Introduction
'All the Ephemera of Our Lives'

In the late 1920s in Old Headington outside Oxford, a woman called Lilian Gurden, who was working in the garden of the home of Mrs Dorothea Johnson, was invited inside by her employer for a cup of coffee. Mrs Johnson was the wife of John de Monins Johnson (1882–1956), Printer to the University of Oxford from 1925 to 1946 and the most significant English ephemerist of the twentieth century.[1] Interviewed in 1986 by another important ephemerist, Maurice Rickards, Lilian Gurden (later Thrussell) recalled Dorothea Johnson telling her that she was unable to take a bath because it was 'full of soaking album pages'.[2] These albums contained printed ephemera from which John Johnson was extracting material for his collection, the 'Sanctuary of Printing', housed in an upper room of the printery of the Oxford University Press. Johnson's interest in paper scraps had been inspired by his early experience as an Egyptologist, 'digging the rubbish-mounds of Graeco-Roman cities in Egypt for the written materials – the waste paper of those ages'.[3] Encountering long queues outside cinemas in 1920s Oxford as he travelled home from work, Johnson was led to contemplate the relationship between twentieth-century visual media, the cityscape, and advertising as a form of graphic and visual art. His not inconsiderable ambition was to document 'the miscellany of the world . . . Trivial things like the development of advertisements on our hoardings . . . all the ephemera of our lives'.[4] Lilian Gurden would be recruited to what she called Johnson's 'marvellous adventure':

[1] See Charles Batey, 'Johnson, John de Monins (1882–1956)', rev. Julie Anne Lambert, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34203, accessed 25 January 2017].
[2] Maurice Rickards, 'The Girl Who Came in from the Garden', *The Ephemerist*, 53 (June 1986), 148–9 (148).
[3] Johnson quoted in *The John Johnson Collection: Catalogue of an Exhibition* (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1971), 7.
[4] Johnson quoted in *The John Johnson Collection*, 8.

> It was through those album pages, and Dr. Johnson asking me to have a go at soaking the bits off while he was busy, that I got drawn in. It was an awful mess – but I managed to cope with them. Before long I got quite good at it, and soon it was a case of coming in part-time, collecting holly for wreaths in the morning, say, and floating, sorting and mounting ephemera in the afternoon.[5]

Lilian Gurden later moved full-time to the Press, acting as an informal assistant curator of the collection, and was in charge of it after Johnson's retirement; a working-class woman with no qualifications, she was, as she said, 'just – ordinary'.[6] From the late 1920s to his death in 1956 Johnson amassed an astonishing 1.5 million items of ephemera.[7] Housed unofficially in the Oxford University Press buildings, close to the machinery and the labour of printing, the collection was moved to the Bodleian Library in 1968. Partial digitisation of the collection on the Bodleian website and a commercial database, published in collaboration with the Library by ProQuest in 2008, mean that some of its contents are more accessible: like the Johnsons' bathtub though, even the resources of the World Wide Web seem inadequate to containing all the trivial paper things that Lilian Gurden was employed to float and sort.[8]

John Johnson was not alone in his fascination with ephemera, the albums that he recycled to make his collections being a sign that many others had made 'books' out of tickets, cards, and labels. This book is a study both of what Johnson collected – the print products grouped under the elusive category of 'ephemera' – and the significance of the field of knowledge which the collecting practices of Johnson and many others represented, what I am calling, following Michael Twyman, 'ephemerology'.[9] Deriving from the Greek 'epi' (on, at, or around) and 'hemeris' (a day), via the medieval Latin 'ephemera', and used in entomology to classify insects that live for a day and in medicine to refer to a temporary fever, ephemera

[5] Rickards, 'The Girl', 148–9.
[6] Rickards, 'The Girl', 149.
[7] John Johnson Collection of Printed Ephemera, Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford, About the Collection [www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/johnson/about, accessed 25 January 2017].
[8] *The John Johnson Collection: An Archive of Printed Ephemera*, Chadwyck-Healey-ProQuest [http://johnjohnson.chadwyck.co.uk, accessed 25 January 2017].
[9] Michael Twyman has argued that it would be 'helpful to have a word to describe the study of [printed ephemera], if only to stress the distinctiveness of this particular category of printing . . . I tentatively offer the term "ephemerology" to define a parallel branch of knowledge or study comparable to bibliography, cartography, and musicology (in its graphic aspects)': Twyman, 'The Long Term Significance of Printed Ephemera', *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts and Cultural Heritage*, 9:1 (2008), 19–57 (31).

describes printed artefacts that were not designed to endure.[10] 'Ephemera' refers to forms of print that are ubiquitous and familiar but which occupy a marginal, even buried, place in institutions and disciplinary formations. Resistant to classification and organisation because it cannot be filed easily or stood up like a book, or because there is simply too much of it, ephemeral print is often to be found literally in the 'too hard basket' – box files in the corners of bookshops or the deepest recesses of libraries. 'Ephemera studies' is not widely recognised as an academic discipline (though it is growing) and the interest in ephemera is still regarded as the amateurish preoccupation (or obsession) of the hobbyist.[11] The investments of literary studies and bibliography in the codex-form book as a vehicle for authorial genius and the pre-eminent genres of drama, poetry, and prose fiction, to the extent of subordinating the materiality of the book itself to the intangibility of the 'work', have similarly entailed the marginalisation of ephemera.[12] Indeed, in this sense ephemera represents the antithesis of the literary: in her 2011 book *The Use and Abuse of Literature*, addressed to 'our culture in crisis', Marjorie Garber deploys ephemera to define 'what isn't literature'.[13]

The rise of Anglophone book history since the 1980s has had the effect of rematerialising the book in literary studies. At the same time, however, book history has itself reinforced the status of the book as the object of study, even though many proponents of the discipline from its early stages were conscious that the codex-form book was contingent on and circulated with many

[10] See *Oxford English Dictionary* entry on ephemera which notes that the in medieval Latin 'ephemera was neuter plural' but that early English practice treated the word as feminine singular. The term 'ephemera' thus tends to oscillate between the one and the many. For convenience I will use it as a collective singular. For a useful discussion of the derivation of ephemera (and its pronunciation), see Maurice Rickards, *This is Ephemera: Collecting Printed Throwaways* (London: David & Charles, 1977), 7–8. Rickards also claimed that the word 'ephemera' has a 'battered history' and was 'never a word for the man on the street': Rickards, *Collecting Printed Ephemera* (Oxford: Phaidon/Christie's, 1988), 13.

[11] For recent work on early modern and Enlightenment printed ephemera see e.g. Michael Twyman, 'Printed Ephemera', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume V: 1695–1830*, eds. Michael F. Suarez, S. J. and Michael L. Turner (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 66–82; Paula McDowell, 'Of Grubs and Other Insects: Constructing the Categories of "Ephemera" and "Literature" in Eighteenth-Century British Writing', *Book History*, 15 (2012), 48–70; Kevin Murphy and Sally O'Driscoll (eds.), *Studies in Ephemera: Text and Image in Eighteenth-Century Print* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2013); Richard Taws, *The Politics of the Provisional: Art and Ephemera in Revolutionary France* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

[12] See e.g. N. Katherine Hayles's comment that 'the long reign of print made it easy for literary criticism to ignore the specificities of the CODEX book when discussing literary texts. With significant exceptions, print literature was widely regarded as not having a body, only a speaking mind': Hayles, *Writing Machines* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002), 32.

[13] Marjorie Garber, *The Use and Abuse of Literature* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2011), 84–6.

other forms of printed matter. In his seminal essay, 'The Book as an Expressive Form', D. F. McKenzie argued that 'a sociology of texts' should be concerned with how 'forms affect meaning' and the 'social processes of their transmission', accounting for 'a history of the book and, indeed, of all printed forms including *all textual ephemera* as a record of cultural change'.[14] The introductory statement to the journal *Book History*, established in 1998, declared a similar catholicity of focus: 'Our field of play is *the entire history of written communication*: the creation, dissemination, and uses of script and print in any medium, including books, newspapers, periodicals, manuscripts, and ephemera'.[15] Yet in spite of the fact that many book historians remain uneasy about the hegemony of the codex-form book, this most interdisciplinary of disciplines remains deeply invested in attachment to the book. The universal aspirations of book history are often difficult to achieve, meaning that though the boundaries and pre-eminence of the 'book' are frequently challenged theoretically, in practical terms they tend to remain in place. An exception is the chapter on printed ephemera by Michael Harris in *The Oxford Companion to the Book* in which he draws attention to the 'dialectic of ephemera and books' that condescends to ephemera as 'the great sea of flimsy print continuously washing up against the sturdy breakwaters of the book'.[16] Harris even goes so far as to assert that 'the separation of books from the printed archive and the privileging of the codex ... seem increasingly untenable' and that the book should have a 'modest place' in the spectrum of print. Book history's interest in the reception and social context of print, according to Harris, should make 'the issue of daily experience – and therefore, of ephemerality – an integral part of its remit'.[17]

The Ephemeral Eighteenth Century takes up Harris's challenge by making printed ephemera and ephemerality a central focus of inquiry, not with the aim of diminishing the status or significance of the codex-form book, but in order to explore how the categories of the book and ephemera as we know them created each other in the long eighteenth century. Samuel Johnson's description, dating from 1751, of 'the papers of the day' (referring to newspapers and pamphlets) as the '*Ephemerae* of learning', has been cited as the earliest example of the application of 'ephemera',

[14] D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (London: British Library, 1986), 13 (my emphasis).
[15] Ezra Greenspan and Jonathan Rose, 'An Introduction to Book History', *Book History*, 1 (1998), ix–x (my emphasis).
[16] Michael Harris, 'Printed Ephemera', in *The Oxford Companion to the Book*, eds. Michael F. Suarez, S. J. and M. R. Woudhuysen, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), I: 120–8 (120).
[17] Harris, 'Printed Ephemera', 128.

meaning something that has a fleeting existence, to printed matter.[18] However, the currency of the term does not necessarily begin with Johnson, important though the historical moment of that coinage was. 'Ephemerality' in both its material and conceptual senses was a constitutive feature of the age of print that began in the mid-fifteenth century. Not only were printed single-sheet indulgences designed for short-term uses the earliest products of the printing press, but ephemerality was also implicated in ideas of the reach, impact, and durability of print after Johannes Gutenberg's invention of mechanical movable type.[19] What distinguished 'print culture' from scribal publication, according to the seminal arguments of Elizabeth Eisenstein, was the capacity of print to preserve the written word: '[o]f all the new features introduced by the duplicative powers of print, preservation is possibly the most important'.[20] Though paper as a support for the printed word was in many respects less durable than parchment or vellum, the advantage of print was that many copies of a particular text could potentially be produced, thereby enhancing the possibility of that text's survival. Critiques of Eisenstein have tended to focus on her concept of 'typographic fixity' – the idea of print as producing a stable and thus reliably reproducible text that could be deemed authoritative, a precondition for the emergence of modern authorship – at the expense of her emphasis on the 'duplicative powers' of print as an insurance or hedge against the loss of the written word.[21] It was the effect of

[18] *The Rambler*, no. 145, in Samuel Johnson, *The Works of Samuel Johnson, Volumes III–V: The Rambler*, eds. W. J. Bate and Albrecht B. Strauss (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1969), III: 11; 'ephemera, n.2.', *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, June 2014 [www.oed.com, accessed 22 July 2014].

[19] For the indulgence see Maurice Rickards and Michael Twyman, *The Encyclopedia of Ephemera: A Guide to the Fragmentary Documents of Everyday Life, for the Collector, Curator and Historian* (London: British Library, 2000), 181.

[20] Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005; first pub. 1983), 87. The concept of 'print culture' has been subject to much debate though it continues to be used in a variety of ways. For a useful summary of its applications see the introduction to Frances Robertson, *Print Culture: From Steam Press to Ebook* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), 1–15; also Paula McDowell, 'Mediating Media Past and Present: Toward a Genealogy of "Print Culture" and "Oral Tradition"', in *This is Enlightenment*, eds. Clifford Siskin and William Warner (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), 229–46.

[21] For the most influential critique of 'typographic fixity' see Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1998), esp. 28–33 and the subsequent debate between Johns and Eisenstein: Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, 'An Unacknowledged Revolution Revisited', *The American Historical Review*, 107:1 (2002), 87–105; Adrian Johns, 'How to Acknowledge a Revolution', *The American Historical Review*, 107:1 (2002), 106–25; Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, 'Reply', *The American Historical Review*, 107:1 (2002), 126–8. See also David McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450–1830* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 151–64.

scale – the sheer number of texts that could be manufactured – that made the printing press a more powerful technology of preservation than the work of the scribe. However, the ever-increasing scale of the production and dissemination of print information, especially after the late seventeenth century, inevitably raised the question of the limits of what could, and should, survive. As Eisenstein notes,

> When written messages are duplicated in such great abundance that they can be consigned to trash bins or converted into pulp, they are not apt to prompt thoughts about prolonged preservation. Manuscripts guarded in treasure rooms, wills locked in vaults, diplomas framed behind glass do appear to be less perishable than road maps, kitchen calendars, or daily newspapers.[22]

The 'duplicative powers' of print, especially after 1700, were such that they potentially preserved too much, making visible and retainable traces of human experience such as the daily life marked on kitchen calendars. Such documents existed in contingency with others deemed more important by acts of preservation. The idea of the ephemeral text that could be consigned to the 'trash' of history, was therefore deeply embedded in what Eisenstein termed 'print culture' in so far as it defined the limits of print's 'preservative' powers, thereby constituting the limits of 'print culture' itself.

The success of the codex-form book as a building block of Enlightenment knowledge, commerce, and cultural life, and subsequently the institutions associated with the arts and sciences in the nineteenth century, was contingent on the 'ephemeralisation' of other kinds of print and the social and cultural experiences such print facilitated and recorded, experiences that would come to be objectified and studied under the rubric of 'everyday life'. So powerful has been the triumph of the book in this respect that the historical specificity of the process of ephemeralisation has been obscured, 'ephemera' and 'ephemerality' being taken-for-granted categories in academic and general discourse that are rarely scrutinised in their own right. Moreover, the triumph of the book can be seen not as a conclusive teleological outcome but as a particular, if tremendously significant, phase in the history of the print media that began in Britain in the late 1600s, with the suspension of the Licensing Act in 1695, and only started to wane with the rise of electronic media in the late twentieth century. Though the 'death' of the printed, codex-form book has been

[22] Eisenstein, *Printing Revolution*, 88–9.

greatly exaggerated in recent years, it is undoubtedly the case that the book's pre-eminence as a vehicle of knowledge and culture has been challenged by the greater relativisation of media forms as a result of the rise of the electronic media.[23] One of the effects of this change has been that other forms of print media, such as ephemera, hitherto invisible, have 'floated' to the surface, like the items in Mrs Johnson's bathtub, in a way that highlights the contingent status the codex always had, how it was produced, circulated, read, and preserved with many other kinds of print.

Ephemerality is increasingly constitutive of the emergent post-print age too, playing a distinctive role in the study and theorisation of digital media. The work of Matthew Kirschenbaum, Wendy Hui Kyong Chun, Lisa Gitelman, and others has drawn attention to the fact that the digital text cannot be said to 'exist' in the same way as printed words on paper because it is the result of multiple layers of coded instructions that are constantly in process.[24] As Andrew Piper notes, 'The digital page . . . is a fake, a simulation called up from distributed data. It is not *really* there.'[25] Computer memory thus represents what Chun terms the 'enduring ephemeral', in the sense, firstly, that what we thought was deleted or obsolete leaves a digital trace that is forensically recoverable, and secondly, that we are aware of the accessing and creation of digital information as transitory ephemeral processes. As Chun states, 'the experiences of using [computers] – the exact paths of execution – are ephemeral. Information is "undead": neither alive nor dead, neither quite present nor absent'.[26] Chun's concept of the 'enduring ephemeral' can be said to be reflected in contemporary concerns about, on the one hand, the evanescence of ever proliferating digital information and, on the other, its persistence and potential recovery by,

[23] See e.g. James Mussell, 'The Passing of Print', *Media History*, 18:1 (2011), 77–92; Anthony Grafton, 'Codex in Crisis: The Book Dematerializes', *Worlds Made By Words: Scholarship and Community in the Modern West* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), 288–324; also Andrew Piper, *Book Was There: Reading in Electronic Times* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012). Related to the discourse surrounding the 'death' of the book are the many books and articles addressing the cultural condition of imaginative literature and the very viability of the reading habits and affective bonds engendered by the book, particularly the novel, in the digital age; e.g. Rachel Ablow, *The Feeling of Reading: Affective Experience and Victorian Literature* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2010); Deidre Lynch, *Loving Literature: A Cultural History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014); see also Garber, *Use and Abuse of Literature*.

[24] Matthew G. Kirschenbaum, *Mechanisms: New Media and the Forensic Imagination* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008); Wendy Hui Kyong Chun, 'The Enduring Ephemeral, or the Future is a Memory', *Critical Inquiry*, 35 (2008), 148–71; Lisa Gitelman, *Paper Knowledge: Towards a Media History of Documents* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014).

[25] Piper, *Book Was There*, 54.

[26] Wendy Hui Kyong Chun, *Programmed Visions: Software and Memory* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2011), 133.

for example, potential employers or government agencies. The fear inspired by the ephemerality of digitised information is not that words and images will be obliterated but, rather, the prospect that they will never go away, representing a nightmarish haunting of the present by an 'undead' past. As I will show in Chapter 1, this aspect of ephemerality is not actually new but is also discernible in the category's formation in the eighteenth century.

Ephemerality as a constitutive element of 'print culture' broadly conceived has thus always been with us, at least since the mid-fifteenth century, and seems set to make the transition from print to the digital age and, indeed, to become more urgent than ever before. The term 'ephemera' is notable for how it occurs in promiscuous and diverse contexts in which it is often used unreflexively and rarely, if ever, theorised. The history of ephemera must therefore take account of how the category has been so successful in functioning anachronistically and discursively. There was 'ephemera' before 'ephemera', in other words. However, while ephemera resonates transhistorically, both backwards into the medieval past and forwards into the digital future, in this book I argue that its reach across time can only be properly understood in the context of the historical moment of its formation in the long eighteenth century.

'This Is Ephemera': The 1960s and After

Before I discuss these contexts, however, it is important to consider the institutional and disciplinary frameworks as well as the 'amateur' circles that have shaped the category of printed ephemera in the twentieth century. The slipperiness of the term is reflected in its currency in a range of domains, some of which also have a marginal status within the academy. An example is printing history for which ephemera has always been important, apparent in the work of eighteenth-century collectors such as John Bagford (1650/1–1716) who acquired and was a broker of title pages, advertisements, and other forms of printed 'scrap' which he dedicated to a never-realised history of printing (though Bagford did not identify what he was collecting as 'ephemera').[27] John Johnson's collecting of ephemera also derived from an interest in it as evidence of the development of printing,

[27] On Bagford see Milton McC. Gatch, 'John Bagford, Bookseller and Antiquary', *British Library Journal*, 12 (1986), 150–71; T. A. Birrell, 'Anthony Wood, John Bagford and Thomas Hearne as Bibliographers', in *Pioneers in Bibliography*, eds. Robin Myers and Michael Harris (New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 1996), 25–39.

though this dimension of the collection became increasingly absorbed in his preoccupation with ephemera as a potential 'museum' of everyday life.[28] A seminal text in the history of the emergence of 'printed ephemera' as a cultural category in the twentieth century was John Lewis's *Printed Ephemera* of 1962. Subtitled 'The Changing Uses of Type and Letterforms in English and American Printing', Lewis's book interpreted ephemera through the lens of printing history.[29] A striking design artefact in its own right, *Printed Ephemera* both informed and reflected innovations in mid-twentieth-century graphic design, as well as stimulating interest in printed ephemera per se.

While declaring its relationship to printing history, Lewis's *Printed Ephemera* also appealed to the ephemera collector. The 1960s was the decade when ephemera collectors began to organise, creating a new visibility for ephemera that was influential on the development of ephemera studies in the academy and also on the collecting policies of major public and university libraries. In the 1960s and 1970s it was still possible to find collections of ephemera from the nineteenth century, the kind of albums that were a major resource for John Johnson. In June 1969, for example, Sotheby's auction house advertised, under the headline, 'Printed Ephemera', 'a collection of eighteenth and nineteenth century pamphlets, and books from the library of Sara Coleridge [daughter of S. T. Coleridge]; chapbooks; juvenile drama; a collection of playing cards; valentine and greetings cards; scrapbooks and albums'.[30] The publicising of this material as 'printed ephemera' was designed to whet the appetite of a growing market. In the 1960s and 1970s ephemera was mainly associated with individual collectors and commercial interests, ranging from Sotheby's to small antique dealers. These individuals and businesses

[28] For Johnson's framing of his collecting in terms of the history of printing see John Johnson, 'The Development of Printing, Other than Book-Printing', *The Library*, Ser. 4, 17 (1936), 22–35.

[29] John Lewis, *Printed Ephemera: The Changing Uses of Type and Letterforms in English and American Printing* (Ipswich: W. S. Cowell, 1962). Lewis's book was published in the context of a wider interest in media and communication in the early 60s, inspired partly by the work of Marshall McLuhan (*The Gutenberg Galaxy* appeared in 1962) and manifested in the exhibition 'Printing and the Mind of Man', which took place at Earl's Court in London in July 1963. See John Carter and Percy H. Muir (eds.), *Printing and the Mind of Man: Descriptive Catalogue Illustrating the Impact of Print on the Evolution of Western Civilization during Five Centuries* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Wilson, 1967). The attentiveness to the ephemeral text as an artefact of print encouraged a particular focus on and appreciation of what later became known as graphic design, reflected in the evolution of the Centre for Ephemera Studies at the University of Reading (established in 1992) that had its origins in printing, specifically typographic, history, latterly developing into a focus on 'graphic communication' in general [see www.reading.ac.uk/typography/research/typ-research centres.aspx, accessed 29 July 2014].

[30] *The Times*, 10 June 1969.

formed informal knowledge and sociable networks that later organised themselves as societies producing literature on ephemera in the form of newsletters and journals and also book-length studies. Maurice Rickards (1919–98) was an important figure in this development, responsible for the much-cited definition of printed ephemera as 'the minor transient documents of everyday life'.[31] Rickards's basement flat in Fitzroy Square in London, so crowded with books and ephemera that he could not find space for a bed and had to sleep on six chairs, was the meeting place for the group that would later form the Ephemera Society. The Society held its first exhibition in November 1975, 'This is Ephemera', in the showrooms of the paper manufacturers Wiggins Teape in Soho, a sign of its links with the commercial world of print.[32] (It is also notable that the exhibition took place very close to the site of no. 32 Soho Square, the home of Sir Joseph Banks and the repository until 1818 of the ephemera collections of his sister, Sarah Sophia). Maurice Rickards was involved in the formation of the Centre for Ephemera Studies at the University of Reading, for which his collection of ephemera was foundational. He also devoted twenty years to writing the definitive reference guide, *The Encyclopedia of Ephemera*, published posthumously by the British Library in 2000.[33]

The academic and institutional visibility of ephemera since the 1990s has therefore been largely due to the work of 'private' ephemerists in the 1960s and 1970s. The associational and commercial networks linked with ephemera as a collectible continue to thrive, the Internet representing a global shop-meet for ephemerists and a resource for ephemera-based research. The cultural 'space' of ephemera in Britain since the 1960s is therefore a distinctive one: it is neither properly 'in' nor 'out', incorporated in both a material and a metaphorical sense within dominant institutions of public culture but never fully assimilated by them. Printed ephemera is a guest in the house of hegemonic cultural formations, like a room bulging with 'stuff' which the householder tolerates but for most of the time tries to ignore. As we shall see, these spatial and material metaphors are not just

[31] Rickards, *Collecting Printed Ephemera*, 7.

[32] *The Times*, 18 November 1975. Similar associations dedicated to the collection and study of ephemera have a longer history in France. The 'Vieux Papier' society was established in 1900 [see www.levieuxpapier-asso.org/, accessed 6 November 2014]; see also Nicolas Petit, *L'éphémère, l'ocasionnel et le non livre à la bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1997).

[33] Patrick Hickman Robertson, 'Obituary: Maurice Rickards', *The Independent*, 20 February 1998 [www.independent.co.uk/news/obituaries/obituary-maurice-rickards-1145817.html, accessed 11 November 2011]; Rickards and Twyman, *Encyclopedia of Ephemera*.