



Universiteit
Leiden

The Netherlands

'By the vse of others penne': the collaborative production of Queen Elizabeth I's English scribal letters, 1581-90

Murphy, C.M.

Citation

Murphy, C. M. (2026, July 1). *'By the vse of others penne': the collaborative production of Queen Elizabeth I's English scribal letters, 1581-90*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4307302>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4307302>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Notes

A Note on Semi-Diplomatic Transcriptions

The manuscripts cited in this thesis have been transcribed by the author as semi-diplomatic transcriptions. Original punctuation and spelling have been maintained, with the exception of the long *s* ('ſ'), which is transcribed as 's', and *j*, which is transcribed as 'i'. Original capitalisation is maintained in word-initial position only. Abbreviations have been expanded and are indicated by italics. In favour of readability, quotations from manuscript sources do not indicate deletions or insertions unless directly relevant to the passage in which the quotation occurs, in which instances legible deletions are indicated by strikethrough, illegible deletions by '[deletion]', and insertions are given in superscript type. Illegible words are indicated by [illeg.]. Words between square brackets have been inserted by the author unless otherwise indicated. In order to aid readability, I have occasionally inserted (?) to highlight passages in which the manuscript's syntax strongly suggests a rhetorical question: this should not be read as an indication of textual uncertainty. Where quotations are taken from primary sources printed in editions or secondary literature (e.g., Robert Beale's secretarial treatise as printed in Conyers Read's *Mr Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth*), the principles employed by those editors are maintained.¹ An exception is the capitalisation of secretary/Secretary, which is adjusted to align with the principles employed throughout the thesis (see 'A Note on the Capitalisation of the Term "Secretary"' directly below).

A Note on the Capitalisation of the Term 'Secretary'

Terms such as Principal Secretary, secretary, clerk, amanuensis, and scribe are often used almost interchangeably and in such a fashion that it creates no little confusion. In this thesis, for clarity the term 'Secretary' is capitalised where used in reference to the Principal Secretary or to the office of Principal Secretary. 'Principal Secretary' is preferred to 'Secretary of State' as the latter term was not in widespread use before 1600 and is therefore anachronistic for the present study.² The capitalised, compound nouns 'French Secretary', 'Latin Secretary', and 'Second Secretary' refer exclusively to those offices. They are capitalised to reflect their official employment by the crown. For the sake of semantic clarity, however, they will always be retained in their compound form, so that the capitalised 'Secretary' only refers to the Principal Secretary.

When uncapitalised, 'secretary' is used to refer to individuals personally employed by the Principal Secretary or other individuals in the work of epistolary production and is *not* used in reference to those employed formally by the Crown. Those individuals formally engaged by the

1 Robert Beale, 'Instructions for a Principall Secretarie, Observed by R. B. for S[i]r Edwarde Wotton: A[nn]o Do[m]i ni, 1592', in Conyers Read, *Mr Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth*, 3 vols (Harvard University Press, 1925; repr. Archon Books, 1967), I, pp. 423–43.

2 Angela Andreani, *The Elizabethan Secretariat and the Signet Office: The Production of State Papers, 1590–1596* (Routledge, 2017), p. 48.

Crown in the Signet Office, the Privy Seal Office, and the Privy Council are referred to as ‘clerks’, with ‘under-clerk’ used in reference to the scribes working beneath these men in their respective departments, attached to them as their personal servants rather than to the Principal Secretary or to the Crown. The term ‘amanuensis’ is generally avoided, but where used is narrowly defined to refer to ‘a person who writes or copies text from someone’s dictation’ and therefore refers less to a distinct role than to a function that any of the aforementioned individuals might perform.³ Where used, the term ‘scribe’ encompasses all those ‘formally or informally requested by another to create the physical entity of a text’, irrespective of their employer.⁴

3 Entry ‘amanuensis’, in Peter Beal, *A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology: 1450 to 2000* (Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 14.

4 Lotte Fikkers and Holly Riach, ‘Manuscript, Women, and Scribal Culture’, in *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Early Modern Women’s Writing*, ed. by Patricia Pender and Rosalind Smith (Palgrave Macmillan, 2022), pp. 1–7 (p. 2), doi:10.1007/978-3-030-01537-4.

Glossary of Key Terms

Allograph

A palaeographic term that refers to an accepted version of a letterform.¹

Approach stroke

A palaeographic term referring to a stroke that ‘records the initial movement of the pen into an essential stroke in the construction of a *letter form*’.²

Ascender

A palaeographic term referring to the part of the letter that ascends above the line.³

Aspect

A palaeographic term referring to the ‘general impression on the page made by a specimen of handwriting at first sight’,⁴ encompassing ‘the height, spread and slant of the individual letter forms and the degree of straightness of the individual lines’,⁵ how neat or messy the hand is, the writing angle (whether the hand is upright, forward, or backward-leaning), and its rotundity (how rounded or angular it is).⁶

Bowl

A paleographic term referring to the rounded compartment of letters, where the stroke does not connect to the stem, ascender, or descender, leaving the component open.⁷

Clerical countersignature

The signature of the signet clerk attendant as appended to a royal scribal letter (‘counter’ to the royal sign manual). Clerical countersignatures occur in the lower right-hand corner of warrants and bills produced in the Signet Office, and indicate that their texts had been examined by the

1 Tom Davis, ‘The Practice of Handwriting Identification’, *The Library*, 8.3 (2007), pp. 251–76 (p. 255), doi:10.1093/library/8.3.251.

2 M. B. Parkes, *Their Hands Before Our Eyes: A Closer Look at Scribes* (Ashgate, 2008), p. 149.

3 Heather Wolfe, ‘The Alphabet Book: A Guide to Early Modern English Secretary Hand’, Folgerpedia, updated 2023 <https://folgerpedia.folger.edu/mediawiki/media/images_pedia_folgerpedia_mw/fc/AlphabetBook2023.pdf>, p. 44 [accessed 27 May 2024].

4 Parkes, *Their Hands Before Our Eyes*, p. 149.

5 Simon Horobin, ‘The Criteria for Scribal Attribution: Dublin, Trinity College MS 244 Reconsidered’, *The Review of English Studies*, 60.245 (2009), pp. 371–81 (p. 371), doi:10.1093/res/hgn153.

6 Peter A. Stokes, ‘Describing Handwriting, Part V: English Vernacular Minuscule’, DigiPal, 21 October 2011 <<https://web.archive.org/web/20200214095101/http://www.digipal.eu/blog/describing-handwriting-part-v-english-vernacular-minuscule/>> [accessed 25 May 2025].

7 Wolfe, ‘The Alphabet Book’, p. 45.

signet clerk attendant before presentation to the monarch for signature. They may take the form ‘Executed (or Examined) per [name of the signet clerk]’.⁸

Contrast

A palaeographic term referring to the visual effect generated by the pen-angle, defined by M. B. Parkes as ‘determined by the angles at which the scribe cut the nib and held the pen [...] recorded in the direction of the broadest strokes, and the opposite direction (at a right angle) of the hairline strokes formed with the edge of the nib’.⁹ The pen angle therefore informs line thickness; variations in line thickness create contrast between broad strokes and narrow or hairline strokes.

Descender

A palaeographic term referring to the part of the letter that descends below the line.¹⁰

Docket

An ‘annotation inscribed on a letter or other document briefly summarizing its contents, or recording some information relating to it, such as the name of the writer, date of writing or receipt, or a reference for filing purposes’.¹¹ In this thesis, the term ‘docket’ (or ‘docquet’) expands this definition to include the short minutes of letters, warrants, and bills that were entered into the registers of the Signet Office.

Duct

The duct, or ductus, of a hand constitutes ‘the way in which the letters are formed, the sequence of the strokes creating a letter [...] how the pen was cut and held, how much pressure was applied to it, how quickly or in what direction the hand moves, [and] how carefully or carelessly the penmanship is executed’.¹² Naturally, the duct of a hand informs its aspect, and the two features are therefore closely related.

Head stroke

A palaeographic term referring to the cross-bar used ‘for letters like *t* or *f*, or to close a bowl, as in *g*’.¹³

8 See, for example: Elizabeth to Burghley, November 1582, place not given, Hatfield CP 13/8 fols 13^v–14^v (fol. 13^v) (countersigned by John Cliff) and Elizabeth to Burghley, 31 October 1585, Richmond, Hatfield CP 14/14 fols 22^v–23^v (in the hand of and countersigned by Nicasius Yetsweirt).

9 Parkes, *Their Hands Before Our Eyes*, p. 150.

10 Wolfe, ‘The Alphabet Book’, p. 44.

11 Entry ‘docket’, in Peter Beal, *A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology*, p. 125.

12 Entry ‘duct’ in Beal, *A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology*, p. 130.

13 Wolfe, ‘The Alphabet Book’, p. 45.

Holograph

The terms ‘holograph’ and ‘autograph’ are often used interchangeably to refer to letters penned by their signatories, as opposed to by scribes. Strictly speaking, ‘holograph’ refers to ‘letters where the signature and main body of the text is in the same hand’,¹⁴ and can therefore technically apply to scribal letters whose authors had permitted their scribes to replicate their signatures. For this reason, some prefer ‘autograph’ to denote letters that were both penned *and* signed by their authors. However, others use ‘autograph’—now popularly associated with the signature—to refer to letters signed but *not* penned by their authors.¹⁵ Elizabeth I’s scribal letters were always signed by the queen herself (indeed, her scribes would prepare a ‘signature box’, a ‘panel on a substrate made by folding, used as a writing guide for a signature’, for the queen’s use when signing).¹⁶ For this reason, the term ‘holograph’ is employed in this thesis to refer to letters that were written entirely in Elizabeth’s own hand, with ‘scribal’ used to refer to those in which the body text was penned by a scribe.¹⁷

Interlinear

Referring to space or text occurring between the lines.

Journal

Beal defines a journal as ‘a daily record of occurrences’.¹⁸ When the term journal is used in this thesis, it refers specifically to the journal used within the secretariat of Sir Francis Walsingham (c. 1532–90), Elizabeth I’s Principal Secretary in the years 1573–90. Walsingham’s only extant journal dates from December 1570–20 April 1583, covering Walsingham’s first French embassy (August 1570–May 1573) and a significant portion of Walsingham’s tenure as Secretary, with a blank during Walsingham’s second embassy to France (22 July–21 September 1581).¹⁹ The

14 James Daybell, *The Material Letter in Early Modern England: Manuscript Letters and the Culture and Practices of Letter-Writing, 1512–1635* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), p. 23.

15 Rayne Allinson, *A Monarchy of Letters: Royal Correspondence and English Diplomacy in the Reign of Elizabeth I* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), p. xii.

16 Entry ‘signature box’, in Jana Dambrogio, Daniel Starza Smith, and the Unlocking History Research Group, Dictionary of Letterlocking (DoLL), 2025 <<https://letterlocking.org/dictionary>> [accessed 23 January 2026].

17 In contrast to her Tudor predecessors, who ceded some of their control over the royal sign manual to their secretaries via the use of a woodcut wet (which is inked prior to being imprinted onto the paper) or dry (which created an impression on the paper which was inked-over by a clerk or secretary) signature stamp, Elizabeth famously refused to delegate the application of her signature, and all signed versions of letters cited in this thesis are signed by the queen herself. There is some evidence that a stamp of Elizabeth’s signature did exist: in 1570, she authorised the use of a stamp by William Cecil. However, this stamp does not appear to have been used routinely: as Felix Pryor points out, ‘certainly it did not set a precedent’ (Felix Pryor, *Elizabeth I: Her Life in Letters* (University of California Press, 2003), p. 14).

18 Entry ‘journal’, in Beal, *A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology*, p. 216.

19 Walsingham’s journal, TNA PRO 30/5/5. See: Mark Taviner, ‘Robert Beale and the Elizabethan Polity’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of St Andrews, 2000), p. 83 <<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/3709>> [accessed 28 December 2021]. Parts of Walsingham’s journal were edited by Charles T. Martin (‘Journal of Sir Francis Walsingham from December 1570 to April 1583’, ed. by Charles Trice Martin, *Camden Miscellany* 6 (Printed for the Camden Society, 1871)).

entries were neatly penned by Walsingham's secretaries.²⁰ In addition to the receipt and dispatch of post, the journal records the queen's movements between royal palaces, Walsingham's own movements between those palaces and his personal residences, meetings of the Privy Council, and the arrival and dispatch of ambassadors 'and of such gent: of noate as accompanie them'.²¹

Letterpacket

Following the letterlocking terminology developed by Jana Dambrogio and Daniel Starza Smith, 'letterpacket' refers to the individual letter substrate 'that has been folded to become its own envelope or sending device'.²² NB the closed compound noun 'letterpacket' should not be confused with the open compound noun 'letter packet', used to refer to the parcel of individually secured letterpackets once bundled together and fastened in an outer wrapper of paper for dispatch.

Lobe

A paleographic term referring to the rounded compartment of letters, where the stroke connects to the stem, ascender, or descender to close the component.²³

Memorial book

A book into which memoranda of daily business was recorded. When the term 'memorial book' is used in this thesis, it refers specifically to Walsingham's only extant memorial book,²⁴ which dates from 25 March 1583 to 3 December 1584, 'with a blank in August and September 1583, while Walsingham was absent on his abortive embassy to Scotland'.²⁵ Its entries encompass a range of matters, including the production of letters and papers, preparations for Privy Council meetings and royal audiences, the apprehension and examination of suspected conspirators, and Walsingham's need to send for, dispatch, write to, or meet with various people. The names of Walsingham's servants are jotted into its margins, revealing to whom distinct tasks were delegated, and its entries are penned in numerous hands, including Walsingham's own.

20 Taviner, 'Robert Beale and the Elizabethan Polity', pp. 82–83.

21 Nicholas Faunt, 'Discourse Touchinge the Office of Principall Secretarie of Estate', ed. by Charles Hughes, *The English Historical Review*, 20.79 (1905), pp. 499–508 (p. 503).

22 Jana Dambrogio and Daniel Starza Smith, *Letterlocking: The Hidden History of the Letter* (MIT Press, 2025), p. 483; entry 'letterpacket', in Dambrogio, Starza Smith, and the Unlocking History Research Group, *Dictionary of Letterlocking* (DoLL), 2025 <<https://letterlocking.org/dictionary>> [accessed 23 January 2026].

23 Wolfe, 'The Alphabet Book', p. 45.

24 Francis Walsingham's Memorial Book, BL Harley MS 6035.

25 Florence M. Grier Evans, *The Principal Secretary of State: A Survey of the Office from 1558–1680* (Manchester University Press, 1923), p. 175.

Otiose stroke

A palaeographic term referring to an ‘ornamental flourish with no function’ – that is, a flourish for embellishment only.²⁶

Privy signet(s)

The term ‘privy signet’ was used by Queen Elizabeth I to refer to her smaller, personal signet-ring seals.²⁷ These were used to seal her holograph letters. None of the signets survive, but impressions of three of them—one depicting a folded knot,²⁸ another depicting the royal arms,²⁹ and a third appearing to depict a type of insect³⁰—can be seen in Elizabeth’s holograph letters to James VI (1566–1625) of Scotland. Rayne Allinson has identified another depicting a small flower, possibly a Tudor rose, affixed to a 1596 letter from Elizabeth to Henry IV (1553–1610) of France.³¹ Not to be confused with the royal signet seal (see ‘Signet Seal’).

Running hand

A palaeographic term referring to a ‘rapidly cursive, irregular, and relatively undisciplined script, or style of writing’, often used interchangeably with ‘free hand’ and ‘facile hand’.³² Used primarily in the production of rough, informal versions of Elizabeth’s letters, including drafts and intermediate versions.

Scribal

Used to describe a letter where the body text (at least) was penned by someone other than the signatory.

Scribal superscription

In this thesis, the term ‘scribal superscription’ refers to the statement ‘By the Queen’ that is penned at the head of a scribal letter ‘proper’ or warrant by the scribe in whose hand the body text is written. It is positioned to the right-hand side of the page opposite the sign manual. In Instructions, the scribal superscription might be penned above rather than opposite the sign manual and occupy a more central position. NB the phrase ‘By the Queen’ should not be misinterpreted as identifying a letter as a product of Elizabeth’s composition: rather, it indicates the instrument of authorisation, that is, it specifies that a letter was authorised by the royal sign

26 Wolfe, ‘The Alphabet Book’, p. 46.

27 Allinson, *A Monarchy of Letters*, p. 178.

28 See, for example: Elizabeth to James VI, 17 February 1587, place not given, BL Add. MS 23240 fols 57^v–58^v (fol. 58^r).

29 See, for example: Elizabeth to James VI, January 1585, place not given, BL Add. MS 23240 fols 7^r–8^v (fol. 8^r).

30 See, for example: Elizabeth to James VI, May 1587, place not given, BL Add. MS 23240 fols 67^r–68^r fol. 68^v).

31 Allinson, *A Monarchy of Letters*, p. 32.

32 Entry ‘free hand’, in Beal, *A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology*, p. 167.

manual (as opposed to, for example, ‘By the Privy Seal’).³³ The practice can be traced to the fourteenth century ‘when the heading *per regem* would occur with or without the sign manual’.³⁴

Second Secretary

In periods where two Principal Secretaries served concurrently, the ‘Second Secretary’ was the junior of the two. The division of duties between the two Secretaries were refined over the years, with foreign affairs coming to be a preserve of the senior ‘Principal’ Secretary, domestic affairs those of the Second Secretary. This division of duties was not formally established until 1782, however, with the creation of the departments for home and foreign affairs.³⁵ In Elizabeth’s reign, the appointment of two Secretaries was sporadic, and the period under consideration in this study (1581–90) encompasses Walsingham’s tenure as sole Secretary (1581–90), a term that was briefly punctuated by the appointment of William Davison (d.1608) as Second Secretary from September 1586 to February 1587. Where used, the capitalised compound noun ‘Second Secretary’ therefore refers to the junior Principal Secretary.

Uncapitalised, ‘second secretary’ refers to the role of ‘seacond servant’ detailed by Nicholas Faunt (1553/4–1608), a secretary of Walsingham’s from around 1578 to 1590, in his account of the organisation of the Principal Secretary’s personal secretariat.³⁶ In an anticipation of the division of duties that would emerge between the two Principal Secretaries of the Jacobean secretariat, Faunt proposed a compression of the two primary branches of secretarial business—matters foreign and domestic—into a two-man system in which a ‘principall’ servant assisted the Principal Secretary as a foreign-affairs specialist ‘cheifly charged with Forraine matters’, while the second secretary took care of information management, intelligence, and ‘ordinarie [that is, domestic] matters’.³⁷

Set hand

A manner of writing in which letters were carefully formed and in which the writer ‘lifted the pen frequently to allow a more precise tracing of the strokes’.³⁸ Used primarily in the production of formal, official documents and the sent versions of Elizabeth’s scribal letters.

33 David Starkey, ‘Court and Government’, in *Revolution Reassessed: Revisions in the History of Tudor Government and Administration*, ed. by Christopher Coleman and Starkey (Clarendon Press, 1986), pp. 29–58 (p. 48).

34 Andreani, *The Elizabethan Secretariat*, p. 129.

35 Grier Evans, *The Principal Secretary*, p. 65.

36 Faunt, ‘Discourse’, p. 502.

37 Faunt, ‘Discourse’, pp. 501, 503.

38 Parkes, *Their Hands Before Our Eyes*, p. 87; see also Entry ‘set hand’, in Beal, *A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology*, p. 376.

Sign manual

The official term for the royal signature, the sign manual was developed as an instrument of authorisation and authentication ‘concurrently with the signet’.³⁹ Its application ‘marked the moment in which a paper became definitive and executive’, and it was applied to all royal scribal letters and the signet warrants and bills that were dispatched to the Privy Seal Office to initiate the authorisation of grants under the great seal.⁴⁰ Elizabeth’s ‘progressively grand, carefully drawn, and highly decorated’⁴¹ sign manual takes the form ‘Elizabeth R’ (Elizabeth Regina) and is decorated with flourishes taken from the Palatino italic script;⁴² in more informal contexts, Elizabeth might sign not with the sign manual but with her initials ‘E. R.’, with ‘the abbreviated form iconic of the intimacy between author and recipient’.⁴³

Signet seal

The smallest of the three royal seals (following the great seal and the privy seal) and that which was routinely affixed to Elizabeth’s English scribal letters and warrants, as well as to the signet warrants that were directed to the Privy Seal Office to authorise the production of letters patent. The royal seals were authentication devices, and could function as either material appendages to a letter—affixed *en placard* or (in the case of parchment letters patent) attached to the foot of the document ‘by pendant cords, thongs, or laces’—or, as was usually the case for Elizabeth’s signet letters, as an adhesive: applied to affix a letter shut.⁴⁴ The royal signet seal is distinct from Elizabeth’s smaller, personal signet seals, which she described as her ‘privie signet[s]’.⁴⁵

Table book

A ‘table book’ is defined by Beal as a ‘small (perhaps octavo or sextodecimo) pocket boo[k] for ephemeral jottings’.⁴⁶ When the term table book is used in this thesis, it refers specifically to Walsingham’s only extant Table Book, which was compiled in 1588 by his secretary Thomas Lake (bap. 1561–1630).⁴⁷ Walsingham’s Table Book contains an inventory of the papers held at his private office at Walsingham House on Seething Lane in London and in his Secretarial chamber at Whitehall.

39 Starkey, ‘Court and Government’, p. 46.

40 Andreani, *The Elizabethan Secretariat*, p. 158.

41 Entry ‘signature’, in Beal, *A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology*, p. 382.

42 Jonathan Gibson, ‘The Queen’s Two Hands’, in *Representations of Elizabeth I in Early Modern Culture*, ed. by A. Petrina and L. Tosi (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 47–65 (p. 60), doi: 10.1057/9780230307261_3.

43 Evans, *Royal Voices*, p. 59.

44 Entry ‘great seal’, in Beal, *A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology*, p. 179; entry ‘seal’ in Dambrogio, Starza Smith, and the Unlocking History Research Group, *Dictionary of Letterlocking (DoLL)*, 2025 <<https://letterlocking.org/dictionary>> [accessed 23 January 2026].

45 Allinson, *A Monarchy of Letters*, p. 178.

46 Entry ‘tables’, in Beal, *A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology*, p. 409.

47 Francis Walsingham’s Table Book, BL Stowe MS 162.

Tapering

A palaeographic term that refers to the reduction in line thickness that occurs as the nib of the quill is turned to create hairline strokes.

Triangle lock

A high-security letterlocking technique and one widely used in the period, particularly in political and aristocratic circles.⁴⁸ The triangle lock was the technique most commonly used to secure Elizabeth's English scribal letters 'proper'. This technique involved folding the bifolium once short edge to short edge to create a central crease, then unfolding, before gatefolding short edge to short edge 'to meet in the middle at the central crease'. The packet was then 'folded again along that crease to make a closed gatefold' and folded 'short edge to short edge once more'.⁴⁹ A slit was created in the packet either parallel or perpendicular to the fore-edge. A triangle-shaped paper lock—cut either from a corner of the writing substrate (a lock-SU) or from a separate piece of paper (a lock-O)—would then be passed through the slit.⁵⁰ The lock tip might then be halved, splayed, and flattened—a splayed tip adding an extra layer of security, making 'it almost impossible to pull the lock back through the slit without breaking it'—and wax or a wafer seal was applied on top of it. The tail of the lock would be wrapped around the letterpacket and fastened over the adhesive: in order to open the letter, the lock had to be broken and 'effectively destroyed', and thus acted as a security device. If the lock had been cut from the substrate, an extra layer of security was baked in: 'because the lock has been cut off from the substrate, the lock can be held to the missing triangle in the corner to see if it matches'. Once locked, the address would be written on the opposite side of the letterpacket, sometimes partially over the lock itself to make 'intervention more difficult', as it would require an interceptor to forge the address as well as the lock.⁵¹ See, for instance, Elizabeth's triangle-locked letter to Sir Ralph Sadler, which has been modelled by the Unlocking History Research Group.⁵²

Two-piece lock

'One of the oldest'⁵³ letterlocking techniques, with a formal and ceremonial function, the two-piece lock was identified in Elizabeth's letters by Jana Dambrogio in 2016.⁵⁴ The two-piece lock was consistently used to secure Elizabeth's royal scribal warrants. The technique involved

48 Heather Wolfe, 'Letter Writing and Paper Connoisseurship in Elite Households in Early Modern England', in *Working with Paper: Gendered Practices in the History of Knowledge*, ed. by Carla Bittel, Elaine Leong and Christine von Oertzen (University of Pittsburgh Press, 2019), pp. 17–31 (p. 19).

49 Dambrogio and Starza Smith, *Letterlocking*, pp. 125, 304.

50 Dambrogio and Starza Smith, *Letterlocking*, pp. 181, 177.

51 Dambrogio and Starza Smith, *Letterlocking*, p. 284.

52 Letterlocking Videos, 'Letterlocking: Queen Elizabeth I of England, Triangle Lock (1584) (UH0042)', YouTube, March 2016 <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o0XOxS0ZQWI&t=1s>> [accessed 29 October 2024].

53 Dambrogio and Starza Smith, *Letterlocking*, p. 236.

54 'Letterlocking: Elizabeth I's Two-Piece Locked Royal Commission, England (1580) (UH0060)', YouTube, 5 May 2016 <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8dwpwS-kWUg&t=146s>> [accessed 21 May 2024].

folding down the top long edge of the bifolium (in a landscape orientation), after which the bifolium was C-folded⁵⁵ to create two multi-layered closure panels,⁵⁶ one of which was expanded to become a pocket into which the other (becoming a closure flap)⁵⁷ was then tucked. Two small ‘vampire slits’ were made through these two multilayer panels, through which a thin strip of paper was threaded (creating a Lock-O).⁵⁸ A papered seal was applied over the two ends of the strip, securing the letterpacket, and the address was penned on the other side.

Uncial

A palaeographic term referring to a letter form that is ‘rounded with [a] bent ascender (instead of looped) as in secretary *d*, where the ascender slants over the lobe’.⁵⁹

Wrapper

A ‘container, usually made of paper, formed to fit around one or more items (e.g. letters, locked letters, enclosures), and then addressed and secured for delivery’.⁶⁰

55 Dambrogio and Starza Smith, *Letterlocking*, p. 123.

56 ‘Closure Panel’, in Dambrogio and Starza Smith, *Letterlocking*, p. 481.

57 ‘Closure Flap’, in Dambrogio and Starza Smith, *Letterlocking*, p. 481.

58 Dambrogio and Starza Smith, *Letterlocking*, p. 236.

59 Wolfe, ‘The Alphabet Book’, p. 45.

60 ‘Wrapper’, in Dambrogio and Starza Smith, *Letterlocking*, p. 485. See: Letterlocking Videos, ‘Family Correspondence... in a Letterpacket, The Netherlands (1706) (UH0155, UH3003, UH3004, UH3005)’, YouTube, 20 December 2017 <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VvA3M3PUU0Q&t=168s>> [accessed 22 January 2026].

List of Figures

- Fig. 1.1.** Elizabeth's signet seal impression. From the British Library Collection: Elizabeth I to Andrew Nowell or Noel, Sheriff of Leicestershire, 16 January 1580, Westminster, BL Add. MS 33594 fols 10^r–11^v (fol. 11^v).
- Fig. 1.2.** Entries in the Signet Office register, May 1589. Signet Office Docquet Books, January 1585–March 1597, TNA SO 3/1 fol. 192^r. Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 1.3.** Placement of an addressee note on a letter from Elizabeth to Sir Ralph Sadler. From the British Library Collection: Elizabeth to Sadler, 31 October 1584, BL Add. MS 89293 fols 7^r–8^v (fol. 8^v).
- Fig. 1.4.** The distribution of scribal hands in the corpus of Elizabeth's English scribal letters (CEESL), 1581–90.
- Fig. 1.5.** The distribution of scribal hands across Instructions, scribal letters 'proper', and warrants in CEESL.
- Fig. 1.6.** Watermark depicting Elizabeth's royal arms. Elizabeth to Peregrine Bertie, Lord Willoughby, Richmond, 6 December 1589, TNA SP 78/20 fols 232^r–33^v (fol. 233^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 1.7.** Watermarks depicting an eagle in a shield and an eagle displayed. Elizabeth to Willoughby, Greenwich, 30 May 1588, TNA SP 84/23 fols 364^r–65^v (fol. 364^r) and Elizabeth to [unknown], 15 May 1583, Greenwich, TNA SP 52/32 fols 32^r–33^v (fol. 33^v). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 1.8.** Watermark depicting a 'G I' monogram in a shield. Elizabeth to John Darcy, 2nd Lord Darcy, 15 August 1584, place not given, TNA SP 53/13 fols 118^r–19^v (fol. 118^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 1.9.** The distribution of scribal hands across manuscript versions in CEESL.
- Fig. 2.1.** The distribution of scribal hands in the letters of Sir Francis Walsingham, 1581–90.
- Fig. 2.2.** Scribe 1's hand in Walsingham's memorial book. From the British Library Collection: BL Harley MS 6035, fol. 29^r.
- Fig. 2.3.** Scribe 1's set hand. Elizabeth to Sadler, 3 December 1584, St James' Palace, TNA SP 53/14 fols 68^r–69^v (fol. 68^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 2.4.** Comparison of the word-terminal *e* allograph in the hands of Scribe 1, Francis Mylles, John Somer, and William Davison.
- Fig. 2.5.** Comparison of the word-terminal *ll* otiose stroke in the hands of Scribe 1 and Somer.
- Fig. 2.6.** Comparison of the word-initial *th* graph combinations in the hands of Scribe 1, Thomas Windebank, Somer, and Nicasius Yetsweirt.

- Fig. 2.7.** Comparison of the formation of graph combinations in the hands of Scribe 1, Windebank, Somer, and Davison.
- Fig. 2.8.** Thomas Lake's running hand. Elizabeth to Sir John Norris, 23 May 1587, place not given, TNA SP 84/14 fols 256^r–57^v (fol. 256^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 2.9.** Lake's set hand. Elizabeth to Norris, 23 May 1587, Nonsuch, TNA SP 84/14 fols 258^r–59^v (fol. 258^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 2.10.** Illustration of allographic variation between Scribe 1's set and running hands.
- Fig. 2.11.** Scribe 1's running hand. Elizabeth to Sadler, 3 December 1584, TNA SP 53/14 fols 67^r–68^v (fol. 67^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 2.12.** Scribe 1's running hand in a postscript. Elizabeth to Sadler, 3 December 1584, St James' Palace, TNA SP 53/14 fols 68^r–69^v (fol. 68^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 2.13.** Scribe 1's set hand in a postscript. From the British Library Collection: Elizabeth to Sadler, 3 December 1584, St James' Palace, BL Add. MS 89293 fols 9^r–10^v (fol. 9^r).
- Fig. 2.14.** Scribe 1's 'blended' hand. Walsingham to Davison, 22 May 1584, Greenwich, TNA SP 52/34 fols 81^r–82^v (fol. 81^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 2.15.** John de Cárdenas' hand, 1589. Cárdenas to Walsingham, 8 October 1589, Sous, Morocco, TNA SP 71/12 fols 28^r–30^v (fol. 29^v). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 2.16.** Cárdenas' hand, 1606. Cárdenas to Dudley Carleton, 28 January 1606, Paris, TNA SP 78/52 fols 10^r–11^v (fol. 10^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 2.17.** Cárdenas' hand, 1619. Cárdenas to William Becher, 8 June 1619, Paris, TNA SP 78/68 fols 245^r–46^v (fol. 245^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 2.18.** Cárdenas' hand, 1590. Cárdenas to Walsingham, 22 February 1590, London, TNA SP 12/230 fol. 116^r. Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 2.19.** Comparison of the word-terminal *e* allograph in the hands of Scribe 1, Mylles, Somer, Davison, and Cárdenas.
- Fig. 2.20.** Comparison of the word-terminal // otiose stroke in the hands of Scribe 1, Cárdenas, and Somer.
- Fig. 2.21.** Comparison of the formation of graph combinations in the hands of Scribe 1, Cárdenas, Davison, and Laurence Tomson.
- Fig. 2.22.** Cárdenas' hand, c. 1594. From the British Library Collection: Cárdenas' petition for a license to transport metals into Ireland, c. 1594, BL Lansdowne MS 77 fols 106^r–107^v (fol. 106^r).

- Fig. 2.23** Cárdenas' hand, *c.* 1594. From the British Library Collection: Cárdenas' 'notes' for his petition for a license, BL Lansdowne MS 77 fols 110^r–111^v (fol. 110^r).
- Fig. 2.24.** Cárdenas' hand, *c.* 1594. From the British Library Collection: Cárdenas' 'notes' for his petition for a license, BL Lansdowne MS 77 fol. 110^v.
- Fig. 2.25.** Scribe 1's 'blended' hand. From the British Library Collection: Walsingham to Sadler, 30 September 1584, BL Add. MS 33594 fols 69^r–70^v (fol. 69^r).
- Fig. 2.26.** Cárdenas' running hand. Cárdenas to Walsingham, 8 October 1589, Sous, TNA SP 71/12 fol. 31 (fol. 31^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 2.27.** Scribe 1's running hand. Walsingham to Robert Bowes (d. 1597), 20 August 1583, place not given, TNA SP 52/33 fols 15^r–16^v (fol. 15^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 2.28.** Illustration of allographic differences between Scribe 1 and Cárdenas' hands.
- Fig. 2.29.** Scribe 1's hand, 1588. Elizabeth to Willoughby, 25 July 1588, Richmond, Lincolnshire Archives 10-ANC/326. Reproduced by kind permission of Lincolnshire Archives.
- Fig. 2.30.** Mylles' hand. Mylles to Walsingham, 22 July 1586, Tower Hill, TNA SP 53/18 fols 135^r–36^v (fol. 135^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 2.31.** Tomson's hand. Tomson to Davison 27 December 1586, place not given, TNA SP 12/195 fol. 125^r–26^v (fol. 125^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 2.32.** Thomas Edmondes' hand. Edmondes to Robert Cecil 26 April 1599, Paris, TNA SP 78/43 fols 124^r–125^v (fol. 124^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 2.33.** Nicholas Faunt's hand. Faunt to Walsingham, 14 September 1584, Walsingham House in London, TNA SP 12/173 fols 26^r–27^v (fol. 26^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 2.34.** Lisle Cave's hand. Cave to Thomas Fanshawe, Remembrancer of the Exchequer, 18 February 1598, 'Lyme Street', TNA SP 46/41 fols 26^r–27^v (fol. 26^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 2.35.** Thomas Phelippes' hand. Phelippes to Walsingham 17 July 1586, place not given, TNA SP 53/18 fols 124^r–25^v (fol. 125^r). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.
- Fig. 3.1.** Scree plot illustrating the relationship between the components generated in the Principal Components Analysis of Elizabeth's scribal letters presented in Chapter 3 (Fig. 3.7).
- Fig. 3.2** Scatterplot visualising the PCA of the top-200 Most Frequent Words (MFW) distributed across the corpus of William Cecil, Lord Burghley, Walsingham, and Windebank's holograph letters.

- Fig. 3.3.** Dendrogram visualising the hierarchical cluster analysis of the top-200 MFW in the corpus of Burghley, Walsingham, and Windebank's holograph letters.
- Fig. 3.4.** Scatterplot of the component loadings from the PCA of the top-200 MFW in the corpus of Burghley, Walsingham, and Windebank's holograph letters.
- Fig. 3.5.** Scatterplot visualising the PCA of the top-76 Most Frequent Function Words (MFFW) in the corpus of Burghley, Walsingham, and Windebank's holograph letters.
- Fig. 3.6.** Dendrogram visualising the cluster analysis of the top-76 MFFW in the corpus of Burghley, Walsingham, and Windebank's holograph letters.
- Fig. 3.7.** Scatterplot visualising the PCA of the top-50 MFFW distributed across the sub-corpus containing drafts of Elizabeth's scribal letters penned in the hands of Burghley, Walsingham, and Windebank.
- Fig. 3.8.** Dendrogram visualising the cluster analysis of the top-50 MFFW in the sub-corpus of scribal drafts.
- Fig. 3.9.** Scatterplot of the component loadings from the PCA of the top-50 MFFW in the sub-corpus of scribal drafts.
- Fig. 3.10.** The distribution of the word 'and' in the sub-corpus of scribal drafts visualised in the 'Plot' tool contained in AntConc 4.2.4.
- Fig. 3.11.** Windebank's use of the word 'and' as viewed in the 'Key Word in Context' (KWIC) tool contained in AntConc 4.2.4.
- Fig. 3.12.** The distribution of the word 'so' in the sub-corpus of scribal drafts visualised in the 'Plot' tool in AntConc 4.2.4.
- Fig. 3.13.** The distribution of the word 'unto' in the sub-corpus of scribal drafts visualised in the 'Plot' tool in AntConc 4.2.4.
- Fig. 3.14.** Scatterplot visualising the PCA of the top-65 MFFW in Walsingham's holograph letters, Burghley's holograph letters, and Walsingham's drafts of Elizabeth's scribal letters.
- Fig. 3.15.** Dendrogram visualising the cluster analysis of the top-65 MFFW in Walsingham's holograph letters, Burghley's holograph letters, and Walsingham's drafts of Elizabeth's scribal letters.
- Fig. 3.16.** Scatterplot visualising the PCA of the top-65 MFFW in Walsingham's holograph letters, Elizabeth's holograph letters, and Walsingham's drafts of Elizabeth's scribal letters.
- Fig. 3.17.** Dendrogram visualising the cluster analysis of the top-65 MFFW in Walsingham's holograph letters, Elizabeth's holograph letters, and Walsingham's drafts of Elizabeth's scribal letters.
- Fig. 3.18.** Scatterplot visualising the PCA of the top-65 MFFW in Walsingham's holograph letters, Elizabeth's holograph letters, and a sample of scribal letters plausibly dictated by Elizabeth.

- Fig. 3.19.** Dendrogram visualising the cluster analysis of the top-65 MFFW in Walsingham's holograph letters, Elizabeth's holograph letters, and a sample of scribal letters plausibly dictated by Elizabeth.
- Fig. 4.1.** Wrapper from a packet of letters. From the British Library Collection: BL Add. MS 33594 fol. 82 (fol. 82^v).
- Fig. 4.2.** Example of a letter marked-up in preparation for the queen's perusal. Sir Edward Stafford to Elizabeth, 25 February 1588, Paris, TNA SP 78/18 fols 52^r–56^v (fol. 52^v). Reproduced by kind permission of The National Archives.

Acknowledgements

As the production of Queen Elizabeth I's letters was a collaborative effort, so the completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the guidance, advice, and support of many. I wish to acknowledge their contributions here.

My greatest debt is owed to my supervisors, Nadine Akkerman and Lotte Fikkers. This thesis would not have been possible were it not for Nadine's FEATHERS project, and I would like to express my gratitude to her for giving me the opportunity to work on such cutting-edge research. The work presented in this thesis has benefitted greatly from Nadine and Lotte's expertise and insight, and the challenges of the PhD experience would have been infinitely more difficult were it not for their patience and encouragement. I am deeply grateful to them for their support and for their faith in me.

I wish to thank the European Research Council for their generous funding of the FEATHERS project, of which this thesis is a part. PhD research can be solitary and isolating, so it has been a great privilege to have been able to pursue this work as part of a larger team. I would therefore like to acknowledge my FEATHERS project teammates, Holly Riach and Jonathan Powell, for their collegiality, collaboration, and for making this research so enjoyable. I am also grateful to Pete Langman for taking the time to cast his editorial eye over the thesis: his expertise has saved me from many a grammatical embarrassment.

The work presented in this thesis has been shaped by many members of the wider scholarly community. Chapter 3 owes much to the expertise of Mel Evans and Mike Kestemont, who both helped me immensely in getting to grips with the stylometric methods used in this chapter. I would also like to thank John Cooper for providing invaluable feedback on an early draft of Chapter 2, Carlo M. Bajetta, Jonathan Gibson, and Guillaume Coatalen for their insights on handwriting analysis and identification early in the project, and Jana Dambrogio for her invigorating letterlocking workshops. To Alison Wiggins and Daniel Starza Smith I am grateful for opportunities to present and teach my research at the University of Glasgow and King's College London, which helped considerably in the development of my ideas.

The findings presented in this thesis rest on the manuscripts held at UK archives and special collections. I would thus like to express my gratitude to the British Library, The National Archives, and Lincolnshire Archives for granting me permission to reproduce images of their materials, and to the research support staff, archivists, and curators at these institutions, Lambeth Palace Library, and Hatfield House for facilitating this research.

Moving to a new country in the midst of a global pandemic and at the outset of a brave new post-Brexit world is not for the faint hearted, and would have been a far lonelier experience were it not for Holly Riach and Jonas Hock. It is difficult to put into words how much I owe to them, and I will always look back on our time together in Leiden with great fondness. The challenges of moving abroad were also lessened substantially by the modern miracle that is FaceTime, and I am eternally thankful to my family—to Kate, Dave, Anna, and Tess—for always picking up the phone, for their unwavering support and encouragement, and for never failing to offer comfort and advice. And finally, I owe the most to Callum, on whose love and belief these years of work have depended completely.