the aliens from 1567 no doubt consolidated its prominence. As early as 1531 'there were appointed within the town...
certain brewers of both ale and beer', while the predominance of the latter is suggested by the fact that in 1543 there were eight official beer brewers to only five recognised ale brewers. The cost and complexity of the brewing process would have rendered most alehouse-keepers and smaller innholders reliant on these common brewers for their product; indeed in 1531, 1553 and 1558, as in Basingstoke, the corporation actually imposed prohibitions on the combination of brewing and retail activity. These were not always observed. In 1564 four innkeepers were presented by court leet jurors for both brewing beer 'and retail[ing] the same by the pot' in their houses, while inventories taken for inns and larger alehouses usually disclose brewing paraphernalia. However, smaller establishments, lacking both the space and capital for the equipment repertoires required by large-scale beer brewing, would have been far more dependent on the corporation brewers. Probate material divulges reciprocal relationships, while the prevalence of the 'iron-bound carts' in which brewers made their deliveries is suggested by frequent complaints by court leet jurors about their deleterious effect on the paved portions of Southampton's road network. The corporation generally defended the interests of publicans within this relationship. Brewers were originally compelled to bring supplementary 'filling beer' to alehouses 'in consideration of the want and lack of their barrels' (beer had a tendency to foam up and 'spurge' in transit), although from 1579 they were ordered instead to 'allow to their customers twenty-one barrels [for] twenty barrels'.

The beer supplied was of different strengths. Although the corporation made several efforts to prohibit the sale of double beer 'to any victualler... to retail within this town' (in 1558, 1568, 1570 and 1596), prohibitions on stronger varieties were relaxed during times of plenty and seldom observed to the letter even when they were in place. In 1596, for example, the assembly read off from the drunken bodily comportment of
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25 *The Dolphin* in 1570 had a tied brewhouse Above the Bar and kept a bed for the in-house brewers in the stable, there was a brewhouse at *The Katherine Wheel* in 1583, while the kitchen of *The George* in 1615 contained two brewing tubs and a water pump. In terms of alehouses, John Manfield had 'brewing vessels' in his kitchen in 1596, that of John Ireland contained a mashing vault and keeve in 1607, while Joan Daniel had a 'brewhouse' next to her alehouse in 1670. Pnv.II, pp. 280-89; HRO 1583 A09/1-2; 1615 AD09; 1596 A080/1-2; 1607 AD35; 1670 AD051.
26 The inventory of alehouse-keeper Roger Here in 1611 records 20s in 'debts due to Roger Turner for beer', while that taken for brewer William Knight recorded debts owing (both good and bad) from twenty-two publicans in 1667. HRO 1611 AD14: 1667 A060/1-3.
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many townspeople that beer-brewers had ‘in very private manner… brewed double beer and the same delivered out and sold to the victuallers and tipplers’. The same order urged beer-brewers to confine their ‘ship beer’ (otherwise known as ‘double double beer’) to the ‘service and provision of shipping… and not to sell any part hereof to any [of] the innholders, victuallers, alehouse-keepers or taverners’, again suggesting that such institutional redirections were commonplace.28

A diverse variety of imported wines were also available from Southampton’s taverns and inns, unsurprisingly given its prominence within the port’s commercial portfolio (the import of wine, especially from France and Spain, was a staple of its seaborne trade throughout the early modern period, attaining particular importance during the seventeenth century).29 Southampton merchants successfully negotiated a monopoly on the landing of sweet ‘malmsey’ wines (from the Malvasia grape cultivated in Italy, Spain and Greece) between 1573 and 1589,30 while assizes of wines communicated orally to the town’s taverners and innholders in 1629 and 1631 also enumerated a range of ‘French’ (Gascony, Rochelle, Muscadet) and ‘Spanish’ (Canary, Malaga, Sack) variants, as well as other miscellaneous ‘small and thyme’ wines.31 Although publicans were unlikely to carry all of these types simultaneously, there was some concession to variety. While attending the quarter sessions in 1573 Lord Lawne and Lord Sandes consumed pottles of sack and claret at The Dolphin, while its cellar in 1624 contained sack, white wine and Gascony wine (a red variety).32 The cellar of John Warren at The Bear contained sack, Malaga wine, white wine and a ‘roundlett of red wine’ in 1647, while Thomas Hawker at The Star was offering his customers French, Spanish and even racy central European Rhenish varieties by 1678.33 Nor was the sale of wine confined to inns and taverns, as it legally should have been; although Peter Clark has established ‘the alehouse that could only serve beer’ as an interpretative landmark,34 wine does seem to have fallen within the purview of Southampton’s wealthier alehouse-keepers, and their purveyance of it would have further disrupted rigid institutional

28 RBIV, p. 30.
30 RBIII, pp. 2-3, 32, 39-40.
31 SRO SC2/1/6, Fos. 241r, 250v.
32 SRO SC5/3/1, Fo. 144v; HRO 1624 A41/1-2.
33 HRO 1647 AD104/1-2; 1678 B23/1-2. Innholders are recorded purchasing illegally landed wine confiscated by the corporation at SRO SC5/3/1, Fos. 159v, 161v.
distinctions for early modern consumers. Alehouse-keeper John Manfield paid 23s 4d for
a pipe of Rochelle wine seized at Lymington in 1566, and on his death in 1596 his
alehouse contained four wine quarts and a wine pint. That operated by John Mullins
had ‘nine wine quart pots without a handle and a wine pint without a cover’ in 1628.
while town cook and alehouse-keeper Edward Phillater possessed a ‘silver wine bowl’ in
1639.

The psychotropic horizons of townspeople were also expanded by the presence
of a range of spirits, long before the ‘gin fever’ of the eighteenth-century. Aqua vitae or
‘water of life’, a famously rough triple-distillation of wine or beer, herbs and spices, was
ubiquitous in the port’s public houses, leaving prominent traces in inventories despite the
apparent absence of dedicated aqua vitae houses as in Salisbury and Barking. Given its
original status as a derivative of wine, it was most common in inns and taverns, and for
these publicans it must have seemed an attractive mode of, quite literally, sweating their
assets; The Katherine Wheel had a still in 1583 and Leonard Mills’ cellar at The Crown
contained four gallons of aquavitae in 1624, while inventories prepared for taverners
Henry Gold, Reynold House and John Biggs from the mid-sixteenth to the early
seventeenth centuries all enumerate stills as well as aqua vitae storage receptacles,
measures and serving vessels. It also had a limited presence in alehouses; John Manfield
and John Mullins, both of whom also served wine, possessed aquavitae pints or bottles
of pewter, as did alehouse-keeper Nicholas Ewens in 1608. Consumer choice multiplied
further from the later 1600s. Brandy was well-established enough in the town by 1675 for
the Assembly to standardise ‘measures for... brandy and all other strongwaters’, George
Allen’s inn contained sixteen gallons of English brandy and four gallons of French in
1708, while rum was readily available at The Bear inn by 1742. Surviving warrants from
the mid-seventeenth century gave town constables the authority to seize ‘spiritous
liquors’ from those who sold them without licence. They were sometimes mixed with
wine to make punch (John Davis’s alehouse contained a ‘silver punch ladle’), while
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English brandy trade see L. M. Cullen, The Brandy Trade under the Ancien Régime: Regional
Specialisation in the Charente (Cambridge & New York, 1998), pp. 1-46. See also B. A. Thusty.
improvements in arboriculture had made cider available by the mid-eighteenth century; in 1741 two soldiers described how they visited a 'bar' in St Mary's parish 'and called for a pint of cider... and paid [the innkeeper] two pence for it'. There is no evidence that stimulant beverages were available within any of Southampton's early modern public houses; however, the inn at the Four Posts was trading as *The Tick's Head* by 1741, suggesting that coffee was being retailed here at this point.

From the early 1600s, these bibulous repertoires were supplemented by the widespread provision of tobacco; leaf as well as 'pudding' (compressed) varieties arrived in the port in small but steady quantities from Virginia (where it was originally exchanged for smoked fish from Newfoundland). Central and local regulations prohibited publicans from selling it (Southampton governors limited the privilege to three grocers, three chandlers and an apothecary in 1632), although it often inveigled its way into their retail portfolios, sometimes as pawn; alehouse-keeper Abraham Vibert accepted some parcels of stolen tobacco in 1628, while in 1630 a man who had recently come from Virginia told alehouse-keeper Mary Audley 'that he had a hogshead of tobacco in the customhouse and bade her take that and pay for herself'. 'Exotic consumption options' were thus not limited to coffeehouse environments, with seventeenth-century patrons regularly encountering these colonial groceries in drinking places and even expecting them to be available for purchase and consumption; arriving at the alehouse of baker George Pigeon in 1650 John Busgrave said 'by God he would eat nothing but that he would have some beer and tobacco', while town accounts reveal that the official recorder and his servants spent £1 6s on 'wine, suger and tobacco' at *The Dolphin* in 1642. Tobacco imbibing in public houses generated extensive paraphernalia and even specialised interior spaces. A 'little brass tobacco box' and 'tobacco press' could be found in taverns belonging to John Biggs and John Pitt in the 1620s, Thomas Heath's inn (as we have seen) comprised a 'room used to put tobacco pipes in' in 1693, while in the
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46 E&DI, pp. 87-8; E&DII, pp. 27-8.
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49 SRO SC2/1/6, Fo. 329v.
same year at *The Green Dragon* alehouse Above Bar the middle chamber contained a ‘tobacco press, cutting board and cutting knife’.

Drinking activity also generated its own extensive material culture repertoires. Inventories prepared on behalf of the town’s publicans disclose a wide variety of beakers, pots, goblets and bowls, most usually in pints or quarts, and functionally and linguistically ‘fixed’ in terms of wine, beer, aqua vitae or water in the nomenclature of the inventories (although they were almost certainly constituted more flexibly in practice). Stone pots were banned by the court leet as they could not be ‘sealed’ with the town’s arms, so most were done out of tin, pewter and increasingly glass. Some drinking vessels were made out of precious metals (the ‘two silver goblets’ belonging to innholder William Christmas; the ‘small silver beer bowl’ in Thomas Gander’s alehouse), although the small number of these high-value items in combination with separate storage conventions suggests that they were used on an occasional basis for drinking rituals, or for VIP guests, rather than in knockabout daily drinking practices. A surprising feature of sixteenth-century inventories is not so much the profusion of drinking equipment as its comparative lack, suggesting that customers would have been expected to furnish their own vessels, or to share those belonging to the establishment; we might expect a small unlicensed alehouse such as that operated by tailor William Folliatt to only have ‘four old pewter quart pots and two old pint pots’, although even *The Dolphin* inn could only boast ‘two pottle pots, five wine quarts and five wine pints’ in 1570. Drinking receptacles proliferated in the seventeenth century, reflecting early seventeenth-century technical innovations within English glassmaking. By 1624, under the stewardship of William Horne, *The Dolphin* had expanded its range of vessels to include, inter alia, four pottle pots, fourteen pints, fourteen quarts, a china cup, sixteen water glasses as well as further glassware in a ‘cupboard in the great hall’, while an inn operated by Thomas Heath had no fewer than ‘four dozen of quart glass bottles’ in 1693.

**Food**

Recent work in tavern studies, especially by Beat Kümin, has also emphasised the extensive food services offered by early modern public houses that have tended to be
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underestimated both by public house scholars and within traditional accounts of eating out interpretatively predicated upon the ‘rise’ or ‘invention’ of the restaurant. As Sara Pennell has recently argued, extra-domestic dining was an inescapable part of life in urban contexts in early modern England, as cramped domestic quarters, scattered provision of hearths and ovens, frequent internal travel and high proportions of individuals lodged in temporary accommodation forced substantial sectors of the consuming population into regularised patterns of eating beyond the home. She encapsulates the socioeconomic, organisational and cultural aspects of preindustrial eating out in terms of ‘urban foodways’, which she substantiates for the metropolitan context; how might we figure urban foodways in this provincial environment, and what role did inns, taverns and alehouses play within them?

Unlike London, Southampton had few specialised eating places such as bun houses, breakfast huts, cook-shops or ordinaries; on only one occasion, in 1650, were a couple explicitly granted ‘leave to keep an ordinary’, and even here boundaries would have been blurred as they were also permitted to ‘sell beer within doors to such as may eat at the said ordinary’. Although a delegation of central government agents described ‘going about to eat at ordinaries, in order to choose which is fittest and cheapest to furnish diet’ for the Spanish Ambassador’s proposed visit in 1623, their perceptions were metropolitan and local people would probably have recognised the institutions in question as alehouses, taverns or inns. Close cognitive, functional and linguistic associations between the sale of food items and public houses from an early stage is strongly suggested by the language used by court leet jurors in 1581, when they described a cluster of illicit suburban tippling houses operating in the orchards to the east of the town as ‘banqueting houses or houses built for pleasure’ whose owners were responsible for ‘overcharging the common’ with their cattle. As we have seen above, these activities

58 SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 60v.
59 CSPD 1619-23, p. 608.
60 CLII, p. 215.
were often combined in publicans' own descriptions of their activities; in 1602 Marjory Watson described how a young couple 'both did eat and drink many times together' in her alehouse Above Bar.  

Prominent food functions are intimated by the primary occupational profile of publicans. As we have seen, it was standard practice in Southampton for the town cook, a liveried officer responsible for catering official events, to also have an alehouse licence devolved to him; an alehouse belonging to Richard Rich, cook in the late sixteenth century, was implicated in the theft of a calf in a set of depositions from 1585, while Edward Phillater from St Michael's parish, who took up his cook's badge and cloak in 1607, was granted an alehouse licence successively between 1619 and 1623 (and was probably trading in an unofficial capacity beforehand). In 1633 the town cook, now John Marlow, was licensed to set up his sign in exchange for a payment of 6d for the use of the town's poor, while George Perry was identified as a 'tippler and cook' in St Michael's parish in the stall and art rolls for 1601. Other victualling trades also generated their fair share of publicans who no doubt exploited the potential for synergies and overlaps. The leases for corporation-owned inn The Lion were held by butcher Thomas Hoskins in the 1560s, while an inn in suburban St Mary's parish was owned by wealthy butcher Richard Vibert in the mid-seventeenth century. For bakers, alehouse-keeping also represented a natural supplement to their principal economic activities; a deposition from 1650, which described how alehouse-keeper George Pigeon 'being a baker went down to draw his customers bread' after serving some patrons with beer in a back chamber, provides an insight into how these activities were combined in practice.

Probate inventories offer further clues about the culinary possibilities of Southampton's public houses and allow us to give substance to accounts of their gastronomic operations. Kitchenware represents an obvious starting point. For sure, not all institutions, especially at the lower end of the spectrum, possessed a designated kitchen; at Peter Hendrick's tiny establishment on the West Quay cooking facilities and equipment were kept in the hall (where it jostled with trestles, tables and beds), and many other alehouse-keepers conducted their food preparation in halls, butteries, parlours and
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even yards. However, as Sara Pennell has noted, this should be seen in terms of the promiscuity of food processing before specialised room use than as evidence of a circumscribed culinary repertoire. Inventories taken for publicans at all levels reveal a far greater quantity, if not variety, of culinary impedimenta than that found in ordinary dwellings. Taverns, given the prominence of their food services, were especially well-equipped; as early as 1558, the kitchen of taverner Henry Gold contained, inter alia, three gridirons, three dripping pans, three chopping knives, four ladles, two skimmers, a fish slicer, two flesh hooks, four each of graduated brass pots and brass pans, three kettles, two chafing dishes and a trivet. However, alehouses also contained impressive collections, again casting doubt on Peter Clark's depiction of extremely limited food services. The 'outroom' which formed the locus of alehouse-keeper and cook Edward Phillater's culinary activities, while by no means typical, contained a wide range of spits, gridirons, pans, knives and cleavers as well as an 'iron jack to roast meat' (the only one of its kind in evidence in the town), while that of Stephen Todey in 1665 boasted three spits, two gridirons, a toasting iron, a pudding pan and a basting ladle as well as a startling £26 in assorted brass kettles and skillets.

Associated material cultures of dining in the form of tableware and linens disclose a similar story. Again, the greatest accumulations are found at those levels of the victualling hierarchy classically identified with the provision of food; The Dolphin inn contained 300 pewter serving vessels in 1570, while John Pitt's tavern contained fifty-eight assorted charges, platters, plates, dishes and saucers done out of pewter, glass and silver in 1628. In terms of napkins and table-cloths, Henry Gold offered his customers four diaper table cloths, six plain table cloths, fourteen towels and three dozen napkins, while the linen room of Thomas Hawker at The Star contained a staggering 328 white napkins by 1678. However, alehouse-keepers could retain similar quantities, which much have shaped powerful senses of the gastronomic thrust of their operations. Customers at John Manfield's large alehouse ate off some seventy-one assorted pewter dishes and enjoyed the use of salt sellers, pewter pepper pots and cruets for vinegar and oil in 1596, while serving wares became increasingly differentiated; both Anna Filleter
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and John Howe at *The Green Dragon* possessed 'white Dutch earthenware' by the late seventeenth century.\(^75\) This was complemented by a similar profusion of food-related linens. Manfield possessed forty-four napkins of damask, diaper and canvas (with matching table cloths, 'all of one suit'), while alehouse-keeper John James offered his customers three dozen diaper napkins and three dozen canvas ones in 1615.\(^76\)

These items were constituted by regimes of use; how might we characterise the dining cultures that prevailed in Southampton's public houses? Notions of 'utility eating', mainly on the part of lodgers and travellers, have hitherto moulded most understandings of preindustrial eating out.\(^77\) Public houses certainly furnished an arena for such practically oriented consumption, although they should be decoupled from tenacious 'host's table' paradigms that presuppose a single and inflexible daily service; such spatio-temporal fixity hardly conforms to the increasing spatial mobility that characterised early modern England, especially in a busy port environment characterised by movements of individuals through the gates and quays at all times of day. Townspeople clearly expected to be able to accompany their drinking with a snack or meal regardless of the timing of their visits; in both 1571 and 1574 the court leet forbade taverners and tipplers from selling individually portioned 'bowl cake and biscuit cake' to their customers for \(\frac{1}{2}d\) (suggesting that the practice was widespread)\(^78\) while when townsman John Busgrave arrived at George Pigeon's alehouse at seven o'clock one evening his host's first question was whether he wanted something to eat.\(^79\) Visitors to the town by sea and land seem to have enjoyed similarly flexible alimentary experiences, constructed around their own needs and trajectories: Devois Davis 'supping' at the house of Ralph Roberts for 4d in 1592; Andover locksmith Thomas Ayres laying at Nicholas Roche's house and electing to purchase some cold meat for his breakfast for 4d in the same year; the six Dutch mariners who arrived at *The Ship* alehouse within sight of the West Quay at 8am one Wednesday in 1628 and 'stayed there about an hour and broke their fast and then departed'.\(^80\)

However, as well as (and even within) these routinised patterns of 'utility eating', it is possible to detect the lineaments of those attributes that typify modern manifestations of extra-domestic food consumption; as Pennell notes in her discussion
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of metropolitan victualling, 'experiences of eating away from home in the course of the working day significantly shaped a growing... consciousness of the locations and composition of opportunities for non-necessary, leisure-time commensality and consumption'. In provincial centres also, public houses formed a preliminary locus for socially constituted pleasure dining; it is worth remembering that court leet jurors encapsulated tippling houses with 'banqueting' functions as 'houses built for pleasure', not necessity, while instances of eating out were often intertwined with other self-consciously leisured pursuits such as gaming. In 1575, for example, Philip Pettivin described how he and two other local craftsmen were playing bowls at the King's Orchard when one of the company 'requested they go to supper at The G', the large inn Above Bar. As early as 1550, a local byelaw regulating closing times acknowledged the sociable eating of the civic elite when it exempted 'any of the aldermen or burgesses who... shall chance to supp at a tavern... in company together'.

As the latter example suggests, while not wishing to diminish the consuming experiences of the lower orders, we should not elide the social as well as spatial locatedness of much of the pleasurable dining that took place within public houses. Banqueting in connection with official town events, which very often exploited inns, taverns and even alehouses, provided the most extensive opportunities for elite commensality. Connections between this convivial gustatory world and the public house network should not be overstated. Banqueting could and did manifest in other public settings such as the 'Cuthorn' clearing on the annual Law Day (when £6 was allocated for external catering by the town cook) or even within the Audit House itself, while a social diary maintained by leading wool merchant Joseph de Lamotte in the mid-seventeenth century reveals that leading visitors to the town such as the Moroccan ambassador and Charles I tended to have feasts presented to them in private environments (even if they happened to be lodged in inns). The assembly also imposed occasional limitations on the public dining possibilities of local officials in an effort to preserve civic funds. In 1595 they issued the 'perpetual order' that, after their swearing
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in, the court leet jury should have their complimentary meal ‘dressed, provided and eaten only at the house... of the town steward and not elsewhere in any inn, tavern or place of common victualling whatsoever’, while in 1617 this free lunch was suspended altogether and each juror was instructed unequivocally to ‘dine at his own house without any charge to this town’. 87

However, notwithstanding these caveats, account books maintained by mayors and town stewards show the dining practices of local power-holders consistently converging on public houses. The annual sitting of the borough quarter sessions, the composition of which mirrored that of the assembly itself, was a dependable source of alimentary opportunities throughout the seventeenth century, and the £5 customarily allocated for the ‘Grand Jury’s dinner’ was invariably directed into the coffers of a publican. Innholders (mainly at The Dolphin and The Star) and taverners were the foremost beneficiaries, 88 although, as we have seen, in 1658 an alehouse operated by widow Anna Filleter was chosen. 89 Likewise, the admiralty court, which sat on an irregular basis in nearby Hamble and which also comprised the Assembly, was often accompanied by a meal at an inn located within the hamlet or in the suburbs of Southampton. 90 On other occasions, no judicial pretexts were required. During the 1593 mayoralty of John Hopton, who was clearly something of a gourmand, 2s 6d was paid to John Errington at The Crozen ‘upon the eating of my Le Venison’ and a further £3 6s 8d was recorded ‘for our dinners at The Dolphin when the Countess of Hereford’s buck was eaten’. 91 The corporation sometimes defaulted on their substantial food debts. In 1670, innholder John Speering made a short and splenetic journey down to the Audit House from his premises brandishing an outstanding bill of £13 10s and ‘charged the mayor, bailiffs and burgesses of the town and county of Southampton as debtors for... dinners and other things kept at The Dolphin inn’. 92

To further support these ‘leisured’ interpretations, inventories yield many examples of spatial divisions between areas for preparation and consumption often seen as characteristic of ‘modern’ dining establishments. 93 We should not homogenise this tendency; we have already witnessed the proclivity of food processing equipment to migrate throughout premises, especially in alehouses (in 1619, to add another example,
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customers seated in the hall of Thomas Cook's alehouse would have had ringside seats for his three spits, gridiron and collection of pots and hooks), 94 while as we have seen public houses intensified the general propensity within early modern dwellings for kitchens to function as general living areas replete with extensive seating and tabling, 95 the kitchen of an inn held by William Christmas in 1564, for example, contained two tables, four benches and eight stools. 96 However, within this diversity of configurations, there is evidence that for some publicans it was desirable to separate out processing and consumption. When both took place in kitchens, preparation activities were sometimes concealed. In the kitchen of John Manfield's alehouse, for example, which contained a characteristic mixture of cooking tools, chairs and tables, assessors suggestively noted 'certain boards to make a partition' in 1596. 97 In larger inn contexts, alimentary practice could be farmed out to a variety of other rooms. Wealthy guests often took meals in their chambers, as in 1623 when Wiltshire upholsterer James Heely described being 'at supper' in a chamber of The George inn Above Bar, which are revealed by a 1615 inventory to have been extensively equipped with benches, stools and tables. 98 Parlours were also common venues; some deponents described being at supper in a parlour of The Chequer inn at Winchester in 1579, while it is hard not to interpret the 'kitchen parlour' apprehended by The Dolphin overseers in 1570 as a kind of proto-dining room. 99 That dishes were consumed in separate interior spaces to those in which they were prepared is suggested by the occasional discovery of 'little bells' among kitchen paraphernalia, presumably used to alert servants upon the completion of a dish who would then convey it to customers waiting in other portions of the structure. 100

And what of the foodstuffs themselves, too often displaced in culturally-oriented accounts of alimentation? Like the contents of cellars, those of cupboards were predominantly local, with marine produce featuring prominently; fish pans as well as piles of 'wet fish' and 'dry fish', the latter with their accompanying salting tubs, are ubiquitous in inventories, 101 while we can safely assume that the oysters which were
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harvested from beds off the western shore of the town, whose extraction was in the gift of the town cook, would have found their way onto public house tables (even if there is no evidence in Southampton of the 'oyster girls' that Pennell has perceived in the doorways of London establishments).\textsuperscript{102} There is also extensive evidence of meat products. Publicans often maintained a chicken coop,\textsuperscript{103} while game from surrounding forests as well as mutton, veal and especially pork were all in evidence, either fresh (as when a young couple shared 'a piece of fresh pork for their supper' at Thomas Loney's alehouse in 1652),\textsuperscript{104} or in such preserved or cured variants as pasties, pies, puddings or most commonly as bacon.\textsuperscript{105} Publicans at all levels of the hierarchy kept large stores of dairy products, especially butter and cheese,\textsuperscript{106} while they would have enjoyed access to extensive herbage in Houndwell fields to the north of the town (which servant Eleanor Beeston described collecting in 1619) as well as to the vegetables cultivated by its market gardeners (Southampton had a special reputation for its peas, and assessors noted bushels in \textit{The Dolphin} and in the inn at Itchen Ferry).\textsuperscript{107} Sweet tooths would have been satisfied by the presence of baked items (such as 'penny simnels', the small, sweet buns with which the young couple at Loney's alehouse followed their pork), or even confectionary; John Manfield's alehouse contained fifteen pounds in weight of liquorice.\textsuperscript{108}

In terms of the supply of foodstuffs, self-sufficiency was a real possibility for those at the top of the victualling hierarchy with extensive holdings of land and livestock, especially if there was combinative potential between victualling and their primary trade. At his inn in extramural St Mary's parish butcher Richard Vibert maintained not only a 'slaughterhouse' full of hogs, sheep, heifers, steers and bulls but also 'fruit in the orchard'
and a field in which he grew wheat and rye,\textsuperscript{109} while even alehouse-keepers sometimes possessed baking facilities, a single cow or a brace of pigs.\textsuperscript{110} However, for the most part the latter were reliant on the market for their foodstuffs, where the comparatively large quantities they required often implicated them in economic abuses; in 1571, for example, Nicholas Roche (popularly known as ‘French Nick’) from St Michael’s parish was presented by the beadle for selling victuals without licence and ‘abusing the market of eggs’, while Edward Wilmott of \textit{The Dolphin} was accused of forestalling fish and butter in 1560.\textsuperscript{111} A more novel procurement strategy was implemented by Peter Quoite, who kept an alehouse at the sign of \textit{The King’s Head} in All Saints parish. In 1587, court leet jurors reported complaints from his neighbours that his mastiff had been ‘fetch[ing] out of their houses whole pieces of meat, [such] as loins of mutton and veal and... pasty of venison, and will not spoil it by the way but will carry it whole to his master’s house’.\textsuperscript{112}

Of course, the array of culinary equipment owned by the town’s publicans rendered their houses common intermediate locations for the preparation of foodstuffs provided by customers, either householders short on space and fuel or patrons who brought their own snacks to supplement their drinking. In 1716 a group of travellers purchased some ‘penny pies’ from butcher George Page and took them to \textit{The Boatswain and Cox} for consumption,\textsuperscript{113} while town records yield two examples of illicit meat being conveyed to alehouses for processing. In 1585 a group of local craftsmen took up a calf and brought it to the alehouse operated by town cook Richard Rich (where its feet were spotted ‘seething’ on the hearth), while in 1593 a soldier described how while he and some colleagues were returning to their lodgings through Houndwell field they ‘took up a sheep and there killed him and left the skin, and brought him into the town to... the sign of \textit{The Talbot Above the Bar} at the land’s end, where the maid of the house let them in and there they dressed and boiled it and presently ate it up, all having one quarter’.\textsuperscript{114} Clear evidence of self-service arrangements is provided by a deposition from 1592, in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{109} HRO 1648 A82/1-2.
\item \textsuperscript{110} Joan Daniel’s alehouse had a ‘bakehouse’, Thomas Sutton had a ‘little cow’, while Elizabeth Rich and Jenkin Hewes kept one and two pigs respectively. HRO 1670 AD051; 1608 AD58; 1605 B63/1-2; 1676 AD056.
\item \textsuperscript{111} CLI, p. 65; RBII, pp. 72-3, 76.
\item \textsuperscript{112} SRO SC6/1/19, Fo. 15r. Marginalia described this animal as a ‘well qualitied dog’; this was praise indeed at a time when municipal authorities were more inclined to fix on dogs as vectors of disease and disorder. See M. S. R. Jenner, ‘The Great Dog Massacre’, in W. Naphy & P. Roberts (eds), \textit{Fear in Early Modern Society} (Manchester, 1997), pp. 44-61. For a more typical complaint about mastiffs see RBII, p. 143.
\item \textsuperscript{113} SRO SC9/4/52.
\item \textsuperscript{114} SRO SC9/3/7, Fos. 19r-20r; SC9/3/9, Fo. 16v. This alehouse was briefly upgraded to an inn under the Mompesson scheme. See BRO D/X 648.
\end{itemize}
which scholar William Awder described staying at ‘French Nick’s’ alehouse with a companion who ‘went forth of the house and there left [him]... willing him to make ready something for supper’. In terms of the ‘takeaway’ food services offered by public houses, although large-scale external catering seems to have been the preserve of the town cooks, there is some evidence that staple items such as bread were provided by hostelries. In 1609 William Chepman of Above Bar inn The Katherine Wheel was summoned to the Audit House to answer for ‘breaking bread buns etc... and retailing the same in and out of his house [italics added]’, which in his defence he correctly claimed was an ‘ancient use and order’ on his premises.

And what of hygiene and sanitary arrangements? It was a priority for the leet jurors, who as early as 1569 reported that a ‘certain man of Guernsey’ drinking in a town alehouse ‘by reason that they doth not use to wash their pots was like to be poisoned’. and recommended that ‘for [a]voiding the danger thereof... order may be taken that no innkeeper, taverner or alehouse-keeper do sell wine, beer or ale but that their pots be washed [and] that men that buy the same may see... the pots washed’. While this insistence on the high visibility of cleaning operations was almost certainly ignored, provision for the cleansing of foodstuffs and serving vessels is identifiable within many establishments. The kitchens of taverns held by Henry Gold and Reynold House contained ‘washing tubs’ and ‘water tubs’ (with the latter presumably employed for rinsing), as did the ‘back kitchen’ at The Dolphin by 1624; while probably also used for clothes, the separate identification of ‘bucking tubs’ (specially designed for cloth) and their placement within kitchens meant they were almost certainly used for cookware and crockery. The George inn Above Bar had fresh water channelled to a pump in its kitchen, while at The Bear inn in 1647 a ‘drink house’ in the yard contained washing tubs and access to a well. Further down the hierarchy, hygiene was taken particularly seriously at an alehouse operated by shipwright Stephen Todey in St Michael’s parish until his death in 1665. As well as tubs, buckets and other washing-related ‘woodenware’ in his hall, his kitchen contained a ‘wooden frame to wash meat’ that, given his primary trade and the absence of comparable devices from other inventories, was probably of his own design and construction.

115 SRO SC9/3/8, Fos. 30r-31r.
116 ABII, p. 75.
117 CLI, p. 57.
118 Pinv. II, pp. 115-6, 380; HRO 1624 A41/1-2.
119 HRO 1615 AD09; 1647 AD104/1-2.
120 HRO 1665 AD100. Todey is identified as a shipwright at SC9/2/11, Fo. 2r.
Lodging

The provision of accommodation represented the final core component of early modern Southampton's victualling triad. Its public houses were the foremost lodging centres of the community; notwithstanding its regular throughput of transients it had no institutionalised boarding houses or barracks, while there were none of the designated craft hostels that Ann Tlusty has noted for early modern Germany. While visitors sometimes secured overnight accommodation in other locales (in 1583 and 1586, for example, two itinerants described sleeping with watchmen on East Street and Above Bar), such arrangements were unpredictable and could not be relied upon. The resulting importance of the quarters provided by public houses is suggested by a reforming ordinance from 1574, for which there is no evidence of implementation; in an attempt to raise the legibility of lodging houses 'for footmen and mariners that come to the town either early or late', it was ordered that 'from henceforth every tippler that is, or hereafter shall be, appointed... to keep lodging for such persons shall have at his door a sign painted with the town's arms'. In 1577, meanwhile, lodgings were at the centre of the leet jurors' vision of victualling when they complained that 'footmen can get no lodging in the tipplers' houses there [Above Bar].

As we have seen, a survey of guestbeds and stabling taken in 1686 by the war office enumerated guest beds for 179 individuals and stabling for 287 horses in Southampton (see FIG 2.1.3). In 1623, more ambitiously, the corporation had informed the Privy Council that 'four hundred beds can be provided in inns, alehouses and private houses'. In what is becoming a familiar story, there is much evidence that visitors used these facilities extremely fluidly and with little regard to institutional distinctions or social status. The main distinguishing criteria seems to have been whether or not stabling was available, as in 1670 when a butcher from Kent describes how he found quarters at 'The Spread Eagle in Southampton being a house which does not usually entertain horses or horsemen'. While travellers with horses would probably have been limited to the

122 Tlusty, Bacchus, pp. 167-80.
123 SRO SC9/3/5, Fo. 22r; SC9/3/7, Fos. 37v-38r.
124 RBII, p. 151.
125 CLI, p. 151.
126 NA WO 30/48, Fo. 75; CSPD 1619-23, p. 608.
127 SRO SC9/3/14, Fo. 5r.
town's inns, foot passengers engaged a promiscuous range of institutions at different levels of the victualling hierarchy, often within the context of the same itinerary where, in a deviation from current practice, different institutions would be utilised on different nights. In 1624, Oxford minister William Morgan described how he and a colleague (a curate from the nearby village of Millbrook) lay at The George on Wednesday, The Dolphin on Thursday, The George again on Friday, and on Saturday 'in the evening... came together to the house of one Roger Morse of this town [an alehouse in Holy Rood parish] and there took up a chamber from their lodging'. From the other end of the spectrum, in 1578 a servant described how, after staying at a series of alehouses on the Isle of Wight, he arrived in Southampton and 'lay at the sign of The George'.

Lodging practices were closely bound up with eating and drinking; indeed, for publicans, bills for food and drink could often be parlayed into more substantial reckonings for full board. In 1586, for example, a Winchester shearman described how he and a colleague arrived at an Above Bar alehouse operated by blacksmith James Coppins at four o'clock in the afternoon, 'the first house he came in where he drank a pot or two of beer'; this led inexorably to supper at nine o'clock, and ultimately to an overnight stay. It was in contexts of heavy imbibing that even townsmen could end up sleeping in public houses. In 1586, baker Robert Starce and two other local craftsmen stayed over in an alehouse operated by town cook Richard Rich after a night of drinking and gaming at Rich's and a clutch of other institutions; Starce described emerging bleary-eyed into the hall the following morning to encounter one of his companions 'lying upon the bench' and another 'in the chimney'. Likewise, at St Mary Bourne in 1580, a group of young men from the village recounted how they were 'making merry with drink and cards in the hall of an alehouse operated by Leonard Mills (who later acquired the leases to The Crown inn in Southampton) when 'being sleepy [they] went into the chamber by the hall to lie down upon the bed to sleep'.

Stays could last considerably longer. In 1639, unemployed labourer John Bodle from Hailsham in Sussex described how he arrived in Southampton 'a month last past... where he hath ever since lay at the sign of The Crown'. Some individuals seem to have lived on a near-permanent basis in public houses, which must in these circumstances...
have acquired some of the characteristics of multiple occupancy or extended households. Civic leaders, ever-keen to foreclose the settlement opportunities of outsiders, attempted to suppress these extended sojourns; in 1575 St Michael's tippler 'French Nick' was again fined 6d for receiving undertenants;\(^{134}\) while in 1581 court leet jurors warned that 't[he] number of strangers... lodged in inns is increasing'.\(^{135}\) However, such patterns of long-term residency appear to have been common. At least two strangers were living in *The Crown* inn in Holy Rood parish in the mid-seventeenth century,\(^{136}\) while in 1606 Mary Palmer, a widow and a member of the French Church, was called to the Audit House as an 'undertenant at *The King's Head* where she had 'lived for xvii years or upwards'.\(^{137}\) The tendency of innkeepers especially to have played host to guests of long-standing is suggested by inventories which disclose rooms allocated to specific individuals ('Slider's Chamber', 'The Old Woman's Chamber'), while, as we have seen, in 1581 Richard Long actually died in his chamber at *The Dolphin* after a long residency necessitated by the elopement of his wife.\(^{138}\)

Moving onto the material and spatial frameworks of dormitory practice, beds, truckle beds and sleep-related textiles were all about in early modern public houses. Small alehouses might have had two, larger ones over ten, and inns up to the forty-four enumerated by *The Dolphin* overseers in 1570. They all had feather mattresses, while a profusion of coverings, hangings and other accoutrements made them cosier and enhanced their visual appeal; the three beds which occupied the 'new hall' had silk quilts and coverings of tapestry, and were adorned with valances, bolsters and hangings.\(^{139}\) Their equivalents in alehouses tended to be filled with rougher materials and to have simpler coverings. The eight beds crowded into Peter Hendrick's small alehouse on the West Quay, for example, were filled with flock or straw and dressed with 'old blankets'.\(^{140}\) However, even within alehouses, beds could carry the more ambitious material aspirations of their keepers, and a range of hierarchies of age, rank and gender could be

\(^{134}\) SRO SC5/3/1, Fo. 152r.

\(^{135}\) CLIJ, p. 232.

\(^{136}\) In 1644 'Mr Ireton, a stranger living at *The Crown* was selling goods to other strangers, while in 1649 Arthur Roles claimed that he lodged at *The Crown* 'the the consent of one Hugh Dickery who lives in the same house'. SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 11v; SC9/3/12, Fo. 23r.

\(^{137}\) MB p. 50. For similar cases, often involving entire families, see ibid., pp. 55, 67, 76, 102, 109; SRO SC2/1/6, Fos. 272v, 274r; SC9/1/14, Fo. 6; SC9/1/26, Fo. 1; SC9/3/12, Fo. 32v.

\(^{138}\) HRO 1581 B070.


\(^{140}\) HRO 1613 A38/1-2.
materially expressed via different orders and qualities of beds. In John Manfield's alehouse seven out of thirteen beds were feather with 'bolsters of the best' and 'fine canvas sheets', while Olive Addison had joined bedsteads of walnut and 'fine Holland sheets'. Even at the more typical institution maintained by urban yeoman John Ireland in St Michael's parish, the beds were mainly filled with feather and had 'coverlets of tapestry'.

The dispersal of beds throughout establishments suggests a high degree of nocturnal privacy within the town's public houses. There is no evidence in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries for the communal sleeping rooms that William Pantin has detected in medieval inns (the maximum number of beds per-chamber in The Dolphin in 1570 was four, while the twenty beds in The Bear in 1647 were distributed between nine chambers). These tendencies were reproduced in larger alehouses, where there is evidence that individual parties could lodge in separate rooms. In 1592, for example, Beaulieu gentleman Richard Neale described how he and his brother slept at an alehouse with two men they had met in The Dolphin but 'not in the same chamber where [he] and his brother lay'. Even in smaller alehouses, where shortage of space often necessitated a greater concentration of beds within individual rooms (for example, the five beds crammed into the forechamber of Roger Halliday's four-room establishment), in an intensification of general urban tendencies effort was made to keep beds out of main living spaces such as halls and parlours and confine them to functionally specialised chambers. Where aggregations were of necessity high, alehouse-keepers often furnished additional concealing devices; shoemaker John Mullins from St Michael's parish dressed each of the five beds standing in his 'back chamber' with 'green curtains'.

However, depositions reveal that these spatial unities were modified in social practice by some far more intimate arrangements. Patrons could share their rooms, or even their beds, with strangers. When scholar William Awder was staying with 'French Nick' in 1593 he described how he and an unfamiliar man were 'in bed both together', and this intimate practice of acquiring a 'bedfellow' (as a deponent at the inn at the
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141 This recapitulates findings on sleeping furniture in London lodging houses in Styles, 'Lodging at the Old Bailey', pp. 74-5.
142 HRO 1596 A080/1-2; 1612 B002/1-2.
143 HRO 1607 AD35.
144 Pantin, 'Medieval Inns', p. 184; PInv. II, pp. 280-9; HRO 1647 AD104/1-2.
145 SRO SC9/3/9, Fos. 3r-v.
146 HRO 1585 B38-1-2; Weatherill, Consumer Behaviour, p. 159.
147 HRO 1628 B53/1-5; SRO SC6/1/36, Fos. 6r-11v.
148 SRO SC9/3/9, Fos. 30r-31r.
Itchen ferry described it in 1590) continued well into the seventeenth century. In 1630, at an alehouse in St Michael’s parish, Joan Dally reported overhearing a whispered conversation between two lodgers ‘as they lay in their bed’, while as late as 1651 a soldier described how, on his way to the Southampton garrison, he fell into company with another man with whom he ‘lodged... at The Rose and Crown in one bed’. Lodgers were always vulnerable to other guests. In 1602, Richard Jones, a gentleman from Denbighshire, described how after eating and drinking at a tippling house operated by a sailor, ‘finding himself very weary with travel’ he elected to take a chamber. While he slumbered, ‘there came two sailors into the room... [who] finding him asleep and seeing he had a pair of green silk garters upon his legs came unto him and untied his garters’. Nor was there any attempt to distinguish guests according to gender, leading to some delicate scenarios akin to those detected by Amanda Flather in Essex lodging houses. In 1578, for example, labourer John Shaldon testified how, in the shared chamber of an alehouse in nearby Emsworth, bearer’s wife Joan Wooley ‘lay in another bed by the others and in the morning she... cast up the clothes and showed her tail... giving herself a clap on the thigh’.

Nor was accommodation at Southampton’s public houses guaranteed. In structural terms, notwithstanding the density of the port’s victualling provision high densities of troops (it was ‘more oppressed than anyone in the shire’ according to a petition sent to the Privy Council in 1628) placed considerable pressure on the lodging infrastructure. During the campaigns of the early 1650s the presence of some 1200 soldiers and Dutch prisoners of war stretched the landscape of drink to breaking point: ‘[T]he sick and wounded [are] already quartered in... victualling houses. The few inns that are here will only accommodate daily travellers, and there is no securing [of] prisoners in merchants’ or tradesmen’s houses’. In 1592, meanwhile, Beaulieu gentleman Richard Neale described how he and his sick brother were unable to secure accommodation at a town inn because ‘all the beds were full with soldiers’. However, in Neale’s case more situational factors were probably in operation (any publican would be reluctant to accept a sick individual onto their premises, and indeed during periods of plague publicans were

149 SRO SC9/3/9, Fos. 5v-6v.
150 E&D, p. 50; SRO SC9/3/12, Fo. 70v.
152 Flather, Gender and Space, p. 71.
153 SRO SC9/3/4, Fo. 2r.
154 CSPD 1628-9, p. 122.
155 CSPD 1652-3, p. 196.
156 SRO SC9/3/9, Fos 3r-v.
actually prohibited from lodging guests).\textsuperscript{157} Innholders and alehouse-keepers were also extremely wary of any lodgers whose ability to pay they doubted, or who might threaten the reputation of the house, even if they might have tolerated such guests under more fleeting circumstances.\textsuperscript{158} In 1630 Mary Audley accepted a stranger from Virginia onto her premises for supper but doubted that he could ‘give her satisfaction for... lodging’; while John Simons, landlord of \textit{The White Horse} inn Above Bar, claimed that when two men arrived at his house ‘about six or seven o’clock in the evening-tide... and then requested of [him] bedding’, he refused upon hearing that they were ‘lately out of trouble from London’.\textsuperscript{159} Indeed, despite his unsavoury reputation, or perhaps because of it, Simons seems to have been extremely conscientious in his vetting of overnight guests; in 1590, a girl out of service described laying ‘in the street as the searchers can witness about the door of \textit{The White Horse}, presumably after she was refused entry.\textsuperscript{160}

\textsuperscript{157} For example CLIII, p. 412; see P. Slack, \textit{The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England} (London, 1985), p. 93.
\textsuperscript{158} On the potential dangers of early modern lodging for those who purveyed it see Capp, ‘Lodging-House World’, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{159} E&DII, p. 60; SRO SC9/3/3, Fo. 25r.
\textsuperscript{160} SRO SC9/3/8, Fo. 2v.
4.2 ENTERTAINMENTS & NEWS

While the provision of drink, food and lodgings represented the core function of Southampton's public houses, a range of wide range of secondary functions and attributes gave these spaces their wider significance within the urban community, not least their functioning as centres of entertainments and news.

Entertainments

Public houses occupied a central place within Southampton's recreational culture as sites in which a wide variety of entertainments were organised (both legitimately and illegitimately). Indeed, these features are traditionally regarded to have increased in importance from the early sixteenth century as a complex of circumstances including increasing magisterial hostility to both Sunday sports and 'profane' uses of sacred space problematised the manifestation of drama, music and gaming within more traditional urban venues (churchyards and the broad expanse of town fields) and displaced them into more sequestered habitats. More recently, Emma Griffin's important accounts of recreation in provincial towns in the long eighteenth-century have encouraged us to enlarge our appreciation 'not simply of the politics of civic rituals, but also of the place', and to attend more self-consciously to 'the significance of space' in determining the shape and development of leisure activities. Her work has focussed primarily on the recreational possibilities represented by streets, squares and marketplaces, although a comparable set of spatial attributes largely explains the popularity of public houses as 'stages for recreation' in early modern Southampton.

Inns were Southampton's foremost dramatic sites. Civic accounts reveal that, as in other boroughs, travelling companies regularly arrived in the town throughout the Tudor and Stuart period (including, inter alia, the Lord Stafford's Players, the Earl of Winchester's Players, the Prince Charles players and two groups of 'puppet players' who arrived in the town immediately following the Restoration in 1661); eight different

---

1 For classic statements see Clark, 'Alternative Society', pp. 61-3; Wrightson, 'Alehouses', pp. 9-10; Heal, Hospitality, pp. 358-60. For an intense spate of prosecutions of gaming in Hampshire churchyards see HRO 21 M65 C1/32/1, Fos. 11v-12r.
companies visited the town in the period 1576-7 alone. However, like most other provincial locations, Southampton had no purpose-built playhouse. As Siobhan Keenan has noted in her recent study of travelling players, inns possessed numerable attractions as surrogate structures. They afforded a wide range of readily adaptable indoor and outdoor playing spaces (especially in the form of galleried courtyards); enabled players to dine and sleep at their place of performance; and enclosed spacious and secure yards and out buildings for the storage of players' carts and other paraphernalia. The town’s foremost inn was mentioned in connection with players in 1540 (when the steward recorded a reimbursement from ‘the King’s Players at The Dolphin which played not’, a plague-related measure), while inns secured a virtual monopoly on the staging of performances in 1623 when the council, following mounting complaints from court leet jurors, disallowed the co-option of the Guildhall over the Bargate as a playing venue in 1623 (FIG. 4.2.1). Not only did ‘the suffering of stage players to act their interludes there’ draw a ‘great concourse of disordered people both by day and night’, but the ‘very

6 SRO SC5/1/39.
hurtful, troublesome and inconvenient' spatial rearrangements entailed by performances disrupted the careful social coding of space 'for that the table benches and forms... set and placed for holding the king's courts are by those means broken and spoiled or at least... so disordered that the mayor and bailiffs and other officers of the said courts coming thither for the administration of justice... cannot sit there in decent and convenient order'. Although the bullring on English Street was also used, like the authorities in Salisbury and Bridgnorth, the corporation actively encouraged the use of public houses as a more suitable alternative: 'Hereafter if any such stage or puppet players must be admitted in this town... they [should] provide their place for their representations in the inns'.

On a more quotidian basis, public houses at all levels of the hierarchy were important centres for an urban musical culture that is attracting increasing scholarly attention. Itinerant fiddlers, pipers and percussionists would have engaged them (sadly, no traces of these melodic patrons survive in the records), while the town's indigenous musical culture was firmly embedded in alehouses. Succumbing to a common occupational hazard, musician Stephen Chaplin was divested of his licence to perform for 'drunkenness and other misdemeanours' in 1619, while it was not uncommon for one of the five badge and liveried town musicians to be awarded alehouse or tavern licences to supplement their official stipends; alehouse-keepers William Tompson in 1609, William Greene and John Brown between 1619 and 1620, and taverner Thomas Spaight in 1639 (when he was fined 10s for allowing a servant to drink at his tavern until he was 'distempered'). As we have seen, musician Brown had traded in an unlicensed capacity from his tenement in New Corner since at least 1615 when the beadles of All Saints swooped after 'hearing a great noise there'; such was the unsavoury reputation of
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7 CLIII, p. 578; SC2/1/6, Fo. 212r.
8 Rance, Southampton, p. 66.
9 Keenan, Travelling Players, p. 92; CLIII, p. 578.
11 SRO SC2/1/6, Fo. 195r; on drunkenness as a 'characteristic of an itinerantly musical lifestyle' see E. Cockayne, 'Cacophony', p. 43. It might be significant in this case that Chaplin's brother William was also an alehouse-keeper. See SRO SC6/1/38, Fos. 6r-10r. On the functions of the town musicians see Davies, History of Southampton, pp. 216-17.
12 ABI, p. 61; SRO SC9/2/1, Fos. 38r-39v, 55r-56v; SC2/1/6, Fo. 311r. In 1605 the Assembly ordered that 'the town musicians, in number five of them, shall have this year and so every year hereafter each of them a black livery coat at the town's charges'. MB, p. 107.
his house at this point that despite 'making petition' (usually a successful strategy) he was still 'absolutely put down from further tippling'.\(^{13}\) Inventories taken on behalf of taverners often disclose instruments, either for their own use or for that of musically-inclined patrons: Reginald House's tavern contained a 'pair of virginals' (a kind of small harpsichord), while that of John Pitt contained two lutes.\(^{14}\) Cooper John Manfield, meanwhile, had paid for his alehouse licence in kind with a drum.\(^{15}\)

However, it was as settings for a variety of urban games and sports that public houses featured most prominently. Early modern games can be distinguished into the more expansive ball-based varieties (bowls, ninepins, quoits, tennis and football), and predominantly indoor pursuits featuring dice, cards and discs/pennies whose scope was confined to the tabletop. In terms of the former, the corporation recognised a range of official sites. The town had a licensed tennis court,\(^{16}\) while in Southampton, as for the southwest generally, bowling had a large following; there was a sanctioned 'half bowling alley' inside a Queen's College property on Bull Street, as well as a fashionable outdoor bowling green (known as God's House Green) at the bottom of Orchard Lane outside the Eastern circuit of walls where, according to a visitor in 1635, 'many gentlemen, with the gentle merchants of this town take their recreations' (FIG. 4.2.2a).\(^{17}\) However, as his

\(^{13}\) CLIII, pp. 485-6; AB IV, p. 5. For more proceedings against the turbulent Brown see SRO SC2/1/6, Fo. 188r; SC9/2/1, Fos. 9v, 26v.
\(^{14}\) PInv.II, p. 378; HRO 1628 A58/1-2.
\(^{15}\) In 1587 'Preston' was paid 5s 6d 'for new heading the drum John Manfield gave the town for his fine for his recognizance for tippling'. SRO SC5/3/1, Fo. 212r.
\(^{16}\) SRO SC5/3/1, Fo. 202v.
observation suggests, access to these authorised venues was likely to be extremely circumscribed for all but the wealthiest citizens, especially given the flowering of bowling as a fashionable elite pastime; as Griffin has noted, any notion that 'the poor had access to a wide and varied range of spaces for recreation... evokes a degree of nostalgia for the simpler life of a preindustrial age... [that] does not quite grasp the reality of public space'. Indeed, in 1600 the leet jurors complained that '[t]he artificers, etc, continue to bowl at God's House Green [with] no redress... which is a thing noted not only by the better sort of this town but also by gentleman strangers resorting to that place, we do desire Mr Mayor and the rest of the Justices to take better regard of it'. The assembly sometimes acted on these recommendations, as in 1596 when mayor Andrew Studley fined six 'artificers' for bowling on the green.

Bowling on the part of the lower orders was thus displaced into other settings. These were not always public houses; gaming in town gardens was possible (in 1613 William Knitchen was presented by the leet jurors for 'delivering bowls to men' at their dwelling houses), while a search warrant issued to leet jurors in 1565 suggests that the grounds of the ruined castle as well as the lanes 'back of the walls' were commonly made over for the purpose (see FIG. 2.2.5). However, drinking places had particular affinities for competitive outdoor play, offering ample liquid resources for bets and refreshment, as well as a wide range of agents who comprised challengers and audiences for feats of skill and accuracy. Many enterprising alehouse-keepers provisioned their gardens (or 'backsides') with the necessary infrastructure in the form of full or 'half' bowling alleys; according to court leet jurors four individuals, all from the drinks trade, were maintaining 'common bowling alleys' in 1550, as was tippler and town cook Richard Rich in 1590 and Simon Reston at Magdalen House on the New Corner in 1620. The practice was most closely associated with the clutch of suburban tippling houses that operated in and around the King's Orchard (FIG. 4.2.1b), where the 'continual bowling' of 'handicraft men and men's servants' often seemed to leet jurors an intolerable parody of the games of the better sort taking place at God's House Green a short stroll down Orchard Lane.
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19 Griffin, 'Popular Recreation', p. 37.
20 CLII, pp. 334-5.
21 SRO SC5/3/1, Fo. 202v.
22 CLIII, p. 456; SC6/1/5, Fo. 12r.
23 CLI, p. 9; CLII, pp. 361, 328.
24 See CLI, pp. 24, 134; CLII pp. 179, 182, 215, 234.
Conventional wisdom posits a decline of outdoor games during the 1700s, although bowling at skittles in the gardens of Southampton's public houses remained a prominent urban pastime down to the eighteenth century. As late as 1745, victualler William Brackstone from extramural St Mary's parish was presented for maintaining 'in his garden or backside... a common bowling alley, kettle pin alley, a place of gaming'.

The town's entrenched culture of bowling should not occlude the efflorescence of indoor games in public house contexts, especially in winter, during bouts of bad weather, or at night. An information from 1570, for example, describes three local men 'playing at bowls in the King's Orchard' before transferring to The George inn to play dice with the fading light. The case captures the predominance of dicing in sixteenth-century contexts; servants were dicing at The White Horse in 1574, at The Dolphin and The Crown in 1577, and again at The George in 1589. By the early 1600s cheap printed playing cards had proliferated in the town, and indeed were often acquired in alehouses (in 1651, Thomas Pottinger explained to examining magistrates that the pack of cards discovered in his cloak bag was 'bought... at an alehouse in London'). In 1607 William Nightingale was summoned to the Audit House 'to answer for his misdemeanour in lying night and day playing at cards and drinking at Harvey's an alehouse [The Ship] in St Michael's parish', a Wiltshire upholsterer was 'at cards' in his chamber in The George in 1623, while in 1656 Edward Langhe described how he 'fell to play at cards with one Matthew Jones a soldier' at The Virginia alehouse in Holy Rood parish.

Other indoor games required more specialised apparatus that was far more likely to be found in public houses than in domestic environments. Tables, an early form of backgammon, was popular from the sixteenth century and manifested at all levels of the hierarchy: two men were 'at tables' in Robert Fuller's tavern in 1574; alehouse-keeper John Pratt was presented for 'having table playing in his cellar' in 1600; while three local men, including the tapster, were 'at tables' at The Crown inn in 1652 (where the game resulted in a brawl and thus ended up before magistrates). They are a common constituent of inventories. The forechamber of The Dolphin contained a deluxe 'pair of

25 SRO SC9/4/307. See also the late seventeenth-century court leet presentments for skittle offences at SC6/1/59, Fo. 16v; SC6/1/61, Fo. 35; SC6/1/63, Fo. 10r; SC6/1/64, Fo. 26r; SC6/1/65, Fo. 13v; SC6/1/66, Fo. 11v; SC6/1/67, Fo. 11r; SC6/1/68, Fo. 12r.
26 SRO SC9/3/2 Fo. 4r.
28 SRO SC9/3/12, Fo. 71r.
29 MB, p. 75; E&DI, pp. 23-4; SRO SC9/3/12, Fo. 120v.
30 CLI, p. 104; SRO SC6/1/24, Fo. 21v; SC9/3/12, Fos. 93v-94v.
playing tables with a set of men unto them' in 1624.\textsuperscript{31} A pronounced vogue for shuffleboard, a game which required players push a small disk in a narrow elongated play area with the purpose of positioning it within a marked area, seems to have developed within the town during the 1600s. Nicholas Bulbeck maintained it at The George in 1613, while designated 'shuffleboard rooms' are mentioned in four seventeenth-century victualler's inventories (that of Thomas Heath boasted the additional convenience of a 'scoreboard').\textsuperscript{32} Finally, evidence of billiards facilities appears at the very end of the period. Five individuals were presented by leet jurors 'for keeping... billiard tables in their houses' in 1695, while according to Amy Froide singlewoman Mary Smith and her sisters ran an establishment that was popular for its billiards table in 1739.\textsuperscript{33}

\section*{News}

The town's public houses were also primary sites for the dissemination and discussion of news, suggesting that in Southampton they played a prominent role in something of a 'public sphere' that, for Habermas and scholars inspired by him, has hitherto been spatially located within the 'revolutionary' physical settings of the coffeehouse, provincial academy, freemasonic lodge and aristocratic salon.\textsuperscript{34} Like these later environments, they were littered by a wide range of textual matter that could form the stimulus for communicative practices in an age characterised by the intertwining of oral and written forms. While there is no evidence that Southampton's innholders ever became formalised postmasters, that they represented key nodes within the epistolary networks that conveyed manuscripts between the different corners of early modern England is suggested by a detailed deposition from 1602.\textsuperscript{35} Michael Wandrick, a chandler who was occasionally retained to help load the carts passing through The Katherine Wheel inn Above Bar, described how Holborn carrier John Thompson told him 'by the next cart upon

\textsuperscript{31} HRO 1624 A41/1-2. For other references to 'playing tables' see PInv.II, pp. 281, 378; HRO 1604 AD42; 1608 AD20; 1608 AD58; 1621 A11/1-2.

\textsuperscript{32} CLIII, p. 436; HRO 1693 A055/1-3. See other shuffleboard references at HRO 1646 AD69; 1677 A104/1-2; 1692 AD11. See also court leet presentments for shuffleboard offences at SRO SC6/1/63, Fo. 10r; SC6/1/66, Fo. 11v; SC6/1/67, Fo. 11r; SC6/1/68, Fo. 12r.


delivery of his trunk he would send a letter from London to [Thomas] Box with [a] desire to this deponent to convey the letter to Box when it came to his hands'. Eight days later, 'being the very next return of the cart from London, he... amongst the bag of letters that the carrier brought from London did find one letter directed to the said Box safe sealed'. A fortnight later he delivered the letter to Box's wife when he saw her during a market day.36

While connections between the port's hostelries and print culture were not as fully developed as those found in the capital, they also contained printed texts. Inventories often disclose books. Bibles were ubiquitous, while the town's leading inns sometimes offered their patrons well-stocked libraries. At The Dolphin inn in 1624, assessors noted 'the book Camden', 'the history of England and Scotland', 'one bible and one common prayer book', 'nine books of divinity whereof one in Latin', 'one brief of chronicles and five other books of histories', as well as 'other divers books of small value'.37 To such small books and pleasant histories were added varieties of cheap print introduced by patrons.38 As we have seen, ballads often joined murals, hangings and paintings on alehouse walls,39 while depositions provide fragmentary glimpses of cheap print in circulation within and between these provincial institutions. In 1578, mariner Richard Bulling described how, while at The White Horse inn Above Bar one Sunday evening in 1578, 'the boy of the house gave unto [him] a small book of libels to read in and afterwards [he] carried the said book down with him to the house of Roger Halliday and drinking a pot of beer having not money about him to pay for the... beer left the said book with him until he had money to pay' (Halliday, a well-to-do tippler in Holy Rood parish, was probably not too aggrieved).40 When Thomas Clapshaw arrived at Southampton from Devon in 1586 and stayed at The George inn, he had 'certain books' in his pannier.41

Information contained in printed matter, as well as that communicated orally by arriving guests, was socialised and made sense of in public house settings; patrons

---

36 E&D, pp. 42-3. On the informal postal service offered by carriers in the Chiltern region see M. Frearson, 'The Mobility and Descent of Dissenters in the Chiltern Hundreds: Communications and the Continuity of Dissent in the Chiltern Hundreds during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', in Spufford, World of Rural Dissenters, pp. 273-5. Southampton's postal network was described as 'safe but slow' by the Privy Council in 1668. CSPD 1667-8, p. 307.
37 HRO 1624 A41/1-2.
39 Watt, Cheap Print, pp. 193-216.
40 SRO SC9/3/4, Fo. 8r; SC6/1/13, Fos. 5v-10v.
41 SRO SC9/3/7, Fo. 30r. See Withington, Politics of Commonwealth, p. 208.
regularly commented upon the religious and political phenomena of their time, their 'table talk' preserved in the records of an urban magistracy always alive to the seditious speech acts of visitors and townspeople. 42 In 1593 James Cox, a barber-surgeon from London, described how one Friday evening at John Roche’s alehouse in St Michael’s parish ‘from supper time until about eleven of the clock at night he was in conference with John Vaughan and others at Mr Roche’s door and within his house, about the scriptures and other matters’ which remain unspecified. 43 In 1628, meanwhile, in an example which neatly captures the intersections between textual resources and ideological expressions, servant Dorothy Tublin described how in the chamber of an alehouse operated by tailor Richard Pye in St Michael’s parish a scrivener from London ‘called for a jug of beer and drank thereof and shortly after, the said stranger looking upon a book lying in that chamber, the same book being (as this relater takes it) the Paraphrases of Erasmus and then throwing it down in a disdainful manner [she] said unto him these words... I think you are a papist to which he answered that [she] was a jade for saying so and added further that if God were not more merciful to our nation then there would not shortly be left this much of our nation pointing to within an inch of the top to one of his forefingers’. 44

The scrivener’s gesture was probably in reference to recent naval reversals in La Rochelle, suggesting that Southampton’s hostleries as well as those of the metropolis enclosed ‘a socially widespread, political dialogue concerning state affairs’. 45 In 1624, in a chamber of Roger Morse’s alehouse in St Michael’s parish, clothier John Percher, curate of Millbrook Mr Butler and Oxford minister William Morgan ‘fell in discourse together touching the wars in the Low Countries and so of England and Spain’. Their political dialogue is preserved in the records of quarter sessions because Morgan deemed Elizabeth I (whose likeness graced the north side of the Bargate) ‘a whore and a witch’; argued that ‘England was weak and the castles were weak naming the castles of Dover and Hurst and Calshot’ (the latter two defended the Southampton Water); claimed that ‘the king of Spain paid more in one year to his soldiers than all the revenues of England were worth’; and, in a final and virtuoso rhetorical flourish, claimed of Prince Henry that

---

43 SRO SC9/3/9, Fo. 69v; SC6/1/21, Fos. 8r-15v.
44 E&DII, p. 20; SRO SC6/1/43, Fos. 6r-10r.
45 A. McShane, ‘Roaring Royalists and Ranting Brewers: the Politicisation of Drink and Drunkenness in Political Broadside Ballads from 1640’, in Smyth, Pleasing Sinne, p. 84.
46 SRO SC6/1/27, Fos. 8r-14v.
before his body was cold on earth his soul was frying on a gridiron in hell'. Such comments, and certainly the records of them, proliferated in the 164Cs and 5Cs. In 1641, at his own alehouse in St Michael's parish, shoemaker John Pratt essayed geopolitics with his claim that 'the king had usurped three shires from the Scots which are Northumberland, Cumberland and Westmorland', while the examinations book for the period 1648-63 teems with examples of drunken attacks on the Lord Protector during the interregnum or Charles I or II immediately following the restoration.

However, more often, the economies of news and gossip that circulated within public houses exercised local traction. In 1641, shoemaker John Pratt was again discoursing freely, this time in the kitchen of a tavern operated by widow Dorothy Batson; indeed, it was probably his own status as an alehouse-keeper and news-broker of long-standing (he had been selling ale since 1619) that contributed to his garrulousness on national and local themes.

Brewer Christopher Benbury described how Pratt claimed 'you there you are one of the assessors [of the parliamentary subsidy]... a plague of god confound all the assessors and the devil in hell confound him that pays a penny'. When Benbury retorted that Pratt 'cursed better men than himself', the shoemaker declared that 'I care not a fart neither for the assessors nor those that taxed me, make all the friends you can of the... cony-skin weavers (meaning the brethren of this corporation)'. Called a knave by Benbury, he replied that 'if any JP of this town should call him knave he would call them knaves again to their faces'. Two sailors were in discussion about a suit then before the admiralty court at The Dolphin in 1627, while in 1642 at the same institution John Severn and Richard Read claim that 'the magistrates of this town might have been ashamed to imprison James Mudge and that they favoured papists'. In the same year, again at The Dolphin, Benbury himself came under magisterial scrutiny for his claim that 'the court leet jury did countenance false weights and measures' and that 'men paid for selling false measures'.
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47 E&DI, pp. 54-5. These comments came to the attention of the Privy Council; see CSPD 1623-5, p. 394.
48 E&DIV, p. 25. Pratt had been selling ale here since 1619. SRO SC6/1/36-51.
49 SRO SC9/3/12, Fos. 119r, 127r.
50 SRO SC6/1/51, Fo. 21v.
51 SRO SC6/1/36, Fos. 5v-13r.
52 E&DIV, p. 18.
53 Ibid., p. 43.
54 SRO SC9/2/10, Fos. 49v. 53v.
4.3 COMMERCIAL FUNCTIONS

Having delineated the core services of public houses and their secondary functioning as local centres of entertainments and news, we must now turn to the complex intersections between the landscape of drink and the borough economy more broadly figured. Via their connections with the carrying trade, public houses (especially inns) occupied legitimate locales in the networks that kept commodities in circulation between the port and its wide hinterland. Within the borough’s internal ‘world of goods’,¹ partaking of and extending recent historiographical emphasis on the ‘informal’ nature of the networks and practices that sustained preindustrial urban economies,² they represented key sites of commercial exchange and interaction, notwithstanding civic attempts to limit economic activity to a more select range of institutionalised venues.

Overland Trade

Although, as we have seen, improvements in Thames pilotage and the rise of Antwerp deprived Southampton of its status as a leading entrepôt for Mediterranean goods,³ the borough remained a busy regional port and market centre characterised by complex and near constant flows of goods.⁴ Analyses of extant port books for the late-sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have shown that throughout our period Southampton continued to import wine and vinegar from northern France and the Atlantic coast of Europe, linen and canvas from France (mainly Breton) and the Channel Islands as well as such staples as wood, coal, oil, tallow, millstones, salt and grains from other English ports such as Newcastle and London. On a much smaller scale, it imported tobacco from New England, Virginia and the West Indies, fish and train oil from Newfoundland, and hops,

naval stores and pottery from the Low Countries. Although never a major manufacturing centre, the commodities produced by borough artisans (especially the 'new draperies' introduced by the Walloon settlers in 1567) and the wheat, barley, oats and peas cultivated by the borough's market gardeners completed the trading portfolio.

Many of these goods were conducted overland. Southampton formed the centre of a well-established system of carting routes that radiated over much of southern England, and a unique survival of 'brokage books' (the accounts of the broker who collected customs on all goods which entered or left the town via the northern Bargate) discloses an extensive (re)distributive trade that encompassed the Hampshire basin for staples, bulky items and household goods and extended into the adjacent counties of Dorset, Wiltshire and Sussex for wines, linen and canvas. The town was physically linked to other inland centres by modes of road transportation whose importance and increasing sophistication within the preindustrial English economy has been most trenchantly stated by John Chartres. From the mid-fifteenth century carts and packhorses plied to and from Southampton during all four seasons of the year; by the mid-sixteenth century there was 'a core of professional carters'; while in the seventeenth century long-wheelbase wagons and the introduction of scheduled carrying services embedded the town in regularised transportation networks. Although John Taylor's 1637 guide The Carriers Cosmographie makes no mention of Southampton among its enumeration of carrying operations between London and the provincial centres they almost certainly existed at this point (Norwich, for example, is also excluded), while Thomas De Laune's 1681 handbook The Present State of London identified three weekly services between the port and the metropolis (via Winchester and Alton).

Although synergies between carrying and public houses were not as close or institutionalised as those that developed with stagecoach services in the eighteenth century.

---

8 Stevens, Brokage Books, p. xvii.
10 Freeman, 'Road Transport', p. 102.
century, inns provided a crucial infrastructure for the carters and wagoners that arrived at and left the town from a much earlier period. Carriers did not always utilise inns, especially if their journeys were short (in 1597 John Pocock described 'having his cart laden with coals in the High Street'), although if an overnight layover was required inns were the natural site, offering accommodation and refreshments for both carrier and horse; spacious and secure storage areas (a carrier's fustian was locked in a barn at The George in 1593); innholders who could take receipt of and supervise merchandise; as well as an extensive cast of dedicated agents to assist in the dressing of horses and the loading of cargoes.

As we have seen, the suburban inns Above Bar offered particular logistical attractions in the form of expansive configurations and ready access to fields and supporting services to which they were adjacent (a large smithy was located between The George and The White Horse) and which they sometimes incorporated; Thomas Broker, who established The Katherine Wheel, was also a wheelwright. The Bear was specifically designed as a carrying in by John Warner under the Mompesson scheme in 1617, casting doubt on Chartres' verdict that innholders seldom deliberately ensnared road transport before the stagecoach era, and depositions offer valuable incidental glimpses into the ways in which it furnished institutional support for carriers from the Hampshire hinterland and beyond. In 1639 Richard Baker, a husbandman from the Hampshire market town of Abbots Ann, described how one Tuesday evening 'his wagon laden with cloth stood in the backside of the inn called The Bear' (it belonged to merchant Peter Seale), while an earlier set of testimonies offers a more sustained insight into carrying regimes in action. According to ostler William Mason, who we have already encountered, one evening in 1631 the inn was hosting both 'the Andover carrier' and 'the Salisbury carrier', the latter with a consignment of linen for Southampton merchant George Gollop (Salisbury, with its thriving cloth industry, was 'by far the largest branch of Southampton's overland commerce'). He locked the gates of the inn and went to bed at eleven o'clock, leaving innholder John Warner and his wife 'in the hall by the fire [with] the carters', but was woken again at two in the morning by the arrival of Henry Clark, 'who help[s] the Salisbury carrier dress his horses'. Assisted by lanterns they 'help[ed] the
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11 On these connections in other contexts see Chartres, 'Capital's Provincial Eyes', pp. 31-8; and idem, 'English Inn', pp. 216-7.
12 Coal, as a bulky staple, only travelled relatively short distances. SC9/3/4, Fo. 2v.
13 SRO SC9/3/9, Fo. 65r.
15 E&DIV, p. 96.
16 Stevens, Brokage Books, pp. xxvi-xxvii.
carriers away’, ‘dressing the... horses’ and ‘help[ing] put the thiller in the cart’. The carriers left via the Windmill Lane exit ‘between four and five o’clock’. Although the theft of two packs of linen rendered this situation somewhat untypical, the prevalence of ‘doth usuallys’ in the account suggests the typicality of the tasks and movements described.

While the town’s suburban inns seem to have acquired a distinct carrying profile, and although intramural inns were to spearhead coaching development in the eighteenth century, clear-cut distinctions between ‘carrying’ and ‘coaching’ establishments had yet to develop for the majority of the period under consideration, and inns within the walls also had links with the carriage of goods. The Star and The Dolphin in particular offered many of the same logistical advantages as the Above Bar inns, such as convenient roads leading from their backsides (see FIG. 2.2.5), large lockable yards, and prominent sites on a main thoroughfare which would prevent carriers from having to negotiate the back lanes of French and Bull Street which were tortuous and unpaved. The names of their chambers, as we have seen, adumbrate these close connections with wider economic networks; The Dolphin in 1570 had both a ‘Salisbury chamber’ and a ‘Kendalman’s chamber’, the latter almost certainly inhabited at one point by Stephen Bateman, a full-time carter from Cumbria who bore consignments of cloth between Southampton and Kendal over a long career that lasted between 1492 and 1546. A sparsely appointed space, it contained four feather mattresses distributed between two standing bedsteads and two sliding truckles (the latter most likely for the servants by which carriers were normally accompanied).

Internal Exchanges

Within the town itself, as in other boroughs, governors attempted to confine the legal exchange of commodities to a limited range of spatial settings. As well as permanent retail premises, the open marketplace retained its significance throughout the early modern period, and ancient guild merchant ordinances confirmed three weekly markets for fish, meat and poultry, the most for any town in Hampshire; the fish market took place in St Michael’s square (FIG 4.3.1a), butchers traded from stalls around the Friar’s

---

17 E&DII, pp. 100-1.
18 Temple Patterson, Southampton, pp. 74-5.
The legitimate sites of economic exchange in early modern Southampton: the fish market (a); the butcher's shambles (b); the poultry market pre-1570 (c); the poultry market post-1570 (d); and the Linen Hall/Tin House (e).

Gate (b), while the largest poultry market (which also featured corn and other consumer wares) was originally held in an open area at the top of the High Street adjacent to St Lawrence's church (c). In 1570 the corporation conferred additional institutional permanence on the latter by relocating it to a specialised market house in the form of a 'comely and well-built extension' to the south side of the Audit House, further down the High Street (d). To these weekly market venues were added four annual town fairs, confirmed by royal charter. The most important was the venerable Trinity Fair, granted in 1496 to facilitate 'a greater confluence of our subjects and others... with free ingress and egress for all our subjects coming thither to trade'. Specialising in horses, cattle and leather, the fair was held on the grounds of a disused chapel to the northeast of the town.


Davies, History, pp. 126-8.

on Trinity Monday and for the three days following. Finally, there was the two-storey Linen Hall and Tin House, originally in St Michael’s square but rebuilt on Westgate Street in 1634 (e), which constituted the town’s only legitimate site for the storage and sale of imported linens and tin ware (Fig. 4.3.2).

A variety of related logics shaped attempts to fix trading activity to these formal locales. On the one hand, the use of such ‘open’ venues exposed bargains to the scrutiny of a wide range of civic agents charged with ensuring the legitimacy of dealings and protecting consumers from unfair trading practices; the relocation of the poultry market immediately to the south of the seat of corporate ‘auditing’ in 1570 was not coincidental. The three town marketplaces were overseen by the mayor in his capacity as clerk of the market as well as four roving ‘discreets’ with a dispensation to burn ‘unwholesome victuals’, Trinity Fair was superintended by the head bailiff (who maintained a booth on the remote fair site) and fell within the jurisdiction of the Piepowder Court, while a salaried keeper supervised transactions in the combined Linen Hall and Tin House. However, there was also civic self-interest; the use of these sites generated vital revenues

---

24 Three further fairs were granted by Elizabeth I in 1600, although these failed to flourish. See Davies, History, pp. 232-3.
in the form of rents and duties, helped realise ancient guild ordinances that burgesses
should have first refusal on imported goods, and in particular reduced the likelihood that
commodities might be ‘foreign bought and sold’ (corporation parlance for any direct
dealing between non-enfranchised individuals by which they might avoid charges due to
the town and endanger the profits of the burgess body who wished to buy cheap and sell
dear). Many of these impulses discursively converge in an order from 1553 which
attempted to bind the storage and sale of imported linens to the designated Linen Hall. It
was complained that ‘the merchants resorting to this town with linen cloth hath contrary
to all good orders... laid it to hostelage in inns and other houses in corners, the town
having both lofts and warehouses meet for the same’. Two problems followed from this;
it not only enabled strangers to avoid such ‘duties of the town as petty custom[s], ostilage
[storage fee] and brokage [fees paid to the impartial sworn brokers who arranged
contacts]’, but any unregulated sales ‘uttered in corners’ were likely to be ‘to the deceit of
the buyers and dishonest [to] the state of the town’. As such, strangers were banned
hitherto from carrying their merchandise to ‘any other place or places as shall be
purposely appointed, and that they make no sales thereof until it be brought into the said
place’. 25

However, notwithstanding these attempts to institutionalise them, as in the
Leicester recently evoked by Yoh Kawana, in practice economic exchange was widely
diffused into a variety of unofficial environments beyond market, fair and hall, among
which public houses featured prominently. 26 Inns seem routinely to be have used for the
receipt and vending of strangers’ goods (that the 1553 order did not end this practice is
suggested by the fact that, during the Caroline period, a new guild ordinance was inserted
that explicitly forbade innkeepers from taking in foreign merchandise). 27 While the
corporation fashioned any foreign buying and selling as ‘private’, 28 a much wider range of
attributes made inns attractive venues, including the involvement of innkeepers in
mercantile sectors, their provision of secure storage facilities, and their status as natural
arenas for stranger-to-stranger interactions. The Star, which descended from merchant to
merchant in the late Tudor and early Stuart periods, was closely associated with the
storage and sale of foreign textiles. In 1565 its keeper Peter Janverin was briefly

25 RBII, pp. 43-4. In the same year a keeper of the linen hall was appointed, a designated Linen Book
was supplied for the recording of storage receipts and transactions (of which six are extant; see
SC5/7/1-6), while in future individuals were fined for storing or selling goods ‘out of the hall’. See for
example SRO SC5/3/1, Fo. 99v.
26 Kawana, ‘Trade, Sociability and Governance’.
27 Davies, History of Southampton, p. 135.
28 For example SRO SC2/1/6, Fo. 268r.
disburgessed for ‘colouring’ two fardels of canvas for a merchant stranger (this refers to the practice of importing and storing them under his own name, thereby evading the customs duties which all non-burgesses were obliged to pay), while in 1609 it provided the venue for a sale of kerseys between two individuals from the Hampshire market towns of Odiham and Farnham. In 1644 one ‘Mr Ireton’, a stranger dwelling at The Crown (a smaller inn in Holy Rood within close proximity to the southern quay), was selling ‘divers wares and commodities to strangers’. Foreign buying and selling also manifested at lower levels of the victualling hierarchy. In 1589 merchant Henry Giles, who also kept a tavern at the end of Broad Lane, was disburgessed for ‘colouring’ half a ton of Gascony wine for a merchant stranger and selling it on under his own name to one Yeats of Newbury. Even alehouses were involved. In 1590 Burladie Darvall, a shoemaker originally from the Channel Islands who sold ale from All Saints parish, was fined 5s by court leet jurors when during a routine inspection of his weights and measures they apprehended ‘in sight in his house one ballet [of] canvas... and there [it] is sold as though it were in the linen hall’, while in 1633 two alehouse-keepers were summoned to the Audit House ‘and questioned for entertaining strangers’ goods at their houses whereas it should be carried to the hall’.

As in Northampton, public houses were also connected with the sale of other goods that, while not bound to the Linen Hall, should technically have been directed to the open market or fair. They were natural territories for this ‘private marketing’. As we have seen, inns (and some alehouses) were often held by those merchants and urban yeomen that were well-placed to undertake middleman activity, while there were also practical incentives for such institutional migrations. While the suburban fairground and three town marketplaces were predicated on accessibility and inclusiveness, as magistrates complained in 1570 in relation to the construction of the covered market house, their unsheltered nature regularly exposed users to ‘rain and tempest... whereby their said victuals and necessaries [are] greatly impaired... as well the buyers as the sellers

29 RBII, pp. 96-7.
30 On this occasion, while the goods were forfeited for the town’s use, the innholder Richard Singleton evaded charge. ABII, pp. 72-3.
31 SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 11v.
32 RBIII, pp. 60-1.
33 CLII, p. 292. Darvall is identified as a ‘tippler’ in All Saints in the stall and art rolls for the same year. SC6/1/21, Fos. 8r-15v.
34 SRO SC2/1/6, Fo. 268v.
thereof much... hurt in their bodies'. 36 We know from churchwardens’ accounts that two stalls were rented on either side of the St Lawrence church porch as well as in its vestry (the latter was occupied by a glover and a shoemaker in 1577), 37 and that neighbouring inn The Star was also one of the beneficiaries of the uncovered nature of the original poultry market is strongly suggested by the prominence of its keeper Peter Janverin among seven burgesses, all St Lawrence residents, who objected strongly to its relocation to the covered market house some 120 feet further down the High Street. That their petition was commercially motivated is further suggested by a defence of the relocation, drawn up by the corporation and sent to the Privy Council, that characterised local opposition as ‘private disliking’ designed ‘to serve... humours and private gain than... any just cause or consideration’. 38

A very wide range of goods appear regularly to have been sold at the borough’s inns. Imported cereals, especially vulnerable to damage by rain and wind in open settings, were often conveyed there. In 1581 court leet jurors complained that ‘meal men... do use to set into John Sedgwick’s, Peter Janverin’s and Roger Halliday’s their sacks with meal and malt contrary to order’; Sedgwick and Janverin held The Dolphin and The Star, while Halliday was an urban yeoman and alehouse-keeper of long-standing from Holy Rood parish (where he was assessed for stall and art at the high rate of 18d in the same year). 39 Horses, officially bound to Trinity Fair where purchases were entered into a toll book, seem often to have been sold from suburban inn The White Horse, 40 while fish and meat might also be diverted from their dedicated market to public houses. In 1577 a ‘bargain of fish’ was on offer at Above Bar inn The White Horse, against stipulations that it had to be sold during the hours of daylight in St Michael’s square, 41 while in 1603, after a reiteration of the square as the most ‘fitting’ place for piscine sales, the leet jurors urged the discreet of the market to ensure that fishermen did not sell it to ‘rippiers’ at Itchen Ferry or ‘at the inns and taverns in the town’. 42 In 1670 town butchers Thomas Lee and

36 RBII, pp. 110-2.
37 SRO PR4/2/1, Fos. 19r, 42r.
38 RBII, pp. 165-9.
39 CLII, p. 210; HRO 1585 B38/1-2; SRO SC6/1/16, Fos. 5r-9v.
41 G. H. Hamilton (ed.), Books of Examinations and Depositions 1570-1594, SR Soc. 16 (Southampton, 1914), p. 29 [the folio on which this incident was recorded is now missing from the MS examination book]; RBII, p. 57. Cellars, the town quays and boats were other common locations for the illicit sale of fish. See SRO SC5/3/1, Fos. 128r, 138v, 139r.
42 SRO SC6/1/27, Fo.
George Veale eschewed the stipulated Friar's Gate and sold their flesh instead at the coach house of *The Dolphin* and the gate of *The Crown*.\(^{43}\)

If inns and taverns were co-opted by those merchants, urban yeomen and craftsmen who negotiated the upper reaches of the market, it was common for alehouse-keepers to supplement their sale of drink with 'huckstering'. Although the noun 'huckster' was applied to street-sellers in many regions, in Southampton as in Salisbury and Scotland a 'huckster' evoked an individual, most usually (but not exclusively) female, who specialised in buying up foodstuffs and small household items wholesale and selling them on from their own premises to the very poor in lesser quantities, and often at lower quality, than what was available at open market.\(^{44}\) Operating at the economic margins, they were regarded with suspicion by civic governors, and while hucksters were tolerated (in 1657 a widow was licensed to keep a huckster's shop selling 'small wares and victuals') they were implicated almost by definition in a full range of market abuses: forestalling, regrating and engrossing.\(^{45}\) They were also closely associated with alehouse-keeping; in 1574 the court leet jury went so far as to claim that 'all of the tipplers in this town are hucksters', and 'alehouse-keepers and hucksters' are discursively conjoined in many of their subsequent presentments.\(^{46}\) The dovetailing of these activities is not surprising. Huckstering, like alehouse-keeping, featured within a repertoire of 'shifting' strategies by which the poor might bolster precarious household economies. Additionally, the sale of drink probably gave individuals both the necessary liquidity to buy up articles in bulk as well as ready access to a market for purchases among the town's poorer inhabitants.

A more detailed picture of the town's alehouse-keeper/hucksters emerges from presentments made against individuals. Sometimes, activities were organised on a large scale. John James, a prosperous urban yeoman who kept a large alehouse in Holy Rood parish, must have maintained a substantial trade as not only was he presented as a 'tippler and huckster' in 1615 but his 'trad[ing] and deal[ing]' was additionally held to be against 'all good orders of the town' because, while enfranchised, he was 'no burgess'. The 'great piles of wet fish' and 'dry fish' enumerated in his inventory give some insight into his range, while the following year his widow Alice was presented for selling pepper and

\(^{43}\) SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 267v.


\(^{45}\) SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 130r.

\(^{46}\) CLI, pp. 104, 140; SRO SC6/1/42. Fo. 18r; SC6/1/32, Fos. 22v-23r.
starch. However, a typical huckster seems to have been a female alehouse-keeper, often unlicensed, with a more modest range of operations, perhaps reflecting restrictions on female participation in retail activity (in 1607 George Exton’s daughter was refused permission ‘to open a shop Above the Bar, and sell small wares by retail’). In 1632, an elderly widow and unlicensed alehouse-keeper Marie Woodyer was called before the assembly and ultimately bound over ‘for selling crockery wares... and saying she would sell it if the justices should hang her, and for abusing the Widow Tirrell and Goodwife Clements [who informed on her retailing activities] in calling of them frightful devils’. Likewise, in 1657 it was reported that ‘the Widow Gilsage does sell ale and does sell small wares as a huckster’.

Drinking houses also offered venues for the still looser and more spontaneous sets of economic interactions that comprised the petty business of townspeople in a period in which secondary markets and resale were structurally embedded features of the English economy. On the basis of his analysis of pre-trial examinations generated by the quarter sessions of Leicester, Yoh Kawana has recently concluded that public houses did not feature as prominently as domestic dwellings as venues for these informal dealings. This is related to the fact that unofficial economic activities were ‘more likely to be found in the areas hidden from the eyes of officials or neighbours’, with ordinary houses accounting for 66% of his sample comparing to a mere 9% for public houses. However, these figures should be approached with extreme caution. In particular, pre-trial data in isolation cannot be used confidently to determine whether the locale being used for an exchange was a public house or a private dwelling. Informants, deponents and examinees would not always specify if ‘the house of x’ was an inn, tavern or especially alehouse (perhaps assuming local knowledge on the part of magistrates, or maybe wishing to conceal their own drinking behaviours), so in the absence of systematic cross-referencing with a borough’s victualling records a reliance on the categorisation of witnesses is likely to severely under-represent the real number of public houses. Indeed, in several instances Kawana cites cases of ‘domestic’ dealings where agents refer to circumstantial activity such as drinking or gaming that strongly implies that the premises

47 CLIII, pp. 488, 527; HRO 1615 AD40.
48 MB, p. 102.
49 SRO SC/2/1, Fo. 256r; SC9/2/10, Fo. 5r. Woodyer is not explicitly identified as an unlicensed alehouse-keeper, although we can infer that she was operating as such because in 1619 a town brewer was indicted for serving her with 20 tuns of beer. See SC9/2/1, Fo. 41r.
50 SRO SC9/1/9, Fo. 5.
in question were in fact functioning as alehouses. Nor is his explanation that informal dealings relied for their effectiveness on concealment particularly convincing. Not only would the busy nature of public houses and their existing status as a setting for transactions in cash or on credit have rendered them a far more promising venue for second-hand purchases and sales, but they also exposed deals to the community gaze and offered symbolically loaded liquid resources for the sealing of deals (what Ann Tlusty has called ‘the contract drink’).

Many Southampton exchanges, reflecting the borough’s important cloth processing functions, involved textile transactions. Some used fardles of cloth were sold at The White Hone in 1602, while in 1639 weaver Nicholas Post described how he resold some lengths of stolen cloth at one inn and three alehouses. There were even stronger connections between alehouses and the town’s thriving trade in second-hand clothing. We will see the willingness of Southampton’s publicans to accept payments in kind, and because of their high value and accessibility outer garments were often the first items to be slewed off and offered as pawn. In 1652, for example, a Kent tallow chandler explained that his business in Southampton was ‘to fetch a coat which he had pawned at one Goody Knight’s above the Bargate... for 6s 6d which... he confesses was pawned here for drink’. Although, as the last case suggests, much pawned apparel was actually returned upon the settlement of the debt, in instances where it was not claimed it could be resold from the alehouse or, more likely, diverted to one of those local individuals who specialised in the retailing of second-hand clothes. Alehouse-keepers thus occupied privileged positions in the networks that kept used apparel in circulation and connected items with new buyers. In 1631, for example, Hugh Pawlett described how after drinking beer at John South’s Above Bar alehouse The Green Dragon ‘he went with his hostess

53 Take, for example, the following roster of ‘domestic houses’: Bartholomew Nidd’s house, where a Leicester parchment maker and a local couple were ‘drinking’; a saddler’s house, where a shoemaker, a yeoman and a visiting gentleman were ‘drinking’; a tailor’s house, where a husbandman, labourer, Glover and visiting Chandler were ‘playing cards’. Ibid, pp. 335-6.
54 See Tlusty, Bacchus, pp. 103-114.
55 E&DII, p. 27; SRO SC2/1/6, Fo. 306r; SC6/1/48, Fo. 18r.
57 ABII, p. 46; SRO SC9/3/12, Fo. 92v. This was probably the Abigail Knight identified as a ‘tippler’ Above Bar in the stall and art rolls for 1648. Fo. SC6/1:54, Fos. 6r-11v.
[Katherine South] to a woman's house nearby who uses to sell old clothes to see if he could find a cloak there. 58

Alehouses themselves were common sites for the exchange of used apparel, and were targeted by specialist peddlers and tinkers for their buying and selling operations. In 1615 William Norry, a 'petty chapman' originally from Newbury, was bailed to appear at jail delivery for the 'craziness and weakness of his brains' and 'his often distempers by drink', which were almost certainly an occupational hazard of his trade. 59 In 1627 townswoman Elizabeth Fashin claimed that she met soldier Richard Peacock when she entered The Grove Maurice 'to offer stockings for sale', while in 1585 shoemaker John Jones described how one morning at The Castle alehouse he sold 'unto a tinker an old black hat without a band for 6d' (he also sold a wicker bottle to another man for the same sum). 60 In 1628, labourer John Emery described how he purchased a coat from a Christchurch sailor at an alehouse operated by sailor Elias Bodin, where two pots of beer sealed the transaction. 61 Of course, many instances of the informal exchange of second-hand clothes came before local tribunals because the garments in question had been or were suspected stolen. In 1741, for example, Elizabeth Wells described how, after a riding hood was stolen from her mother's house by a poor woman who craved use of the fire, she caught up with the culprit at The Red Lion alehouse on English Street who informed her that she no longer had possession of the stolen garment but had 'sold the same at The Turk's Head at the Four Posts in the county of Southampton'. 62

58 E&DII, pp. 85-6.
59 ABIV, pp. 13-4.
60 Ibid., p. 9; SRO SC9/3/4, Fo. 4v.
61 E&DII, p. 27.
4.4 POOR RELIEF

This final section extends the consideration of the economic attributes of the landscape of drink still further to an analysis of how the civic body mobilised public houses fiscally as a means of funding poor relief. Historians have already gone some way to casting the relationship between public houses and the urban poor in a positive light. Peter Clark has identified alehouses as important loci of trade and succour (encapsulated in his statement that they were run 'by the poor, for the poor'), while historians of poor relief have recognised that, even after the decline of medieval help-ales and the introduction of the social welfare experiments of the Elizabethan era, the granting of alehouse licenses continued to function as a species of outdoor relief that prevented poor individuals from becoming chargeable. However, evidence from this port context suggests that urban magistracies worked public houses (and especially alehouses) into their care strategies more imaginatively and extensively than has hitherto been grasped.

Southampton, which as we have seen did not enjoy considerable prosperity during the period covered by this dissertation, furnishes an ideal context for the investigation of these processes, and as in other urban centres poverty became an increasing concern for municipal governors during the course of the period. The resident labouring population who relied on declining real wages to purchase necessities, especially those spinners, weavers and wool-combers employed in a cloth industry characterised by cyclical depressions, were always vulnerable to economic catastrophe (the number of settled poor in receipt of regular pensions doubled between 1552 and 1630, despite population decline over the same period), to which were added the poor migrants who gravitated to the town from other parts of Hampshire. In 1582 the court leet jurors complained that 'this town is marvellously oppressed with undertenants and daily do increase more and more which for the most part are so poor as daily they live at men's doors for their relief... which in the end must needs be at the town's charge'. Problems became especially acute in the seventeenth century, especially in light of the European wars involving the town's main trading partners, dislocations within the cloth industry in the 1620s and 1630s, and in particular the plague epidemics of 1604 and 1665.

---

5 CLII, p. 236.
‘Engines of Impoverishment’?

Within this atmosphere, the leet jurors repeatedly framed public houses, especially alehouses, as ‘engines of impoverishment’ that inescapably compounded poverty and its satellite problems. Most obviously, they were held to destabilise wage-dependant household economies that were already precarious by functioning as homing devices for poor townsmen only too willing to (mis)spend time and earnings in drink. In 1579 the leet jurors complained that ‘divers artificers of this town... haunt taverns and alehouses not only by day but also by night so that many of them spend more than they get’, and recommended the introduction of a bylaw forbidding ‘poor men’ from attending public houses upon pain of a 5s fine for ‘every person that suffers any such guests in their houses’ (that the order was framed with special regard to the cloth industry is suggested by a postscript which explicitly extended the commandment ‘to the strangers [as well] as to the English men’). The squandering of temporal and monetary resources by those who could ill afford to do so was exacerbated by the perceived willingness of Southampton’s publicans not only to serve the poor but to entice them with credit mechanisms, payments in kind and unorthodox measures. In 1609 John James, a wealthy alehouse-keeper from Holy Rood parish, was fined 40s for tolerating ‘very poor man’ Thomas Williams to ‘pawn his cloak there and spend... 18d’. In 1574, Nicholas Borey at the King’s Orchard was presented for selling poor men beer for a penny, while John Errington was offering his less salubrious patrons ‘fingerpots’ in 1577. As Craig Muldrew has noted, as well as facilitating wasteful living, debts on the alehouse score jeopardised the credit-worthiness of poor households and directed their resources away from more pressing financial obligations.

Public houses were also held to compromise the town’s poor through the market abuses that, as we have seen, often attended their core functions. In 1560, a merchant made the ‘scandalous report’ that during his mayoralty Edward Wilmott ‘met the butter wives and butter maids at certain times... without the Bargate, and the fisherman, and... use[d] to take from them butter and fish... at his own price, and brought it home to his own house and inn called The Dolphin, and there converted the same to his own use and

7 CLII, p. 182.
8 ABII, p. 46. James was an urban yeoman whose alehouse had eight rooms. HRO 1615 AD40.
9 CLI, pp. 134, 163.
10 Muldrew, Economy of Obligation, p. 310.
great gain to the great hindrance of poor men'. In 1571 John Elliot of *The Antelope* was fined for engrossing butter, while in 1589 there was a general complaint that the 'innkeepers, taverns and alehouses contrary to ancient order do buy faggot wood, coal, butter, cheese and all other victuals coming to market before eleven of the clock in the forenoon' (repeated more forcefully in 1594). Most pressingly, wholesale brewers and the alehouse-keepers who purchased from them were accused of depleting the market of barley during grain shortages, especially if for use in intoxicatory double beer. Some 'tipplers of Holy Rood', the wealthiest urban parish, were warned collectively in this respect in 1608, the same year in which there was a grain riot which saw a group of women board a hoy in the harbour which had been loaded with fifty bushels of wheat.

Finally, public houses were increasingly regarded with trepidation as lodging sites for mobile labour and other varieties of subsistence migrant who gravitated to urban centres, and whose presence within the walls presaged additional burdens on the rates at the expense of the settled poor. Indeed, vagrancy was a particular concern in Southampton (which, as we have seen, was an attractive option for individuals seeking employment within the military or marine sectors), and it was one of a handful of early modern towns to implement the penalty of hair-cropping. Statutory mechanisms attempted to foreclose such patronage, prohibiting alehouse licensees from wittingly lodging in their dwellings and outhouses any rogues, vagabonds, sturdy beggars, masterless men or any individuals 'above one day and night but such whose true name... he shall deliver to the constables or... unless they be such person or persons as he or she very well knoweth and will answer for'. Nonetheless, despite these stipulations, in both perception and reality urban public houses at all levels of the hierarchy sustained the town's culture of mobility. In 1582 the court leet complained of 'divers strangers terming themselves mariners and seafaring men resorting to this town, whereof the number from time to time increases, being lodged at the inns and tippling houses', with suburban institutions proving particularly popular; in 1608 two female tipplers from East Street, without East Gate, were summoned to the Audit House for 'entertaining rogues

---

11 RBII, pp. 72-3. Allegation repeated at p. 76.
12 CLI, pp. 72-3.
13 CLII, p. 266, 300.
16 Hunter, 'Legislation', pp. 70-1; SRO SC9/2/1, Fo. 57.
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and wandering persons', 19 while in an entirely typical example from 1649 a barber surgeon from Bristol told examining magistrates that he and his wife arrived at Southampton 'and have lay ever since at an alehouse Above Bar called The White Hart'. They were removed from their suburban layover to the less congenial environs of the workhouse. 20

Clearly, many of these complaints could be analytically reconstituted as examples of how public houses functioned as a nexus of 'informal support' for the poor, 21 institutionalising those connections between the retailing of ale and succour forged during the help ales of the medieval period. 22 For the resident indigent public houses offered escape from bitter livings in cramped tenements and rooming quarters, psychotropic and competitive distractions, and, as we have seen, nutrients in the form of bread and beer that could be readily obtained on credit. On his death in 1613, for example, alehouse-keeper and mariner Peter Hendrick (who traded on the West Quay) was owed no less than £11 in 'bills'. 23 Public houses were sites for charity (in 1582 the leet jurors described poor men begging 'at the inns'), 24 while for Southampton's many newcomers, they offered not only diet and lodgings but also 'door[s] of entry to the town community, enclosing the possibility of immediate employment as drawers and maids, as well as news of jobs elsewhere. 25 The importance of alehouses for the would-be urban settler is nicely illustrated by the experiences of Prunell Cowell, a nineteen year-old servant from the Isle of Wight, who arrived at Southampton in 1590. She described how 'she dwelt with one who dwells at The Three Mariners' for two days, during which time 'one French Nicholas coming to the... house saw [her] and understanding she was out of service, did ask if she would go to service and she said yes'. 26 The 'French Nicholas' in question was himself an alehouse-keeper who also features in a subsequent deposition.

19 ABII, pp. 2, 10-11.
20 SRO SC9/3/12, Fo. 32v.
23 HRO 1613 A18/1-2.
24 CLII, p. 236.
25 On these features see P. Clark, 'The Migrant in Kentish Towns 1580-1640', in idem & P. Slack (eds), Crisis and Order in English Towns 1500-1700: Essays in Urban History (London, 1972), pp. 139-41.
26 SRO SC9/3/8, Fo. 2v.
from 1593 (‘at their first coming to the town they came to an alehouse the Goodman’s name French Nick’). 27

**Fiscal Solutions**

As well as these benefits, the rest of the section recovers some more distinctive intersections between public houses and the regularised relief strategies of the corporation. Care of the deserving poor in Southampton was approached by methods typical of the period, and essentially took three forms: charitable provision in the form of bequests, gifts, and, from 1608, collections from church doors (gifts funded two almshouses in East Street and a workhouse in 1632); 28 mandatory poor collections from each of the five parishes from 1572 (functioning efficiently by 1575); as well as periodic payments from a general town fund. As in other borough settings, the common council directed all three mechanisms from the Audit House, disbursing money from the charities and the common chest as well as keeping the accounts of and distributing monies collected by the parish overseers. 29 Arrangements for the indigent placed a strain on all town purses, but in Southampton the number of those requiring support in combination with the comparatively low ebb of civic finances rendered the problem especially acute; during the seventeenth century ‘[p]oor relief, care of apprentices and orphans, the management of charities and almshouses and... the workhouse, took more and more of the magistrates’ time’. 30 In the dearth year of 1630, ‘to the end that they [the poor] shall all in general from henceforth keep their own houses... and not go into any of the inhabitants’ houses to seek any further relief’, the assessment for Holy Rood parish skyrocketed from £30 15s 4d to £60 13s 4d. 31 In subsequent decades, it became apparent that even such unpopular expedients were not adequate to meet the growing scale of the problem. In 1652, after the harvest crisis of the 1640s and the civil war, the corporation admitted that the ‘rates imposed and assessed on the several parishes of this town by the said churchwardens of the same towards the maintenance of the poor are not, by much, sufficient for the same’. 32 In 1665, in the aftermath of domestic and foreign wars and the plague epidemic of that year, the mayor wrote to the king to

---

27 SRO SC9/3/9, Fo. 30r.
28 SRO SC10/1/11.
32 SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 90r.
complain that they 'do find their poverty so great and the poor so numerous and daily increasing... that it is impossible for them to contribute sufficient allowance towards the necessities under which they groan'. Indeed, 'many of those who lately contributed towards the relief of others are now reduced to that necessity as to need relief themselves'.

It was out of such circumstances that the corporation, in dialogue with townspeople, fashioned local and experimental welfare responses, characterised by a blend of private and public interests, in which the landscape of drink was to feature centrally and systematically. The most daring standalone initiative occurred in 1659 when, as in Dorchester and Salisbury some years previously, the council intervened in the brewing industry. With regard to the 'daily an increase of poor people within this town and county and therefore a further increase of maintenance for their relief', the assembly decreed that alehouses should thereafter take their beer only from 'one or more' licensed brewers, with the 'benefit and profit' generated by the licensees to be 'dispensed and converted to the relief of the poor'. Three days later a single candidate had been nominated, alderman Richard Walker, and the terms of the arrangement slightly altered. Rather than donating his inflated profits, Walker would pay for a three-year monopoly at the rate of £80 annually in quarterly instalments. £50 of this was allocated the workhouse, with the remaining £30 to be distributed 'to other poor people according to the discretion of the mayor and justices of this corporation'. A new brewhouse was constructed for Walker Above Bar, and two months later all alehouse-keepers were instructed 'from this day forward' to 'take and buy their beer and ale only of Mr Richard Walker', an injunction that was built into their licensing agreements. However, the scheme proved controversial, and in early 1660 the assembly books contain a tantalising reference to a 'debate of the difference between Mr Walker and Mr Knight concerning the brewhouse' (the latter was no doubt leading brewer William Knight). The disagreement was evidently resolved in Knight's favour, as the same day it was 'judged convenient' that JPs should licence alehouses 'according to the usual course, and former order made to the contrary... notwithstanding'. Indeed, the margin next to the original
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39 SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 159v. The inventory for Knight's brewhouse survives at HRO 1667 A060/1-3.
entry contains a rueful note that the ‘order [was] suspended’.

However, notwithstanding the abortive character of the brewery scheme, there were many more quotidian ways in which public houses participated in the town's ecology of relief.

Most regularly, and as has been noted in other contexts, conferring an alehouse licence on indigent individuals, which required little or no capital investment, prevented them from falling on the poor rates and thus served as a variety of outdoor relief. As we have seen, records of the forty-three individuals licensed to sell ale between the years 1619-1624 disclose a profusion of day labourers and individuals who toiled in the lower reaches of the cloth industry who would almost certainly have (in contemporary formulation) 'become chargeable' were it not for their ale-selling; moreover, fifteen of them (or 36% of the sample) were widows (see Fig. 3.1.1). Potential licensees invariably invoked this component of their eligibility in their petitions to magistrates, especially if they happened to be aged or impotent. We have already heard the appeal of Richard Harvey, the injured seventy-two year old mariner who 'not able to labour, nor having any other means to maintain his wife and children, he did sell and utter beer and ale'. He received a licence, as did many others in similar physical circumstances; the widow Judith Palmer in 1661 who was 'too lame to appear at the Audit House', or Jacob Lewis in 1601 who was 'blind'.

As well as successive annual licenses awarded to the structural or life-cyclical poor the corporation were willing to grant provisional licenses to those who, for reasons of illness or injury, were temporarily unable to support themselves through their labour; relieving these individuals via an interim alehouse licence was a particularly attractive option for the corporation as short-term claimants of this sort were generally relieved from the town's fund rather than by a charity or the rates. One such beneficiary of this nascent form of disability benefits was Alexander Ockleford, the town carpenter during the 1640s, who sustained a work-related injury while enlarging the 'wicket' door of the Bargate in 1647 (this structure can be seen in Fig. 2.2.3). The assembly ordered that he

---

40 SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 161r.
42 SRO SC9/1/1 Fo. 34. Suppression at Fo. 27. An inventory for his premises survives at HRO 1623 AD50.
43 SRO SC9/2/11, Fos. 2r-v.
44 Lewis, who sold ale in St Michael's parish, was assessed for stall and art at 6d, half of the going rate. See SRO SC6/1/25, Fos. 6r-12v.
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be licensed to sell beer until April next and no longer in consideration of his lameness, and when he recovers to desist without any further order'.

In cases where poor individuals were not formally licensed, perhaps because they did not conform to expectations of honesty and respectability, the corporation were often willing to turn a blind eye to their unlicensed tippling. These cases were invariably framed within the pragmatic language of toleration. In 1609 John Mortimer, 'a very poor man' from Holy Rood parish, was 'tolerated towards his relief to draw beer without paying the fine'; likewise, in 1615, widow Elizabeth Reston and John Tull 'in respect of their poverties shall be tolerated to keep alehouses in their houses wherein they now dwell for and during the space of one year next'. Even if toleration was not extended, at the very least such individuals might evade punishment and a fine. In 1619 Widow Furby was called to the Audit House to answer for 'keeping of an unlicensed tippling house'; she 'promised to do so no more and in respect of her poverty her [offence] was forgiven'.

This contrasts markedly with the corporation's handling of unlicensed tipplers from the more lofty keys of the social scale. In an extremely telling example from 1619, as we have seen, wealthy East Street brewer Thomas Malzard had his illegal alehouse suppressed and was ordered to pay 15s 'which was received to the use of the poor alehouse-keepers'. The contours of the graph depicting numbers of licensed and unlicensed tipplers shown in FIG. 1.1.4 can be regarded as in part economically constituted, with increases in sellers particularly characteristic of the depressed decades of the 1590s, 1620s and 1640s.

In addition, revenues generated by drink-related fines both swelled the general town fund and, in a predictable manoeuvre, were more likely than those for other transgressions to be explicitly redistributed back to the poor. One third of the 5s which from 1579 was levied on alehouse-keepers who entertained paupers was earmarked 'to the poor', while in 1621 alehouse-keeper John Pratt as well as the customer found brawling and fighting in his house 'at unseasonable hours contrary to the statute' were ordered to pay 10s and 9s 9d respectively 'for the use of the poor'. Penalties for inebriation, likely to be associated with public houses, were also disposed of in this way;

---
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when George Brading confessed to drunkenness in 1625 he was ordered to pay 5s directly ‘to the churchwardens of St. John’s parish... to the use of the poor’. Between 1615 and 1616, twenty-three (or 34%) out of seventy-nine payments recorded by mayor John Long ‘to the use of the poor’ were generated by the drink trades.

Brewery schemes, the granting of alehouse licenses to the indigent as a pension in kind, the toleration or pardoning of those who sold without formal licence if they happened to be poor and the contribution of drink-related fines to urban fighting funds are acknowledged if underplayed aspects of the micropolitics relief as it has been reconstructed for other urban and rural contexts. However, in Southampton there were some additional ways in which governors worked public houses into their strategy for relieving as many of the indigent as possible while minimising charges to both ratepayers and themselves. From the late 1640s, one innovation was to compel alehouse licencees to devote a small percentage of their profits each week to the poor. This might take the form of a general payment. In 1648 Alexander Ockleford, the injured carpenter who was originally granted a provisional alehouse licence, was allowed to extend it only on the basis that he agreed to ‘pay weekly 18d towards the relief of the poor in the... town’ (stall and art records reveal that he continued to do trade until 1652, after which his widow succeeded him). The following year John Blake, in consideration of his alehouse license, was ‘appointed by Mr Mayor to pay towards the keeping of the poor in body’. Other allocations were more specific; in 1647, widow Joanna Daniel was licensed to ‘brew and sell ale by retail... upon condition she pay 12d a week unto Goodwife Langley’. In the troubled 1660s the details of such arrangements were routinely entered as marginalia lists of recognizances (Fig. 4.4.1). The enshrining of such contracts in documents of record, and the fact that Southampton’s ‘joined up’ governors controlled both alehouse licensing as well as the collection and disbursement of the agreed sums, meant that any alehouse-keepers that failed to make good on their commitments were likely to be suppressed. In 1652 Christopher Kirton, who was permitted to sell ale on the condition that he pay a poor townsman 8d per week, found
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himself fifteen weeks in arrears; the town sergeant instructed the brewers not to serve him with any more beer and his licence was declared ‘null and void’. 59

Even more unusually, Southampton alehouse-keepers might also be compelled to take in orphans or the children of town paupers until they were of an age to be bound out as apprentices; the disposal of offspring as a means of relieving poor parents is increasingly being recognised as a defining feature of seventeenth-century social welfare. 60 For sure, such children in Southampton were sometimes passed onto other trades; however, in these cases these householders expected and received substantial payments towards the child’s maintenance drawn from rates, charity or the town fund. 61

The allocation of poor children to alehouse-keepers whose operating profits could support them enabled both parents to be relieved and the child to be maintained at no cost to corporation or ratepayer. The first record of such an arrangement dates from 1587, when Nicholas Reynolds (a ‘stone-maker’ and alehouse-keeper from Bag Row) ‘took [a] child to keep freely to discharge the town in consideration of his tippling’. 62
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initiative next surfaces in 1606, two years after the devastating plague epidemic of 164, when John Grundy, a shoemaker and tippler from St Lawrence's parish, 63 'was sent for but was not at home whereupon his wife came; and motion was made to her to take a town's child'. It is not clear what the outcome was in this case. Grundy's wife protested that they were already maintaining one of her sister's children, and Grundy himself was not formally licensed until 1613. 64 However, thereafter such arrangements became a characteristic feature of the town's culture of relief.

In many cases, would-be alehouse-keepers offered to take in poor children, or referenced an existing arrangement, to add lustre to their licensing applications. In 1609 the wife of Thomas Sannon, a brewer Above Bar, presented herself at the Audit House the day after a 'sucking child' born to a Southampton pauper had been deposited there and 'offered to keep this child and to put in surety to discharge the town thereof forever, so that her husband might be allowed to sell beer as a tippler'. Her deal was accepted. 65 In 1616 the Widow Grundy was allowed to continue her late husband's alehouse because 'she promised to take Henry Hudson one of the children of John Hudson the late crier of this town and to keep him until he be of age to be bound apprentice to her son-in-law being a smith'. 66 In 1671 Henry Fullford was awarded a license to draw beer 'upon keeping of a deaf child'. 67 However, in other cases the calculus was inverted and existing alehouse-keepers had poor children imposed upon them. In 1629 Francis Barter was 'ordered to be received by John South... in regard of his licence to sell beer' until his father's arrival in the town, at which point South was to 'take another poor town child in his place'. 68 Again, these more coercive arrangements were especially common in the troubled 1660s. In 1664, in consideration of the fact that he drew beer in Robert Neale's house, William Knight was instructed to maintain John Govin's son or 'pay for drawing beer... according to the statute'. 69 Surviving alehouse recognizances from this decade, where the gender of children received by alehouse-keepers are in two cases inscribed in the margin (FIG. 4.4.2), are also suggestive of coercion; the marginalia, while in the same hand, was clearly added in different ink after the original recognizances had been entered into. Once again, the corporation subjected these arrangements to close scrutiny and were swift to respond to altered circumstances. In 1642 Avery Mayor, licensed 'for
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63 SRO SC6/1/26, Fos. 7r-11v.
64 MB, p. 60; ABIII, p. 77.
65 ABII, p. 65.
66 ABIV, p. 41.
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68 SRO SC2/1/8 Fo. 208r.
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keeping a town-born child', had his licence swiftly revoked after it was discovered that the child in question had died.\textsuperscript{70}

It is unclear whether alehouse-keepers kept town children in a spatial or a strictly financial sense. In some cases, arrangements clearly took the more limited form of a directed payment akin to those to poor adults; in 1649 Alexander Ockleford was ordered to 'pay from henceforth towards the keeping of Chaplin's children being often the charge of the town the sum of 12d the week during the continuance of his alehouse licence',\textsuperscript{71} while in 1672 alehouse-keepers Jenkin Hewes and John Luffe were ordered to pay 18d per week between them 'for the maintenance of Andrew Prowse a poor child'.\textsuperscript{72} However, in other cases the fact that no precise sums are mentioned in connection with the deals strongly suggests that they entailed the physical relocation of the child. This would seem plausible; not only did alehouses contain the requisite material culture to absorb existing persons, but the possibility of free labour (most probably as a tapster) would have been a powerful incentive for keepers to open their establishments to poor children. Alehouse-keepers would also complain if the child they took proved unable to work about their establishments; in 1680 alehouse-keeper Christopher Wells complained that the poor parish child placed with him 'hath for a long time been sick and lame and

\textsuperscript{70} SRO SC2/1/6 Fo. 328r.
\textsuperscript{71} SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 45v.
\textsuperscript{72} SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 276v.
his feet rotted off’ to his great charge; the child was thereafter to be supported by All Saints parish, and Wells himself reimbursed the sum of 6s from a bequest.73

CONCLUSIONS

The institutional components of the landscape of drink were distinguished from other urban sites by the unique spectrum of functions and services which intersected within them. Core functions can be rendered as a victualling triad of alcoholic beverages, food and lodgings. Public houses were key venues for the delivery of beer to townspeople in a period lacking an adequate water supply and in which town governors subscribed to cereal substitution, although were also sites for the purchase and consumption of a range of more exotic consumer items (especially southern European wines and New World tobacco) that migrated promiscuously across institutional borders despite official attempts to fix repertoires and ranges. They exhibited a highly sophisticated and diversified gastronomic culture at all levels of the hierarchy (even participating within provincial pleasure dining), and were key sites of overnight accommodation given the lack of institutional alternatives such as craft hostels, lodging houses and barracks.

However, while significant in themselves, especially in terms of reconstructing the consuming experiences and options of the lower orders, a range of other functions and services gave public houses their wider significance within this particular urban environment. They were key recreational sites for drama, music and especially a wide variety of games in a period when access to many of the town’s ‘official’ gaming venues was socially circumscribed, as well as for the dissemination and analysis of information about national and local affairs; a ‘news culture’ did not need to be invented by the eighteenth-century metropolitan coffee house.74 They figured prominently within the borough economy, both as loci of the carrying trades and, more controversially, as sites for a wide variety of ‘informal’ exchanges and interactions beyond a range of formally designated economic spaces. And, most strikingly, they featured increasingly prominently within the fiscal imagination of civic governors as versatile instruments of poor relief that came at little charge to the town. However, one function remains to be investigated: sociability.
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73 SRO SC2/1/9, Fo. 30.
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Public drinking in early modern England was ‘fundamentally a social act’, as evidenced by the negative figuring of lone drinkers within literary genres or, within the Audit House imaginary, by the transgressive and spectral ‘alehouse haunter’ whose solitary drinking usages posed grave threats to civic order (individuals like Lawrence Darvall, who presented an ‘evil and lamentable sight’ as he ‘wandered up and down the streets’ and was eventually shipped to the Low Countries ‘lest some outrage be committed by him’). Accordingly, as well as the subsistence, recreational, commercial and fiscal functions already delineated, inns, taverns and alehouses represented ‘the focal point of... interaction’ within this particular urban community. For sure, the ties of sociability crisscrossed and intersected within other locales. Quays, marketplaces, parish churches and streets were social spaces, while we should not ignore the persistence of home-based entertaining, especially for those of middling or elite status (in 1587, for example, a goldsmith, a clothier, a weaver and two merchants described drinking wine in the ‘dwelling house’ of merchant Peter Elzey, who appears nowhere in the victualling records). However, institutional settings not only offered more space than cramped lodgings, but were both more flexible and better equipped in terms of the kinds of intercourse and leisure they permitted. Having already briefly introduced some users of the town’s public houses, drawing mainly on the evidence of examinations and depositions this chapter develops the argument to an analysis of how and by what mechanisms they were combined, and how the use of this unique species of social space participated in the reproduction of a host of social and gendered identities.

1 Brennan, Public Drinking, p. 135; A. Smyth, ‘Introduction’, in idem, A Pleasing Sinne, p. xv; CLII, p. 344. It is probably significant that Lawrence’s brother Burlady was himself a tippler in All Saints parish. SRO SC6/1/25, Fos. 6r-12v.
3 For a recent analysis of the street as a species of social space see J. Stobart, ‘Shopping Streets as Social Space: Leisure, Consumerism and Improvement in an Eighteenth-Century English Town’, Urban History (1998), pp. 3-21.
5 On some impediments to domestic consumption and the advantages of the public house see Wrightson, ‘Alehouses’, p. 5; Clark, Alehouse, p. 115; Fumerton, ‘Not Home’, p. 505.
5.1 PUBLIC DRINKING & SOCIAL IDENTITY

While literary accounts often framed public drinking places as diffuse and undifferentiated 'theatres of natures and dispositions', and although the social diversity of Southampton’s public drinkers has already been stressed, we are now aware from the work of Thomas Brennan and Anne Thusty that early modern Europeans were cautious about with whom they drank and that, within every variety of public drinking place, patrons structured and focused their socialising via the formation of drinking groups. On the basis of post-Restoration evidence drawn from the dioceses of York and London, Phil Withington has very recently argued that 'company' offers the most meaningful and coherent paradigm for approaching and understanding these 'distinct social bodies' as they existed within English public houses. According to his analysis, when deponents referred to being 'in company' they were not just using a noun or shorthand for proximal relationships but were articulating both the medium and the outcome of a 'distinct social practice' hedged about with codes and norms; to take a telling Southampton example, in 1641 Henry Leavet, a mercer who had been drinking at John Pratt’s alehouse in St Michael’s parish, apologised for the inaccuracy of his earlier testimony as he was distempered by keeping company. Withington’s insight has profound implications for our appreciation of the micropolitics of association within victualling environments and, with certain caveats, this section represents an attempt to apply company ‘as a category of analysis through which the particularity of social practice – and in particular drinking – can be considered and interpreted’.

As we have seen, a potential danger of an emphasis on the internalised ethnography of small group encounters is its potential for short-circuiting space by abstracting public houses into networks of association devoid of material referents. While Withington is sensitive to ‘the structural factors impinging on social interaction’, his statement that ‘it is the dynamics of co-presence as much as its sites that... demand historical scrutiny’ threatens to reduce the latter to an inert platform and elides the reciprocal relationship between individuals and their physical contexts that is the essence
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7 Brennan, Public Drinking, pp. 228-68; Thusty, Bacchus, pp. 147-57.
of space in relational understandings. Thus, before addressing the formation and constitution of Southampton’s drinking companies, it is necessary to enlarge upon those spatial and material resources offered by public houses through which interactions were concentrated and senses of group solidarity intensified.

Individual drinking rooms offered an opportunity for the architectonic realisation of company within wider institutional contexts. We have seen that the chambers of the town’s inns and taverns were well-equipped for socialising (especially those of The George after its early seventeenth-century refurbishment), while even alehouses distributed patrons across a proliferation of halls, parlours, chambers and kitchens, any one of which could be made over for the exclusive requirements of company. In 1650, for example, a soldier from Romsey and a husbandman from Suffolk arrived at an alehouse operated by Walter Bradley in Holy Rood parish and, in a highly suggestive order, ‘called for a room and a jug of beer’. Once inhabited, these spaces were figured territorially and considered off-limits to strangers. In 1623, in the well-equipped environs of The George inn Above Bar, Wiltshire upholsterer James Heely described how Southampton tailor William Adams ‘came into his chamber while he and his company were at supper [and] being a stranger unto all the company there present [was] forbidden to stay’, only to be ‘seen again afterwards the same evening’; according to Adams, he re-entered the chamber after ‘seeing some company there at cards [and] went into the chamber to see them play’. On this second occasion, the inn management stepped in to police company space: ‘[S]taying there a very little while and being willed by the hostess of the inn... to depart he presently departed.’ Likewise, in 1635 James Fowler described how while drinking with a friend at an alehouse in nearby Romsey ‘Joan George (being then a near stranger to this deponent) did impudently intrude herself into the room where this respondent then was’, a fateful intervention that resulted in a marriage contract which in turn led to the suit.

Of course, not all companies enjoyed access to these segregated interior spaces; even in large inns pressure on chambers and parlours would have been intense during peak hours, forcing some drinking groups into halls and tap houses while, as we have seen, alehouses were more likely to offer undifferentiated drinking areas. However, we should be wary of the claim that companies were ‘less obvious in an inn, alehouse or
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12 HRO 1615 AD09.
13 SRO SC9/3/12, Fo. 48v. Bradley gave his occupation as a ‘gent’, although as well as the incidental evidence of the testimonies we know he was operating as an alehouse-keeper because he is identified as such in the stall and art rolls for the same year. SRO SC6/1/55, Fos. 7r-11v.
14 E&DI, pp. 23-4.
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coffeehouse in which more than one company... colonised public space'; even within these ostensibly open environments companies could draw on a range of spatial and material resources to draw attention to their existence as a distinct social unit and focus feelings of fellowship, perhaps in ways that were more satisfying for group reproduction because of their higher degree of visibility. Some of the town's public houses, such as the two-room alehouse operated by former prison-keeper William Bound in Holy Rood parish, offered 'table-board partitions' with which drinking parties could define themselves, while all offered an assortment of mobile scenic elements in the form of tables, settles, chairs, benches and stools which, provided they were not 'to the wainscot' (fixed to the wall), could be disposed into what modern design theorists would term 'sociopetal' spatial formations ('that which tends to draw people together'). Tables, especially if round or lit by a candle, furnished natural focal points (in 1592, for example, haberdasher Robert Cordrye described how he and his company 'were sitting together around tables in the inn called The Chequer in Winchester'), while seating held companies in formation and, if they possessed high backs (such as the ubiquitous settles), would have 'created an implied wall around the seated group'.

Related lines of practice furnished still more strategies for company definition within shared spaces. The purchasing of drinks integrated participants into a common web of financial obligation and reciprocity, while a proliferation of shared drinking vessels such as jugs, flagons and pots, or those gilt cups and bowls passed from lip to lip in the case of the pledging of healths, all regularly replenished or replaced via tableside visits from the publican or tapster, operated as highly charged relational 'instruments.' For example, Robert Cluff, the vintner at The George, 'abused' no less than the leet jury itself by 'bringing of wine in a flagon (to the whole jury) for a pottle which was but three pints' in 1628. This ill-advised manoeuvre was no doubt seen as a particular affront to that company because of their expertise in and responsibility for the town's weights and measures, even as their remonstrance probably enabled them to reaffirm it in a highly

16 Withington, 'Company and Sociability', p. 301.
17 HRO 1674 AD016.
19 HRO 21 M65 C3/11, Fo. 178; Lawson, Language of Space, p. 143.
20 There is no evidence of the practice of health-drinking within the depositional material; however, that it formed part of the town's repertoire of drinking practices is suggested by the occasional presence of gilt drinking vessels in publicans' inventories which have already been noted. In 1618, town accounts disclose that a goldsmith was paid for a 'beer tankard gilt' and a 'beer gilt cup'. SRO SC2/1/6, Fo. 182v.
public way. Gaming also, as the example of James Heely at The George suggests, was a rich source of ‘structural identity’ that created force fields around groups, with interference in the play from beyond the bounds of the company or on the part of new arrivals bitterly resented and invariably resulting in violence. At an alehouse in Sherbourne in 1582, a game of tables between a carpenter, a butcher and a weaver came to blows after the wife of one of the participants intervened and ‘took up a table man’. Another game of tables at The Crown inn in Holy Rood parish resulted in similar scenes in 1652. During the play between barber Thomas Johnson and yeoman Thomas Hawker (who was also the inn’s tapster), feltmaker Edward Bear, who had arrived at the inn ‘with two strange women in his company’ and only joined Johnson and Hawker after ‘the said women [had] departed’, not only took a ringside seat but also ‘did abet the said Johnson in his play’. It resulted in a serious assault with an artefact of company (a beer jug).

In the service of which kinds of companies were these techniques of focused association placed? While most companies exhibited strong tendencies towards social, cultural or vocational homogeneity, congregating on a routinised basis within a handful of institutions where they were regulars and arriving at their doors ready-formed, images of ‘a closed, compartmentalised’ sociability fails to capture the full reality of association in a knockabout port context characterised by near-constant movements of individuals through its wharves and gates. While some companies were subject to targeted and premeditated processes of design, on other occasions company formation – the practice of ‘joining and fastening’ in Withington’s elegant paraphrase – was a far more fluid process that could ensnare a wide variety of agents within its inclusive and unpredictable logic. In 1593, in a common phrase that captures the spontaneity of these moments, Devon cooper John Edwards described how ‘he fell in company at the Watergate with those two Fleming[s]... and so went a drinking’. A later example from 1753 furnishes a more sustained insight into the protean nature of the building of company across a range of public and private settings. According to Scottish mariner James Gullen, he and George Silley were ‘in company’ near the Watergate, a common site for mingling, when they sold a piece of old rope for 6s 6d and settled on a drinking bout with the proceeds.
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After spending half an hour at The Globe inn (pictured in FIG. 2.1.1), they headed to Silley’s lodgings where they fell in company with ‘one Adams and a person whose name he knows not dressed in trousers’. Via Gullen’s ship and another trip to The Globe, the foursome alighted at The Vine ‘where they met with one David Watts’. After leaving they parted with Watts and set out for an alehouse Above Bar ‘but not gaining admission they returned and coming under the gate they met with the said Watts and one John Weeks where they all joined company’.28

These organic processes could bring kin, friends, colleagues, acquaintances and strangers to public house tables in some highly variegated permutations. The following companies, while not typical and brought together under circumstances that must remain obscure, are preserved in the records: a minister, a Beaulieu gentleman and a mariner at The Dolphin inn in 1592;29 a cooper from Devon, two Dutch mariners, a Dutch glasier dwelling in Southampton and ‘a young man naming himself a glass-man from London’ at an Above Bar alehouse in 1593;30 a Denbighshire gentleman, two soldiers and a sailor at a St Michael’s alehouse in 1602;31 a Southampton gentleman, a Poole JP, a blacksmith and a sergeweaver at a temporary ale booth at Trinity Fair in 1650;32 and a Ringwood gentleman, a yeoman, a cordwainer, a glover ‘and Elizabeth his wife’ at Francis Dobey’s alehouse by the ruined castle in 1671.33

However, while we should not reduce early modern public drinkers to ‘ciphers... of larger social, cultural and political processes’, that a range of such factors in some sense shaped the configuration of sociability across the landscape of drink is an inescapable conclusion from the depositional material.34 Most individuals are revealed to have been ‘in company’ with their social peers, whose shared participation in public drinking would at least in part have cemented structural affinities. Two Winchester gentlemen and their wives were sequestered within a parlour of The Chequer inn during the 1579 Assizes, while two merchants (including the innkeeper Peter Janverin) and a surgeon were enjoying a liquid breakfast in a chamber of The Star inn in St Lawrence parish in 1573.35 From the other end of the social spectrum, a cordwainer, a fisherman
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and a day labourer were 'in company' at The Crown inn in Holy Rood parish in 1654.°

Such socially uniform groupings were especially prominent in the alehouses which
studded the small villages and market towns of other parts of Hampshire and Isle of
Wight in which male heads of rural households regularly came together in ways which
must have reaffirmed horizontal ties; the three thirty-something husbandmen at cards at
an alehouse in Wymering in 1579, or the three yeoman drinking in the hall of John
Booker's alehouse in Brading on the Isle of Wight in 1631.37

As well as reinforcing intimacies predicated broadly on social location, drinking
groups expressed and sustained a range of more finely graded cultural and vocational
identities then current within the town. Complaints from the assembly suggest that the
French-speaking Huguenot community regularly shared conviviality within a network of
institutions in and around Holy Rood parish, where St. Julian's chapel within Godhouse
Gate was dedicated to them in 1567 and many of them had dwelling houses. Indeed,
according to a recent study, the practice most likely to bring these migrants before
magistrates was what was perceived as their 'excessive drinking'. In 1576 mayor John
Ayles fined nine 'Frenchmen' for breaking the peace at three public houses,39 while in
1609, Isaye Sarde, William Levett, Abraham Enough and Peter Legay, four of the
younger members of the congregation, were called to the Audit House to answer 'for
breaking the peace fighting and quarrelling at Jourdain's tavern and approved to be
extraordinarily drinking and being drunk at several alehouses'.40 This institution, situated
on the corner of Broad Lane and the High Street in Holy Rood parish, was itself
operated by stranger and yeoman John Jourdain.41 Peter Hereville Junior and Peter du
Chesne were warned to curb their own serial alehouse-haunting in the same year,42 while
in 1669 3s was disbursed in reward 'to the watch that took the three strangers for a
disturbance at The Star'.43

Other drinking companies were crafted along occupational lines; while Michelle
O'Callaghan has recently demonstrated how the taverns of London's Bread Lane

36 SRO SC9/3/12, Fo. 115v.
38 Le Cluse, 'Stranger Congregation', pp. 88-9; for a fuller analysis of the congregation see Spicer,
Reformed Community. However, Spicer does not consider drinking practices. For a recent emphasis
the importance and resilience of alien social networks within English urban communities see R. Esser,
'They Obey All Magistrates and All Good Laws... and we Think our City Happy to Enjoy Them':
39 SRO SC5/3/1, Fos. 158v, 160v.
40 ABII, pp. 31-2.
41 Jourdain is identified as a yeoman in his inventory. See HRO 1627 A27/1-2.
42 ABII, pp. 43, 49.
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provided settings for rituals of professional identification on the part of lawyers from the Inns of Court, in Southampton we witness the enactment of some more rough and ready vocational solidarities around public house tables. 44 In 1586, cobbler Condrit Smith described how one Wednesday afternoon at ‘four or five of the clock’ he and some other colleagues from the vicinity ‘went to Simon Brock’s house a tippler in St Michael’s parish to drink a pot of beer’ before returning refreshed to their workshops. 45 One Wednesday evening in 1624, William Morgan, a minister and schoolmaster from Somerset, met by chance with Mr Butler, the curate of Milbrook (within the liberties the town) and enjoyed three days of specialised company in and around the public house network: ‘[He] came along with him to The George and lay there with him the same night and the next day being Thursday [he] and the said Mr Butler kept company together there all day about the town an lay together that night at The Dolphin and the next day being Friday they kept company together likewise and lay that night at The George and the next day being Saturday they kept company likewise all the day’. 46 One Saturday evening in 1746, a large group of ‘carpenters and shipwrights’ from the West Quay were in company at The Star inn; on this occasion, the provocative sight of a fellow hewer of wood (a sawyer) then being conveyed to the Counter by the constable and three beadles provided further opportunity for the affirmation of group bonds as they piled out of the inn gate and, assisted by the inn’s cook and a drawer, attempted to liberate him. 47

A port context in particular enables us to probe and reconstruct the intersections between drinking groups and other formalised vocational manifestations of company that proliferated within these distinct urban landscapes. The town’s seven licensed porters seem to have been the Southampton analogue of Brennan’s Parisian water carriers, 48 and complaints about their drinking usages can interpretatively reconstituted to reveal an important feature of their corporate identity. Charged with the transport of goods from the two town harbours and the loading of merchant’s carts throughout the town, 49 they were first presented by leet jurors in 1551 for abandoning their designated station at the New Corner and instead ‘sitting at the alehouse while others... do their business’. 50 In 1579 it was again alleged that ‘the porters of this town do haunt alehouses

45 SRO SC9/3/7, Fos. 31r-v.
46 E&DI, pp. 57-8.
49 On the office of the portership see Davies, History of Southampton, pp. 212-13.
50 CLI, p. 29.
and use daily playing at cards and tables... chiefly in the houses of John Grestock tippler and Thomas Jones tippler, both of whom sold beer in Holy Rood and St Michael's parishes within striking distance of the Water Quay. In 1638, to prevent the (mis)direction of town profits to publicans, they were ordered to appear at the understeward's house ‘every working day in he evenings... to make and present their accounts and reckonings... that he may have his piece of all their dues and profits truly paid unto him’. However, while portering was thirsty work, that these humble town officers were not simply (in Peter Clark’s pejorative phrase) ‘alehouse bibbers’ is suggested by their treatment of Thomas Crump, one of their number who overstepped integrative sociability by succumbing to full-blown alcoholism in the early seventeenth century. In 1609, he was committed to the stocks at the behest of his colleagues for ‘being stark drunk by eight of the clock this morning’; court leet records reveal that Crump had himself been operating as a tippler in Holy Rood since 1600, and the round-the-clock availability of alcohol was no doubt a contributing factor to his dipsomania. Later the same year, with no discernible increase in his sobriety, in a calculated shaming exercise he was ‘again called to the [Audit] House and openly reprehended for his drunkenness [and] reproved to his face by his fellow porters’.

Soldiers and sailors, other members of ‘companies’ in larger and more institutionalised senses, also recombined and resurface as drinking companies within the town’s public houses, in ways which were not always complimentary. Three soldiers from one regiment took over the kitchen of John Moyes’ victualling house in 1746, while in 1664 the town’s northern suburb Above Bar witnessed a clash between two groups drawn from Colonel Griffin’s company who had been drinking heavily at two rival institutions. According to three very similar testimonies from Thomas Farrelly, Thomas Allen and John Gregory, all corporals, after leaving The White Horse inn they encountered and attempted to subdue another group of about half a dozen soldiers from the rank-and-file who had been drinking at The Green Dragon alehouse and were now, led by Benjamin Jones, ‘in a mutinous way going forth of the town’. However, on this occasion the authority of Farrelly, a corporal and thus a senior member of the company in institutional terms, came up against that of Jones, who clearly emerged as the leader and
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spokesman of the drinking company that developed within the 'fore room' of The Green Dragon (we know they were in the 'fore room' because of the inventory that survives for this institution from 1693; Jones possibly occupied the 'green rush chair'). Challenged by Farrelly and designated a 'mutinous fellow', Jones 'replied in very uncivil words', calling Allen a 'fool' and labelling Farrelly 'a shitten corporal... that had nothing to do with them'. In justification of their insubordination, and no doubt reiterating the table talk that inspired it, Jones went on to claim that 'they had not received any pay this fortnight and that the captain was a poor fellow and had not wherewithal to pay them and that he played away his money'.

Seamen of various nationalities were even more inclined to use the 'companies' that patterned their wooden worlds at sea as the blueprint for their associative strategies within Southampton's public houses. Two mariners 'of the bark Bullins' were in company in the hall of The White Horse inn Above Bar in 1578, Dutchman Peter Hermonssen was 'drinking at Borey's [Francis Borey's alehouse in St Lawrence's parish]... with his company of his ship' in 1587, while in 1590 Irish mariner Edward Boyes from the 'Flyboat of Hampton' (a small, fast vessel) described how, although lodging with alehouse-keeper John Netley, after the entreaties of fellow seaman Edward Jones he 'went after him up to George Ecton's [Ecton ran a popular alehouse which was, as Boyes' vocabulary suggests, Above Bar] and there drank with Edward Jones and others of the company of the flyboat'. On this occasion the drinking culminated, as did that of the shipwrights in 1746, with a defining clash with another licensed company, this time in the form of the watch. In 1630 Sybil Wall, herself the wife of a sailor, described a calculated build-up of mariners at her alehouse situated across the Southampton Water at Hythe. According to Wall, 'Mr Morgan a seafaring man' and two other sailors arrived from Southampton at two o'clock in the afternoon, to be joined at six by two other mariners, 'all five being of the ship of Mr Elzey's as they reported'. William Covey, the boatman who ferried them over the water, also fashioned Morgan as the chief company architect, describing how he 'came to [him] upon the quay called the Watergate... and asked him what he should give him to carry him to Hythe whereupon they agreed for a groat and Morgan having made his bargain went up into the town and... brought down
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with him... three other seafaring men'. Covey described depositing this group and the later contingent 'to the house of John Wall of Hythe innholder [sic]... where he left them in company'.

Conflict was an endemic part of these drinking groups, both transitory and heterogeneous and habitual and homogenous, and it is as a result of the malfunctioning of company and its descent into forms of verbal and physical violence that so many of them have descended to us in the files of magistrates. However, these fracturings and dissolutions, which in themselves can be regarded as an intrinsic part of social relations, were seldom related to structural dissonance but, as Withington has noted, most commonly developed out of the agency and micro-politics of company itself. Aside from that large body of confrontations which can be interpreted as defences of male honour (explored separately in the following section), it was often professional differences of opinion which preoccupied protagonists, as in 1650 when two local sailors disagreed 'concerning mariner's art' at William Crafford's alehouse in Holy Rood parish. On other occasions it was when the norms of company were themselves transgressed, as when Edward Bear interfered in the game of tables, or when a participant in a drinking bout taking place in a cellar near the Custom House in 1601 accused one of his fellows of theft and deemed him 'not worthy of sitting in their company'. Even more situational factors were sometimes at play, such as the circumstances which led the two Dutch mariners who had been in company with the Devon cooper and the two glasiers at an alehouse Above Bar to stab each other to death one winter's night in 1593. According to the cooper, after leaving the alehouse 'the Dutchmen seeking for lodging and asking at The White Horse [inn] for lodging being there and at other places denied... upon occasion... did fall out together, and drew their knives one at the other'. Although we do not know the history between these two men or the precise nature of their dispute, it seems unlikely that anything more led to their deaths than a conjunction of full beds on the one hand and intoxication, recourse to personal weapons and the growing effects of tiredness and cold on the other. Notwithstanding Southampton's multicultural character, in support of Nigel Goose's recent refutation of widespread xenophobia against exiles there is little evidence that national hostilities were played out within public houses; although Philip Pittoone was fined 10s in 1631 'for disorderly
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drinking and abusing French strangers in their barque', the incident appears to have been disembodied from social formations within the institutional landscape of drink.67

The one exception concerned conflicts between soldiers and citizens, which, as in Augsburg, often played out within public houses and spoke to more serious tensions.68 As we have seen, Southampton's port status and strategic position on the Solent meant that the military was a regular fixture within the town. By definition outsiders, and increasingly distinct from civilians, there is much evidence that troops were 'a constant source of annoyance' and that the urban populace bore the brunt of some disruptive conduct,69 especially if soldiers were left unpaid. In 1626 the corporation petitioned the Privy Council about the 'continual vexation' entailed by the non-payment of 'Captain Bruce's' officers, while in 1628 they complained again that 'the rudeness of the Irish soldiers is a double affliction'.70 Local records lend texture and detail to these complaints about soldierly misbehaviour: committing an unspecified 'outrage' at The Dolphin inn in 1607;71 duping and then robbing a tanner from Millbrook in 1656;72 tearing down the shutters and breaking the windows of The Dolphin in 1717;73 attempting to torch the newly constructed Assembly Rooms in 1746.74 The resulting resentments often simmered over in inns, taverns and alehouses, where military personnel were often quartered or otherwise spent much of their free time. In 1664, Richard Lee from Colonel Griffin's Company described how, after Southampton hatter John James had come into a room he was occupying at The Star inn, he 'asked him whether or not he would spend his penny and thereby fulfil a precondition for joining company. James not only responded in the negative, in itself a powerful expression of rejection and contempt, but went on to say that 'if the town would have been ruled by him they should have shut up their gates against the soldiers now here and not have suffered them to come into the same'.75 In 1746, according to the testimony of soldier's wife Margaret Archbell, while she and some other military wives were talking in the hall of The King's Head and Swan innkeeper Luke Lomar 'came and abused this informant and the other soldier's wives and struck her

69 Temple Patterson, Southampton: A Biography, p. 55.
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several blows with a stick... and threw her down without any provocation given to or any assault first made on him'.

However, the fault lines between citizens and soldiers were not straightforward. While always resenting the costs associated with quartering, the corporation itself often welcomed the presence of garrisoned troops; in June 1661 the mayor and aldermen petitioned the Privy Council to maintain the garrisons at Hurst and Calshot castles to deter pirates. The tendency of captains and commanders to lodge in the dwelling houses of burgesses would have underscored bonds between military and civic elites. The resulting social configurations were also marked out within public houses, and are vividly illustrated by a conflict which took place at The Dolphin inn in 1670. According to the near-identical recollections of hostess Elizabeth Speering and tapster Edwin Daniel, at two o’clock in the morning Captain Henry Herbert and his servant were in company with John Loverig and Peter Guillum, both merchants and burgesses, ‘in the Crown chamber’; an inventory from 1678 reveals this to have been the inn’s most prestigious, containing furnishings estimated at £13 10s 9d. After leaving the chamber, when Daniel (who also plied his trade as a day labourer) appeared with a lantern to illuminate the passage of these illustrious guests as they crossed the hall ‘the said Captain Herbert with a cane in his hand beat the said tapster and threw him down whereupon the tapster’s wife cried out murder’. This summoned labourer Henry Smith, who had been in company with colleagues ‘in another room of The Dolphin’, but when he attempted to intervene Herbert unsheathed his sword and fatally struck him with it.

The example offers a compelling, if extreme, reification of the ‘power geometries’ that intersected public house space and inescapably structured the sociability they contained. While Withington is right to resist a crude functionalism that would reduce these instances of association to their ‘bare societal bones’, and to emphasise the varieties of agency, contingency and personality that particularised companies in specific times and places, in the final analysis we would be unwise to deny any role to public drinking practices in the reproduction of those disparities of power around which early modern society was organised. Legal stipulations and economic logic insisted that publicans accepted people onto their premises of varying age, marital and social status, and public houses ordered and expressed the resulting concentration of hierarchies through a variety
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of means. Drinking choices, even within companies, could operate as a prominent social marker that spoke to 'codes of social inclusion and exclusion'; more subtly, disparities were crafted and transmitted by the 'social logic of space', or the 'intricate internal... spatial geography constructed around status' that patterned drinking establishments. Rooms in particular not only offered spatial materials for the building of company but offered power-holders a chance to indicate their privileged positions within this geography and distance themselves from other guests in more inclusive portions of the structure; to return to our earlier examples, can it be that Slowe's failure to gain access to Heely's chamber had nothing to do with the difference between an upholsterer and a tailor, or that George's status as a singlewoman did not contribute to the 'impudence' of her intrusion? More everyday processes of sociospatial separation that did not result in explicit spatial conflict are disclosed by testimonies from two different companies relating to a defamation which took place in The Chequer inn in Winchester in 1595. According to the deponents, an urban yeoman, a shoemaker and an ostler were drinking in the hall, while two professionals and their wives occupied a semi-private space variously designated as a 'buttery' or 'cellar'. Such themes become especially prominent when we turn our attention to gender.

82 Hanson & Hillier, Social Logic of Space; Flather, Gender and Space, p. 121.
83 For an analysis of the treatment and experiences of singlewomen in the Southampton context see M. Froide, 'Singlewomen, Work and Community'; and with reference to a broader range of urban contexts idem, Never Married.
84 HRO 21 M65 C3/10, Fos. 507, 509, 511.
5.2 PUBLIC DRINKING & GENDER IDENTITY

The role of inn, tavern and alehouse space in the negotiation of gendered relations and identities within the town has so far been missing from the analysis. Public houses have long been regarded as a key locus for the communication and reproduction of the dominant gender norms within early modern society. Traditionally, they have been characterised as predominantly male social arenas whose masculine character was maintained and enforced by modes of informal regulation that ranged from physical assault to defamatory slurs that "tainted the women who... routinely visited there".1 A more recent interpretative tendency has argued for greater gender convergence in the rituals of sociability than has been hitherto assumed. Literary representations of women drinking with their gossips in cheap print and in stage comedies have inspired claims that public houses were in social reality a 'mixed gender space... resounding with female laughter',2 while Amanda Flather and Tim Reinke-Williams have very recently shown how a complex of factors above and beyond gender inflected, but did not preclude, female attendance at the public houses of Essex and London.3 This section argues that revisionist depictions of the world of the tavern as equally open to men and women, while analytically appealing, should be treated with caution: they are often decontextualised,4 are over-reliant on literary tropes of drinking unruly women that may not have conformed to reality (certainly for extra-metropolitan contexts),5 and most seriously tend to collapse three distinctive categories of female presence (failing to distinguish between proprietors, servants and guests) in their depiction of a feminised
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1 For these approaches see in particular Clark, Alehouse, pp. 131-2; and Hanawalt, 'Ambiguous Space', pp. 104-123. Thomas Brennan and Anne Tlusty have also characterised taverns in Paris and Augsburg respectively as a 'predominantly male space'. See Brennan, Public Drinking, pp. 147-51; and Tlusty, Bacchus, pp. 133-45.


5 On the representativeness of literary depictions of female drinking see J. Wiltenburg, Disorderly Women and Female Power in the Street Literature of Early Modern England and Germany (Charlottesville, 1992), p. 19; and Martin, Alcohol, Sex and Gender, pp. 96-104.
public house culture. If we confine our attentions to female patrons, the evidence suggests that women's experience of the social space provided by Southampton's public houses, as in the other provincial contexts explored by Alexandra Shepard and Bernard Capp, was circumscribed and problematic. Although women were indeed often present, it was nearly always as part of mixed drinking companies, with suitors or on business; appearances outside of these regulated frameworks (when they occurred) were freighted with negative assumptions and could ultimately lead to assault.

Space, rather than drinking per se, offers the most useful conceptual framework for approaching these problems. While women's excessive drinking usages were a live issue in early modern England, especially as a precipitant for fears about female sexuality, unlike in Augsburg they seem not to have disturbed Southampton's governors, manifesting in extant civic records on only two occasions, once in relation to the alleged 'lunacy' of an alderman's wife, once in relation to an assault, and in neither case explicitly related to the public house network. Instead, public houses can be figured as highly charged 'territories' that entailed implications for female users irrespective of their individualised drinking behaviours. Feminist geographers, anthropologists and architectural theorists, as part of their broader investigations into the 'mutually sustaining' connections between gender and space, have demonstrated how the attachment of gendered meanings to certain environments, leading sometimes to their wholesale appropriation by dominant male groups, operates as a 'fundamental element in the constitution of gender'. While never monolithic, and always varying according to temporal and socioeconomic contexts, the enforcement of asymmetrical patterns of circulation, access and use via 'the power of convention or symbolism, or through the straightforward threat of violence' both reflects and intensifies prevailing gender
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6 For example, one third of Flather's discussion of drinking houses as 'social space' actually deals with female drink workers. See Flather, Gender and Space, pp. 118-21.
8 In Laura Gowing's analysis of the language of slander in the London consistory deposition books for the period 1604-1660, 'drunken whore' comprised 3% of total accusations. See Gowing, Domestic Dangers, p. 64.
9 SRO SC/2/6/1 Fo. 179r; SC9/1/5 Fo. 6. On concern about female drinking in early modern Augsburg see B. A. Trusty, 'Crossing Gender Boundaries: Women as Drunkards in Early Modern Augsburg', in S. Backman, H. Künast, S. Ullman & idem (eds), Ehrkonzepte in der Frühen Neuzeit: Identitäten und Abgrenzungen (Berlin, 1998), pp. 185-97; and idem, 'Water of Life'.
ideologies, relations and subjectivities. It is in these terms that women's often fraught negotiation of Southampton's landscape of drink should be understood.

This is not, of course, to eliminate women from this landscape altogether. As in almost every other existing case study, town records disclose manifold contexts in which women could and did enter public houses as respectable patrons without fear of reprisals. There is no evidence of exclusively female drinking companies, reinforcing Bernard Capp's suggestion that within provincial towns sociability between women tended to converge on domestic or vocational locales, such as the official washing site at God's House conduit, inaugurated in 1605 and clearly visible in the bottom-right of the John Speed's plan (FIG. 5.2.1), which would have furnished a 'natural site for women to gather and talk' as they cleansed and dried the clothes. However, they often accompanied their husbands to public houses, and there is much evidence that shared recreational visits, especially to inns, formed part of a spousal social round for married couples of varied ages and statuses throughout our period. In 1575, Thomas Clark from London testified that he was 'accompanied for the most part at John Simon's [The White Horse inn Above Bar] with Robert Smith and his wife [and] Robert Schrivan'; Andover locksmith Thomas Eyres also spent a Friday evening there 'a drinking in company of Clement Smith and his wife, Humphrey Withers and Jeffrey Wyatt's wife and her maid' in 1593. In 1654 cooper David Harris 'and his wife' entered The Crown inn in Holy

---
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Rood parish (where they jointly assaulted the innholder), while glover James Deane and ‘Elizabeth his wife’ were present to witness a conflagration at Francis Dobey’s alehouse in 1671. In the absence of a husband, another male relative or close family friend was an acceptable substitute. One Sunday evening in 1591 glazier’s wife Cicely Marsh was in mixed company without her spouse at Nicholas Wallis’s alehouse in Winchester, although, as she was quick to inform the court, Wallis himself was ‘her kinsman’.

For many married couples, close associations with the public house network would have developed during courtship itself, which created another uncontentious framework for female presence. Young couples were a frequent sight on the ale bench, occasionally coming to attention of the authorities if things got too wayward. In 1632 Edward Tatenell, innholder of The Crown, was fined 10s ‘for entertaining one John Burrows a dancer together with the daughter of Thomas Raphe... and others on Wednesday last... at night being a very unseasonable time and in a very disorderly manner’. At the culmination of such rituals, the public nature of inns, their provision of alcohol with which arrangements could be sealed, and perhaps because of their prominence in the development of relationships, respectable houses were common sites for the betrothal itself. In 1595, Hugh Trennell asked widow Philippa Heddington ‘to come and drink with him’, at The Crown inn. While there, he asked her ‘if she could find [it] in her heart to be his wife and to love him whereunto she answered that if she had not loved him she would not have been in his company’. In 1592 at The Chequer in Winchester Bartholomew Cordrye ‘took up the cup and did drink unto’ Constance Mawdelyn by way of a contract (she joined him on the bench ‘and took him about the neck and kissed him’), while in 1631 William Smith joined Mary Fowler in a chamber at The Star inn in St Lawrence parish where, according to witnesses, he promised ‘that he would marry the said Mary Fowler and not leave her in sin’.

The rhythms of work created further opportunities for quotidian female attendance, especially at the lower end of the institutional hierarchy where intersections with the second-hand trade and the urban labour market were most dense. In 1627
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singlewoman Elizabeth Fashin described how she entered *The Grove Maurice* alehouse 'to offer stockings for sale' (on this occasion, however, her presence crossed a boundary when she fell in company with a soldier), while in 1590 Prunell Cowell, a young woman living at her own hand from the Isle of Wight, described how she arrived at *The Three Mariners* alehouse to seek service. Indeed, the wide-ranging ambit of female servants as they made purchases and ran errands around the town encompassed a wide variety of public and private settings and created a further context for fleeting alehouse visits when they entered establishments to fetch the household beer. In 1577, three witnesses reported hearing Catherine Vallet 'sen[d] her maid for a pot of beer' so she and a lover could have the house to themselves, while in 1590 Jeane Rawson, examined for theft, described having 'in her purse 3s 4d which she had of her mother to pay for beer at Sampson's'. Such drop-ins could become more sustained, as in 1592 when shoemaker John Baker described how, while drinking at 'Father Hawker's' alehouse on East Street, servant Joan Sivecott 'came thither, and there they drank a pot of beer'.

The line between women's roles as staff and patron could also become complicated if female hostesses and servants themselves joined company and drank socially with their customers. In 1592 sailor David Davis described how he 'played at cards with his hostess' Bess Parrett, while in 1624 labourer Gilbert Brickleton described how, when he and the town sergeant were at Elizabeth Tompkins' alehouse, their hostess 'was in company with them... in orderly manner'.

As Brickleton's careful qualification suggests, women who appeared outside of these three culturally sanctioned circumstances, and sometimes those who were careful to remain within them, were extremely likely to run into difficulties. Although not subject to processes of rigid spatial segregation, Southampton's drinking houses were still heavily gendered if not entirely gender-specific, and as in early modern Essex, 'the superior power and ability of men to control these spaces is manifest at every turn. The risks for
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women of ridicule, insult and attack on their sexual reputation were real'. Indeed, it might be argued that the demographic profile of a provincial port, with the aforementioned concentrations of swaggering male companies drawn from maritime and military contexts, contributed to the insecurity of these social settings for many women and rendered Southampton's landscape of drink a peculiarly treacherous one. Some townswomen, for example, evidently would not visit public houses under any circumstances, even for those brief moments necessary to acquire a takeaway. In 1623, for example, Dorothy Andrews and Mary Callaway, then in the High Street dwelling house of Dorothy's mother Alice, prudently waited for the arrival of visitor Thomas Hamon before they 'asked him for a pot of beer which he then sent for'. What types of experience might Andrews and Callaway have been hoping to avoid?

Verbal slurs on sexual reputation were the most common hazard, arguably more of a concern within an intimate face-to-face society like Southampton and its surrounding towns and villages than in the relative anonymity offered by regional capitals or the metropolis. Many of the defamations pursued via Winchester's consistory were made against women present in drinking establishments, while when the wife of John James saw the Widow Janverin in her husband's Holy Rood alehouse in 1609 she instantly 'reviled her and called her whore, common whore, with many other shameful and reproachful terms, and words of disgrace tending much to the impeachment of Mrs Janverin's credit and reputation'. The insults in this instance apparently related to a previous source of enmity, although a quarter sessions case from 1586 offers a clearer example of the potential of careless alehouse association to generate defamatory speech acts. Sailor Peter Hermonsen described how, after an evening 'drinking at Borey's [Francis Borey's alehouse in St Lawrence's parish]... with the company of his ship', they realised that they 'had no money but a French crown'. On the recommendation of Borey, Hermonsen carried it to the house of goldsmith Bartholomew Cottismore, whose wife duly converted it for him. When the transaction was concluded, Hermonsen 'desired her to drink with him whereupon she drank with him and went her way'. However, notwithstanding her hasty departure, this was evidently not the end of the story, as Hermonsen had cause to maintain before the magistrates that 'he never spoke any words
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touching the said Cottismore’s wife... as touching her dishonesty or discredit’.  

Even if insults were not forthcoming, the language used by witnesses suggested that respectable women did not visit public houses unsupervised; in 1652 the tapster of The Crown described how feltmaker Edward Bear arrived at the inn with ‘two strange women’.  

Interactions with an unrelated man who was not a husband or suitor in public house contexts had to be negotiated with particular care if the more serious charges of adultery or fornication were to be avoided. The nature of our sources does not allow us to determine if women accused of sexual crimes in alehouses, taverns and inns were actually conducting affairs (see below); however, they do confirm that females in such circumstances were highly likely to be perceived and treated as such by patrons, proprietors and ultimately the authorities. In 1654, a range of witnesses (including the publican’s wife) described the dubious behaviour of Hugh Tanner from Durley and ‘a strange young woman believed to be the wife of William Rooke’, both from Southampton’s rural hinterland, one summer evening at Thomas Loney’s alehouse in St. Michael’s parish. The pair ‘were drinking together at about eight of the clock at night... and had then and there a piece of fresh pork for their supper’. According to Jane Loney, they had also behaved intimately in her house the previous week, on this occasion sharing ‘two pints of mead and a two penny simnel [a small, sweet cake]’ and compounding suspicions by being ‘very familiar together in their discourse... frequently calling each uncle and cousin in the hearing and presence of these deponents’.  

Rooke’s wife might have felt that remaining in a public room would safeguard her reputation; a couple at George Watson’s alehouse Above Bar in 1602, on the other hand, exhibited disregard for the culturally acceptable boundaries of time and space by conducting their relations, quite literally, behind closed doors. According to two of Watson’s permanent tenants, over some three weeks ‘Gubbin of Hythe and the wife of one Webb of Eling’ had been ‘together coming and going... night and day’ from the establishment, whose secluded location in Magdalen Field on the site of a former leper’s hospital was already a highly emotive one. According to widow Alice Cooke, their ‘accompanying together’ was particularly suspect ‘insomuch that to her knowledge they were many times fast locked up together in the chamber... by the wife of the said Watson... never showing themselves but in the evenings... and she verily believes in her conscience that they lived very badly and incontinently’. Elizabeth Shale concurred that
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although they called themselves 'brother and sister and sometimes cousins... their accompanying so together was so private and suspicious as if they had been man and wife they could not be more conversant than they were in private sort'. In her own testimony, attempting to salvage her reputation and that of her house, Watson's wife Marjory claimed a greater degree of variety in their spatial practices (alleging that they 'played at bowls in the orchard and were... sometimes in the hall'), but said that 'their accompanying together was so suspicious... that she did forewarn the said Gubbin not to come to her house any more'.

While such names and accusations had a terrifying reality of their own for early modern women, violence was perhaps the gravest risk posed by public house attendance, much of it of a sexual nature. In a complex case, seventeen year-old singlewoman Elizabeth Armstrong described an assault which took place in an unlicensed alehouse operated by baker George Pigeon of All Saints parish one Monday night in October 1650. While originally on the premises to put Pigeon's grandchild to bed, the terms of her attendance altered when she was coerced into participating in a drinking bout with Pigeon and a customer, bearer John Busgrave, describing how 'they did drink to her and she did sometimes pledge them, and if she did not drink a good draught they would hold the pot to her mouth and make her drink'. The conviviality took a sinister turn. Pigeon left the company telling Busgrove 'he should do what he would'; Armstrong managed to resist his advances, but after the return of Pigeon with 'two pots of beer more' he ejected Busgrave and told Armstrong that 'Busgrave had had his opportunity and now he... would have his'. He 'threw her... upon the bed and stopped her mouth with his tongue so that she could not cry out, and... had the carnal use of her body'. Pigeon's greater capacity to manipulate the spatial economies of the alehouse emerges very powerfully from Armstrong's account; his locking of the door to prevent her departure after completing her duties, and his tactical positioning of company in 'a back room towards the garden so that if [she] had cried out she could not have been heard'. Unlicensed premises such as Pigeon's might have been expected to have posed such risks. However, even higher-status establishments enclosed dangers. In 1678, another singlewoman

34 E&D, pp. 50-2. Watson is not explicitly identified as an alehouse-keeper by any of these deponents. However, as well as the incidental evidence of the interrogations (Watson's wife claimed the couple came to her house 'to eat and drink'), we know he was trading as such because he is identified as a 'tippler' in All Saints Without in the stall and art rolls for 1602. SRO SC6/1/28, Fos. 7r-11v. In addition, a George Watson 'of Magdalen House' was one of those fined £os by the court leet for keeping bowling alleys in their orchards the same year. See CLII, p. 361.

35 George Pigeon was first identified as an unlicensed seller by leet jurors in 1640. He is placed in All Saints Within by the stall and art rolls of 1645. SRO SC6/1/51, Fo. 22r; SC6/1/53. Fos. 7r-11r.

36 SRO SC9/3/12, Fos. 51v-54r.
Elizabeth Beacham described how she was in the kitchen of The Dolphin when one 'Mr Pedley... likewise being there in the kitchen desired to speak with [her] and she went with him into a room behind the dining room and he lay there with her [for] half an hour afterward, and she is with child by him'. 37

Assaults might also be of a non-sexual nature. An especially striking illustration of, in Massey's terms, 'the straightforward threat of violence' in the male policing of drinking space is represented by the experiences of Ann Gutheridge in an unlicensed alehouse operated by weaver Stephen Griffin in St Michael's parish. 38 Gutheridge, who was lodging with Griffin while her husband was at sea, described in a petition to magistrates how in 1649 her host 'did entertain merchant's servants on the lord's day with their sugar and spices at sermon time'. Disliking these 'unlawful courses', she 'would not let them have passage through her room' to fetch more drink, nor 'give [them] notice when sermon were ended'. However, this attempt to determine and disrupt the spatiotemporal ambits of male patrons on the part of the pious Anne did not go unpunished, and the following morning Griffin violently reinscribed his own monopoly on the circulatory possibilities of the house; he broke the iron latch on her door and 'came into her chamber... before her clothes were on' and in front of her daughter 'beat and hailed your petitioner about the room unclothed doing her much hurt'. Concerned friends and neighbours gathered at Griffin's front door to 'take her part', although he 'denied any to come to her assistance'. This complaint elicited no response from borough magistrates. 39

Men

Men used the town's public houses with a greater degree of freedom and flexibility, and it is their drinking practices that have the greatest prominence in civic records. Indeed, as we have seen, when two labourers happened across a leftover deal board in 1637, there was one unselfconscious and almost reflexive avenue for its disposal: '[I]t should serve as drinking money for them'. 40 Public drinking has recently been acknowledged as an important mechanism for the reproduction of early modern manhood throughout Europe, and public houses themselves are now understood as 'theatre[s] of social
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exchange' in which males were required to 'perform'. Such readings of men's understanding and experience of the landscape of drink should not be overstated. As Anthony Giddens has argued with general reference to the limitations of dramaturgical renderings of human behaviour, performances are not 'generic to social life'; if they were, then the 'social world would... be largely empty of substance' and '[t]he whole of social life would be... a desperate search to put on security operations to salvage a sense of self-esteem in the staging of routines'. However, for Southampton's male residents and visitors, there is much evidence that regularised public house attendance was one of those affective rhythms of everyday life that facilitated the visible assertion of certain kinds of masculine identities and attributes in ways not possible or practicable in other urban venues.

At the most basic level, the consumption of quantities of alcohol in public settings constituted a ritual of excess that tested the self-control that was a fundamental of honourable manhood. Southampton's male residents and visitors could spend striking amounts of time drinking. In 1656, a tallow-chandler from Kent explained to magistrates how he pawned a coat for 6s 6d 'at one Goody Knight's above the Bargate' which he 'and his companions... spent in drinking two days together'. Baker Robert Starce testified to a geographically wide-ranging pub crawl undertaken with three other substantial householders that encompassed multiple pots of beer at four institutions one Thursday evening in 1586. After supper, bowls and 'at least twenty pots of beer' at the East Street alehouse of town cook Richard Rich, the company despatched 'six pots of beer' at Robert Porter's house, 'one pot of beer' at William Beckley's house, from whence 'they all went to John Morse the baker and there stayed drinking about half an hour' (all three of these alehouses were in St Michael's parish) before returning to Rich's at eleven o'clock. According to Rich's account the company enjoyed a nightcap of 'two
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44 SRO SC9/3/12, Fo. 92v. An 'Abigail Knight' is identified as a tippler in All Saints Without in the stall and art rolls for 1648. She was apparently operating without a licence. SC6/1/54, Fos. 6r-11v.

45 SRO SC9/3/7, Fos. 19r-20r, 23r.

46 Porter, Beckley and Morse at SRO SC6/1/19, Fos. 3r-10v; SC6/1/26, Fos. 7r-11v.
pots of beer' at Richard Grant’s unlicensed alehouse Above Bar. While these townsmen may have been exaggerating their drunkenness as a mitigating circumstance (they all came before magistrates in connection with the theft of a calf), such quantities had to be consumed without the negative side-effects of a loss of conviviality or bodily malfunctions such as grimacing, belching, spitting or vomiting. The widespread practice of ‘pledging’ drinks often enclosed a competitive dimension akin to a trial of strength or valour; in a cellar near the Custom House in February 1602, Dutch mariner Peter Johnson described how a new-found drinking companion called William ‘drank unto [him] a whole can full of beer, and would urge [him] to pledge him the same can full: the which [he] denied to do, and told him that he would pledge him half a can, but could not pledge the whole can’.

As well as the competitive disposal of large quantities of alcohol, public houses facilitated bonds between men as an arena for the staging of collective rituals of fellowship. Exploiting the functions of beer and wine as markers of accord and goodwill, applied elsewhere in bargaining and the sealing of agreements, the offer of a drink could operate as a powerful instrument of conflict resolution in cases where camaraderie had gone wrong; in December 1576, for example, witnesses described how Portsmouth mariner John Sampson entered Phyllis Bear’s alehouse seeking William White, another sailor with whom he had ‘quarell[ed] in the river of Bordeaux’, and urged him to ‘come to... The Dauphin [where] I will give him a quart of wine’. Pledging, likewise, was not only a competition but ‘an archetypal binding ritual’ that focussed male companies around a common ‘cup of brotherhood’. The refusal of a drink, especially in pledging circumstances, was thus a symbolic refusal of social contact, and most instances have descended to us as a result of the failure of participants to conform to their logic and a subsequent culmination in blows. We know of Sampson’s gesture of reconciliation because White publicly rebuffed it; the following morning they had a swordfight near God’s House Gate which resulted in the death of the latter. Likewise, according to Johnson, after he failed to pledge William the full can he was attacked by him near the Watergate, resulting in William’s death when ‘in defence of his own person [he] also drew his knife’. According to another witness, their dispute actually concerned a stolen

47 Grant at SRO SC6/1/15, Fos. 5r-10r.
48 E&D, pp. 21-2.
50 SRO SC9/3/3, Fos. 13v-14r.
petticoat. However, Johnson was presuming that his partial refusal to reciprocate the pledge (he did, after all, offer 'a half') would in itself be a plausible if inadequate pretext for murderous recrimination in the eyes of the magistrates.\(^\text{52}\)

As these examples suggest, the senses of fraternalism created by public drinking rituals could be fleeting and transitory and, as some contemporary moralists warned, left townsmen vulnerable to the operations of 'false friends' who abused the ready bonds enabled by alcoholic media.\(^\text{53}\) These figures were not optical illusions, and we apparently encounter an archetypal 'pot companion' in Edward Langhe, a soldier with whom Cornelius Williamson, a tanner from the nearby village of Milbrook, had the misfortune to 'fall in company' one October evening in 1656. After drinking in 'William Pavoir's house', an alehouse in Holy Rood parish where they met,\(^\text{54}\) Langh offered to walk Williamson up English Street and let him out of the Bargate. Williamson accepted, and 'for his love... had him into the Widow Kirton's house [an alehouse in All Saints Within] where they drank three flagons'.\(^\text{55}\) After leaving the Bargate, Langh offered to 'bring [him] onward on his way home and he... accepted thereof and thanked him for his love'; the pair left the Bargate together and parted at the junction of Windmill Lane. However, as Williamson continued on his two-mile journey, he 'was suddenly set upon by the watering pond by the seaside by a certain person who struck up [his] heels and fell upon him and took out of [his] pocket a leather bag with five pounds of money therein'. He suspected 'that the same was done and acted by the said Edward Langh'.\(^\text{56}\)

As well as providing a platform for alcoholic forms of excess and fraternalism, the public houses of the port town allowed expressions of masculinity via closely related but analytically distinct lines of social practice. Elizabeth Foyster has suggested that, with the growth of sexual libertinism after the Restoration, 'the notion that sexual conquest was one way to acquire honourable manhood... gained currency',\(^\text{57}\) and the inn, alehouse and tavern table was a primary context for male boasts about sex. Most of the defamation suits for sexual slander which exhibit a connection with Hampshire's public

\(^{52}\) E&D, p. 23.


\(^{54}\) William Pavoir was identified as a tippler in Holy Rood in the stall and art rolls for 1656. SRO SC6/1/59, Fos. 7r-8v.

\(^{55}\) This is probably the widow of the 'Christopher Kirton' identified as a tippler in the stall and art rolls for 1652. SRO SC6/1/56, Fos. 13-20.

\(^{56}\) SRO SC9/3/12, Fo. 120v.

\(^{57}\) Foyster, Manhood, p. 41.
house network involved allegations made against women in their absence. Supporting Foyster's chronology, some particularly unsavoury bluster was legally challenged by female plaintiffs in the early 1700s. In 1703, while in company with a tailor and a cordwainer, yeoman John Freeman claimed that Ann Stevens 'is a whore and a common whore and I have laid with her once and will lay with her again' in a 'low room' of The White Hart inn in Emsworth near Portsmouth. The previous year, at Robert Parkes' victualling house back in Southampton, William Drew bragged to Edward Carter that while walking in the town fields 'he followed Mary Joyner and threw her down and entered her body between two or three inches or more and showed the knees of his breeches and took drink and wished it was his damnation if it was not true'. The fact that it was, respectively, the mother of the slandered party and the husband and wife who ran the premises who testified against these defendants suggests that the male companies themselves probably comprised appreciative audiences for their claims.

Males were also the most common participant in public house games, the importance of which in the constitution of company has already been suggested. It created a unique space for male association in groups and pairs, often interlinked with other pleasurable pursuits; as we have seen in 1570, Philip Pettevin reported seeing John Haskell and John Mark 'playing at bowls at the King's Orchard' before they repaired to The George for dinner and there 'played dice for money all that night'. Games of bowls, dice, cards and tables encouraged competition, and enabled the public demonstration of such masculine virtues as skill and courage and play and, in the event of defeat, good courage in bearing losses that could be considerable. Edward Langhe, the soldier who relieved Cornelius Williamson of his purse, claimed to have lost 40s of his ill-gotten gains while 'at cards' with another solider at The Virginia alehouse in Holy Rood parish. There is of course every reason to doubt this claim, but he evidently felt that it would be plausible.

The incendiary combination of drink and the inherently competitive dimensions of the aforementioned practices within a public setting also rendered the public house a primary venue for fights. Tom Brennan and Ann Thusty have taught us to regard such violence as (in Gerd Schwerhoff's phrase) 'a meaningful and culturally encoded form of
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social action', ritualised and usually stopping short of fatalities, by which respectable males defended their honour before friends and neighbours. We have seen the potential of interference in a game or refusing to pledge to stimulate such affirmations, while verbal slanders, especially on sexual themes, could be as damaging to men as to women and evoked physical as well as legal responses. Thus, in the hall of an alehouse at Brading on the Isle of Wight in 1631, a wrangle broke out between yeomen David Budden and John Horden when the former said of the latter's six children 'none are your own'; Horden himself was seen to violate the norms that structured such pugilism by 'str[f]iking... Budden on the face with his fist' while another of the company 'had his arms and pressed him up against a wall'. Soldiers, in Southampton as in Augsburg, were especially inclined to use public houses as staging areas for violent encounters, which were more likely to be lethal than those of townspeople because of the presence of swords. In 1628, after a tip-off from the tapster at his own lodgings, soldier Henry Wheatley described hurrying to The Bear inn Above Bar where he found colleagues Philip Mahollon (with whom he had been drinking all morning at The Falcon alehouse) and John Clifford 'fighting with their swords drawn in the court of the said inn'. Mahollon, after his own sword was broken, was killed by 'a great thrust in the breast'.

The choice of the courtyard for what appears to have been a prearranged rendezvous between military men cannot have been coincidental. A bustling space at the heart of inn life, overlooked by three wings as well as outbuildings and contiguous exterior zones, yards guaranteed audiences for combat, and on this occasion two further witnesses (the innkeeper's son and its ostler) described the duel from their stations in the inn garden and the stables. We can detect a comparable tendency of men wounded in public house fights to withdraw to 'back stage' regions of the building. At Walter Bradley's alehouse in Holy Rood parish in 1650, soldier Simon Rylie received cuts to his fingers, blows to his face and a serious stomach wound from a rapier after his attempt to serve an arrest warrant on Bradley was violently resisted. A witness described how he
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'went... into the kitchen and there walked up and down'. Likewise, in 1664 Dorothy Small described how after receiving 'several blows to the face and head' from a colleague in the hall of her husband's alehouse in St. Michael's parish, sergeant at mace John Edmonds 'forsook the same [i.e. the hall] and went into the kitchen', where a friend of Dorothy's applied a piece of matt paper to his wound.

We should not homogenise the figure of the drinking male. As Alexandra Shepard has demonstrated, masculine codes of honour and esteem varied significantly according to age and status, and men's usages of Southampton's public houses could both reflect and reinforce these subtleties. In particular, for those whose access to 'patriarchal dividends' was circumscribed (especially the young and the poor lacking the maturity or economic independence required by 'full manhood'), public houses furnished arenas for the elaboration of proudly 'subordinate masculinity' which self-consciously substituted normative values with alternative ones of 'prodigality, bravado, raucousness and excess'. These assertions were fashioned out of the same practices as above, but exhibited different intensities and implications. In 1643, gentleman's servant Robert Morgan confessed how while 'about his master's business' in Blandford (Dorset) at 'about... four o'clock in the afternoon he went into the house of one Mrs Hockney who sells beer... where he continued till... four o'clock in the next morning'. In June 1577, as we have seen, William Cheeseman, servant to a merchant stranger, described how he '[p]layed at dice at The Dolphin' with other servants and the tapster and 'lost seven pounds in money'; on a previous occasion the same company had 'played at The Crown... at which time [he] lost four or five pounds'.

Such groups extended these assertions beyond the architectonic boundaries of the public house, and what distinguished them from other types of company was their special proclivity, while moving between institutions or on their way home, for inscribing counter-codes of misrule onto the streetscape: hollering, breaking work stalls and street furniture, attacking the property of substantial householders and genuinely filling
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darkened arteries with their ‘massive presence’. Civic records abound with examples of rambunctious nightwalking, which inverted expectations that men should work by day and sleep by night and posed a serious public order issue in the absence of street lighting (Southampton had no nocturnal illumination until the pavement commissioners raised 150 streetlamps in 1782), but which for participants represented a meaningful if contested claim to the ‘urban nightscape’. The company initiated by mariner James Gullen in 1753, introduced in the previous section, committed ‘divers outrages’ after being turned away from The Castle alehouse in the small hours, including pulling up pales, throwing ladders down wells, smashing windows, breaking up the ‘fish boards’ in St Michael’s square and bowling empty hogsheads down English Street. Some even more pointed temporary dominance was achieved by a group of apprentices, servants and blacksmiths in July 1759. According to the confession of carpenter’s apprentice John Clark, who was called before magistrates while still presumably hungover, after leaving The Sun alehouse (which traded from the right column of the Watergate) ‘at two of the clock this morning’ the company ‘knocked at several person’s doors and made great noises in the street’. Passing through Butcher’s Row, a wealthy precinct where many alderman had dwelling houses and businesses, the group ‘broke down the painted sugar loaf and painted candles of Edmund Ludlow Esq. mayor of this town... broke the penthouse of Samuel Foy... and laid hold of a rail of the upping stock [a device to aid the mounting of horses] near The Buck alehouse’. 

Clashes with the watch, those householders equipped with special coats, pikes, bells and clappers and badges of office who were officially invested with the control of nocturnal time-space, was a routine component of these subordinate manoeuvres, and watchman William Drake, a weaver by trade, testified to what must have been a typical scenario in 1578. With responsibility for the area ‘from the Bargate to New Comer’ (i.e.


77 SRO SC9/4/553.
the ward of All Saints within), between eleven o'clock and midnight Drake and his colleague saw 'three serving men including Mr Caton's man called Robert' and 'said unto them you must not walk the street so late'. They ignored him, and continuing down English Street attempted to gain access to The Dolphin and then The Crown inns. Turned away at both institutions, the servants returned to the two watchmen. After a second warning, Mr Caton's man 'said he would go where he liked and walk where he liked' and, after the arrival of two more servants 'with their weapons drawn... called them drunken knave watchmen and set hands on their bells saying they would thrust him through with his dagger if [he] chose'. Drake again urged the servants to 'get to their beds', at which point 'they set hands on [him] and pulled him by the coat and drew him by the coat along the street and said he would go with him to Mr Mayor'. At this stage the watch from Above Bar arrived, alerted by Drake's shouts, causing the servants to flee to The Dolphin where they were let in by a chamberlain. 78 Drake's complaint discloses a spatialised poetics of inversion: the servants made accusations of their own, appropriated potent physical symbols of authority ('bells' and 'coats'), and finally enacted their own parody of a disciplinary ritual.

Household Relations

The household provides a final context in which gendered drinking practices (especially those of men) must be considered. If Southampton was a landscape of drink, it was also a landscape of households; as is now well-known, the early modern household, at the heart of visions of civic order, was an economic and social unit whose correct functioning depended upon effective production and sexual morality and whose fissuring had implications not just for members but also for the wider urban community in a context in which it was regarded as a microcosm of state. 79 Public houses should not be seen as exclusively corrosive of these cherished locales. As we have seen, drinking even in large volumes could be an honourable activity for respectable household heads, drinks circulated at the family table were purchased from public houses, while shared conviviality within them could cement relations between spouses throughout marital partnerships as well as at their outset. However, there were a range of contexts in which the relationship could be more antagonistic.

78 SRO SC9/3/4, Fo. 9v-10v.
As we have seen, the implications of men's inn, tavern and alehouse visits for the household economy were potentially the most serious, as the squandering of precious resources or the incurring of debts on drink and especially games left wives and children in want and ultimately threatened to reduce all of its members to the parish. The court leet jurors certainly conceived the relationship between the public drinking of lesser craftsmen and effective householding as incompatible. In 1579 they complained about the alehouse- and tavern-haunting of 'divers artificers' who 'spend more than they get and chiefly in play and in the meantime their wives and children want both meat and drink', and felt seriously enough about the issue to pass a bylaw banning such individuals from public houses upon pain of a 5s fine for the keeper.\(^8\) In 1615, they presented a litany of 'lewd and idle husbands frequenting alehouses and not relieving their wives and family'; they included tailor John Matthew ('one that will not allow his wife and child relief') and town carrier John Cross ('his wife and children in want').\(^8\) Many wives shared their concerns, and on some occasions entered the public house or sent others on their behalf to retrieve their wasteful spouses. In 1570 one Levermore's wife sent John Bennett to fetch her husband from an inn in nearby Romsey,\(^8\) while six witnesses reported how Katherine Perman entered a Cosham alehouse in 1579 and 'seeing them [her husband and his company] at play... spoke... words in anger'.\(^8\) As we have seen, one aggrieved wife in 1582 snatched up a 'table man'.\(^8\)

The public drinking habits of other household members in the form of servants and apprentices could also compromise its productive industry. Money was stolen or embezzled from employers (both Morgan and Cheeseman, introduced above, confessed to funding their drinking and gaming marathons with money provided by their masters for the purchase of wares), and even in cases where thefts were not involved the public house drew them away from household and workshop or rendered them bleary-eyed and incapable for the ensuing workday. Cheeseman, for example, was quick to point out that his visits to The Dolphin and The Crown had only taken place during Candlemas and Christmas. A drunken apprentice was also more likely to attack his employer, as in 1639 when Richard Bream was bound over 'for striking and abusing his master' and 'excessive
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drinking'. Servants and apprentices, like spendthrift husbands, were sometimes made the target of salvaging expeditions. In 1579, two constables testified how 'at the request and complaint' of widow Anne Jourd they arrived at the premises of John Fellows in nearby Titchfield 'being a victualling house and asked for... Ann Jourd's servant being informed by [her] that he had been there at play all day' and at other 'inconvenient times'. Resenting the forced ejection of what was evidently a valued customer, Fellows branded Jourd an 'arrant whore'.

Public house visits could also lead to those arbitrary and excessive acts of domestic violence that were generally frowned upon by contemporaries and jeopardised the conjugal unit that formed the household's core. There is not extensive evidence for spousal abuse at the hands of partners returning from inns, taverns and alehouses in the interrogatory material, although other categories of judicial data contain glimpses. According to three Portsmouth merchants in 1573, Dutch resident and 'very poor man' Lawrence Marshall was a 'reporter daily to alehouses [and] a very drunkard for he has almost killed his wife with beating of her'. In 1637, Southampton tailor Richard Wilton was bound over for 'beating his wife at the tavern and inordinate drinking'; the location (the tavern itself) in conjunction with the citation for excessive consumption suggests that Wilton's wife may well have been trying to retrieve him when the assault occurred. She was evidently long-suffering, as the previous year he had been cited for abusing the mayor in an alehouse while he was again bound over six years later 'for beating his wife and abusing divers women with evil language'.

Finally, public houses could threaten household integrity through their association with sex crimes. Martin Ingram and more recently A. Lynn Martin have both perceived a systemic correlation between inns, taverns and alehouses and adultery. These claims must be approached with caution; as we have seen, the negative connotation that automatically attached itself to unmarried couples in these environments makes any actual role in extramarital affairs methodologically impossible to
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determine. That said, even perceptions of faithlessness could promote marital discord, while examinations in which adulterers themselves reference public houses provide less problematic evidence of implication. In 1572, for example, Margaret Porter confessed to 'using the company' of Robert Cooper both at his dwelling house and 'at The Katherine Wheel in Winchester'.91 The provision of food, alcohol and games, as well as beds in concentrations and configurations unlikely in other extra-domestic environments, would surely have made alehouses and inns attractive to such couples, especially if institutions were selected where both parties were unknown (it is perhaps significant that all four of the individuals suspected of adultery in the Southampton's public houses mentioned above were not townspeople but were from villages in the rural hinterland). While, as we have seen, most publicans would not have knowingly lodged adulterers on their premises for fear of damage to their credit or legal reprisals, complicating Lynn Martin’s claims of a ‘loose sexual culture’,92 they could describe covert orbits. In 1569 an ostler reported seeing an adulterous couple slip into the stables at The Dolphin rather than request a chamber,93 while in 1627 Agnes Burrell described how she accompanied sailor Thomas Tanner to an alehouse operated by brewer Richard Upham (The Rose and Crown in Holy Rood parish) ‘and there she lay with [him] all that night but saith that neither the said Upham nor his wife knew of her being there, for that... Tanner brought her a back way into the said house’.94 Some keepers were more pragmatic, and may even have colluded in the illicit conduct of their clients; according to witnesses to the supposed adultery of Gubbins of Hythe and Webb’s wife at the Above Bar alehouse in 1602 it was the alehouse-keeper’s wife ‘that so concealed them and locked them up in such private sort’.

The same caveats apply to the recovery of the authentic relationship between public houses and other varieties of extra-marital fornication, in an environment in which single women in public houses were often perceived and treated as prostitutes whether they were genuine sex workers or not (in 1637, to add another example to those above, Richard Jones accused Joan Chapman of being a bawd at The Angel in Basingstoke).95 There is very little evidence that any of Southampton’s public houses functioned systemically as brothels, probably because (as in Southwark and the port of Sandwich) since the medieval period the sex trade had been institutionalised at other designated
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sites; there was an ancient network of stews on East Street with its own appointed ‘bawd’, 96 while according to the court leet jurors the old castle was also functioning as a giant bawdy house by 1549. 97 However, we have seen how some proprietors colluded in the sexual exploitation of female servants, while public houses were venues in which sex workers plied their trade on a more informal basis. Two women committed to the town cage after confessing to lying with strangers at an alehouse and a tavern in 1575 and 1577 were probably prostitutes, 98 while in 1599 John Wyatt described how at Joan Potter’s alehouse in nearby Nursling two married men successively entered a loft chamber then occupied by Thomasine Cotton ‘going up by a ladder (and after they were up they pulled up the ladder)’. 99 In 1745 soldier Alexander Baines described ‘meeting with one Mary Humphries in this town and [going] with her to The Roebred alehouse’ where, after laying with her for an hour, she stole a silver shoe buckle and a stock buckle; Humphries confessed to taking the items, but claimed she only did so ‘in lieu of a guinea he had promised her’. 100

CONCLUSIONS

Inns, taverns and alehouses were the most important sites of sociability in early modern Southampton, and the concept of ‘company’ offers a meaningful and coherent paradigm for appreciating and understanding the discrete social formations that we encounter within them. However, ‘companies’ should not be disaggregated from their spatial and material circumstances, and while some were heterogeneous and spontaneous, others were clearly crafted along social, cultural or vocational lines. Instances of structural conflict within and especially between companies were unusual within the town’s public houses although, as in early modern Augsburg, they did form a common staging ground for the playing out of tensions between soldiers and citizens. In terms of gendered identities, against a recent interpretative tendency it has been suggested that for Southampton’s female residents and visitors, beyond a select range of marital and vocational contexts the landscape of drink was a hazardous environment that left them vulnerable to defamatory attacks on their credit, accusations of adultery or even physical assault. This conforms to what has been observed for other provincial settings and was
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probably intensified in a port environment characterised by unusual concentrations of single male agents. Men moved more freely within and between public houses, and as in early modern Cambridge they appear to have been key venues for the articulation of masculinities via drinking rituals and related communicative and recreational practices. However, men's engagement of the landscape of drink varied according to age and status, while the public drinking behaviours of all male householders was likely to be construed by spouses and the authorities as a threat to the integrity of the household. Indeed, it is to the wider question of urban stability that we must finally turn.
As will be clear from much of the foregoing discussion, public houses aroused intense anxieties in Southampton's governors, as for their equivalents elsewhere. Alehouses in particular, in the language of the court leet jurors in 1603 (clearly influenced by a deafening Puritan critique), were 'evil members' of the civic body politic that compromised what has recently been termed 'urban stability' in a multitude of ways: manufacturing impoverishment; encouraging drunkenness; serving as a rival institutional centre to the parish churches; and promoting varieties of crime. Thus, this final chapter surveys the landscape of drink from the perspective of public order. A first section addresses regulatory regimes, and emphasises the agency and initiative of local instruments (especially the manorial court leet) in the control of Southampton's drinking spaces. A second section assesses inter-institutional relationships between church and tavern, while a third explores the intersection between public houses and crime. A final section concludes the analysis by suggesting that inns, taverns and alehouses, far from jeopardising urban stability, served to reinforce it through their widespread functioning as surveillance sites.

### 6.1 REGULATORY REGIMES

Unlike other commodities alcohol is 'almost universally subject to rules and regulations', and early modern England's landscape of drink was superimposed by and enmeshed within varied layers of governance that aimed to supervise most aspects of the trade. The process by which Tudor and Stuart polities attempted to legislatively come to grips with public houses via stacks of centrally issued statutes, proclamations and other national directives has been sketched by Peter Clark for alehouses and, more recently, reconstructed in great detail by Judith Hunter for all levels of the hierarchy. We now have a generally agreed picture of refinement of the 1552 licensing act under the Tudors; a flurry of activity under the early Stuarts (with four acts passed in the first decade of the 1600s alone); consolidation during the 1620s and 1630s; few legislative innovations
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during the civil wars; and, of course, a renewed phase of activity during the Interregnum. However, while the contours of national policy are now clear, we know less about regulatory regimes within local terrains, even though the importance of parochial machinery in the implementation of central orders has been powerfully emphasised in related fields. Historians of state formation are increasingly sensitive to the fact that the agenda of local government was ultimately set in accordance with concerns of local magistrates themselves, with policy implemented at quarter sessions constituting an index of the social and political priorities of local as well as national governors. In these accounts, orders generated by central agencies represent not the end of the law-making process but merely its beginning. Historians of crime and misbehaviour have also argued that we cannot capture law enforcement in terms of a simple confrontation between the offender and the impersonal might of the state, and that the upper stratum of the law played only an indirect role in the regulation of social behaviour. Accordingly, this section reconstructs the micro-sociologies of power through which policy towards Southampton's public houses was reproduced and implemented on a day-to-day basis and at ground level. Only those bodies with direct recognizance over public houses are addressed; Westminster's central common law courts and the Assizes had no role in public house regulation, while other more local jurisdictions (the town or piepowder courts, the admiralty court or even the church court at Winchester) only dealt with them indirectly as a consequence of other offences.


Instruments and Agents

Public houses came under the scrutiny of three main judicial venues in early modern Southampton, where the unique arrangement and concentration of offices arising from corporate status gave the civic community almost complete authority over the landscape of drink. The common council in their capacity as JPs presided over the town's own quarter sessions, held in the Guildhall over the Bargate (pictured in FIG. 4.2.1) and the foremost instrument for the oral dissemination of drink legislation during the charge, the licensing of alehouse-keepers, and the punishment of individuals who sold without license or suffered other disorders in their houses.\(^8\) However, in Southampton the sessions was divested of many of its usual communicative and administrative functions and, alongside the trial of such felonies as larceny, assault, riot, manslaughter, contempt of court and witchcraft, seems 'regularly to have exercised only that of taking the recognizances of victuallers and alehouse-keepers', as well as suppressing those without licence.\(^9\) Even in this capacity the body was irregularly held during the first decade for which records survive and only seems to have met at six-monthly intervals (rather than the usual four times annually) after 1618.\(^10\)

Instead, the close relationship between the court of quarter sessions and the corporate administration 'contributed to a pattern of administration in the assembly that largely superseded other channels'.\(^11\) The assembly, the weekly and relatively informal meetings in the common council which took place in the Audit House, consolidated a wide variety of business on a summary or petty sessional basis, regulating trades and crafts, enforcing byelaws, assessing subsidies, collecting taxes, administering charities and implementing the poor laws. Public houses often fell within their remit: they enforced the assize of ale; prosecuted drunkenness; conferred and removed alehouses licenses on a seemingly \textit{ad hoc} basis; and served as the foremost mechanism for the oral transmission of central legislation relating to the drink trades. On March 21st 1607, three days after it arrived by 'messenger', the assembly read out James I's statute of the previous year to the constables so they could 'warn the tipplers' and pasted 'a copy of the king's... letter to the mayor and justices of this town' into the Assembly Book.\(^12\)

However, the town's highly active court leet represented the foremost venue through which its public houses were regulated. Southampton's court leet, developing

---

\(^8\) Hunter, 'Legislation', pp. 53-4.
\(^10\) See SRO SC9/2/1.
\(^12\) ABII, pp. 55-60. This was the 1606 act against drunkenness. 4 James I, c.5.
out of an ancient manorial jurisdiction designed to detect agricultural defects, functioned through the presentments of twelve 'sworn men', drawn squarely from the middling sort, heard at an annual 'law day' held on the fourth Tuesday after Easter in a wooded clearing (the 'Cuthorn') to the north of the walled town. These quintessentially local tribunals are typically seen as having been superseded by higher jurisdictions, especially quarter sessions and the church courts, by the end of the sixteenth century. However, a growing body of work is emphasising that in many areas they continued to offer 'local, inexpensive and neighbourly justice' to early modern people well into the 1600s. Southampton's leet jurors presented on a wide range of civil and non-felonious 'nuisance' misdemeanours, supervising ditches, highways and bridges, minor bloodsheds and affrays, and recommending byelaws relating to these issues. However, as in the urban manor of the Liberty of Savoy, they exhibited an especially keen eye for public houses, both as part of their official remit (regulating the quality of food and drink, and especially weights and measures, within the community), and through the supplementary issues on which they seem to have voluntarily presented (offering opinions on the 'fitness' of individual publicans and houses, and routinely reporting disorderly or unlicensed institutions). While technically a device of presentment, individuals accused of wrongdoing almost never contested it so presentment effectively functioned as a conviction. However, for the collection of the amercement (the small money fine usually issued by the court) or, more seriously, a referral to the assembly or quarter sessions, the court remained 'entirely reliant on the goodwill of the assembly and senior burgesses' to

---


14 This judgement has been recently reproduced in Braddick, State Formation, pp. 137-8.


which they presented; as we will see below, this created particular tensions in the context of the regulation of public houses. 17

All three regulative venues (quarter sessions, assembly and court leet) depended for their successful functioning on the presentments of an 'unacknowledged republic' of voluntary parish agents who comprised 'the workhorses of seventeenth-century local administration' and who were officially charged with the grass roots monitoring of the landscape of drink. 18 The town had two constables, elected each year, who were supported by twelve annually appointed beadles or 'sergeants' (two for each parish). There was a nightly watch consisting of twelve men (set by the constables and beadles), as well as two sergeants-at-mace, paid, permanent officials of the town who attended the mayor and common council but who had wider powers of arrest if necessary. 19 Alongside their other duties, it was these officers who maintained the peace within inns, taverns and alehouses, summoned those guilty of public house offences to appear before magistrates and, most importantly, presented drink-related transgressions on a weekly basis to the assembly and the leet jurors. However, in Southampton's comparatively intimate demographic and spatial environment, public houses were subjected to the scopic operations of all townspeople and, at times, even that of the mayoralty itself. In 1609 William Russell, who sold ale in Holy Rood parish within a stone's throw of the Audit House, 20 was fined 10s by the assembly for 'having by the view of Mr Mayor himself four or five men of this town... drinking and tippling in his house contrary to the law'. 21 The account books of later mayors disclose some more proactive regulatory peregrination. In 1639 Robert Wroth, a future commissioner for securing the peace of the Commonwealth who had a particular disdain for the landscape of drink, recorded 6s 4d received from two townsmen 'which I found disordered at The Cross' and 6d 'of two townsmen which I found at Mrs Emmott's [The Greyhound]', 22 while in 1661 Edward Downer recorded £1

17 Connor, 'Introduction', p. 13; on the 'limited coercive powers' of courts leet generally see McIntosh, 'Tudor Manorial Leets', p. 76.
19 Connor, 'Introduction', pp. 8-9; Temple Patterson, Southampton: A Biography, p. 65.
20 SRO SC6/1/29, Fos. 7r-11v.
21 ABII, p. 46.
2s 'for several misdemeanours in taverns and alehouses in my several nightly walks'. On what issues did this unique and complex institutional constellation converge?

Alehouse Licensing

The licensing of alehouses formed the cornerstone of regulatory regimes at every level. As Steve Hindle has noted, alehouse licensing represented a 'complex and enduring project' in which 'the disaggregation of [a] moral and economic impulse is artificial'. However, while charging alehouse-keepers for their licenses was an important aspect of fiscal policy, and although limiting their proliferation helped to preserve grain and thus the assize of ale, it is as an attribute of social discipline that it is perhaps best understood. The 1552 act was designed to minimise numbers within local communities, to ensure that only suitable individuals and dwellings might be licensed and that sureties could be taken for maintaining effective governance over a wide range of criteria, and to enable the revoking of licenses and the suppression of disorderly houses. At the local level, it facilitated related visual and material projects of surveillance. The signs that licensees were legally obliged to display almost literally 'flagged up' these potential troublespots for constables, beadles and watchmen, while the careful alphabetical recording of the names and occupations of licensees and their sureties in assembly books, sessions rolls and dedicated recognizance files participated in a wider and intensifying project of bureaucratic 'dataveillance'. These documents of record, lodged in a 'great chest and deal box' in the Audit House parlour, were not only 'treasured and guarded possessions' but placed practical information about alehouse-keepers (in Paul Griffith's phrase) 'within fingertip reach' of magistrates and leet jurors and represented 'working archives for policy-makers'; in 1659, for example, one of many 'books and writings' formally delivered to the incoming town clerk by his predecessor was 'the rolls of... alehouse-keepers licensed'.

23 SRO SC5/3/23, Fo. 4r.
How effectively did Southampton’s local institutions enact licensing policy? As elsewhere, and no doubt aggravated by jurisdictional disputes, the immediate impact of the 1552 act was ‘not exactly dramatic’. It was not entered into the relevant Book of Remembrance (which recorded the minutes of the sixteenth-century assembly), although in an early sign of their legalism in the same year the court leet jurors henceforth deigned to present ‘all tipplers which sell beer and ale without sureties contrary to the commandment given them... in the article’. However, notwithstanding this commitment, the book of fines reveals only sporadic payments for ale and beer licences between 1552 and 1586, and at wildly varying rates. In 1586 mayor Andrew Studley recorded a large single payment of £8 5s for thirty licenses (with fees varying between 3s 4d and 8s), although these seem to have been open-ended rather than renewed on an annual basis. While in 1607, in response to the statute of that year, the assembly ordered that ‘upon Wednesday next all the tipplers as well licensed as not licensed shall be warned by the several sergeants in their wards to come to the House to be ordered as the law requires’, it was not until 1613 that another systematic list of twenty-four licensees appears in the Assembly Books, while quarter sessions (for which order books survive from 1609) do not carry recognizances of alehouse-keepers until 1619. However, from this date recording practices are systematic, with individuals and those providing their sureties named in full, and the recurrence of the same names in subsequent years suggesting that a system of annual permits was now in place. From at least the 1660s licensees’ recognizances were recorded in designated books for ease of access and consultation, one of which survives.

Court leet jurors readily volunteered magistrates information about the worthiness (or lack thereof) of license-holders, often with reference to specific items of statutory guidance. In 1596 they claimed that Edward Staunton ‘a tippler Above the Bar, allowed as we are informed’, was married to ‘a very lewd woman of very bad fame and name’ and therefore was ‘not worthy to be admitted nor permitted neither by law nor by
orders lately conceived by... her majesty's privy council' while in 1602 they declared Matthew Mollard a 'very unruly fellow and not fitting to be allowed to tipple'. Hugh Emery from wealthy Holy Rood parish exhibited the opposite problem in 1571. They claimed that he sold 'beer contrary to the statute, not licensed, and it is thought that he being a personable young man should not be licensed for that will be a hindrance to his living and make him grow to live idly, which were [a] pity'.

Of course, not all alehouse-keepers operated with the official warrants. Although the identification and suppression of illegal alehouses was technically a function of higher courts, as in other contexts where they remained active leet jurors exceeded their remit and, armed with licensing documents, their own local knowledge and the information transmitted to them by constables and beadles, routinely 'backed up JPs' by presenting unlicensed individuals. As early as 1552 some tipplers in Bag Row (the poorest artery in the town) and nine more from other parishes were presented for their want of 'sureties', with further clusters of presentments in 1571, 1574 and 1580 (with the statutory penalty of 20s recommended in all cases). Even after quarter sessions became more consistent in their pursuit of rogue sellers in the seventeenth century, leet jurors continued to present the names of those not 'being of the company of the tipplers licensed delivered unto us by the town clerk' as well as those, in line with statutory provision, of the brewers who had supplied them with beer (see below). Their scrupulous cross-referencing of 'the town clerk's notes' with the pattern on the ground became more sustained from 1655, when fifteen unlicensed individuals were to be 'strongly enquired after and the law swiftly put into execution'; from this point a list of 'tipplers unlicensed' became a formulaic annual fixture of their presentment portfolio.

Jurors evinced special concern with those alehouses that traded in an unlicensed capacity in the outlying villages of Four Posts, Portswood and Hill. This spatially distinctive set of preoccupations can be related to the fact that the discursive and physical maintenance of the liberty, the extent of which had been in dispute since the early

37 CLII, p. 315.
38 CLIII, p. 367.
39 CLI, p. 72. However, a Hugh Emery is identified as a 'tippler' in Holy Rood (where he paid the abnormally high fee of 20s 20d) in the stall and art rolls for 1576. SRO SC6/1/12, Fos. 4v-9r.
40 McIntosh, 'Social Change and Tudor Manorial Leets', p. 82.
41 CLI-III, pp. 30-1, 43, 65, 72, 103, 121, 200, 214.
42 CLIV, pp. 447, 508-9; SRO SC6/1/31, Fos. 24v-25r (1613); SC6/1/47, Fo. 14r. (1635); SC6/1.51, Fo. 22r. (1640)
43 SRO SC6/1/58, Fo. 38 (1655); SC6/1/59 Fo. 18v. (1656); SC6/1/60, Fo. 14v. (1658); SC6/1.61, Fo. 28. (1665); SC6/1/62, Fo. 31. (1666); SC6/1/64, Fo. 28v. (1668); SC6 1/65. Fo. 21r. (1670); SC6/1.66, Fo. 6r. (1675); SC6/1/67, Fo. 12r. (1680)
sixteenth century, had become a leet responsibility (the law day itself was held at the outer edge of borough limits), and that they used presentments against unlicensed alehouse-keeping as a means of reifying its ancient boundaries. In the 1570s, when concern for the redefinition of borough limits was sharpened by the recent loss of Portsmouth, glover Robert Vaughan from Hill (the inhabitants of which had a turbulent reputation for protesting their independence) was repeatedly presented for tippling 'by foreign power and authority' in a 'dwelling within our liberty', meaning 'to infringe... the same', while in 1625 jurors received information that Thomas Oxford 'in Portswood within this county of the town of Southampton' had taken up unlicensed tippling. In 1652, a year in which jurors lengthily reiterated the full scope of town precincts (similar clarifications had been issued in 1600, 1611 and 1651), complained about the 'annoyances' that manifested at their outer reaches, and recommended the appointment of a fulltime town officer for their proper policing, three individuals from Portswood and Hill were presented for 'drawing beer without licence, being within the liberties of the town.'

As the exasperated preambles of many presentments suggest ('we present as many times we have done before... '; 'which heretofore hath been often presented and not as yet redressed... '), as in other jurisdictions leet jurors were consistently frustrated by the failure of their magisterial superiors to act on their legalistic recommendations for the administration of the landscape of drink. That such dissonance developed is hardly surprising. The council had responsibility for the strained civic purse and, as we have seen, they were fully cognisant of the extent to which alehouses (licensed or otherwise) both kept poor individuals off the parish and could be manipulated into some novel fiscal schemes and solutions. Southampton's middling leet jurors, while all substantial contributors to the rates, were not responsible for the civic budget; they were, however, increasingly keen to demonstrate their diligence and statutory know-how and, as Keith Wrightson has famously suggested for Terling and other rural contexts, perhaps also to use their disciplinary campaigns against unlicensed ale-selling to reify and symbolise their
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44 On the controversy over the liberties, especially as they applied to Hill, see *ICH*, pp. 492-4.
45 CLII, pp. 200, 214, 234.
46 SRO SC6/1/40, Fo. 17r.
47 SRO SC6/1/56, Fo. 53v. In 1657, John Bulbeck and the Widow Westfield were presented at Quarter Sessions for retailing beer 'within our liberty of Portswood'. SC9/1/9, Fo. 10.
increasing distance from the customary drinking behaviours and survival strategies of their poorer neighbours.\textsuperscript{49}

Southampton's contribution to this wider 'social drama' reached its tipping point at the turn of the seventeenth century when,\textsuperscript{50} as we have seen, the number of alehouses had proliferated in the context of the harvest crisis of the 1590s and a widespread feeling developed among leet jurors that regulations were being effectively ignored. In 1601 jurors presented 'the inordinate and unnecessary numbers of alehouse-keepers within every ward of this town as well allowed as not allowed'. They fashioned them as 'the only receptacles of all lewd persons and authors and maintainers of them in their vices and wickedness', and urged the assembly to have 'due consideration' and suppress them.\textsuperscript{51} The following year they were still complaining 'as oftentimes we heretofore have done' about Southampton's 'intolerable number of tipplers'. Although 'some of them were indicted at the last quarter sessions', jurors urged 'that it may better be looked unto, they being very evil members within the town'. They suggested 'putting down half a hundred'.\textsuperscript{52} In 1603, with no action forthcoming and to assist magistrates in the execution of the desired purge, jurors took the unusual step of presenting a moral biopsy of the town's entire tippling population by ward: 'Such of them as we think fit to be allowed we have totted them... with this word (fit), and such as we think not fit we have likewise totted them with this word (unfit)' (FIGS. 6.1.1-2).\textsuperscript{53} With no response by 1604, the patience of the jury was exhausted. As well as the standard reference to 'the unnecessary number of tipplers... in this town', they added a calculated legalistic addendum: '[W]hereof (as the town clerk informs us) there is not any one allowed in form of law these two years or thereabouts, but that they and all the others have forfeited their recognizances by their nuisances and disorderly behaviour... we [therefore] desire you that speedy redress may be had of this palpable abuse'.\textsuperscript{54} By 1605, according to the stall and art rolls, the number of alehouses had been substantially reduced (although this had far more to do with the 1604 plague outbreak, a 'watershed' in Southampton's demographic history, than a sudden outburst of magisterial rigour).\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{49} Wrightson & Levine, \emph{Poverty and Piety}, p. 135; see also K. Wrightson, \emph{English Society 1580-1680} (London, 1982), pp. 167-9.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., p. 167.
\textsuperscript{51} CLII, p. 354.
\textsuperscript{52} SRO SC6/1/26, Fo: 22r.
\textsuperscript{53} SRO SC6/1/27, Fos. 17v-18r.
\textsuperscript{54} SRO SC6/1/28, Fo. 19r. On the legalism of early modern presentment juries see Wrightson, 'Two Concepts of Order', p. 28.
\textsuperscript{55} Roberts, 'Population, Disease and Family Structure', p. 361; South, 'Disease in Southampton', pp. 23-6.
FIG. 6.1.1 The leet jurors’ detailed breakdown of Southampton’s tippling population by ward in 1603, with details about the ‘fitness’ (or lack thereof) of individual keepers entered to the left of each name. SRO SC6/1/27, Fo. 17r.

FIG. 6.1.2 Ward breakdown of ‘fit’ and ‘unfit’ tipplers presented by the leet jurors. Notwithstanding a ‘moral geography’ that fixed on the suburb Above Bar, it actually had the highest proportion of ‘fit’ tipplers (probably because of the importance of lodgings in this ward). The intramural St Lawrence and the poorest ward of Bag Row and East Street had the highest ratio of ‘unfit’ tipplers. SRO SC6/1/27, Fos. 17r-v.
Galvanised by a critical mass of central legislation, these more local impulses and perhaps Southampton's own epidemiological variant of fire from heaven, from the seventeenth century magistrates, through the instruments of quarter sessions and the assembly, assumed a more active role in the pursuit and punishment of illegal houses. Quarter sessions was the official venue, indicting thirty-four unlicensed alehouse-keepers between 1609 and 1635 in line with the statute and mobilising punishments varying from small fines to physical sanctions and even forms of detention (unlicensed sellers were expressly committed to The Counter by beadles in 1619 and 1629). However, in real terms the assembly was the more regularly used suppressive device, with magistrates moving against sixty unlicensed sellers in the course of their weekly meetings between 1607 and 1700 rather than waiting for/deferring to sessions. Unsurprisingly, there was a notable cluster of prosecutions during the Interregnum, when fifteen individuals were suppressed. However, in support of Andrew Coleby's arguments about the limited impact of Major-General William Goffe on alehouse regulation in Hampshire towns, all of these suppressions pre-dated his arrival in 1655.

No doubt in acknowledgement of the economic circumstances that both compelled individuals to take up tippling and limited their ability to substantiate large fines, magistrates' handling of unlicensed alehouse-keepers was highly discretionary. Poor individuals, as we have seen, were often 'tolerated' or 'forgiven', while sixteen unlicensed alehouse-keepers summoned to the Audit House in 1618 were all excused with a verbal warning. Fines, where present, were often small and flexible; in 1648 Robert Allen promptly delivered 20s to the Mayor 'for keeping an unlicensed alehouse' but 'afterwards... the same day 10s of the said money was delivered back to the said Allen by order of the house' (however, he remained suppressed). Rather than immediately having their barrels staved according to the letter of the statute, keepers were invariably permitted to 'sell off that beer and ale which they already have in their houses' within a certain time period (ranging from a fortnight up to two months) before

57 However, there was a briefer moral panic on the part of leet jurors in the middle years of the 1620s when they claimed 'the number of alehouse-keepers and of tipplers to be exceedingly increased to the general hurt of the town'. SRO SC6/1/41, Fo. 15v; SC6/1/42, Fo. 18r; SC6/1/43, Fo. 14v.
58 SRO SC9/2/1, Fos. 41r, 121v; SC9/1/23, Fo. 2.
59 SRO SC2/1/8, Fos. 65r, 67v, 68r, 70r, 91r.
60 Coleby, Central Government, pp. 54-5; see also Durston, Major-Generals, p. 177.
61 For example SRO SC2/1/6, Fo. 186r.
62 SRO SC2/1/6, Fo. 188r.
63 SRO SC2/1/8, Fo. 44r.
ceasing to trade. A case in point is offered the Assembly’s handling of unlicensed widow Alice Fulford. In 1670 she was given two months ‘to sell such beer as she now has in her house’, and was to be ‘publicly whipped and her barrels staved’ if she disregarded these limits. However, the following year she was presented again and granted a further month in which she was ‘allowed to draw beer (such as now is in her house)’. Even during the Interregnum magisterial responses to unlicensed alehouse-keepers were shaped by discretionary considerations. In 1657 an amnesty was declared on the borough’s unlicensed tipplers (provided all those guilty of it ‘do dispose of all the beer and ale in their said several houses and cellars on this side of the fifteenth day of this present month of July’), while magistrates ‘smuggled’ additional alehouses onto the landscape of drink under disingenuous institutional guises. In 1650, for example, Richard Hardy and his wife were ‘granted leave to keep an ordinary... and may sell beer within doors to such as eat at the said ordinary’.

Instead, it was the common brewers who served beer to unlicensed houses who faced the most serious consequences. The punishment of brewers was statutorily provided for by an act of 1607, and was enthusiastically taken up by magistrates (in the January of 1615 alone, the assembly pursued only one unlicensed alehouse-keeper compared to five brewers who had delivered over 170 illicit humbertons between them). Cutting off the supply lines that sustained unlicensed tippling via pursuit of a comparatively small group of individuals would have represented an attractive solution to the problem in a town where, as we have seen, few brewed their own beer. Moreover, brewers were a wealthy social cohort, better able to muster cash fines and whose initial transgression was less likely to have been motivated by economic necessity. Unlicensed alehouse-keepers were interrogated about and their names accompanied by the brewers who had served them with beer, which invariably led to prosecutions. Penalties could be draconian; in 1616 brewer Thomas Rowte was whipped as well as fined 20s (evidently long-suffering, in 1630 he was bound over ‘for evil language... touching the contrivers of the laws for punishment of brewers for serving unlicensed alehouse-keepers with beer’).
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while in 1630 the assembly summoned William Knight to the Audit House and fined him a full £5 ‘in composition for serving unlicensed alehouse-keepers with beer’ (Knight was a repeat offender, having appeared before quarter sessions in 1619 for delivering twenty-six barrels to unlicensed houses). On other occasions, however, these fines were reduced. In 1615 brewer Henry Osborne was staring down a ruinous £10 6s 8d fine ‘for selling of beer to persons not licensed’; however, after submitting himself ‘to the censure of the house’, this was commuted to a far more manageable 40s.

Other Priorities

Licensing represented only the outline of the disciplinary framework, and the form of recognizances bound keepers to norms of behaviour over a much wider range of issues than the official dispensation to sell. While statutes relating to the quality of order within public houses were to be enforced by JPs, and applied mainly to alehouses, it was once again leet jurors who, undeterred by the absence of formal authority, comprised the ‘front line troops’ in the enforcement of correct conduct at all levels of the hierarchy. Their concerns discursively crystallised in the image of ‘disorderly houses’ and ‘evil rule’, which jurors reported in more florid and moralising language than that used in connection with other types of presentment or mere licensing offences. As we have seen, a case in point is provided by their handling of John Simons at The White Horse inn Above Bar, with whom they joined running battle in the 1570s. Simons, who also maintained rotten stiles, a dangerous chimney on his brewhouse and sold from illegal stone pots, was presented in 1574 for ‘disorder in that house which... was presented the last year for like disorder which is not amended but grown to greater disorder and more like a den of whores and thieves than a house of civil government, which we desire may be thoroughly looked into and considered of’. To what guidelines did all publicans have to adhere if they were to avoid such fashioning?

Tolerating drunkenness would seem to guarantee fast-track entry to the hall of shame. A 1607 act made drunkenness itself a crime punishable at sessions, reiterated in a reissued Book of Orders in 1608, the same year in which the assembly summoned ‘all the tipplers allowed’ as well as ‘the innholders’ to the Audit House and charged them in
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person with observing the proclamation 'for the avoiding [of] drunkenness'. However, notwithstanding this impressive show of willing, drunkenness is a misleading optic through which to approach the issue of public house regulation in this context. The court leet, which 'set [the] social agenda for the community' in Southampton as elsewhere, had presented two local men (the fencer and an innkeeper) for drunkenness in 1604 after a lengthy preamble about the prevalence of the 'notorious sin', although presented no more individuals for the offence thereafter. While thirteen drunken individuals appeared before quarter sessions between 1609 and 1635 and a further eight before the assembly between 1602 and 1700, their intoxication was not constructed as a sin per se but was normally presented in connection with other offences: lewdness, brawling, irreverent speeches, recusancy, or the neglect of civic office by porters, musicians and constables. Publicans themselves were only presented or prosecuted for allowing drunkenness in special circumstances, as in 1641 when Henry Singleton, a tippler from St Michael's parish, was suppressed 'for suffering Gabriel Coppleston... late parish clerk of Holy Rood, to drink [until he was] drunk in his house whereupon he fell that evening into the town pond and was drowned'.

Town governors were more concerned to impose clear temporal frameworks for public drinking, and general provisions for the ordering the urban 'nightscape' such as curfews and the watch were superimposed by special sets of regulations for alehouses, taverns and inns. As we have seen, nocturnal drinking activity kept people from their beds and disturbed the slumber of working citizens. More pressingly, drunken patrons emerging onto crepuscular streets constituted another species of 'nightwalker' around whom anxieties about urban stability after dark were intellectually organised before the development of artificial lighting. Leet jurors generated local byelaws that aimed to circumscribe access to inns, taverns and alehouses in the 'night season' long before it was
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incorporated into statutory repertoires in 1618.\textsuperscript{91} In 1550 alehouse-keepers were instructed `not to suffer townsmen drinking in their houses after nine o'clock' (with the exception of aldermen and burgesses),\textsuperscript{92} while this was extended to non-residents in 1581 when they asked that, to avoid `inconveniences', `commandment may be given unto the innholders and tipplers of this town to warn and not suffer their guests to walk the streets after eight o'clock in winter and ten o'clock in summer... upon pain of 2s 6d for default made by the host and 12d by the guest'.\textsuperscript{93} Temporal offences were easily detected; in 1621, immediately following an order `for keeping of Holy Rood clock and the ringing of the eight o'clock bell', the Assembly Book records the fining of alehouse-keepers John Pratt and Thomas Mullens the statutory 10s for suffering `unseasonable' tippling (somewhat ironically, and no doubt to the satisfaction of the justices, Mullens' All Saints alehouse was itself called The Bell).\textsuperscript{94}

To concern about improper times we can add fears of improper agents, with certain categories of people not permitted across the thresholds of the town's drinking places. The leet jurors' 1579 byelaw that banned publicans from accepting onto their premises `any poor man... upon pain of 5s' generated hardly any prosecutions,\textsuperscript{95} while beyond sporadic summary fines on the part of individual mayors central directives against the entertaining of townsmen were effectively ignored.\textsuperscript{96} More problematic were individuals of `lewd' life and condition. One of the complaints against John Simons of The White Horse in 1574 was that he `ke[pt] resort of lewd people', while in 1613 one of a litany of complaints about Christopher Ubbley was his entertainment of `divers lewd persons' at his alehouse.\textsuperscript{97} As we have seen, special directives against back doors and remote or `corner' locations were largely designed to foreclose the patronage of this group. Dennis Edwards, who kept an alehouse in Holy Rood parish,\textsuperscript{98} was presented in 1589 for admitting `a great haunting of disordered persons' via a back door.\textsuperscript{99} From around 1600, public houses were regarded with special disfavour if they provided long-term services to newcomers and vagrants, associated with a wide variety of petty misconduct and, if they put down local roots, presaging extra burdens on the rates. The
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\textsuperscript{94} SRO SC2/1/8, Fos. 200r-v; SC6/1/39, Fos. 6r-15r.
\textsuperscript{95} CLII, p. 180.
\textsuperscript{96} SRO SC5/3/13, Fo. 4r; SC5/3/18, Fo. 2v, 3v, 4r; Hunter, `Legislation', p. 48.
\textsuperscript{97} CLI, p. 137; CLIII, p. 470. The assembly also voided Robert Barnes's alehouse licence in 1641 because he entertained `divers lewd persons contrary to the laws'. SC/2/1/6, Fo. 325r.
\textsuperscript{98} SRO SC6/1/20, Fos. 7r-12r.
\textsuperscript{99} CLII, p. 274.
assembly, as holders of the town purse strings, were most energetic in pursuit of those publicans who took in itinerant people, moving against them through their weekly meetings,\textsuperscript{100} as well as via quarter sessions; tippler William Davis was indicted for 'entertaining of the Widow Goffe and her children at his house and for frequent entertaining of beggars and vagabonds which may bring charge to the town' in 1671, as was Goody Okey of St John's parish in 1682.\textsuperscript{101}

Notwithstanding its prominence gaming was also technically prohibited, forming a central part of the 1552 statute. Local agencies did not correlate it exclusively with the town's public houses, but operators of alehouses, taverns and inns predominated in their presentments. The court leet was again in the driving seat, reproducing statutory provision and doggedly pursuing publicans who 'suffered' play within or adjacent to their premises, especially those tipplers that operated out of the King's Orchard to the East of the walled town in the late sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{102} Their concerns peaked again during the Interregnum, when their presentments included a colourful charge against innholder and town cook William Turner. At his Holy Rood inn \textit{The Greyhound} it was claimed in 1656 that 'the skittles fall by day as the dice goes by night... [w]hereby vice is nourished up and wickedness grown to a great height and sin [t]hereby committed by them... such as should work [but instead] play'. He was amerced at 40s, the full weight of the statute, and in a further disciplinary (and rhetorical) flourish it was 'commanded that the said Turner do turn a new leaf and turn out these games and games out of doors' upon pain of a crippling £20 fine.\textsuperscript{103} In the later decades of the century jurors submitted near-annual lists of individuals who maintained ninepins, shuffleboard and, increasingly, billiard tables.\textsuperscript{104}

Concern about drinking times, customer profiles and gaming coalesced around the figure of drinking young people. As we have seen, servants and apprentices in public houses presented a troubling prospect; instead of squandering their modest financial resources in drink and bets, perhaps pilfering from their master or parents in order to do so, they should have been at home in bed, under the watchful eye of an authority figure and preparing for the next day's labours. The issue had always been a concern (one of the complaints about John Simons at \textit{The White Horse} in 1574 was that he kept 'resort

\textsuperscript{100} ABI, p. 71; ABII, pp. 2, 10-11; SRO SC2/1/6, Fos. 272v, 325r.
\textsuperscript{101} SRO SC9/1/14, Fo. 6; SC9/1/26, Fo. 1.
\textsuperscript{102} CLI, p. 134; CLII, pp. 179, 201, 204, 215, 225, 234, 239.
\textsuperscript{103} SRO SC6/1/59, Fo. 11v. In the same year, Edward Bear was also presented and fined 40s 'for keeping of skittles which is an unlawful game and begets such vice as before we... expressed more largely in our presentment against William Turner upon the like offence'. Fo. 14v.
\textsuperscript{104} SRO SC6/1/61, Fo. 35; SC6/1/62, Fo. 13; SC6/1/63 Fo. 10r; SC6/1/64, Fo. 26r; SC6/1/65, Fo. 13v; SC6/1/66, Fo. 11v; SC6/1/67, Fo. 11r; SC6/1/68, Fo. 12r; SC6/1/71, Fo. 7v.
of... men’s servants to his house... and that he had them dicing there all night’), but a particular emotional charge developed around the issue in the 1630s, when the assembly moved against a large number of individuals who had suffered youthful drinking and gaming in their houses. Surprisingly, innholders and taverners predominated in these presentments. Vintners Humphrey Watson and Richard Boles were bound over in 1633 for ‘for entertaining men’s servants a drinking and playing at unseasonable times’, apparently on the instigation of ‘Mr Pescod’, while six individuals, five vintners and Edward Tatenell at The Crown, appeared before the assembly for the same offence between 1631 and 1639 and were fined between 5s and 10s (Tatenell had 3s 4d redelivered to him as he was not present within his establishment when the offence was committed).

Weights and measures constituted the final sustained area of scrutiny, and once again the court leet took an active lead in the identification and prosecution of this special cluster of offences. They were on firmer ground here; the supervision of food and drink within the community was a function of lower courts, and it is hard to disagree with W. J. King’s observation that ‘when courts leet declined or disappeared, consumer protection suffered a serious blow’. In 1551, long before the government made the sealing of pots a legal requirement in 1640, the jurors introduced a byelaw instructing the town sergeant to ‘seal every pot in [every] tavern and inn and tippler’s house... at the mouth of the said pots and not on the lids of the same’ (‘stone cups’, resistant to such globalised branding, were banned by a further byelaw in 1569), while from 1577, to further preclude ‘deceit of the inhabitants’, permission was granted ‘to the foreman of the said jury and such of his company as he shall... call to attend on him to view, lay and examine all the premises’ in an ‘ample manner’ for any pots or serving vessels that were over or under capacity, made of stone, or otherwise lacking the mandatory town seal (which, upon discovery, were broken, defaced or melted down). Publicans at all levels of the hierarchy loomed large in annual lists of weights and measures offenders, due largely to the very wide range of contexts in which they could be presented (see FIG.

105 CLI, p. 119.
106 SRO SC9/2/10, Fos. 11r, 14v.
107 SRO SC2/1/6, Fos. 250v, 255v, 256v, 299r, 307v, 311r.
110 CLI, pp. 161-2. This peripatetic practice continued down to 1665, from when publicans seem to have been required to bring their serving vessels to the Market House. See the order at SRO SC6/1/61, Fo. 34.
FIG. 6.1.3 Publicans as a proportion of the total number of tradesmen presented for weights and measures offences by court leet jurors 1624-1670. Each individual was counted once only. SRO SC6/1/39-S6/1/65

6.1.3); receptacles for both beer and wine, but also for their bundles of hay if their operations included stabling (an official town haymaker was appointed in 1566, the same year in which innkeepers were required to keep ‘a balance with scales at their [h]ostlery door with sufficient sealed weights’). In 1618 for example, Nicholas Hockley of The George was fined over 3s for four faulty jugs, seven faulty beer pots, a faulty wine quart as well as ‘a bottle of hay too light’.

King has argued that the high rates of publicans accused, and the tendency towards recidivism among them, suggests that leet officials charged publicans (especially alehouse-keepers) with weights and measures offences ‘so that fines would be forefeited annually, fines which constituted an unofficial local business tax’. Brewer Christopher Benbury went further in 1642, alleging while drinking in The Dolphin inn that leet jurors ‘countenanced false weights and measures’ in exchange for kickbacks from publicans. However, all of the evidence suggests that Southampton’s jurors were diligent in their undertakings, apologising when presentments were sparse (as in 1605 when ‘the

---

111 SRO SC6/1/6 Fo. 15r.
112 SRO SC6/1/35, Fo. 23r.
114 For which he was bound over at quarter sessions. Benbury was clearly disposed towards drunken claims of this sort, as two years previously he appeared before the same body ‘concerning some abusive words spoken against this corporation and also against the assessors of the subsidies of this present parliament’. SC9/2/10, Fos. 40r, 49v, 53v.
visitation' prevented them from inspecting institutions Above Bar) and proudly recording the detailed sleuthing that sometimes accompanied their activities. In 1579 a juror spotted that innholder John Sedgwick had sent previously defaced pots 'to Wrexhall [a pewterer]... to be newly soldered', while it was noticed in 1654 that John Smith of The Bear had inscribed 'with his own hand three pint pots which were not sealed'. In 1625 six faulty jugs were found in the shop that fronted Morgan Emmott’s inn The Greyhound but were 'esteemed to be in use being some beer found in them'. The arrival of the inspection committee at premises, spatial interventions that would be unnecessary if these fines were a formulaic levy, often occasioned scuffles and speech acts; the wife of taverner John Errington gave jurors 'evil language' when they came to inspect his wine quarts in 1577, William Home of The Dauphin was presented after he 'disorderly and contumaciously' wrestled two beer pots from jurors in 1612 (after initially refusing to open his cellar door), while, as we have seen, at Grafton Jackson’s Above Bar alehouse in 1655 an unsealed and short-measure pint pot was 'hid and carried away by force of his wife she being great with child'.

However, in their guise as consumer champions the court leet could protect as well as encroach on the interests of publicans; in a characteristic episode, their energies converged most vigorously on defective barrels within the town’s brewing trade in 1655. Declaring at the height of the Interregnum regime that 'the alehouse-keepers... have received and taken much wrong', they presented and amerced four established brewers for a wide range of faulty casks; William Knight was again fined no less than £15 for a total of fifteen offending hogsheads and humbertons (or 20s per cask) discovered at his brewhouse and hidden in a nearby conduit. Their presentments on this occasion seem to have elicited a swift and dramatic response from the assembly. The offending receptacles were not subject to the usual 'staving' but underwent a symbolic 'public breaking and burning' before the Audit House (with 'the whole consent of the jury'), while the mayor ordered that 'no coopers should presume to make for the brewers of this town, nor no brewers presume to fill for sale to any of the town, other casks than such commonly called by the name of humbertons which are the sixth part of one ton

---
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122 The three other brewers were fined £5, 20s and 13s 4d. SRO SC6/1/58, Fo. 40.
and do contain according to our ancient gauge and iron rod fort-two gallons'. This instruction was conveyed to the brewers in body at the Audit House, entered into the town Assembly Book and reiterated at quarter sessions.

**Enforcement**

Enforcing this impressive gamut of disciplinary concerns at ground level was far from straightforward. While Garthine Walker has recently rejected the efficacy of 'two concepts of order' as an explanatory model for understanding early modern social and legal relationships, and although Ann Tlusty has detected considerable harmony and consensus between the drinking norms of the authorities and those of the populace in early modern Augsburg, Southampton's inhabitants and visitors often subscribed to rather different understandings of what constituted acceptable uses of the landscape of drink to those acting upon legal authority. While it was no staging ground for crude battles between carnival and lent, as Wrightson has noted, what might be 'unlawful gaming and disorderly tippling' in the eyes of jurors or magistrates was likely to be constituted as 'good fellowship and a good means to increase a love amongst neighbours' by townspeople; we have already seen this demonstrated in clashes between drinking 'companies' and that of the watch. This made townspeople less likely to inform on regulatory offences or to conform to legal stipulations themselves. When the constables attempted to eject woolcomber Richard Gardener after he relaxed in *The White Horse* inn with colleagues after a long day's aligning and separating fleece at an 'unseasonable' time of night, he not only offered them 'contemptuous speeches' but also 'continued there nevertheless'.

Even those agents officially required to present and police (watchmen, beadles, constables, sergeants-at-mace and even the leet jurors) were susceptible to numerous conflicts of interest as they negotiated the often precarious coalface of the landscape of drink; it was in recognition of these tensions that, from 1608, magistrates were
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123 SRO SC6/1/58, Fos. 40-1, 45.
124 SRO SC6/1/59, Fo. 17r.
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empowered to prosecute parish officers who failed to enact drink legislation.\textsuperscript{132} Robert Shoemaker has found in eighteenth-century Middlesex that publicans (even those ‘guilty of permitting immoral conduct in their houses’) were themselves often appointed as constables and headboroughs,\textsuperscript{131} and the same was true for Southampton; John James, an alehouse-keeper who had been presented for misdemeanours ranging from huckstering to calling in the barber on the Sabbath, was serving as the beadle for Holy Rood parish upon his death in 1615,\textsuperscript{132} while alehouse-keeper-turned-taverner Robert Stote was ‘chosen to serve in the office of beadle’ in 1658.\textsuperscript{133} William Bound, one of the sergeants-at-mace, was licensed as an alehouse-keeper upon his petition in 1662,\textsuperscript{134} while Ellis Antram, innholder of The Katherine Wheel Above Bar, had been discharged from the same office for ‘extraordinary negligence and carelessness in the execution’ in 1649.\textsuperscript{135} Simon Brock, a tippler from St. Michael’s parish, was serving as a watchman in 1593.\textsuperscript{136} Taverners and innholders occasionally levered themselves into more exalted regulatory communities. A quarter of the leet jury in 1628 was comprised of innholders (Edward Tatenell of The Crown, Morgan Emmotts of The Greyhound and Richard Masey), on which James Whale of The Dolphin and Peter Whale of The Three Crowns also served in 1637 and 1675 respectively.\textsuperscript{137} As we have seen, Edward Wilmott of The Dolphin attained the dizzy heights of the mayoralty in 1559; however, this actually led to a tightening of regulations at the lower end of the victualling hierarchy when, according to his account book, he pursued fourteen tipplers for their lack of ‘sureties’.\textsuperscript{138}

In addition, parish officers were themselves regular users of public houses, leading them to sympathise with ‘disorderly’ behaviours and occasionally ‘to surpass in their disorders the very miscreants whom they were charged to keep in order’.\textsuperscript{139} In 1624 labourer Gilbert Brickleton described how he was brought to Elizabeth Tompkins’ alehouse ‘by William Combes one of the sergeants of this town who met him near the fish market... and offered to bestow some beer on him’,\textsuperscript{140} while in the same year constables Thomas Dalby and William Sewell were called to the Audit House ‘and
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questioned for inordinate drinking and for breach of the peace at divers times and places'. 141 In 1664, at Joseph Small's alehouse in St Michael's parish, 142 sergeants-at-mace Thomas Osland and John Edmonds fell to a drunken brawl that resulted in the serious injury of the latter; the sergeants at mace seem to have been regular alehouse users, probably because of the salaried nature of their posts, and they were complained about separately in 1621. 143

Even if sober, many parish officers must have been reluctant to intervene in or present drinking disorders for fear of reprisals; in 1609, for example, the assembly activated the statute of 1608 on two occasions, committing the beadle of St Michael's parish to The Counter 'for that he fulfilled not Mr Mayor's commandment... in going to suppress drunkards making an uproar in the street in the Broad Lane', and clapping the 'principal watchman at New Comer' in the stocks for failing to apprehend some 'drunk and disordered persons' who stole the green stocks from Holy Rood church ('but that's pondered'). 144 As the latter qualification perhaps acknowledged, the risks attached to such interventions were real. Verbal abuse from patrons or publicans was almost guaranteed; we have seen how Richard Wilton offered the constables 'contemptuous speeches' when they attempted to prise him from The White Horse, while in 1613 Nicholas Bulbeck, innholder of The George, was summoned to the Audit House to answer for his abuse of a sergeant. In 1633 constable Edward Tatenell, himself the holder of The Crown inn in Holy Rood parish, was offered 'uncivil speeches and gestures' by tailor Richard Baker when he attempted to disrupt his 'unlawful games' in Thomas Pitt's Holy Rood alehouse. 145 However, physical violence was the gravest threat. It was something to which night watchmen were particularly vulnerable; we have already witnessed the experiences of weaver William Drake and his colleague at All Saints within in 1578 (who were called 'drunken knave watchmen' and physically manhandled by a group of servants), 146 while the watch of this ward came under attack again in 1592 by a group of mariners armed with rapiers. 147
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Recoveries of public houses and public order have been often been organised around a tidy interpretative duality between church and tavern; they have been figured as the institutional embodiments of the battle between carnival or lent (or, in more anthropological variants, sacred and profane space), with public houses cast as disrupters of the godly community and, more pointedly, as rival social spaces on Holy Days and during religious services themselves. Such depictions of incommensurability, which rely heavily on the colourful representative industry of Puritan moralists, have been nuanced and complicated by more recent studies; in particular, drawing on evidence from Bern and Bavaria, Beat Kümin has argued that churches and public houses on mainland Europe are more productively understood as 'closely connected and mutually dependent focal points of local cultural life'. What emerges from the Southampton evidence?

Tensions

As was implied in the previous section, public houses were often held responsible for the generalised disruption of the godly community through the immoral activities associated with them. Although in 1631 reforming mayor Robert Wroth solicited Sherfield in Salisbury for advice on how to turn Southampton into a godly city, it was never 'set upon a hill' in the same way as the Wiltshire town or other 'second Genevas' like Colchester, Dorchester, Coventry and Stratford. A godly preacher, the Presbyterian Nathaniel Robinson, was not intruded into the town until 1640s (and not without resistance), and in common with other

---
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pots no systematic campaign for the reform of the manners of the people is detectable. However, notwithstanding the absence of a thoroughgoing civic reformation, the attitude of its governors was 'lukewarm... rather than coldly secular'. As Paul Slack has noted, even those towns that were never wholly in the grip of a godly alliance 'were all, for one reason or another, and at some point or another, reforming towns', especially in the case of incorporated ports such as Southampton and Bristol where bishops devolved a great deal of control over moral behaviour to secular magistrates. Indeed, there are many indications that the atmosphere in the town 'was strongly Protestant, if not positively Puritan'; the common council funded a weekly divinity lecture, while as at Norwich and Sandwich the Calvinist refugee community of St Julian probably sharpened ascetic tendencies (notwithstanding its own drinking behaviours). As we have seen, the ambiguous testimony of public house signs offers further clues; Henry Moore was licensed to draw wines 'at the sign of The Virginia' in 1645, while according to a deposition in 1627 the Widow Lile's alehouse was called The Grace Mauzie.

Despite these iconographic attempts on the part of publicans to prove their godly stripes, from the 1570s it is possible to detect a new tone in presentments that, intertwining concern for civic and godly order, increasingly fixed on public houses as promoters and harbourers of 'sinful' behaviour. Initially, specific institutions were isolated; in 1574, as we have seen, leet jurors encapsulated John Simons' lax management of his Above Bar inn The White Horse as 'evil rule', and the house itself as 'more like a den of whores and thieves than a house of civil government'. During their aforementioned campaign against alehouses in 1600, the leet jurors fashioned them as 'receptacles of all lewd persons and authors and maintainers of them in their vice and wickedness', and in a characteristic manoeuvre invoked the harvest crisis as proof of divine displeasure. Although it was not pursued, jurors paid lip service to the early seventeenth-century reconfiguration of inebriation as a sin in its own right in 1604 when they presented the prevalence of the 'notorious sin of drunkenness... to the great infamy of the public government' and pressed for penalties to be imposed upon an
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innholder and a fencer. As well as holding individuals in a state of false-consciousness that would prevent them from apprehending their sins, drunkenness represented a slippery slope to others. It might lead to blasphemy; in 1639 'Mr Bidker' was fined 3s for 'swearing and being drunk', while in 1660 Messrs Pee and Blackamore were fined 3s and 7s respectively for 'being drunk and swearing several oaths'. Surviving office act books from Winchester's consistory court reveal that intoxicated parishioners were a disruptive presence during church services throughout early modern Hampshire: falling asleep, 'spewing', abusing the minister and other ecclesiastical officials and initiating 'brabbles' with sober parishioners that endangered both Christian harmony and church furniture.

Moving beyond these broader, well-trodden questions about the reform of manners, what was the relationship between church and tavern understood in more specifically institutional terms? The landscape of drink superimposed and coexisted with a sacralised landscape 'filled and defined' by spiritually charged sites and spaces. Southampton's sacred topography coalesced around the five most important points of access to the holy: the parish churches, whose spires dominated the skyline (to the extent that the tower of St Mary's was pulled down in 1550 lest it provide a navigational aid to the French). Four parish churches were within the walls: St. Michael's stood in a square between Bull Street and French Street (Fig. 6.2.1a); while All Saints (b), St Lawrence's (c) and Holy Rood (d) churches were located on the upper east side of English Street. St. Mary's, ruinous from 1550 but rebuilt as a much smaller chapel in 1620, occupied an extramural site at the far reaches of East Street (e). As well as these, the stranger community worshipped at St. Julian's chapel situated in the south-west portion of the walled town near God's House Gate, which had been consecrated to them in 1567 (f). These holy structures functioned ceremonially as viewing and listening platforms for a range of civic practices; mayors were sworn in at St Michael's church, while that of Holy Rood was the proclamation house, the venue where the mayor and corporation attended as a body for Sunday worship, and contained the bell tower from which Southampton took its time. However, as recent work has powerfully demonstrated, they were first and foremost sacred venues that retained their powerful intimations of sanctity long after the reformation.

15 SRO SC5/3/18 Fo. 3v; SC5/3/23 Fo. 4r.
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18 Davies, History of Southampton, pp. 389, 360-1. See the order at SRO SC2/1/6, Fo. 200r.
They existed within a complex patchwork of secular sites, and given the density of victualling provision in Southampton it was inevitable that churches and public houses were occasionally brought into close, and sometimes problematic, spatial conjunction. While, as we have seen, four of the town's eight inns were located in the northern suburb where there was no religious infrastructure, two inns within the walls were immediately adjacent to places of worship; The Star inn occupied a site two plots to the north of St Lawrence's church while The Dolphin was (and indeed remains) two plots to the north of that of Holy Rood (FIG. 6.2.2). More worrying were the physical contiguities resulting from the microbe-like proliferation of alehouses; indeed, court leet records suggest that between 1627 and 1630 All Saints church was actually bracketed by alehouses who interfered with its drainage and jeopardised its churchyard walls. Such juxtapositions perturbed leet jurors and magistrates. In 1589 'two alehouses over-right the church litten by St Mary's', the original mother church of the town, were deemed 'very unfit'. In
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20 Indeed, as an additional source of revenue, All Saints church leased two shops constructed along on its south side while St Lawrence church rented both its vestry and, until their demolition in 1627, two shops which flanked its western porch (occupied in the late sixteenth century by a glover and a shoemaker). Davies, History of Southampton, pp. 396, 378; SRO PR4/2/1 Fo. 42r.

21 John Langmier, identified as a tippler in the stall and art rolls, was presented in 1627 for blocking a watercourse through his garden which received runoff 'from the roof of All Saints church on the north side'. SRO SC6/1/41, Fo. 14r. In 1630 John Green, also a tippler, was presented 'for the want of an iron grate for the water to run through at the east side of All Saints church'. SRO SC6/1/44, Fo. 18r.

22 CLII, p. 274.
FIG. 6.2.2 The close spatial proximity between The Dolphin inn (far left) and Holy Rood church (far right), the most important of the town’s parish churches.

1662, the assembly complained that the alehouse opened by sergeant-at-mace William Bound ‘near to the parish church of Holy Rood which the gentlemen of this house present say is offensive and very unfit to be permitted so nigh to the public place of God’s worship’. Bound was ‘to get him another house to keep a tippling house in or else he is not to have any more licence granted unto him’.

23 In 1670 the same alehouse, this time in the occupancy of Thomas Johnston, was complained of again; neither Johnston ‘nor the house where [he] lives’ were to ‘be more licensed by this house’.

24 It is not hard to see why this vexed establishment ‘next the church’ was a special thorn in the side of the corporation; as well as constituting the town’s foremost sacral and ceremonial venue, Holy Rood hosted episcopal and archidiaconal visitations.

25 Moreover, as the site where the mayor and alderman themselves worshipped, any alehouses in its vicinity (and the indignities they contained) would have been rendered highly and intolerably visible to civic governors.

23 SRO SC2/1/8 Fo. 196v.
24 SRO SC2/1/8 Fo. 266r.
However, church-tavern relations could be temporally as well as spatially antagonistic, and in Southampton public drinking on Sunday was especially problematic as a profanation of the Sabbath; indeed, there were strong impulses towards Sabbatarianism in the town up to and even after the introduction of the Book of Sports (which is first referenced in the accounts of St Lawrence parish church in 1634). Although the majority of instances of Sabbath-breaking found inhabitants engaged in some form of labour (strimming, grinding, opening their shop windows or carting), nearly all leisure-related infractions involved a public house. Such cases seem to have been prosecuted most vigorously in the 1630s. During the mayoralty of Edward Exton in 1636, four publicans were fined for serving wine or beer to their customers on Sunday or on Saints Days. The following year, the indefatigable Robert Wroth fined 'two townsmen which I found drinking at Mrs Emmott's [The Greyhound] on the Sabbath day' 2s; this inn was near Holy Rood church, so it is conceivable that Wroth spotted them as he arrived for or departed from his own devotions. Sunday traders were particularly likely to come to the attention of parish officers if they flaunted and compounded their breach by playing host to revels. In 1631 Matthew Brickleton on East Street was fined 5s for 'disorders in his house upon the Lord's day', as was Goodwife Mingham in 1636. In 1637 the beadles of St Michael's were alerted by a 'great disorder and revelling in the house of Thomas Loney an alehouse-keeper on a Sabbath day at night, to the dishonour of God and disturbance of the neighbours'; not only was Loney 'henceforth utterly suppressed and disabled', but 3s 3d a piece was levied on 'those persons that were drinking there at the time aforesaid'. In 1641 Katherine Dyme was sent to St Michael's prison 'for keeping disorder in her house upon the Sabbath day and other misdemeanours' committed at her Above Bar alehouse.

The time-space disjunction was crystallised most intolerably in those situations where people not only abused holy days but also removed themselves from associated
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29 SRO SC5/3/17, Fos. 6v, 9v.
30 SRO SC5/3/18, Fo. 4r; SC6/1/46, Fos. 6r-10v.
31 SRO SC5/3/14, Fo. 5r.
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33 SRO SC2/1/6 Fo. 298r.
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church-based ceremonies in favour of the rival institutional setting of the public house. This phenomenon was first alighted on by the court leet jurors in 1590 as part of their more general identification and presentment of recusancy as 'a great abuse generally throughout the whole town'. They complained that instead of being 'at the sermon or at service, there are a great number of such lewd persons at taverns, alehouses... tippling houses or such like, a spending their money in rioting, banqueting, tables, cards or other unlawful games'. If the 'wrath of god [that] hangs over us' was to be assuaged, it was recommended 'that the churchwardens or sidemen of every parish may... truly make diligent search of every of their wards continually every Sabbath day of the innkeepers, tavern[er]s, alehouses or other suspected places... and that the constables for the time being may also be [of] assistance unto the churchwardens'. However, the remedy was ineffective, as the following year they complained that 'the old abuse by innholders, taverns and alehouse-keepers in selling victuals in time of divine service is not yet reformed, neither search made by the churchwardens... as was appointed'. Indeed, even when such initiatives were undertaken, they could backfire: at the nearby village of Hambledon in 1607, when churchwarden 'Mr Henley' was despatched to prise Christopher Orgay from a local alehouse he ended up drinking with him.

It is not hard to see why public houses represented a more attractive social venue for many townspeople. Although the perspectives of post-revisionism have rendered such statements unfashionable, reformed parish churches were undoubtedly less physically appealing in their purged, more hierarchical variants. In purely environmental terms, Southampton's denuded church interiors can only have enhanced the seductiveness of the public house. In 1572 the churchwardens of St Lawrence parish record a flurry of payments for 'whiting and plastering the church' (which extended to 'plastering and whiting... the door... by Mr Capelin's pew' as well as 'whiting... the great table by Mrs Gregory's pew'). Additionally, with the declining population many of them had fallen into a disrepair that would have left their poorer users especially vulnerable in the winter months. St Michael's was partially ruinous, while the small band of St Mary's parishioners worshipped in an unfinished and windswept chancel. However, powerful pull factors also operated. Sunday was a popular day of the drinking week, and alehouse-

35 CLII, p. 295. For examples of such Sunday patrols in other contexts see P. Hair, Before the Bawdy Court: Selections from Church Court Records (London, 1972), pp. 68, 88, 111, 151.
36 CLII, p. 295. The complaint was reiterated in 1596. See ibid. p. 306.
37 HRO 21 M65 C1/29/1, Fo. 24v.
38 Clark, English Alehouse, p. 157.
39 SRO PR4/2/1, Fo. 15v.
40 See SRO SC9/2/1, Fo. 118v.
keepers often encouraged parishioners to repudiate novel commitments in the church in favour of the attractions of their own establishments. In 1609 alehouse-keeper John James was fined 2s for 'sitting at his door all the time of sermon and then selling beer and calling in... the barber to drink then' (a high-risk strategy in Holy Rood parish), the same year in which John Jourdain, himself a member of the French church, was fined 20s for suffering twelve strangers to drink 'inordinately in his house... at sermon time'. Such cases continued during the seventeenth century, throughout Hampshire. Thomas Broman was found drinking at The Bear inn at sermon time in 1639, while in 1649 Ann Gutheridge complained that her tippler landlord Stephen Griffin 'did entertain merchant's servants on the Lord's Day with their sugar and spices at sermon time'. In 1650, George Parsons was committed to the town stocks for evading Sunday services and instead drinking 'a pot of beer' at an unlicensed alehouse in the nearby village of Northam, almost literally adding insult to injury by abusing alderman Thomas Heath on his return to the town.

As well as drinking, as we have seen, the public house remained a locus of the sorts of popular recreations that had traditionally been enacted in churchyards but were no longer acceptable in ecclesiastical precincts with reformation campaigns to de-profane church property. Many cases of Sabbath-breaking and recusancy featuring public houses therefore involved games of some sort. Sylvester Newbury was bound over in 1634 for a mammoth gaming session that involved him 'playing with William Cutler at Giles Clements' house and winning his moneys from him, on Saturday all night and on Sunday till after sermon time', while in the same year tippler James Duffield was fined two shillings for 'playing and other disorders at his house upon the Sabbath day'.

Points of Contact

Thus, there were clearly many ways in which church and public house in early modern Southampton were both spatially and temporally antagonistic and increasingly polarised
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in the course of our period. However, as Beat Kümin has recently reminded us, "while tensions undoubtedly existed, there were also mutual benefits and cultural exchanges. Church-tavern relations could be complimentary and symbiotic... as well as antagonistic".\(^5\) What intersections and points of contact emerge from the Southampton material?

First and foremost, close practical associations developed between the two institutions. The churchwardens’ accounts for St Lawrence’s parish, which survive from 1567 into the eighteenth century, allow us to reconstruct these synergies in particular detail (those for St Michael’s also survive from 1686).\(^51\) Churches, like inns, taverns and alehouses, became houses of eating and drinking during the moment of communion, and parish officials often faced disciplinary charges for failing to secure bread, wine or appropriate serving vessels; the churchwardens of Soberton were presented in 1599 as they ‘did not provide wine for... Easter last’, while those of Wymering lacked a suitable flagon for their wine in 1623.\(^52\) The churchwardens of St Lawrence often obtained their own sacramental victuals from local publicans. Between 1608 and 1624 a flurry of payments were made to vintners Christopher Daniel and John Vaughan, and alehouse-keeper and baker John Ellery.\(^53\) Later in the seventeenth-century parishioners paid for deliveries of bread and wine from innholders Thomas Hawker, John Freeman and Thomas Winter,\(^54\) while in the early 1700s a standing order for wine seems to have been set up with the parish’s leading inn The Star.\(^55\) Taverners and innholders probably also loaned pouring vessels on occasion, although, lacking a financial dimension, these informal arrangements would have evaded the careful totting of the churchwardens. Produce and impedimenta from inns, taverns and alehouses might enter sacred space under more quotidian circumstances. As we have seen, it was common practice for labourers and craftsmen engaged in the maintenance of the church fabric to be regularly replenished with beer, almost certainly fetched on a ‘take-out’ basis from a parish
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\(^5\) Kümin, ‘Sacred Church and Worldly Tavern?’, p. 37.
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alehouse. In 1635 there is a payment of 3s 6d ‘for beer to the workmen and labourers’ responsible for implementing the spatial reforms of the Laudian period, while 6d was spent on beer in 1662 ‘for those that mended the pump’. In St Michael’s, also, 10s was paid in 1687 ‘to beer to the workmen’.

Public houses also provided an indispensable infrastructure for clergy. Their attendance was not encouraged; clerics who had distempered themselves in Hampshire alehouses were a reliable source of office causes at the church court, while shortly before the reformation Bishop Fox of Winchester warned the Augustinian canons of the Priory of St Denys, situated a couple of miles beyond the walls, not to combine their regular trips into Southampton to officiate in its churches with dinner in any of its taverns. However, they were impossible to avoid altogether. We have already encountered Thomas Butler (the curate of nearby village Millbrook) and William Morgan (a minister from Oxford) as they ‘kept company’ between The Dolphin, The George and Roger Morse’s alehouse in November 1624, while visiting church representatives were often lodged at inns. A ‘preacher’ stayed at ‘Peter Janverin’s’ (The Star inn) in 1571, in 1637 a group of Laudian commissioners stayed at The Dolphin, while during annual episcopal visitations it was customary for the bishop to be accommodated at an inn as well as a large sum to be allocated to an elaborate dinner. Early entries are coy about exactly where this was held, but later, more effusive payments make it clear that The Star was the venue of choice. On a more routine basis, officials from St Lawrence engaged inn space for the pursuit of their own parish affairs, especially as they periodically rented out the vestry where such activities would normally be conducted, and perhaps additionally as the lack of windows in combination with encroaching buildings made this particular church an unusually dark environment unsuitable for the preparation of minutes or the scrutiny of figures. Indeed, from the 1660s into the early eighteenth century there are a profusion of references to a wide range of inns (mainly The Star, but also The Dolphin, The Greyhound, The Black House and even suburban inn The George) being
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57 SRO PR4/2/1 Fo. 121r, 174v. In 1679 also there is record of payments ‘to the workmen at several times to drink’. Fo. 205v.
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64 SRO PR4/2/1 Fos. 194v, 342v, 344v.
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used for parish meetings, for the election of churchwardens, and for the drawing up and submission of parish accounts.

We can also detect a wide variety of more amorphous social and cultural exchanges. As we have seen, innholders and tavern-keepers often participated in the religious life of their parishes by serving as churchwardens: Peter Janverin, keeper of The Star inn, was one of the incumbents when the St Lawrence accounts open in 1567; vintner John Vaughan served a year's term in 1614; Edward Tatenell (keeper of The Crown) served for the years 1625 and 1626; while William Turner (keeper of The Greyhound) served for the years 1685 and 1686.

Public houses themselves also had sacral associations. While, as we have seen, they operated on a variety of levels, at their most straightforward many of the town's public house signboards evoked religious themes. The Star, where so much parish business was conducted, is the most obvious example (evoking the star of Bethlehem but also the star of the sea associated with the Virgin Mary), but we also encounter The Katherine Wheel (the badge of an eleventh-century order that protected pilgrims en route to the Holy Sepulchre) and, from the 1650s, a tenement called The Angel. Many interiors were furnished by spiritual images and texts; a chamber of The Dolphin contained 'one new picture of Adam and Eve' in 1624 (we have already seen its extensive library of religious books), John Bigg's tavern in Holy Rood parish contained 'one English testament' in 1621, while the kitchen at The Crown inn contained a bible as well as 'a book of the prime supremacy in ecclesiastical causes' in 1624. These may have inspired the popular religious conversations and debates which, as we have seen, seem to have flourished in public house settings. To recapitulate, in 1593 James Cox, a barber surgeon from London, stayed at John Roche's alehouse in St Michael's parish and from supper until eleven o'clock at night 'he was in conference with John Vaughan and others at Mr Roche's door and within his house, about the scriptures and other matters'. In 1628, in a chamber in Richard Pye's tippling house and after a jug of beer, a scrivener from London took up a copy of Erasmus's paraphrases ('a book lying then in that chamber) and '[threw] it down in a disdainful manner'; the maid accused him of being a papist, although he vigorously denied the charge.
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6.3 CRIME

This section addresses the relationship between the landscape of drink and the more serious ‘interpersonal’ offences of violence and theft. To disaggregate these practices from regulative and Sabbath offences is to some extent artificial in a period in which these transgressions were themselves ‘crimes’ punishable before judicial venues and even secular crimes were figured in highly moral ways. However, they can be distinguished for analytical purposes. Historians have been inclined to perceive close connections between inns, taverns, alehouses and these more serious varieties of malefaction. Peter Clark has populated the alebench with an ‘alternative society’ of vagabonds and petty thieves, while within the historiography of crime Jim Sharpe, generalising from his own studies of rural Essex, has found ‘no reason why the disorderly alehouse tucked into a blind corner of the parish should not also serve as a centre for organised criminal activity’. The complaints of Southampton’s leet jurors, as we have seen, provide ample support for such interpretations as they pegged a medley of outlying institutional presences as crime hotspots: they encapsulated an unlicensed alehouse operated by the pavier on the town willowbeds as a ‘ready receptacle for malefactors’; categorised The White Horse inn Above Bar as ‘a den of... thieves’; and labelled Peter Hendrick on the West Quay a harbouerer of pirates and regular receiver of stolen goods.

However, such examples, which populate a minority of disorderly or unlicensed houses with the denizens of a self-contained underworld of career criminals, constitute a rhetorical containment strategy which distorts the quotidian realities of both public houses and crime in provincial contexts. Public houses, as we have seen, were not an activity at the edges but penetrated to the heart of the walled town. Moreover, notions of semi-skilled ‘craft crime’ linked to a discrete criminal subculture need to be adjusted for Southampton, as for most provincial contexts. As Paul Griffiths and especially Garthine Walker have recently argued, most crime in early modern England was not undertaken by...
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2 For a similar distinction see Withington, ‘Views from the Bridge’, pp. 145-6.
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a subcultural criminal community, but rather represented the opportunistic and small-scale manoeuvres of mainstream individuals whose illegal activities did not occupy a world apart but, in Walker's important insight, 'followed general patterns of sociability and economic exchange'. The concept of the 'criminogenic' site, drawn from environmental criminology, helps us combine and theorise these insights, and to explain the prominence of public houses in criminal cases in more nuanced ways than the 'receptacles for malefactors' paradigm allows. Predicated on the insight that urban microsites vary in their crime-producing ability, 'criminogenic' sites, usually at the nub of daily life, are those that enclose situations and scenarios which are in some ways conducive to or facilitative of activity determined as wrongful. The theory does not assume that locales act as a determinant of crime, or are inherently 'bad'; rather, it suggests that crime is a plausible outcome of certain routine combinations of social, cultural and economic practices, themselves wholly legitimate, found at certain sites. The evidence of depositions, which provide unrivalled contextual insights into the social formation of sites of crime, allow us to recover some 'criminogenic' features of Southampton's public houses in two key legal contexts.

Violence

The landscape of drink furnished a primary setting for physical conflicts in early modern Southampton, as throughout Europe; in 1576 alone, for example, all of the nine 'bloodsheds' recorded and fined by mayor John Ayles occurred within public houses. While it is now orthodoxy within tavern studies that such incidents were seldom random or uncontrolled in character (and did not represent, in Peter Clark's elegant phrase, 'general hooliganism'), several factors made fights especially likely to break out in these distinctive urban settings. As we have seen, inns, taverns and alehouses were heterogeneous social environments, while the presence of intoxicants could inflame choleric temperaments or simply relax inhibitions; it seems likely, for example, that the four members of the French church fined 'for breaking the peace fighting and quarrelling

9 Clark, Alehouse, p. 147. For a more subtle approach see Schwerhoff, 'Criminalised Violence'.
at [John] Jourdain's tavern' in 1609 would have evaded magisterial scrutiny had they not spent the Sunday in question 'extraordinary drinking and being drunk' both at the tavern as well as at 'several alehouses' beforehand. As we have seen, the refusal of a drink or a verbal assault in the form of a defamatory insult could easily, and justifiably, escalate into a physical altercation as the injured party attempted to defend their male honour before assembled witnesses, while the competitive games which flourished within victualling environments created a powerful additional context for fights (for similar reasons, the town's licensed tennis court and official bowling green were also frequent venues for 'bloodsheds'). In 1558 'Harry the woolpacker' was fined 3s 4d for 'striking' a member of his company while they were 'playing at dice', while, as we have seen, at The Crown inn in 1654 feltmaker Edward Bear hit Thomas Hawker with a beer jug after there 'arose some difference in their play' while the pair were at tables.

While the majority of violence recorded in public houses involved patrons, relations between customers and hosts created a further faultline for physical conflicts, especially over the delicate structural issues of payment and refusal of service. In 1630, two witnesses described how George Latus (who was himself an ostler at The Dolphin inn) struck Holy Rood taverner John French with a wine pot, struck up his heels and fell on him as, after becoming drunk and abusive towards his host, French had attempted 'to put him out of the house' (or 'forth of doors'), while in 1664 Andrew Burke, who held the inn at the nearby Four Posts, was stabbed by gunsmith John Townsend after he pursued him all the way to the town walls following a dispute 'touching the payment of the reckoning'. It was probably similar circumstances that, in 1565, led James Kettle to 'make an assault and affray upon Thomas Broker', innholder of The Katherine Wheel, 'str[iking] him with his fists, and giv[ing] him very evil words contrary to the peace', while in 1572 James Betts made a 'fray' upon innholder of The Star Peter Janverin. Indeed, it was no doubt their vulnerability to such incidents that led many of the town's publicans to amass considerable armouries. Cooper and alehouse-keeper John Manfield of St Michael's parish, for example, kept a pike, sword, dagger, axe, halberd, two rapiers, a longbow and two spears in his kitchen. On other occasions publicans themselves appear to have been somewhat heavy-handed in their dealings with guests; Matthew
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14 SRO SC9/3/13, Fo. 14r.
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Mollard, who sold ale in a cellar in Holy Rood parish, was fined 6s 2d by the leet jurors in 1602 ‘for bloodshed in breaking a man’s head in his own house with a candlestick’; while innholder Richard Osgood appeared at gaol delivery in 1619 (with sureties from two other town innholders) ‘touching the beating and hurting of Richard Kingston blacksmith and putting him in danger of his life’.

Although people were occasionally murdered in public houses (in 1645 surgeon Arthur King was presented for ‘a manslaughter committed on the body of William Blackhall surgeon at the sign of The Star’), as the foregoing examples suggest, most of the violence which took place within the physical confines of the inn, tavern or alehouse involved fists or artefacts and stopped well short of serious injury. In cases where it did, agents and scenarios are revealed to have been untypical. In 1602, Richard Jones wounded Gilbert Lambert with his sword in the latter’s alehouse; however, Neale had just been targeted by robbers, while he was a gentleman and thus had unusual recourse to such an expensive weapon whose use was legally circumscribed. Likewise, in 1650 alehouse-keeper Walter Bradley disembowelled soldier Simon Rylie in the kitchen of his Holy Rood establishment; however, Rylie had entered Bradley’s establishment not to join company but to serve him with an arrest warrant, while the latter was also a gentleman who was able to pluck down a rapier then suspended from his kitchen wall. More commonly, such extreme forms of violence tended to manifest externally in the streets, even though they were clearly premeditated by consumption and exchanges which had taken place within establishments. It was only after they left a series of town alehouses that two Dutch sailors ‘did fall out together, and drew their knives one at the other’ in 1593, while in 1602, although two Dutch sailors ‘began to quarrel’ within a subterranean drinking establishment, it was at the nearby Watergate that they produced their knives. More clearly still, in 1628 Sarah Harvey described how, after drinking for four hours at her father’s alehouse, two sailors ‘being gone out the house fell out in the street with their knives and one of them... wounded the other’.

The lack of serious violence within public houses, and its cognate tendency to be displaced into other settings, is best explained by the formal and informal mechanisms
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for conflict resolution which patterned these environments and usually prevented the escalation of disputes. The town’s official police institutions in the form of constables, beadles and watchmen, as we have seen, paid special heed to these environments and, if summoned, could enter premises to separate combatants; in 1607 a payment was made for the cure of a constable bitten by a dog while suppressing ‘an outrage committed by some of the king’s guard’ at The Dolphin inn in 1607, while in 1678 clothworker William Andrews described how, when a carpenter from a visiting sloop ‘fell upon him and beat him... and threw him down’ in an unspecified alehouse, ‘he cried out murder and one of the beadles of this town came to his assistance and rescued him’. Publicans, legally obliged to maintain good order in their houses, also had a powerful interest in keeping the peace between their customers; when Richard Jones was examined about ‘the occasion of his quarrel’ with tippler Gilbert Lambert, he plausibly claimed that when a sailor came at him with a ‘poniard’ (a small, slim dagger) ‘the said Lambert that is now hurt came between them and it was his fortune to receive the blow.

However, the restoration of order was not a monopoly of official agents, and the first attempts to reconcile individuals invariably came from within company itself (even though we must be aware that individuals testifying to incidents of violence were likely to amplify their own mediatory initiatives before magistrates). When soldiers Philip Mahollan and John Clifford were duelling in the courtyard of The Bear inn in 1628, their colleague Henry Wheatley described how ‘he cried to him [Clifford, then gaining the upper hand] as he was a man to hold his hands’, while in 1650 mariner Richard Corben described how, when ‘there happened some blows’ between him and Mark Rogers at William Grafford’s alehouse after they fell out over ‘mariner’s art’, their colleague John Pitt ‘endeavoured to part them... and commanded Rogers to keep the peace’. It was not unusual for individuals and groups from beyond the boundaries of company to intervene in fights, especially if they felt solidarity with the injured party or the terms of engagement were seen as disproportionate. We have already seen how labourer Henry Smith came to the defence of labourer (and tapster) Edwin Daniel when he was physically assaulted by an armed soldier in the hall of The Dolphin inn in 1670, while when the fight broke out between taverner John French and customer George Latus in

24 MB, pp. 96-7. It is not clear if the dog in question was involved in the suppression or was one of many mastiffs who roamed the streets in this period. See complaints at CLI, p. 16; RBII, p. 143.
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the former's tavern in 1630 a wide variety of agents from within and beyond the establishment participated in the stabilisation of social relations; his daughter-in-law Anne Shackley described how she despatched French's maidservant Mary Guillett 'to call in company to part them, and she herself loosed her father in law's hand from... Latus's hair, and presently came in [her] brother Andrew Shackley and parted them and others suddenly after'.

Theft

Rather less serious attention has been paid to the relationship between the public house network and theft (used here to encompass larceny, burglary and robbery); indeed, in his study of Parisian institutions, Thomas Brennan has concluded that public houses 'were rarely the scene of such crimes'. In Southampton, by contrast, theft was the single most common issue beyond regulative offences in connection with which public houses at all levels of the victualling hierarchy appear in the records of the court leet and quarter sessions. While historians of early modern England have acknowledged these links in other contexts, there has been a tendency to unconsciously reproduce contemporary stereotypes about 'dens of thieves' and 'alternative societies', rather than to tease out the environmental features of public houses, in themselves mainstream, non-transgressive and related to core functions, which were likely to implicate them in property crime.

That is not to say that they weren't sometimes instrumentalised by semi-organised criminals, especially drawn from the ambulatory population of migrant workers and servants in search of employment who regularly resorted to petty theft in order to survive. In 1584, weaver and confessed thief John Skinner described staying in six public houses throughout southern Hampshire. Two wayfarers who stayed at Southampton's institutions Above Bar confessed to using their suburban layovers as headquarters for larcenous operations and repositories for stolen goods. George Land, an itinerant carpenter, arrived at Southampton in 1583 'and there lay at the sign of The George'; he described using the inn as the base for a series of raids on town gardens for leftover planks of wood. In 1593 Thomas Eyres, an locksmith from Andover, described staying first at The George and then transferring to 'Mr Roche's' alehouse. While at the
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latter he stole linen, wool, two cloaks and two hats from Peter Trimchin's dwelling house and took them 'unto Mr Roche's house to his lodging and there put it into his coffer': the following evening he described breaking into the cellar of Stephen Michelet, 'a Frenchman dwelling in St Michael's parish', and stealing an earthen pot of butter which he also 'carried unto his host's house... and the maid of the house named Bess was up... and let him in'.

On a more quotidian basis, the provision of intoxicants rendered the public house a 'seductive' space that could play a key role in tipping especially its poorer clients into theft. Many Southampton examinates referenced drunkenness arising from public drinking when their own thefts were committed; while these appeals could certainly have been deployed falsely as a mitigating detail, they could equally refer us back to circumstances that sound all too plausible. Eyres had been drinking at The White Horse inn when he committed his first theft. Interrogated about how a stolen soldier's coat found its way into his dwelling house, labourer James Chidley 'said he... was drunk and did not know what he did when he took the said coat and carried it to his house'. Likewise, in 1636, Norwich mariner Manass Harwood confessed to stealing a piece of silver from a ship he was helping to unload on the southern quay while 'overcome' after drinking in the Holy Rood alehouse of Morgan Ollas, his landlord. The closely related communicative norms of 'table talk' could furnish additional inducements. In 1586, after a day of heavy imbibing at various town institutions, shearman John Atkins described how at nine o'clock he and colleague John Bodman arrived at the unlicensed tavern operated by wealthy merchant Dennis Rowse in St Lawrence's parish and 'there drank a pot of beer together... and fell to complaining about money'. Bankrupt, under the influence of alcohol and stimulated by Rowse's lavish dwelling, Bodman confessed to returning after the tavern had closed and stealing bacon, napkins and tablecloths from Rowse's cellar while Atkins kept watch in the neighbouring garden of The Star inn.

As this example suggests, public houses also promoted property offences in that they themselves offered a proliferation of targets for the 'sharp eye and fast hand' in a

35 SRO SC9/3/9, Fos. 68r-69r.
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41 SRO SC9/3/7, Fos. 17r-18r. Rowse was fined 6s 8d as a 'vintner' in St Lawrence's in 1594. SC6/1/22, Fos. 7r-13v.
context of public access that would insulate perpetrators from the more serious charges of house-breaking or burglary. Inns and alehouses were receptacles not only of malefactors but, as we have seen, of an unusual concentration of those household items (cloths and linens, pots and serving utensils) that attended their hospitality functions and always attracted petty thieves, especially female ones, due to the ease that attended their removal, storage or transformation and the speed and profitability with which they could be resold. Drinking and serving vessels done out of pewter were a popular choice. In 1577, nine year-old Alice Davis confessed to the piecemeal theft of flower pots, porridge dishes, spice plates, candlesticks and beer pots from Above Bar inn The White Horse, which she then sold to town pewterer John Wattis. In 1618 Elizabeth Quentin stole a pewter pot worth six pence from William Rawlings' inn, while in 1621 a singlewoman from Chichester and a widow from Abergavenny were indicted 'for stealing a quart pot of pewter and a pewter platter' from alehouse-keeper Anne Greenaway. Sheets were also prime targets; in 1623 one Burton stole sheets and other linen from the alehouse of widow Mary Lawrence, while the following year Joan Randall, a servant at The Dolphin inn, confessed to stealing 'out of one of her Mrs' chests a fine large sheet, which she divided into three parts', two which she worked into aprons and one of which she hid under her bed (where it was discovered by innholder's wife and veteran of the trade Susanna Hockley). In 1697 a soldier stole 'linen and other things' from Edward Deal's victualling house. Prepared foodstuffs might also be opportunistically swiped from public house kitchens for immediate consumption; in 1746, victualler's wife Martha Moyes described how 'a pudding and a dumpling [were] taken out of a pot which was boiling upon the fire in the kitchen... by some persons sitting there'.

Added to the material culture repertoires of the house itself were the commodities and personal effects introduced by carriers and guests. Unattended wagons in the courtyards of inns, laden with fabrics relating to Southampton's important cloth

44 SRO SC9/3/3, Fo. 30v.
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trade, offered rich pickings if gates were left unlocked or temporarily pinned. *The Bear*
Above Bar was Southampton’s main carrying inn, and experienced frequent raids on its
carts (not least as it offered convenient egress into surrounding fields and along the
coast). In 1631 two packs of linen cloth were stolen from the Andover carrier there, 52
while in 1639 weaver Nicholas Post confessed to stealing a fardle of white cloth ‘out of
the wagon in the backside of the inn called *The Bear*... and that he carried the same away
into Houndwell, and threw it into a ditch’. 51 The contents of the chambers and chests of
overnight guests were also enticing and readily accessible at a time when many of
Southampton’s institutions (especially its alehouses) had latches rather than locks on their
doors, or still lodged guests together or in passage rooms without any independent
access. Clothes were particularly sought after, both for their important symbolic
dimensions and buoyant resale value. 52 In 1623, tailor William Adams stood accused of
passing through James Heely’s chamber in *The George* inn and stealing a cloak left on the
bed while Heely was distracted with cards. 53 In 1649, London tanner William Roles
described how, while sleeping at *The Crown* inn in Holy Rood parish, apprentice Arthur
Moody ‘came secretly into [his] chamber’ after unhooking a latch and ‘did privately take
the breeches... lying upon his bed’, while in 1651 London embroiderers Thomas Deacon
and Thomas Parham arrived at Southampton with ‘a suite of clothes being a pair of
breeches and a jacket and a green apron which [lay] in a chest in the chamber’ of a
Salisbury inn. 54

As sites that combined sociability with regularised financial transactions public
houses were a venue for the identification and priming of promising targets for pick
pocketing and robberies. Most often, victims were selected within establishments and
robbed as they made their way home. In 1574, one of the complaints lodged by court leet
jurors against *The White Horse* inn was that a ‘Captain Bartholomew’, set upon by five
footmen while three or four miles out of town, had ‘reported to his judgement and
thinking the watch to have been made in that house’. 55 On a Saturday in October 1656,
‘having received of one Richard Hobbs 18s’, Millbrook tanner Cornelius Williamson
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49 SRO SC9/4/387. For more examples of thefts from the town’s eighteenth-century publicans see SRO
50 E&DII, pp. 101-4.
51 E&DIII, p. 96.
52 See B. Lemire, ‘The Theft of Clothes and Popular Consumerism in Early Modern England’, *Journal
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'went over unto one William Pavior's house to drink' (Pavior ran a popular alehouse in Holy Rood parish). As we have seen, he 'fell in company' with labourer, soldier and false friend Edward Langhe who manipulated the rituals of company to get him drunk and, on the pretext of walking him home, 'struck up [his] heels and fell upon him and... took out of [his] pocket a leather bag with £5 of money therein' by the town watering pond on Windmill Lane. More unusually, victims might be robbed within premises. In 1602 Richard Jones, the gentleman from Denbighshire encountered above, shared a pot of beer in Gilbert Lambert's tippling house with a soldier and 'finding himself very weary with travel, and not desirous to walk... lay down there a while upon the bedside'. While he slept two sailors came into the room 'the which sailors finding him asleep and seeing he had a pair of green silk garters upon his legs came unto him and untied his garters'. As we have seen, in 1745 Mary Humphries stole 'a pair of silver shoe buckles and a stock buckle' from a soldier after a liaison at The Rcebuoe alehouse.

Southampton's public houses also offered an arena for the disposal of stolen goods, where illegal practice again conformed to and relied upon mainstream patterns of circulation and exchange. Representational economies often figured publicans as knowing receivers of contraband, as did the leet jurors. In 1602 they recommended the suppression of Peter Hendrick as he had 'received men's servants into his house when they should be keeping of their master's ships at all hours of the night, whereby many men have lost much of their ship provision and [it is] thought that much of it is conveyed that way'. However, the line between organised receiving and other varieties of acceptance was a fine one in an informal economy in which payment routinely and legally 'ebbed and flowed across the threshold between cash and kind'. Southampton's firmly entrenched culture of pawning, whereby small items were offered as a payment in kind or to secure additional credit, was readily manipulated by those wishing to convert stolen objects into immediate dividends (labourer John Cock encapsulated the logic in 1637 when he instructed his colleague John Ralles not to return a deal board abandoned in the backside of a dwelling on which they had been working 'because it should serve as drinking money for them'). Examples of this form of disposal abound. In 1583, a
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mariner brought a stolen soap tallow of eight pounds in weight into Hugh Emery’s Holy Rood alehouse so that he and colleagues might ‘drink often in the house’; while in 1624 a silver spoon stolen from servant Elizabeth Warton was pawned at ‘the sign of The Bear’ by a wheeler. Many publicans were probably less inclined to ask questions if proffered items could be incorporated without further transaction into their retail portfolios. In 1630 Abraham Vibert, who sold ale in St Michael’s parish, purchased in money and beer seventeen pounds in weight of leaf tobacco that had been stolen from the cellar of the vicar of Holy Rood. Likewise, in 1583 a calf rustled from a nearby close apparently served as the substantial reckoning for four townsmen at the East Street alehouse of town cook Richard Rich (where its distinctive hooves were witnessed ‘seething in a pot’).

Illicit objects could also be readily insinuated into the networks for the exchange of second-hand goods which, as we have seen, crisscrossed Southampton’s public houses. In 1576 Edward Boryet confessed to selling stolen wax to Thomas Ecton at The White Horse inn, while breeches stolen during a burglary at nearby Hill were hawked to John Knott at Thomas Dally’s St Michael’s alehouse in 1637. Two years later Nicholas Post, the larcenist we encountered previously stealing cloth from wagons at The Bear, confessed to retrieving his ill-gotten fardle from the town fields and selling it ‘several times, in piecemeal’ at eleven places, four of which either Post himself or subsequent record linkage has identified as public houses: at ‘the inn over Itchen ferry’ (twenty-four ells); at William Lyle’s alehouse in St Lawrence’s parish (twenty ells); at John Marlow’s alehouse in St Michael’s parish; and at Anthony Everest’s drinking establishment ‘at The Black House’. When a woman carried off a riding hood from a High Street dwelling house in 1741, she sold it at The Turk’s Head inn at the nearby Four Posts on the same afternoon.

On a larger, more organised and altogether more daring scale, the traffic in stolen horses also relied on virtually identical methods of exchange as a legal trade in horses that frequently manifested outside of Trinity Fair in selected inns or alehouses with stabling
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facilities and was often sustained by the local knowledge of ostlers and innholders. In 1602 Somerset clothier Richard Whitaker attempted to sell a stolen horse at The White Horse (the institutional focus of Southampton’s legitimate horse trade), while in 1583 Edward Elyford had arrived at The Dolphin on a suspicious dun gelding that he attempted to offload. Henry Henstridge, the keeper of The George inn Above Bar, embarked upon what can only be described as an equine crime spree across south-western England in the summer of 1650, and the patient magisterial reconstruction of his activities over some sixteen folios of the relevant examination book discloses his extensive reliance on the contacts and stables provided by the public house network (concern with horse theft was particularly intense during and immediately following the civil war when the overwhelming demand for draft animals had caused prices to soar). The testimonies implicate The George inn itself; an alehouse in nearby Swathling; ‘Farmer Fry’s’ alehouse in Wanstrow Common; an alehouse in Laighton; an alehouse in Evercritch (Somerset); and finally The Cross Keys inn at Salisbury. However, when innholder Richard Vibert was asked ‘how a certain grey nag came into his possession’ in 1642, he was able to prove his innocence with reference to ‘the toll book kept for entering such bargains and sales’.
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So far we have mainly been concerned with the threats posed by the landscape of drink to urban stability; threats to the church, their relationship to crime, and their submission to a wide variety of early modern technologies of surveillance (which extended to the collecting and ordering of information about publicans as well as regimes of looking and listening). In this final section, I will conclude the analysis by demonstrating how public houses, in Southampton as in Augsburg, could be 'enlisted by the authorities as an aid to social control' by functioning as sites of surveillance within the urban community.

Michael Frank has provided a useful basis for such an interpretative manoeuvre in his analysis of publicans as instruments of social control in eighteenth-century Germany, in which he fashions publicans as 'authorities' agents' responsible for the monitoring of 'ordinary inhabitants'. However, his focus on the figure of the publican ignores a wider range of personnel encountered within public house environments and elides the agentic role of physical conventions. This is surprising given the prominence of an iconic architectural set piece within surveillance paradigms; while there is debate over the precise role and functioning of Jeremy Bentham's panopticon within the Foucauldian schema, it is the spatial organisation of sight-lines at a material site that facilitates 'conscious and permanent visibility' and the subsequent range of disciplinary psychological effects (culminating in self-monitoring 'docile bodies'). We cannot liken the drinking rooms of inns, taverns and alehouses to the cellular 'small theatres' of the panopticon, or even to other extra-carceral but 'total' environments such as factories, schools and hospitals; as we have seen, public houses, especially at the lower end of the victualling spectrum, were seldom purpose built, and it was not until the nineteenth century that recommendations emerged for the 'laying open' of pub interiors through the abolition of 'secret' compartments. However, we can nonetheless apply what Soja has termed his 'provocative spatialisation of power' to the quotidian settings of early modern Southampton.

---
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Beyond the obvious fact that public houses were more readily exposed to official scrutiny than ordinary dwellings, a range of spatial attributes contributed to their functioning as surveillance sites. By their nature, and as we have seen, they contained a greater concentration of agents than many other urban locales; while by no means always busy they experienced a steady throughput of drinkers and lodgers, to which were added publicans, their families and small armies of support staff in the form of tapsters, drawers, maids, chamberlains and ostlers. All of these potential surveillants enacted their social and vocational roles within open spatial settings; while public houses contained a complex mixture of public and private spaces, inventories reveal most establishments to have had a main drinking room, most usually a hall, parlour, forechamber or, in the case of inns, a designated taphouse. As we have seen, even in alehouses, volumes could be striking; Ann Filleter could seat seventeen individuals in her forechamber in 1674, while Olive Addison’s hall contained some sixty yards of wainscot benches in 1611. Moreover, there is little evidence from the inventories that these drinking rooms were subdivided by the multiplication of concealing partitions that seem to have been common within metropolitan establishments. Only one alehouse, that operated by William Bound in Holy Rood parish, contained ‘table board partitions’, and it is unclear exactly how they were configured. Even when drinking took place within more sequestered interior spaces, they were still frequently exposed to prevailing sightlines by cracked walls and torn hangings, by their status as ‘passage rooms’, or through the provision of ‘porthole doors’ (as at Henry Padgett’s alehouse in 1629). In which contexts could these unique social and spatial conventions be used for surveillance?

Crime

Recent studies have noted that one of the central purposes of surveillance practices is to ‘sort out, filter and serialise who needs to be controlled and who is free of that control’. A wide range of itinerant people - usually mobile labour, but officially fathomed as ‘vagrant’ - constituted early modern England’s foremost ‘panoptic sort’, as we have seen, such individuals provoked intense anxieties in Southampton’s authorities, with their co-option of the town’s public house network causing particular concern. However, just as newcomers exploited public houses, so town governors used these institutions to
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monitor the identities and movements of non-residents in ways that would not have been possible in purely domestic settings. Alehouse-keepers were statutorily required not to 'suffer any person to lodge or stay in his house above one day and one night but such whose true name and surname he shall deliver to some one of the constables or in his absence to some of the officers of the same parish the next day following'.

Indeed, in cases where newcomers could not secure alehouse accommodation, they often described lodging in the dwellings of constables, beadles or watchmen. Publicans at all levels of the hierarchy regularly deposed to the ambits and activities of wandering persons. In 1586 Francis Borey, who kept an alehouse in St Lawrence's parish, claimed that he knew itinerant Richard Pointer 'who... lay in his house at twelve months past... for four nights and... that he never saw him work at any time', while even John Simons, that scourge of the leet jurors at The White Horse, described the appearance and movements of two individuals 'lately out of trouble from London' who unsuccessfully sought beds at his inn in 1577.

In the 1670s, when fear of 'firings' at the hands of newcomers was running high after similar incidents in London and Taunton, magistrates instructed constables, beadles and watchmen to interrogate innkeepers as well as to 'search all inns and other public houses and give Mr Mayor an account of all strangers that come to town'.

However, while peripatetic groups were the primary targets of such social sorting, the close monitoring of all was required in a period where, as we have seen, criminal behaviour was not confined to a self-contained underworld. Moreover, the eternal vigilance required in such scenarios was not a monopoly of state actors, even the unpaid, temporary officers that comprised the 'unacknowledged republic' of parish communities. Instead, we are now fully aware that the early modern criminal justice system, at the level of the detection of crime as well as during the final and juridified stages of the legal process, depended overwhelmingly on the participation of lay agents.
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Within a social and legal context in which ordinary householders comprised 'lead investigators', and as the sheer volume of pre-trial depositions concerning crimes in or relating to public houses suggests, they possessed a number of attributes that rendered them suitable for the detection and further prosecution of felonious activity.

Guests, servants and publicans were alive to the 'visual cues' that often formed the first indication that a crime had recently been committed and could be used as evidence of culpability before examining magistrates. While definitions of eccentric behaviour were highly discretionary, they often took the form of bodies out of time and place, moving against the normal circulatory rhythms of public house life. In 1649, at The Crown inn, Salisbury glover Arthur Moody was apprehended after midnight by guest John Russell as he moved through his passage room after stealing the breeches of William Roles, a London tanner lodged in the adjoining chamber. Woken by a 'rushing of papers', he saw Moody crouched 'between the window and the bed's feet', and 'called unto the people of the house to bring a candle and assist him'.

Public houses also provided natural environments for acts of ostentation and conspicuous expenditure that could cause individuals to fall under suspicion. In 1650 Thomas Atkins, innkeeper of The Cross Keys at Salisbury, told Southampton's magistrates that suspected horse thief Henry Henstridge had not only drank at his establishment but had arrived 'booted and spurred' (i.e. on horseback) was also 'very full of money, and pulled... his handful of money out of his pocket'.

Public houses also promoted a variety of aural indicators that might be suggestive of a recent transgression. 'Careless boasting' of criminal activity ensured a direct route to an inquiry, and, as we have seen, inns, taverns and alehouses were natural settings for male grandstanding. Horse thief Henry Henstridge once again fell foul of this; while deep in his cups at an alehouse in nearby Swathling, he bragged to the alehouse-keeper that he planned 'to bestow £100 in horseflesh this summer'. In 1702, William Drew entered Robert Parkes' victualling house and claimed that while walking in the town fields 'he followed Mary Joyner and threw her down and entered her body between two or three inches or more and showed the knees of his breeches and took drink and wished it was his damnation if it was not true'. His eschatological fate is unknown, but of more
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immediate concern was probably the warrant issued for his arrest.\textsuperscript{21} As sites of bargaining, proprietors and other guests frequently reported overhearing spoken agreements between thieves and their accomplices for the transport and disposal of stolen items. In 1587, when drinking at an alehouse in nearby Totton, Roger Byston described seeing George Johnston deposit a blue coat with local resident William Trippe ‘and desired the said Trippe to sell it for him... for as much as they could get for it’. while in 1637 victualler’s wife Joan Dally reported overhearing a stranger agree to sell for John Knott a pair of breeches which he was suspected of stealing from a dwelling house in nearby Beavis Hill while the two shared a bed in her St Michael’s establishment.\textsuperscript{22}

They also supplied manifold contexts for the reification of stolen objects. Although some were less scrupulous, most publicans reported suspicious items when they were offered them at pawn; in 1630 alehouse-keeper Mary Audley described how Francis Clark offered her a dubious hogshead of tobacco ‘and bade her take that and pay for herself’,\textsuperscript{23} while in 1639 alehouse-keeper Anna Lile described how she became suspicious when weaver Nicholas Post offered her a piece of cloth which was ‘wet’ (as we have seen, it had been stolen from a wagon and hidden in the town fields).\textsuperscript{24} The following year, innholder John Warren described being offered ‘three yards of red broad woollen cloth’ which had been recently carried off from the garden door of a dwelling house in nearby Nursling.\textsuperscript{25} Even if incorporated into material culture repertoires, stolen goods might still be spied in circulation by eagle-eyed customers. In 1624, while drinking at The Bear inn, a carrying establishment Above Bar, James Warton spotted an engraved silver spoon which had been stolen from his sister’s master some weeks previously, and which had been pawned there by a wheeler.\textsuperscript{26} Inns were also fully integrated into early modern England’s legitimate trade in horses, and as such formed natural venues for the identification of stolen animals that might have evaded detection in other contexts beyond the designated Trinity Fair.\textsuperscript{27} Southampton’s trade in horses centred on none other than The White Horse, and stolen nags bearing physical signs of recent disguise or
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mutilation were spotted and stayed there at the behest of watchful ostlers in 1575, 1579 and 1602.  

A range of these attributes converge in the detailed depositions of Nicholas Everard and Leonard Mills, tapster and innholder of The George inn respectively, taken in relation to the theft of a horse in 1593. Mills described how, one Saturday evening, George Tompson from nearby Itchen Ferry complained while drinking in his taphouse that ‘there were two fellows who had stolen a gelding and a mare from him and that one of their names was Large’. According to Everard, the following Monday between seven and eight o’clock ‘the said Large and another man unknown... having a red face came into The George in their boots... and told [him] that they had a nag at Hill to sell... then came into the taphouse and drank about a half a dozen of beer’. Everard described how ‘well knowing the said Large and supposing the other fellow to be the other [thief]’ he ‘did immediately certify his master’s brother who draws the wine in the house of the two being there and willed [him] to tell his brother Leonard ... that those two men were those of whom Tompson had given them warning’. Mills described how, having been summoned to the taphouse from a chamber where he had been dining with guests, Everard ‘whispered in his ear that those two were the fellows after whom Tompson did enquire’; after making normal conversation with the men, let them ‘go forth of doors’ to Hill (as he believed ‘that they might be better taken [there] than here’) and, accompanied by Everard, walked to the dwelling house of Tompson’s brother Thomas (a shoemaker who lived within the walls) and ‘told him’. The three walked to Hill to seek the culprits.  

**Sexual Immorality**

It was not only felonious behaviour that early modern English were vigilant of; in a period in which sexual immorality was a perennial public concern, manifested in parliamentary acts against adultery and bastardy, it behoved all townspeople to be on the lookout for any carnal relations that manifested outside the prescribed channel of Christian wedlock. Adulterous wives and their lovers, as we have seen, were likely to have used public houses. They were venues for ‘legitimate’ courtship rituals; provided food, drink and games; and offered an enclosed environment, complete with beds, free
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from both spouses and, if the chosen establishment was in a town or village where one or ideally both parties were not known, neighbours who might report their conduct to public authorities. However, as we have seen, within the intimate patterns of looking, listening and movement that characterised public houses, especially of the smaller variety, other guests and proprietors frequently detected the illicit nature of their 'resorting' and rendered account of it before the relevant secular as well as ecclesiastical judicial bodies.

In 1652, several witnesses, including the alehouse-keeper's wife, reported on the suspect behaviour of two people from the liberties, Hugh Tanner from Durley and a 'strange young woman' believed to be married to William Rook of Upham, in the public room of Thomas Loney's alehouse in St. Michael's parish. They were seen sharing a jug of mead, a piece of fresh pork and some 'penny simnels' (a small, sweet bun); moreover, they were 'very familiar together in their discourse, and did frequently call each other uncle and cousin, in the hearing and presence of these deponents'.

The request of a back room, 'private' room or chamber, which most establishments even of the smallest variety offered to their guests, might be seen as offering adulterous couples a degree of protection from the straining eyes and ears of surrounding agents. However, as Laura Gowing has noted, such seclusion strategies were unlikely to be successful in a period when urban interiors were divided by thin and crack-prone plaster partitions, and in which vigilant individuals proudly reported peering through and listening at architectonic apertures (keyholes, half-open doors, holes in walls) for the moral good of their communities regardless of legislative provisions against 'eavesdropping'. One of the guest chambers of Ralph Robin's alehouse in St Michael's parish, as we have seen, contained a large hole into a neighbouring property in 1576, while the following year three witnesses reported seeing Catherine Vallett committing adultery in a chamber of her alehouse through a 'hole in the wall'. Moreover, as we have already seen in the case of 'Gubbins of Heath' and his lover at George Watson's alehouse in Magdalen Field Above Bar (which scandalised Watson's tenants by being conducted 'in private sort'), simply occupying such spaces, especially if behind lock and key, invited suspicion precisely because they offered a degree of insulation from the controlling 'public' gaze that prevailed within main drinking areas. Larger establishments offered more in the way of 'back stage' zones, but their use was subject to the scrutiny of a wider
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range of vocational actors and, if discovered, had entirely the same implications. In 1569 John Manreth, ostler at *The Dolphin* inn, described how he had seen his colleague Matthew and married woman Agnes More go ‘into a stable... where nobody was and continued half an hour the door being shut’.  

Cases where extramarital fornication was uncovered in public houses are by nature more suggestive of the intimacy of their looking and listening regimes, especially their special ability to permeate with dormitory practice into interior spaces that would for the most part be off-limits in ordinary dwelling houses. This porosity is highlighted in a series of depositions from 1580 which report on the sexual deportment of Leonard Mills, who ended his career as an innholder in Southampton, but at this stage was still plying his trade as an alehouse-keeper in the Hampshire village of St Mary Bourne (near Andover).  

Three young men who had been enjoying drinks and cards in his establishment one Sunday evening turned state witness on their host, providing Winchester’s consistory court with detailed accounts of his fornication with a servant, Agnes Iparame, in a bedchamber during their visit. After a period of ‘making merry in the hall’, the men described how ‘about midnight’ they retired to a ‘chamber by the hall to lie down’. The chamber, characteristically for a small alehouse, contained two beds; they shared one (again, this was common practice), while ‘lying upon the other bed as though they were asleep [were] Leonard Mills... and Agnes Iparame’. The men feigned slumber and sharpened their sensory faculties. Surely enough, after ‘a good while in which [it] might be thought they were asleep’, they heard ‘tumbling and stirring’ from the adjacent bed and, ‘by reason of the glimpse of the fire in the hall giving onto the chamber door’, could ‘plainly espy Leonard upon Agnes’. They also reported whispered exchanges between the pair, claiming that Leonard urged Agnes ‘to be as good as your word’, assured her that the room’s other occupants were ‘fast asleep’, and in response to her request for haste replied in a Pepysian manner that while he ‘could despatch him quickly... I have such pleasure in it if I could tarry very near an hour’.  

**Speech Acts**

That surveillance was not wholly an ocular operation, despite the marked visual bias of its orientating theoretical models, has been implicit within the foregoing discussion:
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public houses exhibited their own distinctive 'heard worlds', 39 and we have seen publicans and patrons combine the evidence of their ears with that of their eyes to lend multisensory authority to their accounts of varieties of (mis)behaviour. However, the next section participates more explicitly in what has been termed a 'sound history of surveillance' by exploring some ways in which public houses enabled the detection of misdemeanours that for the most part could only been sonically apprehended: what was said. 40

As we know from the work of Laura Gowing and others, in a very real sense words had power in the towns and villages of early modern England; in a society of low literacy locutionary acts were the raw materials out of which a 'common fame' - and, by extension, the obliteration of local reputation - were fashioned, and Hampshire people regularly deployed private litigation in the form of defamation suits at the Winchester consistory against those individuals who jeopardised their credit through slanderous allegations. 41 The communicative norms of inns, taverns and alehouses made them an extremely common location for such insults; then as now alcohol loosened tongues, and public houses were prime settings for attacks on and defences of honour as well as for the exchange and dissection of local hearsay about the intimate details of personal lives (or 'talk about talk'). However, the very high number of defamation suits located within public houses must also suggest some ways in which they facilitated the detection of slanderous speech acts and, in turn, furnished their victims with the necessary resources to restore their reputations at law. 42

A verbal assault in a public house, especially if it occurred in the hall, was extremely likely to generate a large number of 'credible witnesses' in the form of customers, publicans and various support staff who could report on what they had heard and whose presence contributed to the gravity of the offence in the eyes of the court. 43 While the validity of testimony from patrons could always be contested for reasons of

42 As well as the examples cited in the following discussion, see also HRO 21 M65 C3/11, Fos. 25, 318; M65 C3/9, Fos. 233-4; 21 M65/C3 8, Fos. 58-9, 108-9, 133-4, 459-60; 21 M65 C3/7, Fos. 81-2; 21 M65 C3/4, Fo. 642; 21 M65 C7/1/93, 95, 96; 45-6, 48-9, 35-7; 21 M65 C7/2/237-8, 171-3, 108-10, 50-1, 46, 40-1, 5-8; 21 M65 C7/5/32.
43 An interrogation pro forma from 1711 asked deponents 'in whose presence were such words spoken'. HRO 21 M65 C7/2/5.
drunkenness (in 1631, in relation to a slander at The Swan alehouse in Winchester, a friend of the accused discredited John Adderley’s incriminatory statement ‘by reason he was very much in drink for so he was’), this was unlikely to devalue the evidence of proprietors, tapsters or ostlers. Other ‘public’ settings for insults (wells, meadows, cathedral closes, marketplaces) offered a similar number of surrounding agents; however, these comparatively open environments were more exposed to ambient noise and prevailing wind and lacked the architectural acoustics ideal for the accurate perception of speech. A small alehouse which held both defamer and witnesses in a single room was perhaps the ideal detection chamber (as in 1591, when four individuals reported on hearing Nicholas Lacy call Helen Clements an ‘arrant whore’ while sitting at the fire in a Winchester alehouse), although sound is no respecter of space and could carry through the multiplication of drinking rooms characteristic of larger establishments. In 1595 for example, when John Lambert said to Thomas Parrett that ‘I have known thy wife better than thou dost’ while they were seated in the ‘cellar’ or ‘buttery’ of The Katherine Wheel in Winchester, he was overheard and testified against by three witnesses (including the inn’s ostler) who placed themselves in the adjoining hall at the time of the insult.46

The listening regimes of public houses could also operate in the interests of the defendant in defamation suits. They were not always full, and some witnesses referenced the sparsity of attendance levels to diminish the magnitude of the injury to the plaintiff; in 1587, while clothier Peter le Gay confirmed that Mary Elzey called Mary Watton several varieties of whore in a tavern operated by a Southampton merchant, he added that ‘there was not great company present and therefore this deponent thinks that the name of Waterton cannot be much impaired’. Given their role as brokers within local rumour networks, publicans were also well placed to exculpate defendants if their claims were not sui generis but instead happened to form part of an existing and more widespread ‘fame’. Testifying in Sandly vs. Levermore in 1574, innkeeper William Pratt from the nearby market town of Romsey confirmed that while he had heard Levermore say to John Bennett that ‘you keep her [Alice Sandly] and she is your whore’, there was already ‘a fame of incontinency between Alice Sandly and Bennet’ in the community ‘before the speaking of these words’.48

44 HRO 21 M65 C3/12, Fo. 58.
45 HRO 21 M65 C3/10, Fo. 164.
48 HRO 21 M65 C3/4, Fo. 779.
Of course, it was not only ordinary householders who went in daily fear of gossip, verbal abuse and libellous attacks on their credit; Southampton’s corporation itself listened carefully for those discussions of national and local themes that opened discursive space for the sorts of discontent and wildfire rumour that, if left unchecked, could incite violent crowd action in the form of riot or rebellion. The role of quotidian speech acts outside of formalised communicative arenas within the politics of resistance has been powerfully emphasised in recent work. In particular, James C. Scott’s comparative anthropologies of the politics of speech and silence, widely endorsed within early modern studies, have encouraged historians to configure the utterances of inferiors as ‘weapons of the weak’ that constituted indirect challenges to the authority of local elites. According to Scott such expressions flourish at semi-secret or ‘sequestered social sites’, and within the field ‘alehouse gossip’ stands as a metonym for a full gamut of empowering subordinate verbalisations. For sure, many scandalous statements originated in public house conversation; as we have seen, their constant flow of travellers rendered them ‘revolving doors of news, rumour and gossip’, while the presence of alcohol removed those inhibitions to fugitive statements that might have prevailed in other spatial contexts. However, there is something problematic about regarding the resulting talk as a type of ‘offstage behaviour’ or ‘hidden transcript’ whose manifestation within what has been termed the ‘unregulated space of the alehouse’ was a guarantor of concealment from the ruling groups whose authority it is seen to frustrate. Instead, evidence from Southampton’s quarter sessions, where seditious speech was vigorously pursued by the council in their capacity as JPs, suggests that public houses functioned as principal terrains for the detection of oral dissent in urban contexts.

As we have seen, public drinkers, most commonly strangers to the town, were frequently heard and reported for discoursing treasonously on the highest affairs of the realm, all of which can be analytically reconstituted in terms of surveillance. When the London scrivener drinking in Richard Pye’s alehouse in 1628 threw down a copy of The

---


50 Scott, Domination and the Arts of Resistance, p. 20.


52 Fox, Oral and Literate Culture, pp. 352-3.

Paraphrases of Erasmus 'in a disdainful manner' and claimed that 'if god were not more merciful to our nation there would not shortly be this much left of our nation, pointing within an inch to the top of one of his forefingers' he was testified against by Pye's servant, a singlewoman called Dorothy Tublin. Likewise, when minister and schoolteacher William Morgan from Somerset became even more garrulous on foreign policy in the chamber of an alehouse operated by clothier Roger Morse in St Michael's parish in 1624 (claiming, to reiterate, that Elizabeth I [whose portrait graced the Bargate] was 'a whore and a witch', that 'England was weak and the castles were weak' [injuring local pride by specifying the local battlements at Calshot and Hurst which protected the Southampton Water], and that Philip II 'paid more in one year to his soldiers than all the revenues of England were worth'), he was testified against by his travelling companion, a local man also present and the alehouse-keeper. Publicans were also likely to be reported by their customers for their own scandalous interjections on current events: when John Pratt, a shoemaker and alehouse-keeper of long-standing in St Michael's parish, claimed in 1641 that 'the king had usurped three shires from the Scots which are Northumberland, Cumberland and Westmorland', he was reported by a mercer then drinking in his house.

Intelligence gleaned from public houses about destabilising dialogue on global issues acquired a powerful ideological charge in the 1650s and 60s. During the Interregnum, Southampton's Parliamentarian loyalists staked out the ale bench and strained their ears for the linguistic indiscretions of nostalgic Royalists. In 1656, labourer John Pee described how while drinking at 'Old Kingston's who sells ale in the town' he heard William Braithwaite claim while 'much in drink' that 'my Lord Protector is a cheater and I will prove him a cheater'; Pee, clearly something of a Republican toady notwithstanding his own drinking behaviours (he informed on the fornication of two lovers in a town ditch three years later) was probably not trying to exonerate Braithwaite with reference to his intoxication so much as to exploit and perpetuate the prevailing propaganda image of Royalists as profligate dipsomaniacs. Under the Restoration
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54 E&DII, pp. 51-2. Pye is not explicitly described as an alehouse-keeper in Tublin's deposition, although he is described as a 'tippler' in the stall and art lists for 1628 and was presented for a 'quart pot unsealed' the previous year. SRO SC6/1/43, Fo. 6r-10r; SC6/1/42, Fo. 17r.
55 E&DI, pp. 54-8. Again, deponents do not specify Morse as an alehouse-keeper. However, he is identified as a 'tippler' in the stall and art rolls for 1624. SRO SC6/1/39, Fo. 6r-15r.
56 E&DIV, pp. 25-6. Pratt had been selling ale since at least 1619. SRO SC6/1/36-51.
regime, Royalists tuned their ears; in 1660, three men reported on Christopher Highton's alehouse claim that 'King Charles I (of famous memory) is a traitor'.

Yet it was discoursing on Southampton matters, with its greater potential for fomenting disquiet in the Audit House backyard, which was probably the priority of the council. Records disclose 'weapons of the weak' constantly exploding in the hands of their wielders as slurred insults and grumbles about civic power holders were heeded in hostelries and transmitted to their intended victims through judicial venues. In 1636 it came to the attention of mayor Edward Exton that, 'behind his back in an alehouse', tailor Richard Wilton claimed that 'he [Exton] took 12d of him to buy a shoulder of veal for his supper; meaning 12d taken from him by Mr Mayor for his profane swearing and cursing'. A further 12d was levied on Wilton for this 'scoff and derision'. Likewise, fishmonger Robert Cross, who sold ale in St Michael's parish, reported in 1577 that his customer John Harrison called the alderman 'knaves' for confiscating his eels. Still more serious were specific allegations of institutional corruption which flourished in the powder keg of the 1640s. In 1642, two concerned tapsters at *The Dolphin* informed on Richard Read's allegation that town magistrates 'favoured papists', while in the same year in the same inn common brewer Christopher Benbury was overheard articulating the potentially detonative claim that 'the [court leet] jury did countenance false measures and weights' and that 'men paid for selling... false measures'. In 1724 a peruke-maker drinking at the same inn reported its tapster William Smith for speaking 'abusively of the corporation' (specifically his claim that 'there was not any honest man in the corporation except Mr Leonard Cropp').

**CONCLUSIONS**

Public houses were enmeshed in various layers of governance in early modern England, although existing work has been too preoccupied with the warp and weft of central policy at the expense of the local apparatuses through which it was reproduced, and which could introduce priorities and power conflicts unforeseen by national governors. In Southampton the jury of the manorial court leet emerge as the most vigorous would-
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58 SRO SC9/3/12, Fo. 127r.
59 SRO SC9/2/10, Fo. 23r.
60 SRO SC9/3/3, Fos. 33v-34r.
61 E&DIV, p. 43.
62 SRO SC9/2/10, Fos. 49v, 53v. Benbury was clearly disposed towards indiscretions of this sort, as two years previously he appeared before the same body 'concerning some abusive words spoken against this corporation and also against the assessors of the subsidies of this present parliament'. The spatial context of these earlier claims is not specified. Fo. 40r.
63 SRO SC9/4/112c.
be controllers of the landscape of drink. However, for the implementation of their recommendations they remained reliant on a common council who, while increasingly effective in the prosecution of unlicensed alehouse-keepers in the seventeenth century, remained highly discretionary in their handling of regulative offenders up to and during the 1650s. For the enforcement of central and local preoccupations all bodies were reliant upon a large core of unpaid officials, many of them themselves in various ways or at various times 'people of the inn', who faced numerous challenges and conflicts of interest in the police of drinking spaces.

Although there were spatio-temporal conflicts between church and tavern in early modern Southampton, there were also numerous practical and cultural interdependencies and points of contact. Likewise, although public houses represented a common setting for the more serious interpersonal offences of violence and theft, these reflected not a marginal status but rather developed out of the centrality of these environments to legitimate modes of social and economic exchange. Although early modern operations of representation often likened public houses to closed environments, to 'receptacles', 'nests' or 'dens' impervious to processes of social monitoring, inns, taverns and alehouses were in fact ventilated and shot through by practices of looking and listening and thus performed stabilising political work as objects of surveillance within the urban community. However, this rehabilitation of public house sites as loci of surveillance necessarily places a question mark over any 'hidden transcript', those hostile statements and gestures so central to recent excavations of popular political agency, that relies for its subversive force on 'remain[ing] essentially hidden, passing by unnoticed' within hermitic habitats such as the alehouse. Indeed, in light of Andy Wood's very recent attempt 'to qualify the... emphasis upon the agency of labouring people' within a Yorkshire valley, it seems pertinent to ask if there is a 'darker, more pessimistic' story to be told here also; a story in which alehouse remarks were dangerous, not empowering, and where publicans informed on paying customers, patrons on their hosts and good fellows on each other not out of deference or respect for authority but because of 'repression, fear [and] anxiety' in a social and political environment characterised above all by its 'hugely unequal distribution of power'. For all the insistence on the negotiated character of authority within recent work, the cooption of public houses by Southampton's governors ultimately reveals as much about the reach and adaptability of urban ruling structures than of their susceptibility to modes of contestation.
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64 P. Griffiths, A. Fox & S. Hindle, 'Introduction', in idem, Experience of Authority, p. 6.
7 Conclusions

At six o'clock one Tuesday evening in the March of 1651, the peace of a quiet corner of Southampton's landscape of drink Above Bar was shattered by a violent rescue from arrest. In his account of the incident Abraham Kent, a husbandman from the nearby market town of Romsey who was serving as a special bailiff, described how he served an arrest warrant on 'William Palmer the elder of this town butcher in Windmill Lane'; although not indicated in the testimony, Palmer was an unlicensed alehouse-keeper from St Michael's parish (although it is not clear that his unlicensed status was the occasion of the warrant; the despatching of a special bailiff suggests that it was for debt).\(^1\) Kent described how, leading Palmer past the 'Bear Corner' (the junction of the road Above Bar and Windmill Lane occupied by The Bear inn [FIG. 7.1a]) with his colleague Robert Saunders, Palmer 'threw himself down of his own accord and clasped his hands and legs about a post [which probably bore the inn's sign] and said he would go no further'. At this point, 'many women and other company being gathered together... threw many stones at them', leading to a scuffle which nearly resulted in the stabbing of Saunders and the escape of Palmer. However, after giving him 'divers blows', Kent described how they subdued their prisoner and, with harmony restored, 'went quietly to together to The Katherine Wheel [inn] [b] where this examinate and Saunders got him into the house and shut the doors and kept them fast until company with great violence broke open the door and rescued... Palmer from them'.

Thomas Pee, a Southampton woolcomber who witnessed the affray, testified to a different version of events. He claimed that 'near The Bear [inn] he saw the bailiffs with each of them a great cudgel beat him [Palmer] down, and as soon as he was getting up they beat him down again, and gave him many blows to the number of forty... and presently they helped him up again and carried him away towards The Katherine Wheel'. At this point 'many people being gathered together threw stones at the... bailiffs, and when the... bailiffs and Palmer came to The Katherine Wheel Kent beat the said Palmer down again and Saunders drew him by the arms into the house, and Kent continued beating him with his cudgel and treading upon him whilst Saunders drew him in, and having gotten him in the bailiffs shut the doors'. Pee described how he and the company heard

---

\(^1\) He first appears in the stall and art rolls for 1648. SRO SC6/1/54, Fos. 6r-11v.
'many blows', and 'heard the said Palmer cry out murder, and at length the back door being broken open... Palmer got out and escaped from the said bailiffs'.

This incident condenses and encloses many of the themes and conclusions of this study. For Pee and the other neighbours, the violent mishandling of an alehouse-keeper by two outsiders and the choice of an ancient inn as the setting for the abuse (which included 'shut[ting] the doors' long before the tolling of the curfew bell) must have seemed an intolerable travesty of agents and spaces which would have been central to their social and cultural worlds. We have examined this centrality from many angles. They provided livelihoods for both their proprietors and their servants (including many more women than has hitherto been assumed), and were loci for the acquisition of both dietary staples as well as the consumption of a range of more exotic consumer items and some highly differentiated gastronomic experiences. They were sites for games, the exchange of news and used goods and, perhaps most importantly, were the place where 'company' was most likely to be joined and a wide range of social, cultural and vocational affiliations expressed and reproduced. Indeed, as in the case of the shipwrights at The Star which we have already encountered, it seems likely that the 'company' that liberated

2 SRO SC9/3/12, Fos. 60r-61r. On similar rescues in the French context see Rau, 'Tavern Conflict', p. 108.
3 As we have seen, The Katherine Wheel was established by the wheelwright Thomas Broker in 1573. See his payment at SRO SC5/3/1, Fo. 141r.
Palmer via the back door of *The Katherine Wheel* had its own social origins at *The Bear* inn, perhaps in the 'arbor' filled with tables and benches that appraisers noted here in 1647.4

Although there is every reason to doubt his claims, in Kent's account *The Katherine Wheel* is also figured and fashioned as a site of order. At the very heart of the leet jurors' moralised geography, the inn operates not as a disorderly space but as a venue for the reimposition of the bailiff's authority and the restoration of urban stability. Likewise, the following year, Kent again described how he and a fellow bailiff carried another arrestee (on this occasion a butcher called Thomas Lee) 'to the house of Ellis Antram... called *The White Horse* and kept him in an 'upper room'.5 For sure, Southampton's governors perceived potential for disorder in the landscape of drink as they surveyed it from the corporate locales of Guildhall and Audit House; in particular, as we have seen, they subjected alehouse-keepers to intimate processes of visual and textual monitoring. However, as in Augsburg, what emerges more strongly from the evidence is the far wider range of contexts in which public houses were used to express and reinforce visions and varieties of civic order; as economic nodes in the vitally important carrying trade; as lodgings for elite guests and settings for corporate meetings and commensality; and as a highly versatile means of funding social services. More sinisterly, they were used to monitor the identities and movements of newcomers and especially the speech acts and gestures of townspeople and visitors in ways that complicates their participation within an emancipatory 'hidden transcript' and contributes to a critique of the usefulness of the concept to early modern power relations that has only very recently started to emerge.

A range of other conclusions are adumbrated in the accounts of Kent and Pee. The use of the language of geography in the title of the thesis is not coincidental, and throughout the analysis the importance of the material and spatial frameworks of public drinking has been emphasised and evoked as 'one of the protagonists of the events narrated'.6 Southampton people did not experience inns, taverns and alehouses as 'texts' or 'representations' but as 'substantive geographies' (or 'concrete venues of public life') that differed quantitatively and qualitatively from other urban sites. Even in this quiet stretch of agricultural land Above Bar their density was great enough to dominate the interrogations and, characteristically, their signs could be both 'clasped' and, some days
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4 HRO 1647 AD104/1-2.
5 SRO SC9/3/12, Fo. 84r. On this occasion also a drinking company intervened.
after the event, linguistically mobilised by a bailiff and a woolcomber to anchor their experiences in time and space (the 'Bear Corner'). A range of practices and agents converged in public house settings in ways not found and often not practicable in other urban venues and institutions. More pointedly, their internal micro-geographies were rich in visual and social meanings and were primary terrains for the negotiation of ideas about publicity and privacy as economic and domestic functions overlapped in complex ways. The agency represented by 'company' was not just a meeting of 'people and people' but, in Amos Rapoport's phrase, 'people and things and things and things' as drinking groups mobilised internal boundaries (chambers, parlours) and other spatial components (chairs, tables, candles, drinking vessels) to focus their sociability and reify their existence within public space.  

Closely related, the accounts of Kent and Pee also suggest the importance of local knowledge within drinking cultures; they knew how to refer to the 'Bear Corner', and probably also that William Palmer was himself a seller of ale. The study has drawn on evidence from a small stretch of time and space and the local framework of Southampton's landscape of drink has constituted (in Andy Wood's phrase) a 'substantive' as well as a 'methodological' focus. This might seem strange at a time when the stability and meaning of parochial entities is facing a historiographical onslaught from networks at a variety of scales; David Rollison has recently claimed that early modern towns are optical illusions created by the arrangement of their institutions and archives, while as a port Southampton clearly participated in the wider zone of exchange and circulation that we now know to call the 'Atlantic World'. However, from the perspective of public drinking and social micro-sites, these approaches have distinct analytical limitations. For sure, as we have seen, a Southampton tavern was likely to be operated by a Frenchman, to contain goods from Portugal and Virginia, and to be populated by a rambunctious 'company' of Dutch mariners. However, as Anthony Giddens has noted with reference to time-geography, to make these wider lines of force the object of enquiry has the interpretative side-effect of reducing the individual nodes within which they intersected (in this case inns, taverns and alehouses) to 'black boxes'. Moreover, an emphasis on larger (especially global) schemes and patterns distorts the

---

8 Wood, *Politics of Social Conflict*, p. 27.
9 Rollison, 'Exploding England'.
experiences and subjectivities of those poor individuals who so often set up alehouses; John Pratt, a shoemaker who sold ale from the same dwelling in St Michael's parish between 1619 and 1654, would surely be intrigued to learn that Southampton was an archival trick of the light, or that he was an inhabitant not of a Hampshire port but of an ‘Atlantic World’. And empirically, as we have seen, anyone who entered Southampton encountered and temporarily inhabited a landscape of drink that was highly particular in terms of its physical constituents, personnel, range of goods and services and regulatory culture (where central government directives were selectively and discretionally enforced by a unique constellation of local agencies).

Finally, and with special reference to public house studies, the interrogations of Kent and Pee suggest fluidities and slippages between public houses and agents, as the arrest of an unlicensed alehouse-keeper spatially and imaginatively intersected with two ancient inns. Throughout, we have seen that the ‘three-fold institutional categorisation’ of alehouse, tavern and inn, enshrined in common law and used as the format for all existing approaches to English public houses was complicated and reworked across Southampton’s landscape of drink. Although still useful ideal typologies, and while the largest inn would still occupy a very different material and social world to the smallest alehouse, the border energy between many institutions in a very real sense broke down these distinctions in both perception and social practice. In particular, within such a dynamic setting, types of user did not remain quarantined within individual classes of establishment but ranged promiscuously between the different levels of the hierarchy and interlinked alehouse, tavern and inn within their drinking and lodging itineraries.

---

13 Clark, English Alehouse, p. 5.
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