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The material conditions that influenced early modern women’s writing are crucial to understanding what women wrote and how their work can be read. Like all material artefacts, early modern women’s texts do not reach readers in isolation, but emerge through complex systems of production, transmission and reception. Criticism of early modern women’s writing in the last decade has increasingly emphasised their engagement with different generic forms and modes of circulation, expanding the parameters of the field beyond literary interpretation of the texts themselves to an engagement with their intricate textual histories. The current volume builds upon this work to produce a wide-ranging account of the rich and diverse material cultures through which early modern women’s writing was produced, transmitted and received. It focuses on the ways in which this writing was culturally mediated: how it was originally packaged and promoted, how it circulated in its contemporary contexts, and how it was read and received in later revisions and redactions. In doing so, Material Cultures of Early Modern Women’s Writing aims to illuminate not only the ways in which we read, analyse and value early modern women’s writing, but also to expand our understanding of the production, transmission and reception of early modern literature more broadly.

Collectively, the essays in this volume draw upon recent developments in the history of the book in order to rethink the bases upon which we formulate early modern women’s authorship, publication and circulation. They engage with new models of production and publication developed by Matt Cohen in his fascinating, original monograph The Networked Wilderness: Communicating in Early New England (2009). Cohen situates texts within broadly defined contexts of production, combining the particular material condition of an individual
text with its cultural and historical context. In Cohen's terms, the material qualities of a text, such as typography and ornamentation, are ‘treated as standing in a mutually constitutive relationship with language, literary history, the immediate conditions of production of a text, and things like ideas, belief, and tradition’. Further, rather than focusing on the single original act of publication, Cohen analyses what he terms the ‘publication event’, an approach that emphasises the performative elements as well as the provision of information in publication, and extends a text’s publication to its retransmissions beyond the original publication moment. Used in The Networked Wilderness to break down traditional divisions between European American and Native American textual production, we apply this approach in this volume to rethink early modern women’s participation in the complex networks of exchange through which their works were transmitted and received. Rather than static instances of single publication, conceiving early modern women’s writing as publication events taking place in multiple modes over time means that each instantiation of a text operates both discretely and ‘in terms of its relation to simultaneous and past representation in other media’. The ways in which these texts might relate to each other range from imitation and appropriation to subversion and contest. According to this model, publication is not singular, closed and controlled; rather, it is open, multiple and heuristically volatile.

This model of publication events compliments other formulations of early modern textuality that view texts as material artefact, textual collage, social network and collaborative enterprise. In all of these, publication is viewed as ‘choral’, involving typesetters, printers, booksellers and readers as well as authors. Such approaches, by placing originary authorship in productive relation with both initial and subsequent instances of circulation and exchange, allow the idea of early modern women’s writing itself to be interrogated and expanded. The field of early modern women’s writing has never been richer in terms of volume and variety of texts and authors, but our assessment of what constitutes a woman writer often remains tied to an identifiable female voice and a more or less original text considered in its first context of production. In rethinking textual production and publication in early modern women’s writing, this collection builds upon recent work that is interested both in the historical work of women’s literary labour and the function of gender in textual production. It considers literary activities that have hitherto been considered ‘extra-authorial’, such as women’s patronage, editing and even translation, as well as writing that
Introduction

is produced in multiple redactions and configured as women’s writing only partially, or in certain publication contexts. As Cohen argues,

[r]egardless of one’s understanding of the author function and no matter how present the author is at the scene of printing, books have always needed a series of producers, each of whose power can predominate over reception or deployment at different moments in the production, circulation, and consumption process.9

This emphasis on multiple textual producers is particularly useful in opening up early modern women’s studies beyond literary readings of ostensibly autonomous authorship to include the often surprising range of alternative roles women played in early modern literary culture. In addition, it shows the association of gender and authorship to be dependent on complex material histories of production that shift over time, uncoupling a static model of historical woman writer and text and replacing it with one that views this relationship as temporally, spatially and textually contingent.

A new focus on materiality is key to our collection’s investigation of the relationship between women and writing in the early modern period. Over the past four decades, the material turn in early modern studies has opened up important new avenues for literary research.10 The study of canonical male authors in particular has benefited from analysis of the complex range of material conditions that contributed to the production of their canons.11 As yet, however, little work has been conducted on the material contexts affecting early modern women’s writing. Significant exceptions include the invaluable textual introductions to critical editions of now-canonical early modern women authors such as Lucy Hutchinson, Aemilia Lanyer, Elizabeth Cary, Mary Wroth, Mary Sidney and Elizabeth I,12 as well as those emerging into canonical status, such as Anne Askew, Elizabeth Tyrwhit, Anne Lock and Katherine Parr.13 While earlier studies dealing with early modern English material tended to favour either the medieval (Summit 2000) or the eighteenth-century end of this period (McDowell 1998),14 an emerging strand of scholarship on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Englishwomen’s writing has begun to include material concerns as a crucial part of its methodological repertoire. Of note in this context is work on the material practices of early modern women’s reading by Heidi Brayman Hackel and Edith Snook, and recent monographs by Patricia Demers, Kimberley Anne Coles and Helen Smith that explicitly locate women’s writing in relation to its modes of production and consumption.15 Equally
valuable in this regard are essay collections and anthologies on women’s participation in early English manuscript culture that trace its circuitous routes of coterie transmission, and those on women’s religious writing that pay particular attention to its varied material forms, such as prayer books, scriptural collage, letters and marginalia. A number of studies of the material conditions affecting early modern literary culture more broadly have begun to include a significant proportion of essays on women’s writing, counterbalancing a previous tendency to include one or at most two essays dealing with such apparently secondary material. A glance at the current state of play in the wider history of the book, however, suggests that early modern women’s contributions to this history remain largely marginal to the otherwise progressive and generative counter-narratives this body of scholarship continues to produce.

*Material Cultures of Early Modern Women’s Writing* addresses these gaps on several different levels. At the most immediate, local level of early modern women’s studies it aims to shift questions of production, transmission and reception from the periphery to the central subject of analysis, providing new case studies of the materiality of women’s texts from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries. At the level of early modern literature more broadly, the collection explicitly genders the relationships between literary texts and material cultures, demonstrating how the very differences that constitute the field of women’s writing can work to challenge and refine existing understandings of publication, authorship and authority in the early modern period. At the macro level of the history of the book, and specifically through its confrontation with normatively masculine models of early modern textual production, the collection underscores the necessity for this wider history to consider women’s sometimes distinctive modes and methods of textual engagement. If early modern book history has been relatively successful in incorporating insights from the study of non-canonical male textual producers, its record with accommodating the potentially different modes of women’s textual engagement has been significantly slower.

In presenting a sample of women’s textual engagements from across the long early modern period, *Material Cultures of Early Modern Women’s Writing* thus aims to complicate our existing understanding of three significant fields: early modern women’s writing, early modern literary culture, and the ongoing development of the history of the book.

In asking ‘what constitutes evidence in book history?’ Cohen sheds light on a residual bias in current methodologies: ‘For most book historians’, he writes, ‘the emphasis on textual materiality has seemed to preclude the study of communal, mnemonic, and ritualized information.’
As Germaine Warkentin has argued, ‘the book historian is grounded in ... solid materiality’, and thus ‘book history assumes the basic bibliographical requirement of marks made upon a material base for the purpose of recording, storing, and communicating information’.21 As Cohen points out, however, the focus on textual materiality exists alongside, and indeed contributes to, a troubling ‘undertheorization of materiality’ itself. In Cohen’s admirably understated phrase, ‘alternative bases for book history might be imagined’. In response to this challenge, these essays take as their objects of analysis the physical materials of early textual production, oral performances and redactions of various texts, and modern developments in data collation and retrieval. In doing so, they ask what possibilities these new methodologies might open up for our understanding of early modern women’s publication practice in England, by expanding our conceptions of field, context and publication mode.

At the same time, this collection suggests that it is equally important to bring literary and rhetorical analysis, particularly from a gendered perspective, to bear on the conventional wisdoms of Western book history. Book historical narratives that are currently emerging as canonical or commonsense can, we believe, benefit from literary-critical reading practices this history has in some cases left behind. Book history will sometimes ignore the rhetorical claims and literary impact of the books it studies, while conventional literary criticism can often take for granted the book as a self-evident, and singular, material artefact. Essays in this volume examine not only discrete material practices, such as patronage, editing or translation, that early modern women engaged in, but also how such specific textual engagements were represented rhetorically to their immediate and subsequent audiences. Bringing literary-critical and book-historical approaches together, the collection raises challenging questions about the efficacy of existing categories of production, transmission and reception in accounting for the range of early modern women’s textual engagements.

The material focus of this collection provides an opportunity to showcase new critical approaches to the physical artefacts and production processes of early modern women’s texts. Questions we have asked ourselves in this enterprise, and have asked our contributors to consider, include: how does our understanding of early modern material culture shift if we take into account the diverse practices of literary production and participation used by women in the period? What new categories of analysis need to be developed to better reflect the full range of women’s modes of textual engagement? And how do theories of gender – both
historical and present-day – continue to influence the reception and critical analysis of early modern women’s literary labour?

Helen Smith’s essay on ‘Women and the Materials of Writing’ provides a starting point for these questions, as she unearths fascinating evidence of early modern women’s engagements with the physical objects, spaces and products of writing. Complementing recent scholarship, including her own, that considers women’s reading as a situated practice, Smith turns in this chapter ‘to the places, and especially the tools, of women’s writing’ by considering ‘how the physicality of writing is made present as both the subject and the medium of women’s inscriptive practice’. Her analysis encompasses both disparate material artefacts and the works of neglected and well-known writers, straddling demarcations between types of authors – canonical and non-canonical; modes of transmission – manuscript, print and physical object; and forms of materiality – as both the medium and subject of composition. The result is a vibrant and multifaceted picture of early modern women’s engagements with the materials of writing, one that situates the early modern woman writer ‘in a constant negotiation with her sometimes reluctant tools’.

Rosalind Smith’s chapter on the marginalia in Mary Queen of Scots’ Book of Hours similarly considers the book as material object, tracing the unique circumstances of this volume’s production and location over its titular owner’s lifetime and beyond. Smith considers three distinct types of marginalia: the queen’s independent marks of ownership, ten other signatures, and fourteen quatrains in French in Mary Stuart’s autograph hand, reconstructing an illuminating narrative of the unusual path this politically volatile book took, from the French court of Mary’s youth, through her incarceration at Sheffield Castle, to its memorialisation, after her death, by readers both sympathetic and hostile. The unusual range of marginalia Smith uncovers here, and the distinctiveness of both the book as physical object and its potential political uses, provides a new perspective from which to address ongoing discussions about the significance and use of early modern marginalia. Both the material pages of this book of hours and its history of circulation are simultaneously ‘ordinary and extraordinary, individual and communal, personal and political’, making the annotations to this text ‘a new and significant example of a larger archive through which early modern women’s uses of the spaces of the book might be explored’.

Chapters by Deborah Uman and Patricia Pender also consider the production of early modern women’s writing, this time from the perspectives of translation and patronage respectively. Uman places Elizabeth
Cary’s most famous work, *The Tragedy of Mariam*, in the context of translations Cary wrote at the beginning and end of her career, arguing that while *Mariam* is often heralded as the first original play written by a woman in English, it can also be fruitfully considered an exercise in ‘translation with latitude’, of the kind that Shakespeare practised and Dryden advocated. In this analysis, translation figures as a form of collaboration ‘that is neither fully the creation of the original author nor of its translator’, allowing us to understand ‘collaborative practices as a type of “third term” that destabilises categories of originality and imitation’. By considering Cary’s literary representations of fraught female community in *Mariam* alongside paratexts to her translation of the *Reply* of Cardinal Perron – which celebrate actual collaborations with historical women – Uman suggests that, ‘perhaps ironically, [Cary’s] conversion and forced separation from her husband may have given her the opportunity that Mariam lacked, to forge alliances with other women, to celebrate literary communion, and to reaffirm her voice within the practice of collaboration and translation’.

Patricia Pender’s examination of the roles played by Queen Katherine Parr in ‘Englishing’ the *Paraphrases of Erasmus* similarly considers women’s practices of collaboration and translation, analysing the complex network of authors and extra-authorial agents involved in the ‘publication event’ of this important Reformation work. Analysing the richly rhetorical language of dedications to Parr by the volume’s editor, Nicholas Udall, alongside Udall’s own translations of the efficacy of biblical similitude in his exegesis on the metaphors of quail, mincemeat and leaven, Pender argues that contemporary representations of Parr’s patronage venerated her active, even militant championing of Reformist publication at the same time that they celebrated her more conventional image as ‘spiritual huswife’ to the realm. Reevaluating critical distinctions between ‘principall autours’ and ‘lesser ministers and servauntes’, this chapter suggests that early modern understandings of women’s textual production approached our current notion of collaborative co-authorship more closely than we have hitherto allowed.

The second set of essays in this collection moves beyond issues of production to consider the material processes of transmission and reception that have affected early modern women’s texts. Apart from the detailed textual histories included in critical editions of single authors mentioned above, as yet surprisingly little work has been done on the transmission of early modern women’s writing, despite the recent emergence of valuable scholarship on the transmission of canonical male authors such as Shakespeare.22 Chapters by Michelle O’Callaghan, Kate
Lilley and Margaret Ezell include contemporary histories of circulation – in manuscript, print and promotional publicity – which shed light on the forms and methods through which early modern women wrote and their place within social, scribal and political cultures.

Michelle O’Callaghan uncovers unusual evidence of women’s participation in the largely male, often misogynist, early seventeenth-century vogue for burlesque poetry, in verse written by or attributed to Lady Mary Jacob. Uncovering the elusive textual history of a pair of bawdy answer poems between a male flout and female speaker, through their original manuscript appearances early in the century to their later emergence in the printed miscellanies of mid-century, O’Callaghan suggests that, ‘just as these verses are recontextualised and reworked through the process of transmission, so too their “authors” are re-configured and re-embodied, ascribed different identities in different publication contexts’. As O’Callaghan notes, female-voiced bawdy poetry ‘raises particular problems’ for authorial attribution; ‘it would be highly problematic’, she argues, ‘to see the “female author” constructed within these bawdy voices as necessarily coterminous with a woman writer.’ Instead, O’Callaghan maps, across a variety of extant copies, the ‘shifting formal frameworks and socioliterary networks within which the “authors” of female-voiced bawdy poetry were produced and reproduced’.

Kate Lilley’s essay is similarly concerned with networks of transmission of early modern women’s writing, and explores the circulation history of the poetry of Katherine Philips, focusing on ‘the forms and company in which Philips is and has been “made available”’. Her interest is in the material and affective Philips, her ‘poetics of association’ from the complex originary circulation histories of her manuscript poems to their chequered afterlives in print. Lilley intriguingly traces a history of reading and readers of Philips through editing practices, readerly annotation of individually bound books and her own reading experience, in order to highlight the imbrication of books in daily life from the seventeenth century to the present.

Lilley’s juxtaposition of late twentieth-century reading with that of the early modern period is mirrored in Margaret Ezell’s essay, which considers the promotion and circulation of seventeenth-century writers, Susanna Centlivre and Catharine Trotter. Ezell proposes the Penny Post as an early form of social media and in doing so extends insights into the marketing and literary celebrity of authors examined in earlier essays in the collection. She takes as her subject the ‘deliberate and strategic publication of personal and familiar texts’ by Centlivre and her contemporaries, and demonstrates how such materials, with their
coterie cachet, were used by canny publishers ‘in an initial step toward the creation of a commercial persona’. She writes that ‘exploring the ways in which some women self-consciously used the transformation of seemingly personal artefacts into purely textual ones as a mechanism for entering print causes us to reconsider terms such as “familiar” and private in this public commercial space’. In a startling leap that is paradoxically typical of Ezell’s scholarship, she relates this practice to the self-promotion strategies of young Japanese women writing cell phone novel instalments for social media spaces such as the ‘Magic Island’. Pulling the publication practices of early modern women into dialogue with twenty-first-century technologies of ‘print’ and publicity, this chapter opens stimulating avenues for analysis of the ways in which material textual cultures affect women’s writing, in the past and in the present.

As Lilley and Ezell’s chapters suggests, transmission histories often extend beyond the circumstances of their contemporary circulation to later generations, illuminating the different material and intellectual cultures in which women’s texts have been alternatively revived and neglected, and allowing scholars to theorise about significant changes and continuities in the transmission of women’s texts over the last 400 years. This collection’s attention to reception analyses the uses to which early modern women’s texts have been and continue to be put in different cultural contexts, and examines the critical reception of early modern women’s studies as a distinct field over time. This focus on the material mediation of early modern women’s texts raises important questions not only for understanding the individual texts and authors involved, but also for understanding the reception of early modern women’s writing and its relationship to the wider field of literary studies. The final two chapters of this volume address pertinent questions confronting reception: what roles have interpretive communities played in the transmission of early modern women’s texts? What role might the digital humanities have in future reception of these texts? And what challenges does a new material understanding of early modern women’s writing pose to conventional narratives of English literary history?

Paul Salzman’s reconstruction of the revival of Lady Mary Wroth’s play Love’s Victory by Henrietta Halliwell-Phillipps in the nineteenth century offers an intriguing case study of the later transmission and reception of early modern women’s writing. Investigating the intimate local coordinates of the manuscript’s recovery and redaction at the hands of Halliwell-Phillipps, her father, Sir Thomas Phillipps, and her husband, James Orchard Halliwell, Salzman uncovers a familial drama
as literary, domestic and dynastic as that which beset Wroth in her composition of the seventeenth-century text. Issues of attribution again take centre stage in this material history, as none of the agents involved in the recovery of Wroth’s play were seemingly aware of her authorship, despite the presence of a rare Wroth manuscript of *Pamphilia to Amphilathus*, ‘in Wroth’s most careful italic hand’, in the very library of Thomas Phillipps in which *Love’s Victory* was being transcribed. Romance and happenstance aside, Salzman’s account of the nineteenth-century reception and redaction of *Love’s Victory* provides us with a detailed micro-history of this text at an important Victorian phase of the antiquarian interest in early modern English literature. In this respect the chapter points usefully towards further opportunities for research in the field of nineteenth-century receptions of early modern women’s texts.

The final essay in the volume, by Marie Louise Coolahan, places us firmly and unapologetically in the twenty-first century and asks us to consider the channels – of archive, edition, database and network – through which we apprehend early modern women’s writing in the academy today. As a central participant in the European Union’s COST project, ‘Women Writers in History’, Coolahan surveys recent digital projects in the field of early modern literary studies to consider the opportunities and challenges such initiatives provide for the study of early modern women writers. The transnational scope of such projects as ‘Women Writers in History’ is clearly one of the benefits of such large-scale international research collaborations, but, as Coolahan suggests, careful attention needs to be paid to the local, material circumstances of the production, transmission and circulation of each text in order to grant researchers the sophisticated access to texts this scholarship promises.

Collectively, the essays assembled in *Material Cultures of Early Modern Women’s Writing* demonstrate how early modern women’s writing – a field that was once seen as a peripheral area of interest – can shift a field on its axis, so that women’s writing and its material conditions of production, transmission and reception can be seen as an especially productive starting point for those interested in the merging fields of reception history, book history, manuscript transmission and cultural history. It offers a tasting plate, as it were, of promising new approaches to the material analysis of early modern women’s texts. As a whole, this collection has been built on the rationale that the material history of early modern women’s writing is a neglected history that needs to be uncovered, and that doing so will inevitably pose challenges to current
understandings of literary history more broadly. Its essays provide new insights into where and how early modern writing practice was situated – its tools and materials, sites and spaces – as well as interrogating the values and uses of these writing practices. They also expand conceptions of early modern textual forms to include extra-literary materials, collaborative practices and extended circulation and reception histories, in ways that destabilise autonomous models of authorship and draw sometimes startling connections between the writing and reading of the past and the present. While canonical literary history might perceive early modern women’s works as marginal to the main concerns of early modern literature, it is our experience that their very difference from what we expect of a literary text sheds important new light on our discipline’s categories of classification. These essays thus pursue questions about the nature of authorship, materiality and textuality that can only be broached from the unique perspective of early modern women’s writing.

Notes


1
Women and the Materials of Writing

Helen Smith

One copy of the 1623 Shakespeare First Folio, now at the Folger Shakespeare Library, is marked with the fragmentary testimony of a seventeenth-century woman (see Figure 1.1), about whom little is known, other than her name:

margarit by is my name and
with my peen I wright this same
and if my peen hade ben better
i sholld

Margaret By's broken final line doubly registers the allegedly stuttering presence of her pen: she not only writes about it, but also – by ceasing to write with it – calls the reader's attention to the presence of the quill in her hand, and to the sometimes vexed relationship that existed between the writer and her tools. An aborted first attempt at the verse, along with one complete and two partial signatures, reinforces the link between literacy and pen-work, composition and inscription.

What By's fragmentary testimony reminds us is that writing is an embodied act, undertaken by men and women who employ a range of specialist tools, and whose writing (in the sense both of script and of content) is shaped by the physical and social contexts in which it takes place. By's verse is one of an array of ownership poems, signatures and inscriptions that mark the pages of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century books, and have been brought to light by scholars seeking to recover evidence of past reading. Reflecting on the relationship between ownership verses, pen practices, signatures and the texts they accompany, William Sherman asks: 'are students of marginalia and readers' marks supposed to study these inscriptions and, if so, how are they to be
Figure 1.1 Inscriptions by Margaret By in a copy of the Shakespeare First Folio

Source: Folger Shakespeare Library, STC 22273 fol. 1, no. 32. Reproduced by permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library.
described and approached? Sherman suggests we can interpret such fragmentary records variously as epigraphs, as sites of sometimes disruptive memory, or as acts of appropriation that take a canonical object (the book), and deploy it to new ends. Heidi Brayman Hackel further proposes that ‘marks of ownership and recording ... contribute to a history of reading’, offering evidence of ownership and circulation. Yet in considering these marks as documents in the history of reading, there is a danger that we neglect their significance for the history of writing as a material, embodied and responsive practice.

Where recent scholarship has encouraged us to understand women’s reading as a situated practice that took place in locations from the chamber to the open fields, this chapter turns instead to the places, and especially the tools, of women’s writing. It considers how the physicality of writing is made present as both the subject and the medium of women’s inscriptive practice. In his wide-ranging study of early modern epistolarity, James Daybell explains how writing has been made to matter along two trajectories. Materiality may be registered ‘in terms of the physical characteristics of manuscript letters and the meanings generated by them. ... Such forms were imbued with social signs and codes that affected meaning.’ Thus in *The Gentlewoman’s Companion* (1673), Hannah Woolley concluded her instructions on the appropriate contents of a letter with a stern reminder:

Have especial care of blotting your paper, giving it a large Margent; and be curious in the cutting your Letters, that they may delight the sight, and not tire the Reader. Lastly, be curious in the neat folding up your Letter, pressing it so that it may take up but little room, and let your Seal and Superscription be very fair.

Alongside questions of layout and presence, Daybell argues, ‘the term materiality also encompasses the “social materiality” of letter texts, in other words the social and cultural practices of manuscripts and the material conditions and contexts in which they were produced, disseminated and consumed’. In this chapter, I want to extend Daybell’s taxonomy still further by exploring two additional modes of thinking materially, tracing the encounters between early modern women writers and their tools of writing, and the relationship between written (and printed) objects and subject matter.

The first half of this chapter attempts to reorientate our understanding of women’s relationship to the objects of writing, and is inspired, in part, by Sara Ahmed’s demand for a ‘queer phenomenology’, a rethinking of
the relationships between people and their environments that recognises how the material presence of objects imposes certain attitudes and directions of approach. A body, Ahmed argues, ‘gets directed in some ways more than others. ... If such turns are repeated over time, then bodies acquire the shape of such direction.’ Ahmed returns repeatedly to the question of women’s place at the table: the foundational object of phenomenological thought. It is at the table that Edmund Husserl’s famous meditation upon situated perception, and hence the scholarly field concerned with how we come to know the world around us, begins. As Ahmed points out, Husserl’s table for writing and thinking is somebody else’s (a woman’s) job of tidying, cleaning and sorting; Ahmed asks ‘Who faces the writing table? Does the writing table have a face, which points it towards some bodies rather than others?’ This chapter (this ‘paper’), then, pursues the early modern functions of paper, ink and quills in order to recognise some of the alternative directions from which early modern women approached and appropriated the practice and place of writing.

Husserl defines ‘perception’ as ‘an attentive perceiving’: ‘I am turned towards the object, for instance, the sheet of paper; I seize upon it as this existent here and now. The seizing-upon is a singling out and seizing.’ In directing his attention towards ‘the paper’ – an example that is far from arbitrary, given that it is precisely the surface upon and with which he is working – Husserl distinguishes it from the ‘background’ of ‘books, pencils, an inkstand, etc’, which are ‘also “perceived” in a certain manner, perceptually there, in the “field of intuition”’. In the second part of this chapter, I follow the line of Husserl’s directed perception, turning to the ways in which writing materials become the subjects of inscription, emerging as the matter of writing in a triple sense: not only as the materials that make writing possible, but as the subject matter (the res) of that writing, and as frames for and participants in the processes of composition and cognition.

‘Necessaries for writing’

In the directions to ‘such as desire to be Waiting Gentlewomen’ that open The Compleat Servant-Maid; or, the Young Maidens Tutor (1677), Woolley concludes a section on syrups with the remark: ‘Thus having given you some short directions for Preserving, Conserviug [sic], and Candyng, I shall in the next place give you some rules and directions, how you may attain to write a good legible Hand.’ Accompanied by a set of elegant foldout engravings demonstrating complex letters and
flourishes, Woolley’s directions begin with making the pen, a process that requires the would-be writer to have a ‘penknife with a smooth, thin, sharp edge’ and to ‘take the first or second quill of a Goose wing and scrape it’ before cutting a nib. Arguing that Woolley categorises ‘handwriting as a basic skill of housework’, Wendy Wall suggests that these instructions rely upon the skilled servant’s ability ‘to wield a knife properly in order to chop ingredients, shape pastries, and carve at the table’. In *The Compleat Servant-Maid*, this congruence is striking: only fifteen pages after learning how to make a pen, the reader receives instructions on ‘How to Rear or Break a Goose’, returning us abruptly to the carcass that was the source both of writing implements and of roast meat.

Woolley goes on to instruct her reader how to hold the pen, and then, in a paragraph that reminds us of the bodily and situated nature of writing, ‘How to sit to write’. Asserting the importance of physical self-discipline, Woolley directs the reader: ‘hold your head up the distance of a span from the paper, when you are writing hold not your head one way nor other, but look right forward’. With her right elbow drawn in, and left hand steadying the paper, the novice writer is also asked to consider her materials, ensuring she is possessed of thin, freely flowing ink, and ‘white, fine, and well gumm’d’ paper.

At this point, Woolley’s guide to writing becomes difficult to distinguish from the numerous instructions for culinary and medical practice that accompany it in the printed text; she directs her reader: ‘Rub your paper lightly with gum-sandarac beaten fine, and tyed up in a linnen cloth, which makes the paper bear ink better, and the pen run more smooth’. Sandarac (red arsenic sulphide) was otherwise used for medical treatments or as a poison. In tone and form, Woolley’s directions for paper-preparation chime with the receipts that elsewhere guide users to prepare and preserve a range of fabrics and of sweetmeats. Woolley’s guide prompts us to reorientate our approach to women’s writing, recognising that we might approach women’s literacy from the direction of domestic practice and utility, rather than as an aspiration to an elite male preserve.

Figure 1.2 reproduces a portrait of Mary Neville, Lady Dacre, engaged in the act of writing. As well as her quill, Neville is equipped with an open pot of ink, with its cover resting beside it, and a pouncepot, or pot of sand, to blot her copy. Like quills, ink was often prepared at home. The 1588 edition of John Partridge’s *The Widowes Treasure* contains recipes for a veritable rainbow: ‘a perfect black Inke to write or limme withall’, ‘A very good Greene’, ‘An other Greene’, ‘red Incke’ and ‘An Emerald Greene’ (‘Take Verdegres, Litarge, Quicke Siluer brayed to
powder, and ground with the pisse of a yong child’). A receipt book, passed down from Mary Granville to her daughter Ann with the rueful inscription, ‘Mrs. Ann Granvills Book which I hope she will make a better use of then her mother’, contains recipes ‘To make Inke Verie Good’, ‘Mr Wm ffen’s receipt to make rare Inke giuen mee in Malaga Ano
1646’, ‘To make double Incke kalled In French anCre Lui’sente’ and ‘To make incke ye Spanish way’, as well as a Spanish recipe ‘Para haser buena Tinta’.21 Each of these receipts is distinguished by one or more manuscript manicules, emphatic additions that do not accompany any of the other receipts in this substantial volume, and thus suggest a self-conscious flourish to mark the moment at which the material of writing coincides with the instructions for its own production.

Mary’s father, Sir Martin Westcomb, served as consul at Cadiz; the inclusion of Spanish recipes in the volume attests to the material and cultural exchange that took place between Catholic Spain and Protestant England. The position of the directions for Spanish ink, opposite ‘Mr Leonard Wilkes Receat for Good chocolate and the mixture it ought to haue of things’, is a further reminder of the confessional politics of post-Reformation Europe: brought back from colonial voyages to Central and South America, drinking chocolate quickly became fashionable in Spain. England was slow to follow this trend, and ‘the first Englishmen to acquire a taste for chocolate were “hispaniolized” Englishmen or former Catholic exiles’.22 Thus, the material space of Granville’s page makes vividly present the exotic, and potentially dangerous, Catholic knowledge that underlay both good ink and fine chocolate.

As Margaret By’s ownership note, with which I opened, attests, the relationship between ink, pen and writer was not always smooth. In the sixteenth century, Lady Katherine Paston grumbled: ‘I write this as much in hast as may be: with a pen of my Cosine Cooks which I think haue written many an indenture, it is but a bad one’, and added a postscript to another letter: ‘never wors pen never wors paper nor wors writer’.23 Paston’s grumble about indenture writing can be read as a simple expression of the over-use of a pen for legal business, but it hints too at the possibility that what is written works upon the writing tool: the pen seems to have taken on the dry and unfruitful character of a land-grant. In the early seventeenth century, Lady Dorothy Bacon complained to her niece, Lady Anne Drury, that ‘my penn is naught, my eycke worse, and my inwensyon worst of all’.24 Complaints at the unreliability of pens were a frequent trope, but Bacon’s, like Paston’s, is intriguing in the way it links together the material and the conceptual, using the structure of the list to move through a misbehaving pen to sticky ink, and thereby rendering the sluggishness of Bacon’s ‘invention’ peculiarly material.

Writing to James VI of Scotland after the long hiatus in their correspondence that followed the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, Elizabeth I blended the emotional situation of the writer with the physical state
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of the pen, complaining: ‘My pen, my deare brother, hathe remained so long dry as I suppose hit hardly wold have taken ynke againe’. Each of these examples attests to the temperamental nature of a dry or abused quill, but equally suggests how writers deployed the physical resistance of their writing tools as a figure for the exigencies of invention and expression. In 1620, Mary Cornwallis Bourchier, Countess of Bath, complained to her sister, Lady Jane Bacon, ‘if my tears wooll wyrt black, I need no inke’: a compelling example of the inexpressibility topos being expressed through an attention to the act of writing.

Finally, as well as the open book in which she writes, Neville holds an almost closed book, in which her thumb marks her place. Her pose reminds us not only that women's writing was frequently intertextual, drawing on, and repurposing, existing writings, but that it took place across a range of books and surfaces. The Yorkshire noblewoman Margaret Hoby wrote in a range of spaces, including her bible, her sermon book, her table book, her testament, her commonplace book, her household book, and, of course, the diary in which she recorded each of these acts. Alongside the evidence of surviving manuscript texts by women, suggestive traces of the sites and surfaces of women’s writing emerge in funeral sermons, although they must be treated with caution, as both didactic and idealising.

In his 1662 sermon for Lady Anne Waller, Edmund Calamy recalled: ‘She hath a large Book in Folio written with her own hand, wherein under several Heads of Divinity, she hath registred the Observations of her reading both out of the Scriptures (which were her delight) and out of the Writings of our best Divines, and out of her own experiences’. Calamy uses the terms of Waller’s writing to describe her devotional practice, insisting she ‘wrote them in her Heart as well as in her Book, and her life was an exact Commentary upon the Sermons she heard’. In a substantial collection of funeral sermons penned by celebrity preachers (published in 1660), an unnamed woman is described in similar terms: whenever she read,

she had a Paper-book by her, and in reading would note down particular points ... and that in such a manner, as if so be they had been the Common places of some young Divine. ... I my self saw no less then two quires of paper writ out with her own hand, collected partly out of other books, but principally out of Sermons, not noted at Church, when she heard them, but when she came home.

This praise of domestic composition suggests that women’s writing was a private practice, undertaken in the chamber or closet; so too does
Edmund Rainbowe’s remembrance that Susanna Howard, Countess of Suffolk (1627–1649) ‘hath sometimes the day after the Lords Day, locked up her self in private, and from her Memory committed to writing a Sermon, which she had heard the Day before, so perfectly that little was wanting in the very words wherein it was delivered’. Rainbowe’s emphasis upon the technology of the lock suggests the absolute enclosure of Howard’s writing. In similar terms, William Basse answered his own question ‘Who haue the best naturall Memories?’ by calling to mind ‘one Mistresse Iostlin of Cambridgeshire, … vpon the first rehearsall she was able to repeat 40. lines Latine or English, and to carry a whole Sermon from Church, and after set it downe almost verbatim in her chamber’.

Basse concludes his testimonial with a note, ‘She wrote a Legacy to her child before it was borne, and prophesied of her owne death, and died accordingly at the time.’ ‘The Approbation’ by Minister Thomas Goad, which prefaces Jocelin’s published legacy, equally insists upon the privacy of her writing, recounting that:

> when she first felt her selfe quicke with childe (as then travelling with death it selfe) shee secretly tooke order for the buying a new winding sheet. ... And about that time, vndauntedly looking death in the face, priuatly in her Closet betweene God and her, shee wrote these pious Meditations; whereof her selfe strangely speaketh to her owne bowels.

Imagining the double enclosure of Jocelin, encased within her chamber and addressing her own womb, Goad too insists upon the ‘privacy’ of writing, materialising Jocelin’s self-consuming writerly labours as exemplary for his readers.

Yet the space of the closet was not always private, nor did ‘privacy’ occupy the same conceptual ground as it does today. In Hackel’s words, ‘the context of privacy, then, rather than the word itself determines whether an act is solitary or shared, individual or communal’. In her bedchamber at Hardwick Hall, Elizabeth Shrewsbury (Bess of Hardwick) had ‘three Deskes Covered with lether whereof one a great one, a lyttle deske to write on guilded’, alongside a number of coffers and boxes. Bess’s chamber was evidently far from ‘private’ in any modern sense, since her Maid’s chamber was accessed through hers, and the room also contained a bed for her granddaughter, Arbella Stuart. Both Woolley and Margaret Cavendish further complicate the notion of private writing. Woolley scolds her readers: ‘It is very ungentile and
indiscreet, to peep over any Ladies shoulder when she is either writing or reading; or to cast your eye seriously on any one’s papers lying in your way.’ Cavendish, in turn, complains: ‘AS it was formerly the Fashion, or Custom of those that received Visits, if they were Weary of their Visitors, to look in their Watches, or to Gape, or Yawn; so now it is to have always, or for the most part, Pen, Ink, and Paper lying upon the Table in their Chamber, for an Excuse they are writing Letters.’ This overt display of writerly activity is framed by Cavendish as part of the furniture of elite impoliteness, yet suggests the routine presence of writing materials, including a writing surface, in noble and gentry women’s chambers.

Neville’s writing table is covered with a green cloth: an intriguing hint about the furniture at which at least elite women wrote. Understood as a particularly soothing colour, and the dominant hue in Renaissance furnishings, this green fabric encourages us to note the influence of writing space upon the writer. Where Bruce Smith has argued for an ‘ambient reading’, which encouraged a ‘constant – and constantly varying – interplay between the verbal and the visual’, Neville’s green table encourages us to consider writing as an equally ambient activity, taking place within, and informed by, particular spaces, draped (at least for elite writers) in the rich hangings that at once render the scene of writing contiguous with the landscape beyond the house and ‘figure as physical, period-specific versions of the *assemblage*, the interlacing, the weaving, the infolding that Derrida finds in the space between one letter and another’. The glimpse of script in both of the books that Neville holds aligns her writing with the inscribed title on the wooden post of her chair. This perhaps suggests that Neville, like the ironically forgotten artist, painting in the style of Hans Eworth, is making a claim to an epigraphic public identity, and scriptive immortality.

Where some of the writers discussed above indicate that women wrote in gathered quires or in paper books, significant evidence indicates that many women wrote on loose sheets. Sending her juvenilia to a friend, Cavendish warned: ‘you believe them to be so many several sheets of Paper folded into Quarters, or Half Quarters, as into little Baby-books … but the least of these Books are two or thre Quires of Paper’. Both infantilising single-sheet ‘Baby-books’, and marking her own distance from them, Cavendish nonetheless brings to view a paper culture of slender, folded ‘books’ used for writing. In memorialising Susanna Howard, Edmund Rainbowe attested that her writing practice moved between the books she read, and loose papers; her preference for devotional texts was made evident ’both by the Books marked in
the Margent, and noted with her own hand, as also by her papers and memorials, when she began to read any Book’. Rainbowe goes on to address an imagined interlocutor who demands: ‘had she no Errours, no infirmities or sins? truly yes, she had, and … she hath left a Catalogue of them upon record under her own hand, as hath been seen since her death amongst her papers’. While many women’s ‘loose papers’ must have been lost or destroyed shortly after, or even before, their deaths, John Egerton, second Earl of Bridgewater, produced a handsome, bound manuscript, titled "True Coppies of certaine Loose Papers left by ye Right ho:ble ELIZABETH Countesse OF BRIDGEWATER Collected and Transcribed together here since Her Death, AnnoDm. 1663", which survives in three separate witnesses, and brings together a range of prayers and meditations relating either to specific instances in Egerton’s own life (‘A Prayer in the Sickness of my Girle Franck’) or to more general failings (‘Against Sluggishnesse and Lazinesse in Religious duties’). This unusual collection suggests something of the range and quantity of writings that might have been dispersed upon scraps and sheets of paper, and are much less likely than bound volumes to have survived.

James Daybell has found women’s letters written on scraps of paper as small as 2 by 1.6 cm, including the minuscule letters of the gentlewoman Elizabeth Bourne. Famously, Anne Clifford dispersed mottos and ‘Sayings of remark’ around her bedchamber, on ‘her Walls, her Bed, her Hangings, and Furniture … causing her Servants to write them in papers, and her Maids to pin them up’. Early modern England was not the ‘paper-short’ society that has frequently been invoked by scholars. Paper, classified according to its quality and appearance, was used for numerous functions, including covering windows and walls, curling hair, a rich array of decorative and craft practices, and in both cooking and the preparation of domestic medicines. Hannah Woolley may have taught her readers to write, but her books contain diverse other uses for paper: to preserve cherries, candy borage flowers, make fine cakes, candy Marigolds in wedges, ‘the Spanish fashion’, make cakes of lemons, preserve roses or gilly flowers, make Comfits, cover Seeds or Fruits with Sugar, make Marmalade, cure the bloody flux, render a red face pale, dye a range of objects, shape starched lace, and – jarringly – prevent miscarrying. In such an environment, writing becomes continuous with a range of paper practices, which orientate the writer within and towards the world in particular ways.

It is not sufficient, then, to attribute women’s use of paper scraps to the alleged scarcity of this ubiquitous material. Instead we need to investigate the physical and conceptual resonances of slips, scraps and
‘rags’ of paper. In 1573, Isabella Whitney presented the reader of her *Sweet nosgay* with a complex pun when she asked him or her to ‘yet savour to these SLIPS in which I trust you shall finde safety’. In keeping with her guiding conceit, Whitney uses the language of gardening to describe her intertextual adventures in Hugh Plat’s *The floures of philosophie* (1572). Drawing on the humanist trope of commonplacing as plucking flowers from another’s garden, Whitney goes further, transforming her figurative bouquet into a sweet-smelling prophylactic against the dangers of plague-ridden London. Yet the pun that brings together floral slips – cut flowers or branches to be grafted – with slips of paper might also testify to a culture in which women’s writing was frequently materialised as scraps and shreds.

In a manuscript Book of remembrances, Elizabeth Isham, the daughter of a Nottinghamshire gentry family, described her mother’s long illness: ‘I can no better express my mothers troubles then out of the nots of her handwriting, which she keept (carrying then about her) as remembrance and instructions to her selfe.’ In later periods of melancholy, Isham returned to her mother’s notes for sustenance. This practice resonates with Martin Billingsley’s insistence in his writing guide, *The pens excellencie* (1618), that writing is an essential art for women as it allows them to ‘commit many worthy and excellent things to Writing, which may occasionally minister vnto them matter of much solace’. Brought into conversation with the ‘notes’ carried by Isham’s mother, Billingsley’s ‘matter’ becomes double-edged: it is at once the subject matter of the writing and its intimate material form that render it consoling.

Rather than, with Cavendish, suggesting that women prefer ‘Short works’ (among which she somewhat surprisingly includes ‘Romances’) because abbreviated genres are best suited to women’s ‘Brief VVit’, we might instead consider the kinds of concrete relationship that short forms bring into being. Commenting on the Renaissance vogue for miniature writing and printing, Susan Stewart suggests that signification (and, we might add, significance) ‘is increased rather than diminished by its minuteness’; the notes carried by Isham’s mother are freighted with meaning precisely because of their scale, and their relationship to the folds and curves of the body. Equally, Stewart suggests, miniaturisation distorts time, transcending ‘the duration of everyday life in such a way as to create an interior temporality of the subject’. Caught up in the demands of pen- and letter-cutting, detailed folding and composition within defined ‘rules’, the early modern woman writer might be seen to occupy both the space and time of writing, in a constant negotiation with her sometimes reluctant tools.
'Ye high flown quills'

Ahmed notes the multiple valences of Husserl’s paper as it is presented to the reader:

I read writing printed on paper, and on the paper I read about the paper that is apprehended by Husserl. The paper is also ‘in’ the writing, and hence the writing is ‘around’ the paper. … The field of background intuition, against which the object becomes posited as given (the paper) provides for Husserl the very ‘stuff’ for writing, the very materials out of which his phenomenology is borne [sic].

In some early modern women’s writings, paper, pen and ink emerge as tools and as subjects of creative composition. Writing to Jane Lady Bacon in 1629, Dorothe Randolph concluded a detailed letter, ‘And now my paper reminds me I have bine so teadious to you, and bids me say noe more but that I am / Your most loving, faithfull, & humble servant.’ Like Margaret By’s pen, Randolph’s paper emerges as doubly a matter of concern, bearing her words to her recipient, and prompting her, by its material limits, to conclude her letter.

For a number of women, the tools of writing provided an appropriate subject matter to conceive of and negotiate their own entrance into poetic composition. Isabella Whitney, for instance, offers a verbal picture, akin to the portrait of Neville discussed above, in her mock will and testament, written to mark her (possibly fictional) retreat from London in 1573. Concluding her poem with a parody of the formula used to record the presence of legal witnesses, Whitney testifies that ‘Paper, Pen, and Standish were / at that same present by’, bringing into view the writerly qualities of her conceit, and the self-consciousness of her relationship to the written word.

In the prologue to her Several poems, published in 1678, Anne Bradstreet complains:

I am obnoxious to each carping tongue,
Who sayes, my hand a needle better fits,
A Poets Pen, all scorne, I should thus wrong.

Bradstreet’s invocation of the ‘Poets Pen’, and its implied distance from the tools and techniques of domestic life, metonymised by the needle, looks rather different when brought into conversation with evidence of women’s material awareness of their writing environments. Indeed,
when we consider evidence of women’s writing on surfaces other than paper, and with objects other than pens – Lady Jane Grey, for example, left a series of Latin aphorisms ‘written by hir owne hand with a pin’\(^{58}\) – the distinction between needle, pin and pen becomes distinctly blurred.

The doubleness of Bradstreet’s apparent self-deprecation has been widely noted: she demonstrates her qualifications to wield the pen even as she draws attention to her alleged inability to do so. In the final stanza of ‘The prologue’, Bradstreet materialises the pen in striking style, in a ‘soaring’ conflation of the poet and ‘his’ writing technology as she apostrophises ‘ye high flown quils, that soare the skies, / And ever with your prey, still catch your praise’. The dual existence of the quill at both the writing and the kitchen table renders this poetic flight distinctly literal, and adds a material continuity to Bradstreet’s imaginative contrast, in her immediately previous poem, ‘To her most Honoured Father Thomas Bradley Esq; these humbly presented’, between her ‘lowly pen’ and the ‘Eagles quill’ she requires to produce poetry worthy of her father.\(^{59}\) In a similar conflation of the feather and the pen, Anne Southwell castigates herself as a ‘weake female’, asking rhetorically ‘how dares thy waxen plewnes approtch the soonne’. In this moment of apparent modesty, Southwell depicts the religious female writer as a new Icarus, in danger rather from the extent than the absence of her literary ambitions.\(^{60}\)

Where Whitney explicitly, and Bradstreet and Southwell implicitly, suggest the material presence of their writing tools, Mary (Sidney) Herbert aligns those tools with the suffering body. In her address ‘To the Angell spirit of the most excellent Sir Philip Sidney’, Herbert tells her deceased brother:

```
... theise dearest offrings of my hart
dissolv’d to Inke, while penns impressions move
the bleeding veines of never dying love:
I render here: these wounding lines of smart
sadd Characters indeed of simple love.\(^{61}\)
```

The chiasmic movement of these lines suggests a mutual influence between the expressive tool and the situated writer: Herbert literalises her intense feeling as her tool of writing (drawing on the trope, noted above, of tears as ink). At the same time, she suggests that the pressure of her quill stirs new passion and prompts the further outpouring of those ‘sadd Characters’, which are themselves double-edged, ‘character’ referring to both the letters Herbert writes and to the genre of short
description, and ‘sadd’ conjuring not only sombre feeling, but the dark shades of Herbert’s ink.62

While Sidney’s translations of the Psalms present themselves most often as operating in an oral mode, on a handful of occasions the matter of her writing appears to crystallise in her written lines. In Psalm 45, textuality and orality are conflated as Herbert proclaims: ‘My tongue the pen to paynt his praises forth, / shall write as swift, as swiftest writer maie.’63 In Psalm 69, Sidney’s speaker laments: ‘Unto thee what needs be told / my reproach, my blott, my blame?’64 While the terms of a ‘blotted’ reputation do not necessarily invoke the processes of writing, the reproduction and circulation of these lines in manuscript lends them a material force that recalls the emotive qualities of Herbert’s passionate ‘Ink’. Equally, her complaint, ‘needing food they sett me gall: / Vineager they fil’d me store’, conjures the materials of ink, made and written by women like Mary Granville, whose first receipt asks for ‘a quart of Beere vinegre, a pound of galls bruised’. This coincidence lends a richly material resonance to Herbert’s prefatory description of her ‘Deepe wounds enlarg’d, long festered in their gall’ (‘To the Angell spirit’, line 19). Gall here is both a state of bodily imbalance, and part of the materials of writing.

It is in the work of Margaret Cavendish that the bond between writing as material process and writing as subject matter emerges most fully, as she deploys the situated, material analogy of writing to grapple with the subtle operations of matter and cognition. In one of her Sociable Letters, Cavendish complains about her unruly materials, asking her addressee:

Give me leave to tell you, that I write this Letter with no Small Difficulty, for though I sit so near the Fire, as I have Burn’d a part of my Clothes, yet the Cold is so Furious, as it doth not only Freez the Ink in the Standish, but in the Pen I am writing with, so that I am but a Cold Writer, nay, the very Thoughts seem to be Frozen in my Brain, for they Move very Slowly, as if they were Stupified.65

A vivid reminder of the material effects of the environment upon both writing body and writing instrument, Cavendish’s complaint aligns the two, and suggests that the intractability of her cold ink slows the customary vigour of her thoughts. Cavendish moves immediately to natural philosophical speculation, debating whether or not it is possible that this intense cold ‘hath Travell’d from the Poles hither’, in a mode that establishes the content of her cogitations, as well as her ability to cogitate, as intimately linked to her environment.66
In her *Philosophicall Fancies* (1653), Cavendish draws on the technology of the table-book (an erasable and hence reusable wax tablet, as owned by Margaret Hoby and Margaret Spencer, among others67) to demonstrate that motion is produced by rational and sensitive spirits, rather than occurring independently:

Like as a point, that writes upon a Table-book, which when the Letter that was writ thereon, is rub’d out, the Table is as plain, as if there were never any letter thereon; but though the letters are out, yet the Tablebook, and Pen remain. So although this Motion is gone, the spirit, and matter remain…68

In attempting to articulate a difficult concept, Cavendish not only draws upon her own experience of note-taking and erasure but invites her readers to speculate upon their own paraphernalia of reading, writing and research.

The status of writing as matter emerges with particular force in Cavendish’s *Philosophical Letters* (1664), where she comments:

... the several parts of Matter have a more easie way of communication, then Mans head hath with his hand, or his hand with pen, ink, and paper, when he is going to write ..., if you do but compare the rational part of Matter to the head, the sensitive to the hand, the inanimate to pen, ink and paper, their action to writing, and their framed figures to those figures or letters which are written; in all which is a mutual agreement without noise or trouble.69

Despite Cavendish’s identification of ‘pen, ink and paper’ with the ‘inanimate’ part of matter, lacking the capacity for will or movement, her use of this analogy suggests less that she has directed her attention to her materials than that those materials have prompted the particular formation of her thoughts. The painful operations of thinking and writing are brought together as a disjointed process, which stands in marked contrast to the easy communication of matter in all its parts.70

Cavendish’s use of the term ‘framed’ renders the material craft of writing cognate with the shaping of matter into physical forms. In the *Sociable Letters*, Cavendish reverses this analogy, establishing her early writing as chaotic matter deprived of a shaping frame. She tells her correspondent:

... you will find my Works like Infinite Nature, that hath neither Beginning nor End, and as Confused as the Chaos … in my Sixteen
Books is Sense and No Sense, Knowledg and Ignorance Mingled together, so that you will not know what to make of it.\textsuperscript{71}

Characteristically attentive to her own writerly inattention, Cavendish makes the manuscript page vividly present, warning her would-be reader there are such huge Blots, as I may Similize them to Broad Seas, or Vast Mountains ...; Also there are Long Hard Scratches, which will be as Bad for your Eyes, as Long, Stony Lanes would be to your Feet.

Finally, in the \textit{Philosophicall Letters}, Cavendish turns to the matter of writing not as analogical to, but as directly engaged in, material movement. Entering into the debate about self-motion, which distinguished vitalist thinking (which held that matter was possessed of its own motive force) from mechanism (which insisted all motion came from God), Cavendish concludes:

when your Author [Hobbes] says, \textit{That, when the hand, being moved, moveth the pen, the motion doth not go out of the hand into the pen, for so the writing might be continued, though the hand stood still, but a new motion is generated in the pen, and is the pens motion}: I am of his opinion, that the motion doth not go out of the hand into the pen, and that the motion of the pen, is the pens own motion; but I deny, that after holding the hand a little while still, and beginning to write again, a new motion of the pen is generated; for it is onely a repetition, and not a new generation, for the Hand, Pen and Ink, repeat but the same motion or action of writing.\textsuperscript{72}

There is a vivid sense here of mind in motion, of Cavendish not simply reproducing Hobbes’ material metaphor but finding a means to think through an intractable topic in the very movements of her own writing about motion. Cavendish’s lively pen, which is impelled by the hand, but in being moved generates its own distinct motion, is, undoubtedly, idiosyncratic. Yet it is also generative, allowing us to see writing process not simply as a set of social and cultural encodings manifested in bodily practice, but as a collaboration between material effects.

Speculating on what it might mean to turn away from Husserl’s table, or to discover new orientations, Ahmed laments: ‘We don’t know what it means to follow the gift of the unexpected line that gives us the chance for a new direction and even a chance to live again.’\textsuperscript{73} It is precisely in following the inky line of women’s engagements with the tools
of writing, and witnessing the ways in which they emerge as objects at hand; essential technologies for domestic, cultural and social practice; and collaborators in the actions of thinking and feeling, that we can begin to discover a new orientation towards the matter of writing, and to trace the inventive matter in and of women’s material texts.
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Dispensing Quails, Mincemeat, Leaven: Katherine Parr’s Patronage of the Paraphrases of Erasmus

Patricia Pender

As a prominent patron of humanist scholarship and Reformed religion, and the author of several devotional works in her own right, Katherine Parr exerted a significant influence on the English Reformation – as several scholars have begun to explore. Yet to date, it is the texts that most legibly bear her authorial signature that have attracted critical attention. Parr’s patronage, by contrast, has long been widely celebrated as historical fact and at the same time surprisingly ignored as a social, literary and mechanical process. In the Acts and Monuments (1563), for instance, John Foxe paints a triumphal Protestant portrait of the queen as the period’s ‘only patroness of the professors of the truth’. And Parr’s recent biographer Susan James goes so far as to say that Katherine was ‘by conviction, by influence and by actions the first true queen of the English Reformation’. According to James Kelsey McConica’s 1965 portrayal of the period, Parr's generation found appropriate patronage, not in a Machiavellian Secretary of State, but in a noble lady of irenic temperament and sincere attachment to humanist learning. ... It is in her circle, which revives the traditions of her royal predecessors Margaret Beaufort and Catherine of Aragon, that the Erasmian spirit finds new shelter and influential support.

While some of these claims are undoubtedly exaggerated, and have been subject to historical revision, they nevertheless highlight aspects of Katherine Parr’s patronage that have been taken for granted and in doing so paradoxically overlooked.

This chapter explores Parr’s patronage of the 1548 Paraphrases of Erasmus Upon the New Testament, via its editor Nicholas Udall’s dedications. Udall’s
dedications open a window on to the way Parr's involvement in this project was represented to its immediate readers: to the court, the king, the public and Parr herself. Like several chapters in this volume, the methodology informing my approach is indebted to Matt Cohen's concept of the 'publication event', which views the publication process as emphatically choral: as the collaborative, aggregated work of writers, publishers, booksellers, readers and performers. He writes:

Regardless of one's understanding of the author function, and no matter how present the author is at the scene of printing, books have always needed a series of producers, each of whose power can predominate over reception or deployment at different moments in the production, circulation, and consumption process.

By exploring Parr's role as patron of the Paraphrases, I hope to expand our understanding of women's contributions to the material culture of the period to include extra-literary textual agency or what I want to call 'agency beyond (capital A) Authorship'. The concept of the publication event allows us to see women patrons as significant cultural producers in the early modern period, regardless of the extent of their individual authorial outputs.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, and with the significant exception of Elizabeth I, the roles women played as patrons of early modern literature have often been viewed, in Julie Crawford's terms, as conventional, decorative or titular, and a cover for more important relationships such as those between men. In 1962 Franklin B. Williams presented as 'perhaps the most significant finding' of his Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses in English Books before 1641 the idea that 'patronage was more widespread among women than might be expected'. New historicism's fascination with the operations of power drew renewed attention to issues of patronage in the 1980s and 1990s, but with few exceptions focused primarily on male authors and patrons. David Bergeron takes up Williams' findings in his study, 'Women as Patrons of English Renaissance Drama' (1981). Although he notes that, 'if we expect each case to pinpoint some deed, some beneficence, that led the dramatist in gratitude to dedicate his play to a particular woman, we shall be both frustrated and disappointed', Bergeron nevertheless argues that, 'without understanding the role of women as patrons we are left with a partial and incomplete picture of theatrical activity in its richest period'. In the wake of Barbara Lewalski's work, there followed an increased interest among feminist scholars in the issues of patronage
that surround Aemilia Lanyer’s (1611) *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*,\(^{14}\) and the patronage activities of both Mary Sidney Herbert, Countess of Pembroke and Lucy Russell, Countess of Bedford have attracted ongoing scholarly attention.\(^{15}\) This coverage remains inadequate given the fact that Williams identified 773 addresses to women patrons in the period to 1641, and this figure rises to 1,116 if we include women who received dedications alongside their husbands and those that address women as a group.\(^{16}\)

Recent studies by Micheline White, Julie Crawford and Helen Smith have begun to provide a more comprehensive and complex picture of early modern women’s patronage. In a series of astute articles, White has produced detailed reconstructions of the complex networks of patronage surrounding Reformation women and their literary and religious coteries.\(^{17}\) Julie Crawford’s forthcoming monograph, *Mediatrix: Women, Politics and Literary Production in Early Modern England* includes new research on the patronage activities of Mary Sidney Herbert, Margaret Hoby, Lucy Countess of Bedford and Mary Wroth.\(^{18}\) Helen Smith’s wide-ranging chapter on women patrons in *Grossly Material Things: Women and Book Production in Early Modern England* considers a wealth of material that expands our picture of patronage to include women as patrons not just of authors, but of particular books, stationers and even presses.\(^{19}\) The variety of examples Smith’s research unearths attest, in her words:

> to the difficulty of placing the patron within the circuit of communications [...] s/he may be the ideal reader whose imagined response informs composition; the commissioner who sets the initial parameters of a given text; an agent in the process of publication; a guide to other readers; an unwitting advertising tool; or some complex combination of those functions.\(^{20}\)

Parr’s multiple roles in ‘Englishing’ the *Paraphrases of Erasmus* position her as all of the above: she is at once the ideal reader and initial commissioner, an agent, guide and advertising tool, though a far from unwitting one.

Katherine Parr probably began work on *The Paraphrases of Erasmus* in the period of her regency, between mid-July and late September 1544, or soon thereafter. Henry had instructed his archbishop, Thomas Cranmer, to attend daily on the queen during his own absence in the French campaigns, and it is from this period that we can trace signs of Parr’s growing shift to a more Reformist position in matters of religion, as well
as an increased awareness of the potential of her public role. Her publishing project in this instance was a decidedly ambitious one. Erasmus had started printing his Latin paraphrases on the four Gospels and Acts in *Paraphrases in Novum Testamentum* in 1521. By 1543 there had been seven Latin editions and numerous revisions published. Erasmus's project itself was understood, by at least some of his contemporaries, as comprehensive. In his prefatory material to the 1548 English translation Nicholas Udall presents the *Paraphrases* as ‘a treasour, and in manier a full librarie of al good diuinitee bookes’. Udall’s biographer, William Edgerton, states that, ‘in good humanist fashion Erasmus had digested and turned into popular form the scholarly annotations of generations of learned commentators on the New Testament’. The result was, Edgerton claims, ‘a running commentary, devoid of scholarly apparatus and school men’s phrases, by the most famous scholar of the day upon the most important book of the time’. The purpose behind the production of Erasmus’s Latin text was similarly epic in scope. Mark Vessey argues that,

[a]s a series of evangelical orations, Erasmus’ *Paraphrases* ... are a natural embodiment of their author's intent to make the Word of God effective in his own age: only if the gospel were *heard* again in its most persuasive form, [Erasmus] believed, could it move human beings to the life of Christ-like piety in which their salvation lay.

At the same time, Vessey continues,

the *Paraphrases* are unmistakably the product of a highly evolved and rapidly developing textual and typographical culture. Virtual scripts for preaching rather than transcripts of sermons actually preached, they are the work of a man who was making the printing press his pulpit and who would always rely on others to give physical voice to the gospel message as he phrased it.

The notion of publication as collaborative and choral is particularly appropriate to this picture. In the publication of the *Paraphrases in Novum Testamentum*, authorial agency is shared among a variety of different players, not least of whom we must reckon Erasmus himself and his printing partners, the ‘generations of learned commentators’ on the New Testament that he digested, the preachers who performed – ‘gave physical voice’ – to his ‘virtual scripts’, and the evangelists themselves, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. Ultimately of course, in this world view,
God is the prime mover, the chief collaborator, whom Udall in dedicating the complete 1548 volume to Parr calls ‘the motioner, the autour, and the worker of all goodness’.26

Turning to this English translation, we can see something of the scale of the project, and of Parr’s escalating literary and theological ambitions, reflected in the material artefact of the printed book (Figure 2.1). The first two printed books to bear Parr’s name, the Prayers or Medytacions (1545) and the Lamentacion of a sinner (1547) are each physically modest textual productions, slim, light, octavo volumes suitable for carrying about the person and appropriate for private reading. In contrast, The first tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus upon the newe testament is an early modern doorstopper – a thick, heavy folio volume more than three inches thick and running to hundreds of pages; it is clearly designed for prominent display and public reading – a role it was to fulfil under the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth. This large-scale enterprise required a variety of textual producers. Parr herself undertook the general management of the project. She championed and rewarded financially the printers, Edward Whitchurch and Richard Grafton, who would eventually produce it. She employed Udall as general editor and as the translator of Luke and Acts. She commissioned Thomas Key or ‘Caius’ to translate Mark, at the urging of George Owen, one of her royal physicians. And she persuaded Princess Mary to undertake the translation of the Gospel of John. When Mary’s ill health prevented her from completing this task, Parr had Francis Mallet, her chaplain, join Mary’s household to assist her.

In his nineteenth-century Ecclesiastical Memorials, John Strype suggests that Katherine herself may have translated the Gospel of Matthew, and Susan James, Parr’s modern biographer, claims that ‘it is not impossible, indeed, it is highly likely, that some or all of this work was done by the queen herself’.27 James cites verbal echoes and Parr’s extensive use of Matthew in other works as evidence. In her eagerly awaited and excellent critical edition of Parr’s Collected Works, Janel Mueller does not mention this intriguing attribution, and suggests instead Richard Taverner or John Bale as likely candidates.28 As valuable as a credible attribution of the translation of Matthew might be, however, we do not need firm evidence of Parr’s translation of any part of the text to argue for what is – in a strictly material sense – her authorship of the project in its entirety.

In order to grapple with the multiplicity of authors and agents involved in this publication, we might enlist Roger Chartier’s still provocative notion that the author of a book is not necessarily the writer of
Figure 2.1 Katherine Parr, *Prayers stirring the mynd vnto heauenlye medytacions* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1545), *The lamentacion of a sinner, made by the most veruous Ladie, Quene Caterin* (London: Edward Whitchurch, 1547), and Nicholas Udall, ed., *The first tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus upon the newe testament* (London: Edward Whitchurch, 1548)

a text. The book is a material artefact; the text is a literary script. The person or people who make possible, who ‘author’ the material book, may or may not be the same as those who actually write what goes in it. Stephen Orgel’s insight that the authority of an early modern work lies in its publication is of help here. And publication need not be limited to printed publication in this instance. Indeed, Cohen’s formulation of the publication ‘event’ includes oral and visual communication as well as the different stages of textual publication, from its inevitably social production, through the complex channels of its transmission, to its various receptions and redactions. While this expanded material history of publication as a series of publication events is not always easy to trace, the effort to do so, I believe, rewards us with a fresh appreciation of the network of factors – interpersonal, cultural, legal and technological – that influence the life and afterlives of a text.

I am not, of course, arguing for Katherine Parr’s autonomy in the material authorship of the English Paraphrases. I am, however, arguing for her centrality to the network of agents that helped produce this book in England in its printed form. In this way, and somewhat ironically, collaborative printed textual production resembles coterie manuscript transmission, in which ‘authorship’, Cohen relates, ‘was a civic or social space whose authority derived from the collective “poetics of exchange” set up by the circulation of the text – in a select social circle – rather than a single autonomous author’. The fact that Erasmus in his Paraphrases was writing ‘virtual scripts’, which needed to be performed – ‘given voice’ – in the sermons of Latin-speaking clergy, extends this circle exponentially, and a fuller account of the material history of Parr’s Paraphrases would need to take into account the multiple publication events of its oral performance, in churches across England, which were mandated by royal injunctions in the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth. If Erasmus’s Paraphrases constituted, in Edgerton’s words, the thoughts of ‘the most famous scholar of the day upon the most important book of the time’, Parr’s Paraphrases became, under three successive Tudor monarchs, legally monitored reading for the English clergy and public: a text whose purchase and use was either proscribed or prohibited by the highest power in the state. Edward made the purchase and display of the Paraphrases mandatory for every English church, while Mary later suppressed the book, despite her early role in its development. Under Elizabeth’s reign, the Paraphrases returned to favour, and was deemed ‘required reading’ for all English church officials below the status of Bachelor of Divinity. Our understanding of Parr’s role in the history of the book, and in the English Reformation more broadly, must be enhanced by this awareness.
The first tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus upon the newe testament was ‘imprinted at London in flete street at the signe of the sunne by Edward Whitchurche the last daie of januarie’ in 1548. It commences with a dedication ‘To the moste puissant Prince, and our moste redoubted soueraigne Edwarde the sixthe, by the Grace of God Kyng of Engelande, Fraunce, and Irelande, defendour of the faith, and on the earth next and immediately under God, of the Churches of Engelande and Irelande the supreme head’ by ‘your moste humble, lousyng, and obedient subiecte, Nicolas Udall.’ This is followed by Udall’s preface ‘To the Ientill christian reader’ and his dedication, ‘To the moste vertuous Ladie Quene Katherine dowagier late wyfe to the moste noble and moste victorious kyng Henry the eight of moste famous memorie.’

The book is then divided into five sections covering the four gospels and Acts, with each section introduced by a different combination of paratexts. An intriguing map of the network of agents involved in the production of the Paraphrases emerges from the plethora of prefatory materials included in the 1548 volume, which collectively resist any straightforward or singular ascription of influence. Erasmus had dedicated his paraphrase on each gospel to a different national figurehead (Charles V, Frances V, Henry VIII and Ferdinand Archduke of Austria), and these are included in translation in the English edition. Udall himself provides an additional six dedications: the first to Edward VI, four to Katherine Parr, and a preface to the reader. Udall’s paratexts are a rich resource for the study of contemporary attitudes towards the Roman Catholic Church, the reputation of learned women, and religious debates about translation of biblical works into the vernacular, although here I focus directly on his construction of Parr’s patronage. Of the book’s dedications to Katherine two address her as queen (Thomas Key’s of Mark and Udall’s of Luke), making these the earliest gospels translated, and three address her as dowager queen (Udall’s dedications of John and Acts as well as of the overall volume), suggesting that these were completed in the months following Henry’s death.

What can Udall’s dedications tell us about Parr’s role in Englishing the Paraphrases of Erasmus? Dedications are notoriously flattering forms, but this does not mean that they should be dismissed as empty rhetoric. We ignore the paratextual packaging of the printed book at our peril. For Gerard Genette, the dedication in particular is always:

a matter of demonstration, ostentation, exhibition: it proclaims a relationship, whether intellectual or personal, actual, or symbolic,
and this proclamation is always at the service of the work, as a reason for elevating the work’s standing, or as a theme for commentary.  

As Helen Smith suggests,

dedications can be at once sites of rhetorical play, peritextual structures designed to constrain and direct the reader, and elements of the complex system of patronage that drew together social, political, and religious, as well as literary, life.

In dedicating his own translation of Acts to Katherine, Udall writes that:

your hyghnesse ... deserueth no lesse then to be estemed and called the chiefe patronesse: not onely for dyuers moste godly Psalmes and meditacions of your owne penning and setting foorth: but also for procuryng this present weorke of Erasmus Paraphrases to be translated to the use of the unlearned multytude, whiche can go no ferther then the understandyng or readyng of Englyshe.

Parr is praised as an author in her own right, alluding to her 1545 *Prayers or Meditations*, but also, possibly to the 1544 *Psalms or Prayers*. Alongside her ‘procuring’ of the *Paraphrases*, Udall sees these textual productions as part of Parr’s ‘labour in the same vineyarde of Christes gospell’: ‘your studious diligence in acquiryng knowelage ... of ... holy scriptures, not onely to your owne edifiyng, but also to the moste godly ensaumple and enstruccion of others’. For this labour he renders ‘publique thankes to your highnesse, as well for your other godly travail in fertheryng the knowelage of Goddes woorde, as also moste specially in settyng men in weorke to translate the paraphrase of Erasmus upon al the newe Testament’:

Wherin ye doe both to the young and to the old, as well to the high as to the lowe, and no lesse to the ryche then to the poore, shewe muche more bounteous liberalitee in delyng about and in makyng common unto al good English people the heavenly ieweles of Christes doctrine, then if ye should open all kinges cofers of worldly treasoures, and dele to everie one suche aboundaunce as might make them all welthie and riche foreuer in this world.

Parr is referred to here as the ‘chief patroness’ not only for the work in question but presumably also for the late Henrician and early Edwardian
state. The central term provided for her work of patronage is ‘procuring’, a word whose etymology from the classical Latin *procurare* (to look after, take care of, attend to, to take charge of, to administer), and the post-classical Latin (to obtain, gain, to bring about) inform the meanings of the Anglo-Norman and Middle-French verb *procurer*, which suggests a further variety of activities, from having the care of, interceding, pleading, carrying something out and causing it to be brought about, to occupying oneself with as a procurer or agent. Udall’s use of the word ‘procuring’ reflects classical as well as early modern usages of the term: Parr obtains the work through some form of initiative; she attends to, takes charge of and administers the project; she causes it to be brought about by setting ‘men in weorke’ for the purpose of translation; and she occupies herself as an agent by ‘delyng about and in makyng common’ the *Paraphrases*, distributing ‘unto al good English people the heavenly ieweles of Christes doctrine’ – a distribution of largesse that Udall presents as more valuable than if she should equitably dispense ‘all kinges cofers of worldly treasuress’.

Udall praises Parr not only for her own labour, but also for her leadership of others. The queen,

> at your exceeding great costes and charges dooe hire other weorke-men to labour in the same vineyarde of Christes gospell. ... And as a good captain partely to the encourageynge of his foreward soldiers, and partely to the shamyng of dastardes or falseherted loytreeres, ledeth and guideth his armie and goeth hymself before theim: so your grace, ferre otherwyse than in the weake vessels of woman sexe is to bee looked for, dooe shewe unto men a notable exaumple of forwardenesse in settyng penne to the booke.

The reference to Parr’s ‘hire’ of other workmen, ‘at [her] exceeding great costes and charges’ is an unusually explicit description of the financial aspect of her patronage, an aspect that is usually omitted in simply ceremonial dedications. Parr’s role as a leader is also foregrounded here, with military metaphors insisting that hers was a role with material consequences; Katherine is not merely a nominal figurehead. Importantly, her labour in this endeavour entails not only encouraging but also shaming or chastening; she endeavours to guide the loiterers in her army through her own notable and forward example.

This passage also contains one of Udall’s few straightforward references to Parr’s gender. He writes: ‘so your grace, ferre otherwyse than in the weake vessels of woman sexe is to bee looked for, dooe shewe
unto men a notable exaumple of forwardenesse in settyng penne to the booke'. Katherine’s role as exemplar, to noblewomen and indeed to all Englishmen, is attested to throughout Udall’s dedications:

And by this meanes dooeth your highnesse right well declare that all your delite, all your studie, and all your endeuour is by al possible meanes enployed to the publique comoditie of all good Englishe peo-

ple, the kynges moste louing and obediente subiectes, to bee nouzled and trayned in the readyng of Goddes woorde.48

In this passage, however, Udall uses Katherine’s unusual strength, figured as difference from the ‘weake vessels of woman sexe’ to exhort English men in particular to continued literary labour. Katherine’s ‘notable exaumple of forwardenesse in settyng penne to the booke’ is designed to admonish, guide and lead her countrymen to further feats of textual production following her model of diligence.

Parr’s gender is also alluded to in Udall’s repeated recourse in these dedications to the georgic metaphors of cultivation and husbandry, or rather, ‘huswifry’. He writes of the Paraphrases as the biblical ‘mustard-sede’, that:

ye of your excedyng charitee and zele towards ye countrye folkes did in suche wyse help to sowe in the fielde of Englande, and did so cherishe with the fatte bateleing yearth of the paraphrase, that where before it was in the yies of the unlettred the leste of al sedes, it is now shot up and growen muche larger in breth, then any other herbe of the fielde, so that it now spredeth the braunches in suche a cownp-

ace, that all Englishe readers maie therin finde many places where to light, and to builde theim nestes.49

Moreover, according to Udall, Parr’s labour is ‘the spiritual leaven whiche your grace beyng a ghostely housewife for the behouf of al the wholle royalme of Englande’ has ‘made sauourie and of a pleasaunt relice to al Englishe peoples taste’.50 He writes:

Where the texte of the gospel afore was in some partes (though alwaies special good and holesome foode and verai restorative to suche as were hable to brooke it,) yet to the complexion of grosse, rude and grenestomaked englishmen, disagreyng and hard of diges-
tion, yet ye by procuryng the wholle paraphrase of Erasmus to be diligently translated into englishe, have minced it and made it
everie englishemannes meate, though his stomake be never so weake or tendre.51

Katherine's 'godly cure in conservyng' the Paraphrases in English 'hath made so sound and stubstauncial meate for all complexions of people, that it maie bee to everye bodie lyke the abundance of quailles raining down in wildernesse from heaven'.52 Parr's contribution itself is the 'aigre-douce' – the sweet and sour sauce – that makes 'more liquide' and palatable the 'drye and unpleasaunt' stuff of the Latin Scripture.53

Finally, and significantly not until after Henry's death, Udall praises Parr's role as the

faithful and continual coadiutrice unto [the king] in all his most deuout and godly procedyngs concernyng the knowlage of God and his woorde to bee sette foorth to the people ... for England's cause, to whose publique benefite and edifiying in true religion, al these your unceassaunt peines and trauailles doe finally redounde.54

These passages present a veritable barrage or concatenation of biblical and early modern allusions to the preparation and digestion of food, and it makes sense to ask what role, if any, Parr's gender might have played in Udall's language choice. On the one hand, as Mary Caruthers notes, ‘[m]etaphors which use digestive activities are so powerful and tenacious that “digestion” should be considered another basic functional model for the complementary activities of reading and composition, collection and recollection’ in the period.55 According to Michael Schoenfeldt, in early modernity ‘the stomach is at the centre of an organic system demanding perpetual, anxious osmosis with the outside world’.56 In this context, Helen Smith suggests that, 'if we recognize the extent to which early modern reading was understood as an embodied practice, we can see the description of gustation as more than metaphorical, rooted in an understanding of the effects of reading upon the body'.57

In their level of detail, some of Udall's descriptions of Parr's patronage seem both more and less than metaphorical. On one hand, the language used is visceral and graphic ('gross', 'rude') but also surprisingly utilitarian and quotidian (a 'savoury' and 'pleasant relish'), evoking an unusual speaking picture of the queen at her housewifely duties. On the other hand, the extended metaphor of Parr preparing, mincing, saucing and administering Erasmus's Paraphrase to tender-stomached Englishmen works effectively as a conceit, yoking, in T. S. Eliot's famous phrase, heterogeneous ideas by violence together. Similitude and difference are
equally important to the impact of these descriptions. We know, for instance, that this is not intended as an historically accurate picture of Katherine Parr as domestic goddess. Parr would not have made her own mincemeat: women would not have been present in any formal capacity in Henry's kitchens. Katherine may, however, have ordered an *aigre-douce*, a sweet and sour sauce that was one of the most prevalent types of basic seasoning during the European Middle Ages. She might even conceivably have dabbled in conserving, which achieved something of a vogue among gentlewomen in the late sixteenth century.

Yet these possibilities are precisely beyond the rhetorical point of presenting Katherine Parr as the nation's maker of spiritual marmalade.

The point of the conceit is to make us register the aptness of the similitude despite our initial resistance to its rhetorical audacity – thus the unlikely image of Parr nursing testy Englishmen made invalidish by their dependence on the vernacular, or, more appropriately, helping an English public infantalised from being excluded from the Latin Catholic church to slowly start to consume scripture in its translated form, must compete with the more orthodox and comprehensible metaphor of the queen as a 'ghostely housewyfe for the behufe of al the wholle royalm'. The disconnect between image and historical reality makes way for an appreciation of the justness of the comparison. But Udall's descriptions retain traces of rhetorical strain attributable to the tension he encounters negotiating Parr's historical role as queen and her archetypal value as figure for women generally. His metaphors are decidedly mixed, perhaps self-consciously, evoking shifting frames of reference, from the figural to the historical and material. And this rhetorical play is not unrelated to his subject. His biblical allusions to mustard seeds and leaven evoke contexts in which the status of metaphor is itself subject to critique.

In his own translation of 'The Paraphrase of Erasmus upon the gospel of S. Luke' Udall considers the parables of the sower and his mustard seed and the housewife with her leaven in the light of Christ's rhetorical practice:

Therefore the Lorde as it had been one enspired with a newe spirite, to thentente he would make the multitude of the people geue the better eare unto hym, saied: to what thyng shall I saie the kyngdome of God to be lyke, or to what thyng shall I compare it, to make you understande what manier a thyng it is, by comparison of some thyng that is to no creature of you all not excedyngly well knownen? And whan the people euerie one of theim loked to here some royall high
similitude, taken of some comparison of the sunne, or of lightenyng, or of some other suche lyke matier: Jesus thought better, to take a parable out of a litel sede that no bodye estemeth or setteth by. It is lyke (saieth he) to a litell graine or corne of mustaredsede.61

Following Erasmus, the mustard seed functions for Udall as analogy for the gospel, which ‘for one litel litel grayne that was sowed, it brought forth many thousandes’. Similarly, as the ‘litel lumpe of leauen, whiche a wyse housewyfe dyd hyde in thre bushels of mele’ until it ‘turned all the saied mele … so in lyke manier the lowe and humble doctrine of the gospell shall one daie thoroughly possesse all the uniuersall nacions of the worlde’.62 What is particularly interesting here is Udall’s demystification of biblical similitude: he is at pains to point out how Christ subverts his listeners’ expectations of ‘some royall high similitude’ by recourse to a humble metaphor that is to every ‘creature of you all […] exceedingly well known’. Udall’s descriptions of Parr’s patronage adopt a similar rhetorical logic: early modern readers who might well expect some royal high similitude for their queen’s literary labour are surprised by her comparison to a humble housewife. In his extended conceit of Parr’s culinary ingenuity, Udall models his own dedicatory rhetoric on analogies employed by Christ and in doing so directs attentive readers to the Paraphrases’s explication of the efficacy of figurative language.

Paraphrasing a later reference to mustard seed at Luke 17, Udall asserts that:

Certes by the graine of mustardsede, the Lorde signified himself. […] whan the graine of hys bodye was bruised on the crosse, and was in death (as it wer) buiryed within the grounde. The effectuall strength of thys graine wrought in the disciples […] as the which wer not the principall autours ne head dooers of the thynges that they wrought, but onely ministres and seruauntes.63

Metaphorically, the mustard seed is a polyvalent referent signifying not only Christ (as explicitly here), but also his disciples, the gospel, and in Udall’s use of the analogy, subsequent sanctioned iterations of the scripture such as the Paraphrases of Erasmus. In presenting her as both the sower of mustard seed and the wise dispenser of leaven, Udall’s dedications provide masculine and feminine biblical models for Parr’s patronage, but they also provide two important meta-critical frameworks through which his own dedicatory rhetoric should be read. They allude to specific scriptural explications of the operations of
metaphor, thus suggesting ways in which Udall’s own language might be interpreted, and they alert readers to models of textual production beyond ‘principall autours’ and ‘head dooers’, including the ‘ministres and servauntes’ of the gospel. Katherine is thus positioned by Udall as the Henrician state’s chief patroness in an extended network of literary labour that eschews an exclusive focus on ‘principall autours’ or what I have called ‘capital A authorship’ to recognise the crucial contributions of the gospel’s lesser ‘ministers and servauntes’.

Udall’s graphic language choices in these dedications – ‘uncessaunt peines and trauailles’, ‘exceeding great costes and charges’ – tell us that he views Parr’s patronage as active and productive, even aggressive, rather than passive or simply decorative. According to Udall, Katherine was the active ingredient – the spiritual leaven – that made the _Paraphrases of Erasmus_ accessible and palatable to the English public. A tireless labourer in Christ’s vineyard, she inspired and commissioned others to labour likewise, leading her collective of good soldiers in a collaborative textual production of ambitious proportions and of greater historical significance than we have hitherto acknowledged. As patron of the English _Paraphrases_, Janel Mueller writes, ‘Katherine committed herself to advancing the people’s understanding of Scripture and, with it, their capacity to nurture and answer for the state of their own souls – thus exercising, by indirect means, functions analogous to those of a pastor.’64 This chapter has started to sketch some of the many roles that Parr played as patron of the English _Paraphrases_: in modern terms as general manager, engineer, commissioner, financer; in early modern terms as labourer, soldier, gardener, nurse and housewife, and ultimately, in material terms, as architect and author of the vision of the whole.
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Recent work on early modern women’s marginalia has already revealed much about the ways in which early modern women read and wrote, using the materials of manuscript and print as markers of relationships and as tools for self-positioning. However, as Heidi Brayman Hackel has argued, such traces are thought to be relatively rare, and, to date, studies of substantial archives of marginalia have centred on books annotated by two authors: Margaret Hoby and Anne Clifford. In this chapter, I would like to begin to examine a third significant archive: Mary Queen of Scots’ diverse collection of marginalia in her Book of Hours. This illuminated fifteenth-century manuscript was given to Mary during her time in the French court and was added to over her lifetime and beyond. It contains three different types of marginalia: the queen’s independent marks of ownership, ten other signatures and fourteen quatrains, or fragments of quatrains, some signed and all written in French in Mary Stuart’s very clear italic hand. This chapter examines all three of these types of marginalia in order to reconstruct what Jason Scott-Warren describes as ‘the anthropology of the book’: evidence not only for reading but also for understanding the place of this Book of Hours in the individual, social and material fabric of the lives of its owners and readers over half a century.

Although this is a relatively large collection of marginalia within a single text, Mary Stuart’s Book of Hours has received little critical attention, despite the last decade’s increased critical focus on the material traces of book use. Its absence within English literary histories derives at least in part because its poems are in French, but written by a sovereign who moved between the French, Scottish and English courts, and as such they occupy an uncertain status in nationally focused genealogies of women’s writing. The marginalia also occurs in a devotional
text, one of the hundreds of surviving private prayer books owned and
routinely annotated by women, which themselves form a rich and
intriguing archive only now beginning to be considered as part of early
modern women’s use of the spaces of the book.7 Mary Stuart’s Book of
Hours is particularly interesting, however, because it is at once ordinary
and extraordinary. Her practice of annotation is not unusual for women
who owned private prayer books, but the kinds of marginalia it contains
and how those marginalia were circulated were shaped by her status
as an extraordinary political figure in the period. The book’s marks
of ownership, signatures and poems participate in the economies of
exchange, self-positioning and intrigue that are inseparable from Mary
Stuart’s charged political presence in France, Scotland and England.
As such, the text supports recent readings of early modern women’s
marginalia as active, political and goal-oriented, rather than private
verses of little significance. Ordinary and extraordinary, individual and
communal, personal and political, the marginalia in Mary Stuart’s Book
of Hours are a new and significant example of a larger archive through
which the material cultures of early modern women’s writing might be
explored.

Mary Stuart’s marginalia are found in a very particular type of text:
the Book of Hours. Mirroring the recitation of the hours taking place
in monasteries, with complex sets of offices that varied according to
the liturgical calendar, Books of Hours began to appear in manuscript
from the thirteenth century.8 They took the form of a single set of
canonical hours devoted to the Virgin Mary containing a stable col-
lection of psalms and prayers that later supplemented or replaced the
Psalter. The Book of Hours enabled laypeople to perform a simplified
form of daily devotions at home or in private, centred on the Little
Office of the Virgin Mary as ‘a single set of prayers to be recited – in
Latin – each day’.9 By the later fifteenth century, they also contained
other liturgical elements such as the Calendar, lessons from the gospel,
selected Psalms, and additional prayers and Offices. These later versions
became personal compendia of written prayers with a central common
element, derived from the public liturgy, yet modified individually. As
such, the genre itself was designed to be simultaneously personal and
communal, blurring the boundaries of individual and shared devotional
practice.10 Further, as Virginia Reinburg has recently argued, Books
of Hours were also choral publications, the product of many hands:
‘scribes, printers, booksellers, devotional writers and above all, lay
patrons and owners’.11 Their contents may have been conventional, but
what was inside the books’ covers varied considerably by region, scribe
or publisher, and from additions deriving from individual ownership and use. They are the most conventional and, as Eamon Duffy remarks, the most ‘intensely personal’ of texts: centred by a core office and shared devotional practices, but adapted and modified according to individual preference.\textsuperscript{12}

Although primarily used in household devotional practice, Books of Hours were also used as vehicles for wider forms and expressions of sociability. They were both medieval bestsellers in manuscript and one of the chief products of the new technology of print in the early modern period. In both forms, the books were given or bequeathed to friends, children, godchildren, chaplains and servants. As part of this dynamic of social, familial and devotional bequest, use and exchange, they were frequently marked and annotated; indeed, they were designed with broad margins for this purpose. Eamon Duffy notes that almost half the 300 Books of Hours in the Bibliothèque Nationale have manuscript annotations and additions, and it was equally common for English authors to annotate their copies, in a surprising variety of genres.\textsuperscript{13} These marginalia range from marks of ownership, birth entries, obits (reminders to pray for a person on the anniversary of their death), public assurances of affection, and trophy signatures, to more radical material additions such as the inclusion of pilgrim devotional cards pasted into the volume.\textsuperscript{14} Even simple familial annotations performed a complex mix of functions: they linked the promotion of spiritual well-being for the user of the Book of Hours with affection, alliance, requests for remembrance, and at times the material evidence of dynastic continuity. This marginalia, together with contemporary accounts of their use, indicate that Books of Hours had a communal function within households – they were meant to be looked at by others, whether within the spaces of the page or even as props for performances of devotion within public spaces.

Many inscriptions within Books of Hours were in the form of simple lyrics, from poems asking for the return of the book if lost to poems asking for remembrance. When Maud Parr donated her husband’s book of hours to his brother Sir William Parr, for example, she reminds him of his familial obligations by inscribing, under the most lavish illustration in the book:

\begin{verbatim}
Brother et es another sayenge
That owt of syt owt of mynd
But I troste in you
I shall not fynd it true
Maud Perre\textsuperscript{15}
\end{verbatim}
In the same volume, her niece Katherine Parr, the future queen, writes at the foot of a suffrage and a picture of her name-saint St Katherine of Alexandria:

Oncle when you do on thys loke
Pray you remember wo wrote this in your boke
Your lovynge nys Katherine parr

This is one of a number of such short, conventional lyrics, often by women, that can be traced through early modern Books of Hours. Female sovereigns are highly represented in the number of familial inscriptions in prose and poetry annotating Books of Hours: BL, Add MS 17012, for example, contains prose inscriptions from Elizabeth of York, Katherine of Aragon and Mary Tudor. However, their use of inscription is also comparable to that of middle-class women who also asked to be remembered in the prayers of their friends and family. Men and women frequently collected prayers in the margins of their Books of Hours, and they also wrote their own devotions. The margins of these texts contained poetry and prose, autographs and inscriptions, prayers by others and by the owners of the books themselves. Given that many of the surviving, annotated Books of Hours were owned and signed by women, they form an astonishingly rich resource of early modern women's scribal marginalia.

One reason, perhaps, that this resource has been overlooked in recent explorations of histories and traces of women's reading is because the diverse practices that made up the devotional recitation and reading of prayers do not map readily upon the male-authored models of reading that have been seminal in critical work on marginalia. In ‘Studied for Action: How Gabriel Harvey read his Livy’, Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton argue that scholarly male reading ‘was always goal-oriented – an active, rather than passive pursuit’, intended ‘to give rise to something else’, a ‘public performance, rather than a private meditation, in its aims and character’. This essay has influenced histories of reading in early modern women’s writing chiefly through the work of Julie Crawford, who persuasively argues that Margaret Hoby’s dialogic and communal reading practices were also ‘goal directed’ in the sense that they sought real-world effects, ones that extended past the familial and sociable practices of godly culture to her region and beyond. Crawford uses Hoby’s example to argue against an earlier critical tendency to see women’s spiritual reading as private, domesticated and implicitly in keeping with their subordination. She argues that this is a critical
fiction rather than a reflection of historical practice, and joins William Sherman in arguing that both women and men read within the base of operations that was the household in ways that could be domestic and communal, as well as contestatory and goal-oriented. But Crawford also argues, along with Hackel and Sherman, that material traces of such complex reading practices by women are rare – sufficiently rare for Hoby’s reading of de Mornay to be seen as a key site for the study of early modern women’s reading practices. Critics working with early modern women’s marginalia routinely cite an anecdote where Ann Boleyn scolded her maid for writing verse in the margins of a Book of Hours, implying that such marginalia were transgressive rather than orthodox, forbidden rather than common. In fact, the multiple examples of marginalia contained within Books of Hours suggest that the reverse was closer to women’s historical practice. They indicate that women often used scribal annotation as part of their devotions and as a form of intimate exchange within and across households. If recent work on marginalia has sought to uncover how women, like men, read in scholarly and goal-oriented ways, then Mary Queen of Scots’ archive might provide a new context through which this very specific type of early modern women’s book use might be understood within overlapping domestic, communal and public contexts.

Significantly, Books of Hours are ‘choral’, according to Matt Cohen’s model of the publication event, not only in their publication but also in their content; they are collections of devotional material. This raises the question as to whether their marginalia are marginalia at all – in the sense that they might be secondary to ‘the text proper’ as Evelyn Tribble calls it – or whether they should be viewed as another part of an already diverse compendia. In their overlapping uses, both recording devotional practice and providing a personal script for prayer, where readers could recite a script written by another, record their own scripts, or copy others, these texts contain processes by which, Virginia Reinburg argues, ‘readers can be said to be the authors of the texts they read, and the prayers they recited’. If it provides a new perspective on women’s marginalia, thinking about this archive also puts pressure on the ways in which we define reading in the period. Rather than an understanding of reading only as interpretation oriented towards real-life events and actions, women’s daily reading or recitation of Latin prayers in the Book of Hours, in an often unfamiliar language, yet surrounded by vernacular signatures, obits, prayers and poems, indicates a broad range of practices associated with reading. Agents of circulation, sociability, dynastic ambition and self-positioning, these books were read simultaneously
for meditation and for familial and communal purposes: for action, even if such actions may not always range as widely as Hoby's regional and religious engagements. There is much evidence that women used many different types of books in their households, whether manuscript or print, to store and circulate individual and collective records, registering different types of reading practice and turning the book itself into an archive. The diversity of these additions, often accumulated over time, points towards a complex archival economy, one that allows a spectrum of uses that might co-exist or contradict one another, from the simultaneously private and communal acts of prayer to goal-oriented political action.

In the case of Mary Stuart's Book of Hours, however, its status as the material artefact of the devotional practice a Catholic queen, regnant or in exile within hostile Protestant states, its circulation among her peers as a tool of alliance or remembrance and its use as the means of disseminating her secular poetry, means that it could never be an apolitical, private and domestic text. Yet neither is it a widely disseminated print text: it occupies an intriguing liminal status in its mixed content of devotional text and images, signatures of possession and exchange, and texts of pious meditation and secular lyric. It exemplifies the particular kind of archive that such books became: serving a number of functions – pious, domestic, sociable and political – which might shift according to place, time and circumstance over a lifetime and, as we shall see, beyond. It is to the three different types of marginalia contained within this lavish, illuminated fifteenth-century French manuscript that I now turn to illustrate this complexity.

The first kind of marginalia in the archive contained within the Mary Stuart Book of Hours are the simplest: her marks of ownership. Folio 1r is inscribed ‘A moi, Marie R’; across the lower margin of folios 12v and 13r is ‘Ce livre est a moi, Marie Reyne. 1554’; folio 110r has ‘Marie, R. 1579’ and folio 145v ‘Marie R’. These inscriptions indicate something of the length of time the Book of Hours was in Mary Stuart's possession – in 1554, she was 12 years old and living in the French court; in 1579, five years before her execution, she was 37 and imprisoned at Sheffield Castle. In marking the Book of Hours twice as ‘mine’ and four times with her signature, Mary Stuart circulates her text under her name for others to read, a name with very different meanings in the contexts of the French and Scottish courts and her imprisonment at Sheffield. In 1554, her emphatic marks of ownership – ‘Ce livre est a moi Marie R. 1554’ – are aligned with the first of the sequences from the Gospels, that of Luke, beneath a miniature depicting Luke at study accompanied
by his emblem of the sacrificial bull and Latin text beginning the story of the Annunciation to Mary with the appearance of the angel Gabriel.

While intentionality in these instances must be speculative, Luke is the patron saint of artists and students, and his gospel is the only account that contains the Magnificat – the canticle of Mary, which made evident her sacrifice, strength and devotion to God.28 One of her later undated signatures in the Book of Hours, ‘Marie R’ on folio 145r, is written beneath a miniature of the Virgin Mary and child, with a kneeling female figure at their feet.29 Her signature here denotes both her material possession of the book and, again, affiliation with her namesake the Virgin Mary – a figure who became an increasingly transgressive site of divine authority in Elizabethan England.

The Book of Hours is also filled not only with evidence for its circulation under Mary's name, but with ten other signatures. As Jason Scott-Warren argues, such marking up of the early modern book by multiple hands was common, indicating sociability as well as possession.30 At folio 39r are the signatures ‘E Shrewsbury’ (Elizabeth Talbot, Countess of Shrewsbury), ‘T. Sussex’ (Thomas Radcliffe, Earl of Sussex), ‘Nottingham’ (Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham) and ‘W. Essex’ (Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex). It is an intriguing cluster of names. As Charles Howard only became the Earl of Nottingham in 1596, his signature must have been added to the text after Mary Stuart's execution in 1587 – as Lord Admiral he was the commissioner at her 1584 trial and, according to secretary and diplomat William Daveson in his testimony from the Tower, urged her execution as the best solution to the problem of her presence in England.31 The signature of Walter Devereux, on the other hand, must have been inscribed between 1572, when he became the Earl of Essex, and his death in 1576. His signature is mystifying – engaged with colonising Ireland from 1573 to 1575, he must have visited Sheffield in either 1572 or 1576 to even have had access to the Book of Hours. The signature of Elizabeth Talbot, in whose households Mary was imprisoned from 1569, is less unexpected, as is that of Thomas Radcliffe, Earl of Sussex; a commissioner with Norfolk and Sir Ralph Sadler in Elizabeth's first enquiries into Mary's forced abdication, Radcliffe sent Mary to Tutbury under the Shrewsbury's care so that she would be a 'nearer guest'. Sir Nicholas Bacon and Edward Fiennes de Clinton, first Earl of Lincoln, also sign the volume at folios 229v and 197v respectively. Both were commissioners in Elizabeth's second enquiry at Westminster in November 1568, with Radcliffe, Norfolk and Sadler, as well as Leicester and Cecil Saye.32 As Edward Clinton became the Earl of Lincoln in 1572, he must have signed the volume
between 1572 and 1585; he was both Lord Admiral and a member of the Privy Council, and spent time in 1572 in Paris as part of his role in ratifying the treaty of Blois.\footnote{33}

Another set of signatures are scattered on separate pages towards the end of the Book of Hours. That of Mathieu Stewart, Earl of Lennox and Mary’s father-in-law when married to Henry Stewart, Lord Darnley, indicates that the Book of Hours was signed by him on folio 159r while Mary was in the Scottish court. The signature of his granddaughter, Arbella Seymour née Stuart (daughter of his second son Charles Stuart and Elizabeth Talbot’s daughter Elizabeth Cavendish), also appears on a single leaf, folio 189r, as ‘your moste vnfortunate Arbella Seymoure’. Mary Stuart left the Book of Hours in her will to her niece Arbella, and as she became Arbella Seymour in 1610, this signature must have been added long after Mary Stuart’s death, between 1610 and 1615. The most personal of the signatures in the text is from Ambrose Dudley, brother to Leicester and Earl of Warwick from 1567. He signs himself at folio 197v ‘Very loving and affectioned friend, A. E. of Warwick’. Warwick and Leicester were close allies as well as brothers; they visited Buxton spa together in 1578 at a time when Mary Stuart was also frequenting the spa. Although she claims in a letter to Mauvissière that no one else was allowed to enter the spa during her visits, it is tempting to speculate about how Warwick’s affectionate signature came to be added to the volume.\footnote{34} There is evidence that Leicester visited Chatsworth after his 1578 cure – perhaps in the company of his brother – when Mary Stuart was in residence there.\footnote{35} Most surprising of all, however, is the presence of Sir Francis Walsingham’s signature in the Book of Hours on folio 81r. Given his central role in gathering evidence for Mary’s plots to assassinate Elizabeth that led to her execution, his name, probably added after her death, represents a sinister incursion into one of the queen’s most personal of possessions, her private prayer book.

The collection of signatures in the Book of Hours is as interesting for who it does not include as for what it tells us about Mary’s alliances and visits during her imprisonment. While captive, she was officially allowed a retinue of up to 30, which at times expanded to up to 41 or in some reports 50, and included Lord and Lady Livingstone, Mary Seton and three other ladies of the bedchamber.\footnote{36} Yet it contains no signatures nor obits from her intimate circle apart from those of Lennox, Elizabeth Talbot and Arbella Seymour in a way that is quite unusual in comparison to the marginalia in other Books of Hours. If half the signatures indicate through the use of a first name or an inscription a more intimate relationship, the other half denote a title – the author
as Essex, Lincoln, Sussex, Shrewsbury or Nottingham. This diversity suggests very different modes of circulation of this book. Its marginalia in the form of signatures denote familial relationships, friendships and alliances, but also scrutiny, contemporary or posthumous. Despite Mary Stuart’s strenuous claims of possession, it is a book circulated under many names, some of them hostile.

Equally intriguing are the multiple lyric poems also written into this Book of Hours. As we have seen, the addition of scribal marginalia to Books of Hours was orthodox practice, with obits at times taking the form of simple lyrics. Further, as scholars such as Stephen Orgel have shown, all types of books could contain quite unrelated manuscript material, such as the quasi-legal testimony concerning the uses of land found on the verso of the title page of Thomas Lodge’s translation of Seneca’s essay.37 However, Mary Stuart’s collection of devotional lyrics, while in a tradition of scribal annotation to personal prayer books, is far from a disparate collection of unrelated annotations. All are fair copies, without in-text correction, indicating that these poems are not drafts but polished lyrics to be circulated and read. They form a thematically linked collection of fourteen poems and fragments that, in its complexity and extent, might be seen as an important new work within early modern women’s poetry, as well as a significant collection of marginalia. This discrete archive of poems can only be understood through its material relationship to the larger compendia of texts that forms the Book of Hours. Each poem is positioned in relation to the other content, textual and visual, of the page upon which it is written. This means that the Mary Stuart poems are written and read as interventions within a larger archival economy predicated on relations more complex than centre to margin. Mary Stuart’s scribal additions to the illuminated manuscript in her possession, itself a compendia of texts, again bring into question the very marginality of marginalia in this context. While they are added at a different time from the other content of the Book of Hours, they frame and interpret the earlier texts and images as much as that text determines their meaning.38

Nowhere can this reciprocity be seen more clearly than in the poem, written in Marie Stuart’s hand and signed Marie, in the bottom margin of folio 129v:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{un Coeur que loutrage martire} & & \text{A heart tormented by insults,} \\
\text{par un mepris ou dun refus} & & \text{contempt or by a slight} \\
\text{a le pouvoir de faire dire} & & \text{has the power to say:} \\
\text{Ie ne suis plus ce que ie fus} & & \text{I am no longer what I was} \\
\text{Marie} & & \text{Marie}^{39}
\end{align*}
\]
The Latin text that this poem appends is the second nocturne of the Office of the Dead, Matins. As Micheline White argues, the Office of the Dead (the Dirige) contained verses ‘thought to articulate the despair and hopes of those in purgatory’, and in reciting these verses readers hoped to both relieve their suffering and to suffer imaginatively with them. This intercessory function between the living and the dead is specifically linked here to a reading from Job 14: 13–16:

Lectio sexta (Iob 14):

The sixth lesson (Job 14):
Who will grant me this, that in hell thou protect me, and hide me, till thy fury pass, and appoint me a time, wherein thou wilt remember me? Shall man that is dead, thinkest thou live again? All the days, in which I am now in warfare, I expect until my change do come. Thou shalt call me, and I shall answer thee. To the work of thy hands, thou shalt reach thy right hand. Thou indeed hast numbered my steps, but (130v) spare thou my sins.

In these verses, Job’s meditation upon his despair becomes an imprecation to God to be remembered, invoked and reached out for. It reminds the reader that even in the darkest of times, hope of God’s redemption still exists: ‘thou shalt call me, and I shall answer thee’.

The marginal verse accompanying this biblical example of the hope of redemption says something quite different, however. Rather than an expression of piety and of the possibility of divine grace, its focus is secular. The speaker’s injury derives from a loss of face, the specifically social exclusions of insults, contempt or slights. The third line however outlines a new source of power, the power to ‘faire dire’, to speak, which sets up the quatrain’s final line where what the speaker has to say is a statement of both loss and renewal: ‘I am no longer what I was.’ There is no call and response, yet the dynamic of this bleak and simple quatrain is also the dynamic of Job’s experience of loss, despair and renewal. Because of the poem’s secular range of reference, such an inference can only be drawn from the poem’s material place on the space of the page, from the juxtaposition of margin to text.
Yet at the same time that it evokes a common devotional experience, that of the despairing sinner turning to God, this poem also has broader political dimensions. When the speaker refers to his or her experience of public disgrace, particularly in the verbal form of insults, and claims to be ‘no longer what I was’, shadowed behind this experience is the personal history of Mary Queen of Scots. She was, in Elizabeth I’s poetic terms, the ‘daughter of debate’, textually vilified through ballads, pamphlets and books as a murderer and adulterer, stripped of her sovereignty and kept in England as prisoner. The quatrain’s position alongside a verse of the Office of the Dead draws a parallel between the queen’s experience of disgrace and imprisonment on earth and that of those in purgatory, with the effect that its speaker embodies the mediatory function between the living and the dead involved in reciting the Dirige. In addition, the trope of self-alienation with which the quatrain concludes recalls the first stanza of Elizabeth’s 1582 poem ‘On Monsieur’s Departure’, particularly the concluding couplet:

I grieve and dare not show my discontent;
I love, and yet am forced to seem to hate;
I do, yet dare not say I ever meant;
I seem stark mute, but inwardly do prate.
  I am, and not; I freeze and yet am burned,
Since from myself another self I turned.

As there is no extant sixteenth-century manuscript copy of Elizabeth’s poem, it is impossible to trace a transmission history in which Mary Stuart might have read and responded to Elizabeth’s work. However, it is striking that both queens use the convention of self-alienation to demonstrate their textual power: Elizabeth through a display of Petrarchan rhetorical virtuosity that underlines her active role in the Duc d’Anjou marriage negotiations; and Mary Stuart through the sonnet’s paired and answering genre, the complaint.

In the Book of Hours’ poem, the speaker’s loss is irrevocable and her state of change effected rather than contingent, meaning that her power to speak rests in the power to record and lament loss. However, the statement ‘I am no longer what I was’ also contains an element of threat in the speaker’s refusal to disclose what it is that she might have become. The opacity surrounding the speaker’s transformed identity here is precisely the submerged threat that Mary Stuart posed as a captive former Catholic queen within the English state. Site of
resistance, martyr and rival sovereign to Elizabeth, even in captivity Mary was a locus of different forms of unrest – an unresolved political problem located in the ambiguity surrounding her identity asserted in this poem. In its juxtaposition with the passage from Job, however, that complaint is implicitly figured as God’s will, a loss of self that leads back to God’s favour. It creates a competitive dynamic by which Elizabeth’s Petrarchan rhetoric of self-alienation might be trumped by an alienation that suggests not only the elevated spiritual status of the speaker as God’s elect, but also the eventual restitution to favour of that speaker, a restitution that might be read as spiritual and political. It concludes with Mary Stuart’s signature, ‘marie’, indicating that the quatrain was to be circulated to others under her name. Far from a private meditation, this poem might be seen as evidence of a reading of Job 14 that envisages action as outcome, albeit in the future and through God’s grace.

The dynamic of public shame and rejection by others, then redeemed by personal piety and a future, after death, among God’s chosen in heaven, recurs across the quatrains as their unifying topos. Folio 81v contains eight poems and fragments in different hands and inks, which return to the speaker’s concern with her loss of renown and her compensating strategies, converting public dishonour to evidence of private piety in a move recognisable from other women’s use of complaint. These quatrains and fragments are crowded onto a rare blank leaf in the volume, opposing an illumination of King David with open prayer book and harp, praying to God whose image crowns the miniature, rays of light issuing from his open mouth. A small amount of text of Psalm 6: 2–11 is under the illumination, ‘Domine ne in furore tuo arguas me neas in ira tua corripias me’ (Lord rebuke me not in thy fury nor chastise me in thy wrath). This psalm presents the speaker in weakness, torment and trouble, turning to God and asking for deliverance. His weakness is exacerbated because he is surrounded by enemies, but his case is answered when the Lord hears his appeal and accepts his prayers, with the result of a sudden reversal of fortunes in which the speaker’s enemies are put to shame, ruined and rejected.

This penitential psalm offers striking resonances with Mary Stuart’s condition in prison; a fall from favour, surrounded by enemies, but still with the hope that God’s intervention will reinstate her, either on earth or in heaven. David was commonly used as a model of contrition, with the Penitential Psalms a conduit for penitents to figure their own contrition. The material location of this collection of eight quatrains and fragments opposite a related penitential psalm suggests a parallel
between the writing of Mary and the psalmist King David, suggestively amplifying the queen’s claims to sovereign authority, lyric and spiritual. The first two of these quatrains introduces the theme of the speaker’s sorrow at her lack of support from others:

Qui iamias dauantage eust contraire le sort
si la vie mest moins utile que la mort
et plus tost que chager de mes maus laduventure
chacun change pour moi dhumeur et de nature

Who ever had a more contrary lot!
Since life is less meaningful to me than death,
and rather than transforming my misfortunes
each one changes my mood and my very being

Come autres fois la reno[m]rne vole plus par l univers
isy borne son cours divers

Now, as in the past, fame doesn’t fly across the universe.
Its unpredictable course is confined here

la chose delle plus aimee

its most loved object.

Marie R

Here, the speaker’s lament for her state ‘contraux le sort’ gives rise to a second, repeated theme across the quatrains: a longing for death. While this is an expression of conventional piety, it occurs in a quatrain signed ‘Marie R’, shadowing behind the speaker the figure of the queen. This connection then also intimates the power the death of Mary Stuart would have for a Catholic constituency invested in her martyrdom. Aligned with the Virgin Mary, the speaker would be both religious and political martyr. This political aspect of an otherwise interiorised quatrain is borne out in its concluding couplet, which outlines the transformative power of misfortune – ‘Chacun change pour moi d’humeur et de nature’. The speaker uses misfortune to signal a process of transformation culminating in death, which constitutes a political threat within the Elizabethan state. Again, the nature of that transformation need not be made explicit: its power lies in the unpredictability that death for the speaker, whose voice circulates under the signature of the queen, might bring. The following quatrain, also signed Marie R, is a related meditation of the loss of the speaker’s fame: once extensive, now contracted to ‘La chose d’elle plus aimee’, herself as subject and object of that fame. Her fame is contained and contracted for the moment, but the potential for its release upon her death is implicit. Both poems signal a retreat from the world,
but one invested still in the emotional and political circles from which the speaker positions herself as excluded. They are complaints oriented towards the capacity for redress rather than the amplification of a grievance. Positioned opposite the image of David and the text of Psalm 6, the redress for such secular grievances will implicitly come from God, imaginatively elevating the queen to the politically volatile status of martyr.

The next two poems on this page focus upon the speaker’s own strategies of redress, in the face of ‘une triste sejour’ in the world. The third quatrain is focused, appropriately, on the hours guiding the speaker’s devotional life, and on her death as a vehicle for public influence:

les heurs ie guide & le iour
par lordre exacte de ma carriere
quittant mon triste seiour
pour isy croistre ma lumiere
le xxx mai

I observe the hours and the day
according to the precise requirements of my duty
leaving my sad abode,
here to increase my light

Devotional practice leads in death to divine illumination, but that illumination is figured specifically as earthly influence, already present in the world – ‘isy’ – but increased by death. It could not be a clearer statement of ambition, nor of the public uses to which the speaker in these poems seeks to recruit her piety. The speaker’s final position in this quatrain, as a light for those on earth to follow, mirrors the illumination on the facing page, where an image in god’s illuminating rays animates the prayers of David on earth. This connection is underlined in the following quatrain, which imagines a female figure who ‘dhonneur sait combler’, is then transformed into ‘un bel ange’:

Celle qui dhonneur sait combler
chacun du bruit de sa louange
ne peut moins qua soi ressembler
en effet nestant que un bel ange

She, who from honour knows how to gratify
each one according to the noise of his praise,
cannot be less like herself
indeed being only a beautiful angel

Rather than a collection of unrelated fragments, then, this folio presents four related poems to the reader, which both refer to each other and to their position within the manuscript and its images, in order to present a case for the speaker’s elevation after death to political and religious
martyr, and even further, to angel, intermediary between heaven and earth. As such, these are not private expressions of conventional piety, but assertions of imminent influence and power.

Angels were complex and contested figures in the early modern period, but took on a new importance in late sixteenth-century Counter-Reformation Catholicism as a weapon against heresy and as a means of intensifying personal piety, especially in the face of Protestant ambivalence. In particular, as Peter Marshall and Alexandra Walsham argue, the role of angels as guardians was asserted as a reinvigorated cult within the Tridentine church, and their powers and virtues were employed as a means of reinforcing ‘the superior resources Catholics had at their disposal over Protestants in resisting the wiles of the devil’. The protection of guardian angels could be invoked by the Catholic subject alongside that of the Virgin Mary, and, as David Keck illustrates, the Virgin Mary could be figured as the Queen of the Angels and positioned as their standard intermediary. Mary Stuart’s deployment of the image of an angel in the pursuit of a political narrative of secular complaint and divine redress is a rhetorical masterstroke. It reinforces not only an anti-Protestant agenda, but a raft of identifications of her idealised and embattled speaker with God, his intermediaries and the queen’s divine namesake, the Virgin Mary.

The figure of an angel also appears in two subsequent poems, in the bottom margins of folios 130r and 137v. Both these poems provide the metaphoric counterpoint to the queen’s unreliable, hostile companions on earth. In the first, the angel is the focus of a meditation on heavenly thoughts:

si nos pensers sont esleves
ne lestimes pas chose estrange
ils meritent estre aprouves
ayant pour obiet un bel ange

This poem appends the concluding prayer of the third nocturne, ‘Libera me domine de morte eternal’, said on the day of the dead, and when the three nocturnes are said together. The Latin text addresses the day of judgement, a day of anger, fear and calamity, when God comes to ‘iudicare saeculum per ignem versus’ – to judge the world by fire. This response is immediately followed on the same folio by the text of Psalm 35, ‘Judica domine nocentes me expugna impugnantes me’: ‘Plead thou my cause Lord with them that strive with me’. In a text where the
figure of ‘un bel ange’ has been explicitly associated with the speaker, and that speaker identified with the queen, this quatrain positions that angel as the focus of meditation after death – a site of illumination for the devout at prayer. This figure has been elevated by God on the day of her judgement, a sure sign that God has validated her cause against those hostile to her in the world.

In its next and final appearance, the angel figure has migrated from one associated with the queen in life, to that of the guardian angel. The poem in the bottom margin of folio 137v is a similarly simple and polished lyric that refers again to a heavenly angel directing earthly behaviour:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pour recompense ou pour sala[j]re} & \quad \text{As compensation or reward} \\
\text{de mon amour et de ma foie} & \quad \text{for my love and my faith} \\
\text{rendes men ange titulaire} & \quad \text{return to me guardian angel} \\
\text{autant comme ie vous en doye} & \quad \text{as much as I owe you.}
\end{align*}
\]

While the speaker remains on earth, her relationship with her guardian angel is one of reciprocity and equality, anticipating in the context of this sequence of quatrains the speaker’s elevation to that state and reinforcing her earlier identification with angels. It appends a section from the 41st Psalm, beginning ‘Dum diciunt mihi per singulos dies ubi est Deus tuus quare tristis es anima mea et quare conturbas me’ (Whilst they say to me each day where is thy God why art thou heavy O my soul, and why dost thou trouble me). The Latin text contains not only the response to hope in God, but also the speaker’s thirst for God, the ‘fontem viviam’, living fountain, before whom he/she will be called to appear. In this context, the speaker’s assured expectations of return upon her love and faith are again an expression of imagined spiritual leadership and intercession between heaven and earth. But in the context of the other poetry in this volume, where the care of the guardian angel has resulted in imprisonment, abandonment and humiliation, this quatrain carries an element of critique; directed not towards God but his emissary and highlighting the contrast between the speaker’s state in the world and her imagined state after death. This tension thematically underscores all of these scribal verses, without exception, and means that they need to be considered not only in terms of the texts they individually append but also as a larger and coherent sequence of some poetic ambition.

The final poems within the Book of Hours turn again to the secular, the first taking the form of a vivid complaint against the veniality and fickleness of friends placed beneath the 7th lesson from Offices of the
Dead, Job 17, where the speaker describes his house as hell: ‘infernum domus mea est’. It is followed by a complaint against the times at folio 158v, beneath a prayer in French to the Virgin Mary, in which the speaker’s supporters are aligned with fearlessness in the face of an age devoid of good:

en feinte mes amis change leur bienveillance
My friends feign their concern,
tout le bien qu’ils me font est desirer ma mort
wishing instead to see me dead
et comme si mourant jestois en deffailance
and as if dying I was merely in a faint;
dessus mes vestemens ils ont jette le sort (138r)
they have cast lots for my clothes.

ils ne apartient porter ces armes
Only those with an indomitable spirit,
qua ceus qui dun coeur indomte com[m]e nous nont peur des allarmes
who have no fear of danger
du temps puissant mais sans bonte (158v)
in these hard-hearted times

The sequence of poems finishes with a conventional meditation on mortality appended to another vernacular prayer at folio 172v:

La Vieillene est un mal qui ne se peut guerire
Old age is a sickness without cure
Et jeunesse un bien qui pas un ne menage
and youth is a blessing without care
Qui fait qu aussitot ne lHomme est pres du mourire
Immediately man is born he is near death
Et qui lon croist heurheux travaille advantage
Successful is the contented life

These final poems temper the speaker’s earlier fantasies of power through martyrdom with their focus upon the imperfect world in which she remains, however temporarily. The collection of poems returns to where it began, with the speaker’s dissatisfaction with her particular circumstances in which both friends and the times seem to militate against her. However, in the general cast of the final meditation, that
narrative is seen to be more widely applied; a complaint not only against the speaker’s circumstances but against the human condition where contentment is the only means of gaining success. It turns the sequence of poems back to the reader, contextualising the speaker’s often vehement, interiorised alienation to present a poetic, as well as a spiritual, exemplarity to her readers, contemporary and future.

Collectively, these poems present a fragmented poetic sequence, one that not only supplements the biblical text that it appends but also forms a new text within it. Read together with the strategically placed marks of ownership in this text and its collection of autographs, the thematic coherence and political ambition of this sequence indicates that this is an archive intended to be seen, whose disparate parts were used by the queen to shore up her primary political agenda of sovereign legitimacy: spiritual, political and poetic. It also contains signatures from her enemies, reminding us that this text is no more coherent than the other, multiply constructed archives that constitute Books of Hours: it was available to a variety of interpretations and uses that worked for and against the queen in her lifetime and beyond. This Book of Hours provides another place where early modern women’s uses of marginalia can be seen to face out to the world, to be public, political and geared towards action. Yet these marginalia occur in a text also used for daily devotional practice, indicating that it might also have other uses, across a spectrum of public and private functions that complicates our understanding of the role of marginalia in the lives of its authors and readers. In the case of Mary Stuart’s poetry, the political uses to which such poems might be put are more retrievable than their uses in more intimate acts of meditation and prayer, and to emphasise the public aspects of these poems and marks is not to forget their other types of use in devotional practice. To this end, the broader archive of marginalia within other Books of Hours remains to be examined to understand how, why and to what purposes, different kinds of women readers and owners of these devotional texts might have read and written in the margins of their books.
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Elizabeth Cary’s literary career was bracketed by translations. Her first known work, *The Mirror of the Worlde* (1598), was written in early adolescence and is a translation from the French of regional descriptions by Abraham Ortelius that he wrote to accompany maps in a world atlas. Cary’s last published text, which reportedly she thought of as her finest endeavour, is *The Reply of the Most Illustrious Cardinall of Perron* (1630), a translation that Cary used to gain entry into political and religious debates that were of particular importance to her as a convert to Catholicism. At present her most famous work, *The Tragedy of Mariam* (1613), a Senecan drama that adapts the writings of Josephus, is, I suggest, rooted within and indebted to early modern translation practices, practices that contributed significantly to the material conditions of women’s writing during this period.⁴ Over the last two decades, critical attention has turned to translations produced by early modern women, quickly shifting from an initial view that the practice limited women to subservient literary roles to analyses of the complex set of authorial choices and negotiations that go into producing even the most ‘faithful’ translations.² In my own work on the subject, I have argued that translation, which even now is often viewed as an uninspired or menial activity, gave women entry into the rich literary culture of the Renaissance. By considering how female translators represent themselves and their work, we can see that translation reflects the limitations women faced while simultaneously giving them the opportunity to transcend these limitations.³ Additionally, as an activity that is inherently collaborative, translation offers a valuable model for viewing the complexity of female literary authority. I have found a thematic emphasis on female community in the work of many women translators, an emphasis that reflects, revises and complicates the practice of collaboration between
female translator and the absent and usually male author. The discursive communities depicted in women’s translations may also underscore the historical communities that facilitated women’s participation in translation activities. In this chapter I revisit my theories of translation as collaborative authorship, reading The Tragedy of Mariam in conjunction with Cary’s translations. While Cary’s Reply is dedicated to Queen Henrietta Maria and recognises Catholic women’s ability and need to cooperate in promoting religious tolerance and acceptance, her Mariam amplifies the animosity among women that appears in her source, challenging any easy connection between female community and women’s writing, and instead highlighting the danger of women’s public speech. By looking at Cary’s literary output as a whole, I consider how her changing sense of the collaborative potential of translation contributes to our understanding of the authorial roles available to women during the early modern period.

Women and translation in early modern England

When studying the material conditions of women’s writing, we need to consider translation both as part of those conditions and also informed by those conditions. Given the remarkable number of female translators during this time, no picture of women’s writing in the early modern period would be complete without looking at translation. Working against the belief that public writing was particularly scandalous for them, women may have understood translation as offering a valuable loophole in avoiding the stigma of print, since it was often seen as part of an appropriately virtuous education, and the process could be understood as advancing the voice of the original author rather than the translator. Viewed in this context, translation thus helped women enter the literary sphere while seeming to adhere to the holy trinity of chastity, silence and obedience. Initial discussions of women’s translation in the early modern period tended to see the practice as giving women little opportunity to transcend these restrictions. In contrast to Tina Krontiris’ suggestion that translation ‘called for a relatively passive role’ and Mary Ellen Lamb’s claim that literal translations did not give women access to any authorial voice, Micheline White argues that translators saw themselves as ‘powerful cultural agents’. The potential for such contrasting opinions, even in recent scholarship, points to the conditions that fostered the practice. Although, as Brenda Hosington has rightly pointed out, the works themselves belie ‘old claims that translation was a safe and silent task’, its appearance as such was, I suggest,
a critical factor in the flourishing of translations by women during this time. The choices in what women translated (and their abilities to translate at all) were similarly linked to innumerable cultural influences both at the micro-level of an individual’s education, her linguistic skills, her access to texts and the support she received from families and friends, and at the macro-level in terms of prevailing views of appropriate female behaviour, publishing demands and religious and political controversies, to name a few. Indeed, historical and cultural developments such as the Protestant Reformation and the concomitant elevation of the written vernacular, the rise of humanism, increasing literacy rates among women and laypeople, and emerging articulations of national sentiment, all contributed to the growing role of translation and women’s engagement with it in the early modern period.

As has been widely acknowledged, a number of humanist educators sanctioned the practice of translation, specifically of religious works. Advocates for women’s education, such as Thomas More and Richard Hyrde, put their theories into practice and taught the girls and women within their domestic spheres. It is not surprising that several prominent women in these circles, including Margaret More Roper, Elizabeth (Cooke) Russell and her sister Anne (Cooke) Bacon, who were encouraged to pursue their desire for knowledge, followed their teachers’ advice, and produced some remarkable prose translations of religious works. Such work was not uncontroversial. That women might bring their interpretive and revisionary skills to the practice of reading and translating religious texts was of grave concern to leaders of church and state even as the Reformation brought about increased access to vernacular Bibles and other sacred works. The new accessibility of the Bible also underscores the polyvalence of scripture. If anyone can read the Bible, then anyone can interpret its meaning. Concern over the fragmentation of biblical doctrine led to an Act of Parliament during the reign of Henry VIII that attempted to abolish this ‘diversity of opinions’ by forbidding women, except for noble and gentlewomen, and men in various occupations, to read the New Testament. Elizabeth Cary’s most explicitly religious work, her translation of Cardinal Perron’s Reply, wades directly into such controversy as she engages in a dangerous critique of the Church of England, including ‘a specific request that the king recognize the spiritual authority of the pope’.

In translating plays about the ancient Greek and Roman empires, Jane Lumley, Mary Sidney Herbert and Katherine Philips forsake religious subjects, though their projects are still closely linked to humanist theories of education. Lumley’s translation of Euripides’ The Tragedie of
Iphigeneia, in particular, was probably a school project that the young translator then presented to her father, Henry Fitzalan, the twelfth Earl of Arundel, who took great care to educate both his daughters and his son. Despite the fact that facility with Greek was less common than leading humanist pedagogues might have wished, Lumley’s exercise of translating a classical play demonstrates that at least one elite young woman received a course of instruction at home that mirrored that of young men educated in Oxford and Cambridge. Curricula in the sixteenth-century classroom included numerous Latin dramatists, and students frequently translated or imitated sections of plays, particularly orations and declamations that provided models of inquiry and persuasion that would equip young men ‘for responsible public life’. Cary’s translation of Ortelius, which she dedicated to her uncle Sir Henry Lee, is another example of an academic exercise produced by a ‘bookish, multilingual, humanist-educated’ adolescent, and her presentation of it to the most prominent member of her family suggests that having a scholar-daughter may reflect well on an up-and-coming household. The atlas genre, while not directly about ancient Greece and Rome, demonstrates an interest in the world at large and may offer a critique of imperialism offered from a woman’s perspective, a critique that is also implicit in the dramatic translations of Lumley, Sidney Herbert and Philips. Additionally, The Tragedy of Mariam, often described as the first original play in English by a woman, fits squarely into the genre of Senecan drama, practised by Lumley and Sidney Herbert, which helped women avoid any obvious stain from the common stage while paving the way for Katherine Philips to craft a dramatic translation for the public stage.

In addition to or perhaps because of the number of female translators during the early modern period, the practice was also associated with women on a metaphorical level, as is suggested by John Florio’s oft-quoted characterisation of his translation of Montaigne as ‘this defective edition (since all translations are reputed female)’, and the seventeenth-century adage ‘like women, translations should be either beautiful or faithful’. Given that he dedicates this work to Lucy, Countess of Bedford and her mother Lady Anne Harrington, Florio’s description of translation as female and defective can certainly be read ironically, and the complexity of the allusion, as Jonathan Goldberg has shown, undermines the simplicity of Florio’s initial equation. Nevertheless, in examining the language used by translators and theorists, Lori Chamberlain has found frequent gendered metaphors for translation that link women and inferiority, matching the common belief that
women are naturally the inferior sex. Chamberlain calls for a feminist theory that does not simply transform translation from a reproductive activity into a productive one but rather uses collaboration as a model for the combined efforts of author and translator. Such a theory is reflected in some early modern perspectives on translation, such as the Earl of Roscommon’s use of the language of friendship when advising would-be translators on how to decide what to translate. Describing the ideal author/friend as the translator’s other self, as his intimate beloved, Roscommon imitates the rhetoric of Aristotle and Montaigne, a rhetoric that Jeffrey Masten also finds in Florio’s translation of Montaigne’s *Essays*, revealing ‘a complex negotiation of the issues at the nexus of homoeroticism, male friendship and collaboration’. Masten argues that collaboration provides an appropriate interpretive model for Renaissance discourse because it ‘acknowledges language as a process of exchange’ and does not focus on ‘policing discourse off into agents, origins, and intentions’. For Chamberlain, however, Roscommon’s emphasis on male friendship and his typical figuring of the text as a female whose chastity must be protected creates the image of a blank page that ‘is impossibly twice virgin – once for the original author, and again for the translator who has taken his place’. Finally, it is this female chastity that ‘resolves – or represses – the struggle for paternity’ between author and translator and underlies, and possibly undermines, Roscommon’s optimistic view of collaborative translation.

Among early modern female translators, there are numerous examples whose focus on collaboration and female communities seems to answer Chamberlain’s call for a feminist theory of translation. For Mary Sidney Herbert, whose coterie of readers and writers was central to her reputation as both a patron and a poet, her method for circulating her writing among her household suggests a collaborative project that fits well both with the practice of translation and a focus on communal forms of expression and instruction. Sidney Herbert describes a process of collaboration in her prefatory poem ‘To the Angell spirit of the most excellent Sir Phillip Sidney’; here she describes the complicated process of brother and sister working together to translate into English the words of David, who himself is said to have been transcribing the words of God:

```
To thee pure sprite, to thee alone’s addres’t
this coupled worke, by double int’rest thine:
First rais’dde by thy blest hand, and what is mine
inspired by thee, thy secrett power imprest.
```
So dar’d my Muse with thine it selfe combine,
as mortall stuffe with that which is divine.22 (1–6)

The frequent shifting between first and second person pronouns and the images of coupling and combining in this stanza reflect the intricacy of this process and suggest the potential both for rivalry and for intimacy between the sister and brother poets. Sidney Herbert’s language matches Masten’s description of early modern collaboration as a process that seems to reinscribe the hierarchy of male dominance and the superiority of originality but ultimately requires the ‘dispersal of authority’ and is an act of mutual friendship, sexual enjoyment and jouissance.23 Several critics have looked at the feminist possibilities of collaboration, focusing on it as both a strategy for resistance and a reflection of women’s defined identities in relation to others.24 Viewing translation as a collaboration that is neither fully the creation of the original author nor of its translator allows us to understand collaborative practices as a type of ‘third term’ that destabilises categories of originality and imitation.25 The dispersal of authority present in such works allows Sidney Herbert to challenge the perceived inferiority of her ‘secondary creations’ and to play with preconceived notions of authority. Going even further, Aemilia Lanyer, who prefaced her creative revision of scripture with numerous dedications to various women – Sidney Herbert included – uses Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum to suggest that a community of learned women can challenge the gender hierarchy that insists on women’s secondary status.26 She does this by reimagining Eden as an all-female paradise in which the love shared among women is of singular importance, as valuable and as dangerous as learning among women can be. Lanyer’s paratextual material also highlights the role of readers within this collaborative model. As Patricia Demers reminds us, ‘the act of translation invites and requires company’, which involves at minimum, ‘a source text, a target language and audience, including critical, skeptical readers, and a translator (or translators) who is/are willing, eager, capable and, occasionally, commissioned’.27 The community of readers for Cary’s Reply, including most notably Queen Henrietta Maria, played a vital role in her choice of text and even the shape of her translation. As Karen Nelson explains, Cary’s work participates in the religious debates of the 1630s stemming from questions about Henrietta Maria’s role in court and the country. While contributing to the conversation defending ‘Catholicism’s essential nature’, Cary’s framing of the translation shows her active engagement with ‘a rather large company of connected, powerful Catholics’.28 And if, as Cary suggests in her preface, her goal is
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proselytising, then the reader response to her work is equally important to her sense of the translation’s purpose. While Cary's final publication fits squarely with the model of female community that I have suggested has been necessary for, or at least emblematic of women’s translation, *The Tragedy of Mariam* depicts a fictional landscape in which all the women are at odds with one another. The play’s relationships between women stand in stark contrast to several idealised friendships between men. Reading this play in the context of Cary's more straightforward translations gives us the opportunity to reconsider this model of female community as a critical facilitator of female literary authority.

**Elizabeth Cary and translation**

Early in *The Lady Falkland her Life* (c. 1655), Cary's biographer emphasises the young Elizabeth’s facility with learning languages and her lifelong devotion to translation:

> When she was but four or five year old they put her to learn French, which she did about five weeks and, not profiting at all, gave it over. After, of herself, without a teacher, whilst she was a child, she learnt French, Spanish, Italian, which she always understood very perfectly. She learnt Latin in the same manner (without being taught) and understood it perfectly when she was young, and translated the Epistles of Seneca out of it into English; after having long discontinued it, she was much more imperfect in it, so as a little afore her death, translating some (intending to have done it all had she lived) of Blosius out of Latin, she was fain to help herself somewhat with the Spanish translation. Hebrew she likewise, about the same time, learnt with very little teaching; but for many year neglecting it, she lost it much; yet not long before her death, she again beginning to use it, could in the Bible understand well, in which she was most perfectly well read.29

Even if this account is hyperbolic, Cary’s extant writings and the many praises she received from other writers focusing on her linguistic abilities confirm her impressive talent for and dedication to translation. Praising Cary in the preface to his 1597 *Heroicall Epistles*, Michael Drayton points to the sweetness of the Italian and French tongues ‘if spoken by your admired self’.30 Likewise, John Davies includes Cary in his dedicatory poem to *The Muses Sacrifice* (1612), writing of her, ‘Art, Language, yea, abstruse and holy tongues, / they wit and grace acquired thy fame to raise; / And still to fill thy own and others’ songs; / thine
with thy parts and others’ with thy praise.’ Marta Straznicky argues convincingly that by linking Cary to Mary Sidney Herbert and Lucy, Countess of Bedford, Davies strongly suggests that Cary was connected to the ‘most prominent female literary figures of her time’ and that she was, in some way, included in the network of writers often called the Sidney circle. In this way, Davies proposes the importance of a literary community for women. His description also highlights (though cryptically) the collaborative nature of translation, suggesting a practice that requires an act of combination (of Cary’s songs and parts with others’) that can lead to improvement upon the original and fame for the translator. Although Cary never describes directly her own thoughts or theories about translation, her work suggests contextual shifts in her thoughts on the collaborative potential of her endeavours.

Cary’s *The Mirror of the World*, was probably produced in 1597 when she was eleven or twelve years old. In her meticulous edition of this work, Lesley Peterson offers a thorough analysis and comparison of Cary’s work to the original, concluding that Cary was relying on the 1588 and 1590 editions of *L’Epitome du Théâtre du Monde d’Abraham Ortelius*, and noting that the translation is very close to Ortelius’ with only occasional errors, omissions and paraphrasing, and ‘no instances of extended revision, invention, or interpolation’. The few subtle changes that Cary did make, along with the *Mirror’s* clear enthusiasm for Italy and its occasional references to female inhabitants, suggest to Peterson that long before Cary wrote *The Tragedy of Mariam* and *The Reply*, she was balancing her respect for authority with a frequent need to challenge traditional beliefs, and that these challenges included an interest in a ‘Roman alternative to Protestantism’ and a keen sense of the limitations placed on women’s intellectual and physical freedom. Of particular note to a discussion of translation as collaboration is Peterson’s point that the *Mirror* shows Elizabeth Cary ‘as one who understands herself to be a reader and writer among other readers and writers, and one who is concerned to understand her identity in terms of her relationship to other individuals and other communities. These include communities united by family ties, scholarly interests, national identity, and religion.’

This sense of seeing herself as part of a community is particularly evident in Cary’s dedication to her uncle, Sir Henry Lee, which I reproduce here in its brief entirety:

> To the righte honorable my Singular good Uncle Sr Henry Lee knighte
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of the moste noble order of the garter.

Receive here honorable Sir my humble presente, the fruites and endeavours of my younge and tender yeares, an acknowledgement of my bounden duty to you[,] for thoughte I can no way sufficiently expresse my gratefulness for many your great favours nor presente to you any thinge worthy of your selfe yet give mee leave I humbly beseech you to present to you this little treatise, the viewe of the whole worlde[,] as a thinge beste awnserable to your moste noble disposition, leaving to your considerate judgemente & wise regarde the controule of what is herein amisse to be reformed by the experience of your many yeares travailes abroade in the worlde. And as riper yeares shall afforde mee better fruites with greater judgement I shall be ever ready to present you with the best of my travailes.

Your ever obediente
Neece
E Tanfelde

Cary's flattering address, her evident humility, and her choice of metaphors to represent her work are certainly conventional, as is her sense of obligation and gratitude towards her uncle. But she also depicts her translation almost as a living document, something that responds to Lee's interests and that will change based on his experiences. Her repeated use of the word 'travailes' to mean both travels and painful exertion yokes together the physical explorations that her uncle is at liberty to take and her seemingly more limited intellectual explorations of which this translation is an example. The additional meaning of travails as the labour and pain of childbirth only underscores the gendered differences between their possible sets of experiences as well as the view of translation as the product of two parents, one male and one female. In this way we can understand the recurrence of the word (and the related references to her work as 'fruits') as highlighting the difference between dedicator and dedicatee. At the same time, Cary's prediction of her future travails, whether physical or intellectual, suggests that the distinguishing factor between them is their respective ages rather than their genders. Moreover, although Cary takes pains to recognise Lee's contribution to this treatise, her title, 'The mirror of the Worlde translated Out of French into Englishe by ET' curiously omits the name of the text's 'true father', the French author Ortelius, thus
giving Cary considerable room for self-promotion within a genre that features self-effacement.

While Cary's relationship with her uncle underscores the communal nature of her translation efforts, the translation itself figures the theme of community in its reiteration that geographic parts must function together to create a greater whole. *The Mirror* takes as its premise the constant division of the world; the treatise begins with a section entitled, 'The universall worlde', which is then divided into 'Europa', 'Asia', 'Africa' and 'The new worlde'. Descriptions of regions or countries within each of these four sections follow, and these too are quickly divided; for example, under the heading of Englande we learn that the island once called Albion is split into the southern region of England and Northern Scotland, while Spain contains fourteen realms, including 'Portingall', until its split from Spain in the year 1100. In various sections, *The Mirror* discusses the geographical and historical reasons for such divisions, recognising the political, religious and linguistic implications of nationalist movements and empire-building. The tone used to describe these cultural shifts is generally neutral, but the work's most laudatory language is reserved for those regions that are nonviolent and recognise the value of cooperation and governance by consensus rather than by conquest. For instance, the country of Swetland (Switzerland) 'is peaceably governed without any superior ... by 13 leagued townes confæderate together by oath' (181), and the inhabitants of Sardinia, while rustic and simple, are kind to strangers and 'neither make nor have any offensive weapons' (191).

*The Mirror* also suggests that community-building is a feminine alternative to the masculine model of violent conquest. In its praise of Italy, *The Mirror* links good government and education, referring to the region as 'the Queene of Christendome, and the princesse of the world which by her force and poure haith bene reduced under her obedience and by her learning and doctrine haith bene instructed and trained up in politique manners, laws and customes' (182). While acknowledging Rome's empire-building, this passage seems to value *translatio studii* over *translatio imperii* in its emphasis on instruction and its feminine metaphor for Italy as both ruler and teacher. The next sentence shifts to men, but again the focus is not on violent conquest. Instead Italy's 'wise men' are praised for having studied 'all those thinges which he thinketh may serve for the attaining of some science, as the knowledge of many tongues, languges, Physick, Lawe, Astronomy or Theology' (182). We see a literal community of women in the description of
Greece, which, Peterson explains, is ‘one of the freer translations’ in Cary’s project. Here *The Mirror* depicts the mourning habits of women:

> when any one deceaseth they assemble themselves in a certaine deputed place, and in the mourning before daie they begin to roare, beate their brestes, scratt their cheeks, and teare their haire. ... Amonge the reste they chuse out a woman that haith a good voice and smoeth bigger then the reste, to rayse the noyse, beginning and letting fall her voice. (196–7)

Peterson links this scene to Cary’s *Mariam* in recognising the ‘transformative effect’ of women’s suffering. The movement between the group and the individual also provides a model of collaboration that simultaneously facilitates individual expression – a model of collaboration similar to the practice of translation.

Over thirty years after dedicating *The Mirror* to her uncle, Cary published *The Reply of the Most Illustrious Cardinall of Perron*, a text that ‘was the culmination of a controversy begin in 1614–15, when Jacques Davy, Cardinal Du Perron, addressed an Assembly of the Estates General regarding a proposed oath ... that was primarily designed to defend the crown against the right of papal deposition’. While clearly a politically dangerous project, the *Reply* is one of several religiously charged translations produced by women on both sides of the Reformation divide, and it demonstrates the critical importance of translation in the lives of recusant women, many of whom were brought to Catholicism through reading translated texts. Cary’s dedication to England’s most visible Catholic woman, Henrietta Maria, builds on the model of female community hinted at in her translation of *The Mirror*; in this case Cary’s need for a supportive community was much more than symbolic. After her public conversion and forced separation from her husband, Cary received financial support and assistance with educating her children from several women, including the Queen and the Countess of Buckingham. As Frances Dolan argues, we can see Cary’s conversion not only as a loss of her spouse, status and wealth but also as a gain of female patronage and even authority in regard to her children’s upbringing. It is likely that without such material support from these women, Cary would never have had the resources to produce her translation of Perron’s work.

These gains are evident in Cary’s dedication in which she places Henrietta Maria ‘farr above other women’, but simultaneously implies
a sense of common ground based on gender and religion, defining Henrietta by her female positions, ‘daughter of France’ and ‘Kinge James his Sonns wife’ before concluding ‘And for the honor of my Sexe, let me saie it, you are a woeman ... therefore fittest to protect a womans worke’ and ‘you are a Catholicke, and a zealous one, and therefore fittest to receive the dedication of a Catholike-worke’. Noting that the French-speaking Henrietta Maria did not need Cary’s translation in order to understand Perron, Gunilla Florby reads this dedication as creating a bridge between women of different social status and acknowledging their shared interest in promoting Catholicism. Cary’s ‘To the Reader’ continues to build bridges, this time to a more general audience defined not by gender but by common interest. Cary carefully explains that she is not seeking ‘glorie from Translation’, but rather that ‘I was moved to it by my beleefe, that it might make those English that understand not French, whereof there are maine, even in our universities, reade Perron.’ While appropriately humble, this dedication is not especially self-deprecating. Cary does engage in the requisite denigration of her sex, but she also refuses to use the ‘worne-out’ excuse of being pressurised to publish and instead characterises her translation as ‘well done’. In this way she portrays translation as a vehicle to connect those who can read Perron with those who cannot, so that both groups can have access to the same text and work together as a community of Catholics. She admits to her individual talent while deferring to the importance of the group benefit. Just as highlighting Perron’s name, here and in the title of her translation, and focusing on her individual contributions, Cary continues to demonstrate the collaborative nature of this project.

We see this theme further addressed in the several praise poems that follow her dedications. The second, titled simply ‘Another’ and signed ‘F. L. D. S. M.’ (Father Leander de S. Martino), compares Cary to three Roman women known for sacred transformations:

Who doth not prayse th’ Empresse Eudoxias fame,
   That made old Homer tell our Ghospells story?
Or noble Proba Romes immortall glory,
   That taught sweet Virgil sing our Savious name?
Or gracious Elpis, safe Boetius love,
   Whose sacred hymnes holy Church doth approve?

In describing both centoists, who rearranged epic verses to tell Christian stories, and epic poets with similarly praiseful language, this stanza characterises the rearrangements created by Proba and Aelia Eudocia as
collaborations between equals. Even Elpis, who wrote hymn lyrics of her own, is represented not just as Boethius’ love but also as working in a kind of partnership with the holy Church. Cary is then heralded as the paragon of female writers, whose mind is of ‘These three great gracious Ladies full compri’sd, / Their worth, their witte, their virtue equaliz’d’, and the reader is instructed to ‘look on this work, and you shall plainly find / Eudoxia, Proba, Elpis yield in all / To this Translatresse of our Cardinall.’ With this ending, Martino invites readers to participate in his appreciation of Cary, expecting mutual agreement with his praise of her. In his final two words, he returns to the idea of Cary working in conjunction with Perron, and again moves to include the audience in this joint endeavour with the telling phrase, ‘our Cardinall’.

The introductory material works in concert with the treatise’s thematic emphasis on conversation and communion. The work is set up, as its title indicates, as a dialogue, with each section beginning with an observation made by King James and the response offered by Perron. Despite its potential for hostility based on deep religious differences, the tone remains strategically neutral, even respectful of opposing views. It is what Florby calls an ‘eirenic’ text, using similarly conciliatory techniques as Henrietta Maria did in her court entertainments designed ‘to promote a positive image of Catholicism and to calm dissension’.45 Nelson explains that in its argument that the king can acknowledge the pope without giving up temporal power, The Reply offers a fraught call for political and religious reconciliation.46 The first chapter of the treatise responds to disputes over the name ‘Catholic’ and the doctrine of the Communion of the Saints. By defining Catholic as a way for the Christian church to ‘discerne the true Church from hereticall, and schismaticall Societies’, The Reply does offer a model of exclusion and separation, but it takes great pains not to reject the king’s church. By explaining the Communion of the Saints, Perron and Cary offer appeasement by admitting to uncertainty in the interpretation of this controversial doctrine, while at the same time offering a definition that highlights a sense of the church as a community consisting ‘not in the simple number of the faithfull, every one considered a parte; but in the joint Communion of all the bodie faithfull.’ This transcendent view of community is notably gender neutral. It also exceeds the view of collaboration I have identified as critical to the process of translation. However, I would suggest that part of the appeal for Cary in Perron’s text is its sense of the parts coming together to create a more powerful whole – itself a kind of figurative translation. Moreover, as a woman whose religious faith has ‘forced her into conflict with powerful men',
and who received significant support from women, Cary's sense of the potential of community could well be gender specific and confirm Dolan's speculation that Catholicism may have offered 'positive ways to construe female authority'.

In contrast to her first and last works, *The Tragedy of Mariam* appears on the surface to offer a very different view of women's community. Additionally it is not a straightforward translation. The title page of Cary's *Mariam* confirms Barry Weller and Margaret Ferguson's characterisation of it as 'the first original play by a woman to be published in England'. Nowhere does it suggest that the play is a translation of Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews* or a rendition of Thomas Lodge's translation of the ancient text, just as Shakespeare's histories and tragedies do not announce themselves as translations of Holinshed and other source materials. Nevertheless, I find it warranted and valuable to consider the play as a kind of translation for several reasons. As mentioned above, the term was highly flexible, as evidenced by Dryden's classification of translation detailed in his 'Preface to the translations of Ovid's Epistles'. Dismissing the word-for-word metaphrase as 'servile', Dryden venerates paraphrase, calling it 'translation with latitude', while pointing out that in imitation 'the translator (if now he has not lost that name) assumes the liberty, not only to vary from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion'. Certainly *The Tragedy of Mariam* can be understood as a work of paraphrase or imitation. Cary's choice of closet drama substantiates this assessment, given that the genre as a whole relies on imitations of Seneca and is derived from the Garnier model, brought to England by Thomas Kyd's translation of *Cornélie*.

To look at *Mariam* as a paraphrase or imitation also allows us to see how Cary's project fits with the more straightforward translations being produced by other women and how she might use the persistent bias against translation (as evidenced in Dryden's conflicted praise above) to her advantage. In her choice of genre and subject matter Cary follows the precedent set by other female translators. Sandra Fisher reads this 'tendency to choose well-known stories from prominent sources' as part of a strategy of circumlocution used in other 'marginal genres as religious writings, translations, and closet dramas' that helps authors avoid public responsibility for their writings. Cary's literary career undercuts this theory to a degree; she certainly accepted the public responsibility of her translation of Perron and seemed careful not to present *Mariam* as a translation. At the same time, as her play demonstrates, Cary was well aware of the restraints placed on women's public voice. Reading the play within the context of translation, then, helps us explore how
Cary navigates limitations placed on female authority and authorship, limitations that she addressed through translation before and after penning *Mariam*.

The women in *Mariam* are constantly at odds with one another. Both trapped in distasteful marriages, Salome and Mariam are the play’s most obvious enemies, spewing insults, plotting against each other and unable to recognise their shared predicament. Similarly, Mariam and Doris might realise that they and their families have both been abused by Herod, but instead Doris wishes revenge on the ‘high-hearted Mariam’ (2.3.253), and Mariam in turn defends Herod’s divorce by quoting from scripture ‘That he that being match’d did deadly hate: / Might by permission put his wife away, / And take a more belov’d to be his mate?’ (4.8.588–90). Even Mariam’s own mother harshly chastises her daughter for mourning the reported death of her husband, who in Alexandra’s eyes is nothing more than the murderer of Mariam’s grandfather and brother. In each case, the potential for women’s community is disrupted by their complicated relationships to the tyrannical patriarch. Each woman challenges Herod but never as directly or as venomously as she challenges the other women.

Cary derives this antagonism from her source. In Lodge’s translation of Josephus, he writes: ‘But Mariamme upbraided and publickely reproached both the kings mother and sister, telling them that they were but abjectly and basely borne. Whereupon there grew a great enmitie and unrecoverable hatred betweene the Ladies; and from thence also there arose an occasion of greater accusations and calumniations th[a]n before’ (279). Josephus’ Alexandra is particularly hateful and cowardly, protecting herself against Herod’s wrath by publicly calling the doomed Mariam ‘a wicked woman, & ungrateful towards her husband; and that she wel deserved the punishment that was adjudged her’ (281). By giving more time and speech to her female characters, Cary adds depth and complexity to these women but she also extends and amplifies the animosity among them. These expressions of malevolence stand in stark contrast to the articulation of friendship between Constabarus and the sons of Babas, and later between Constabarus and his ostensible enemy, Silleus. Laurie Shannon characterises the relationship between Constabarus and the men he is protecting as an ‘uncomplicated friendship’, and she argues that Cary would certainly have known the works of Cicero and Montaigne that are echoed in the play’s representation of this alliance. Constabarus’ relationship with Silleus is thornier. As rivals for Salome, the men are in a similar position to Mariam and Doris, but rather than building a mutual hatred, they bemoan Salome’s
role in standing in the way of their friendship. After wounding Silleus, Constabarus helps him recover, explaining, ‘I hate thy body, but I love thy mind’ (2.4.388), to which Silleus responds:

Thanks, noble Jew, I see a courteous foe,
Stern enmity to friendship can no art:
Had not my heart and tongue engag’d me so,
I would from thee no foe, but friend depart.
My heart to Salome is tied [too] fast
To leave her love for friendship, yet my skill
Shall be employ’d to make your favour last,
And I will honour Constabarus still. (2.4.289–96)

With three explicit references, this passage clearly participates in the early modern discourse that depicts male friendship as an idealised relationship requiring perfect equality. From its start, this discourse has excluded women from true friendships both with men and with each other, an exclusion that Cary’s play seems to reinforce. Understanding male friendship as ‘a counterpoint to absolutism’, that finds its gendered alternative in female chastity, Shannon argues that Mariam ‘records under protest the fatal effects of a woman’s attempt to enact a chaste or constant integrity specifically created for males’.56 For Shannon, the play decries women’s inability to form friendships in the play as an effect of patriarchal, tyrannical power. Naomi Miller also reads the play’s disruption of female bonds as a critique of tyranny and patriarchy, though she is somewhat more optimistic in her suggestion that by exposing the conflict between women, Cary is able to show that women, ‘without losing their voices’, can decenter ‘standard early notions of fatherly authority’.57

Miller’s logic demonstrates the difficulty of finding an encouraging view of women’s speech, women’s writing and women’s community in this play. As Margaret Ferguson has shown, Mariam’s opening question, ‘How oft have I with public voice run on’ (1.1.1) challenges ‘the play’s own mode of material existence’, and she reads the play as recognising the need for but finally rejecting the potential of collective rebellion.58 That Ferguson links the play’s exploration of female voice to the potential for collective action recognises a connection between community and voice that the women in Mariam find impossible to achieve. However, by viewing the play as a kind of collaborative translation and paying attention to Cary’s strategic use of source material, we can understand this lack as contributing to the play’s tragedy.
In her important analysis of the connection between Cary’s *Mariam* and Lodge’s translation of Josephus, Alison Shell explains that Lodge, in fairly typical Renaissance fashion, focuses on the ‘moral utility’ of history; he ‘more unusually ... stresses his readers’ obligation to interrogate their own lives by actively reflecting upon relevant historical exemplars, both good and bad’.59 In other words, Shell writes, ‘Lodge calls for readers and historians to be partners’, a lesson that Cary reflects through her chorus, which practises a ‘two-stage process of reading and moral digestion’.60 Translation too calls for active engagement by the reader. Using such a process and taking seriously Lodge’s prefatory instruction to avoid the pitfalls of bad historical examples,61 an audience member might not take as final the chorus’ condemnation of Mariam’s unchaste thoughts and words. In its claim, ‘For in a wife it is no worse to find, /A common body than a common mind’ (3. 243–4) the chorus speaks against the bridge-building celebrated in Cary’s *Mirror* and *Reply*, but its rhetoric is not wholly persuasive. Although Mariam may have been spared if she had not voiced her thoughts, she also might have avoided her fate by finding out what she had in common with the other women in the play.

To interpret the play’s representation of antagonistic women as a cautionary tale is additionally made possible by the contrast between the play’s backbiting women and Cary’s dedicatory poem to her sister-in-law, also named Elizabeth Cary, in which the writer embraces the discourse of friendship to celebrate the women’s sisterhood:

When cheerful Phoebus his full course hath fun,
His sister’s fainter beams our hearts doth cheer:
So your fair brother is to me the sun,
And you his sister as my moon appear.

You are my next belov’d, my second friend,
For when my Phoebus’ absence makes it night,
Whilst to th’antipodes his beams do bend,
From you, my Phoebe, shines my second light.

He like to Sol, clear-sighted, constant, free,
You Luna-like, unspotted, chaste, divine:
He shone on Sicily, you destin’d be
T’illumine the now obscured Palestine.
My first was consecrated to Apollo,
My second to Diana now shall follow.
Bearing striking similarities to Mary Sidney Herbert’s ‘To the Angell Spirit’, which preceded her joint translation of the Psalms, this poem establishes a clear hierarchy between husband and sister, but the references to the sister as ‘second’ also play on the view of the ideal friend as a second self. The parallel structure used throughout the poem creates a fragile sense of equality between Cary’s male and female muses, representing also the composition process for this play and her earlier one (her lost ‘first’ play, ‘consecrated to Apollo’) as a collaborative one. The last stanza’s string of adjectives, however, reminds us of some key differences between a woman who is ‘unspotted, chaste, divine’ and a man, ‘clear-sighted, constant, free’. A woman who remains pure in mind and body may have access to sacred knowledge. The bar for a man is set lower; with his constancy comes freedom, the very thing denied to women, the very thing limiting women’s choices as individuals, as friends, as translators and as writers.

Reading The Tragedy of Mariam through the lens of translation studies provides an opportunity to reconsider how we understand the conditions of early modern translation and the ways in which the practice of translation affected women’s access to the role of writer. Although the play itself does not celebrate female friendship discursively as other works have, I would argue that the work still reflects a desire for women’s community by suggesting that part of Mariam’s loss stems from her inability to sympathise with other women. That Mariam’s women cannot even see their shared grievances or imagine the value of coalition-building reflects how difficult collaboration could be for women, which we can also understand as one of the many limitations that made writing for women such a daunting endeavour. For Cary herself, this challenge may have been felt most keenly as a young wife trying to reconcile her place in the family with her literary aspirations and her shifting religious beliefs. Perhaps ironically, her conversion and forced separation from her husband may have given her the opportunity that Mariam lacked, to forge alliances with other women, to celebrate literary communion and to reaffirm her voice within the practice of collaboration and translation.

Notes
1. There has been much recent discussion on Cary’s likely authorship of The History of the Life, Reign, and Death of Edward II and/or The History of the Most Unfortunate Prince King Edward II. I don’t have room to enter into that debate or to offer a full analysis of that work in this chapter. I would suggest, however, that many of the reasons I read Mariam as implicated in the practice of translation hold true for both versions of Edward II as well.


6. For an excellent discussion of women’s religious writings, see Kimberly Anne Coles, *Religion, Reform, and Women’s Writing in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), in which she argues for the singular importance of women’s religious writings in the sixteenth century and for the ‘shaping force’ exerted by religious women that led to the English Reformation, pp. 2–5.


9. Kenneth Charlton explains that although More and Erasmus strongly advocated for including in the humanist curriculum the study of Greek, which they saw as ‘the roots of Christianity’, grammar schools rarely paid serious attention to the subject, and even in the universities, ‘no important school of Greek studies developed’, in *Education in Renaissance England* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965), pp. 65, 117, 159. Marta Straznicky compares Vives’ different instructions for teaching Princess Mary and Charles Mountjoy, and the difference is glaring. While he suggests Mary need study only the pronunciation of Greek letters, for Mountjoy he includes ‘a separate, detailed regime for the study of Greek language and literature’, *Privacy, Playreading, and Women’s Closet Drama, 1550–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 24–5.


11. In ‘On First Looking into Lumley’s Euripides’, *Renaissance and Reformation*, 23 (1999): 26, Patricia Demers uses this phrase to describe Lumley, but it seems equally appropriate to characterise the young Elizabeth Tanfield.
Although this translation was produced before Elizabeth took the name of Cary, I will be using her married name for simplicity and consistency through this chapter.

12. In her introduction to Cary’s translation, Peterson notes that the dedication to Lee seems to correspond to his knighting by Queen Elizabeth. Furthermore, she points out that Cary’s father, Lawrence Tanfield, was an ambitious lawyer, knighted just two years after his daughter’s strategic marriage, *The Mirror of the Worlde*, ed. and intro. Lesley Peterson (Montreal and Kingston: McGill University Press, 2012), pp. 16, 4. Later quotations from *The Mirror* are from this edition.

13. I have suggested that the plays of Lumley, Sidney Herbert and Philips ‘interrogate the links between linguistic translation, national rivalry, and political conquest that are particularly relevant during times of civil and religious unrest, of continued conflict in Ireland, and European exploration and colonization in the so-called New World’, in *Women as Translators*, p. 73; Peterson identifies a similar challenge in Cary’s translation of *The Mirror*, pp. 22–3.

14. While the generic name indicates a work designed for the most intimate of spaces, Marta Straznicky’s comprehensive study of women’s closet drama rightly contextualises these works in ‘a cultural field in which private and public are shifting rather than fixed points of reference’. Even as she explains that closet drama crosses between private and public simply through the printing and publication of the works, she argues for the importance of retaining the category and understanding it as ‘a tactical construct which was itself the condition of possibility for women’s playwriting’, pp. 1–3. We can see a strategic connection in the reasons women chose to write translations and the reasons to write closet drama as both provide an ostensibly safe outlet for creative expression, while still participating in contemporary political and religious discourse.


16. Lori Chamberlain discusses the implications of this long-lasting phrase and its tag ‘Les belles infidèles’, noting that it establishes an ‘implicit contract between translation (as woman) and original (as husband, father, or author)’ as well as upholding the double standard of female and male behaviour, in ‘Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation’, in *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (New York: Routledge, 1992), p. 58.


26. In discussing Lanyer’s *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* in the context of translation, I am both relying on the more expansive early modern understanding of the term to include practices such as imitation and acknowledging the debt Lanyer owed (and which she also recognises) to the women’s translations that preceded her work. I see Cary’s *The Tragedie of Mariam* in a similar light and elaborate on this view later in the chapter.


29. Quotation from *The Lady Falkland Her Life*, by one of her daughters. This is included in the edition of *The Tragedy of Mariam The Fair Queen of Jewry* that I will be using later in this chapter, eds Barry Weller and Margaret W. Ferguson (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994), p. 186.


33. Heather Wolfe, in her introduction to *Elizabeth Cary Lady Falkland: Life and Letters*, also notes that Cary was praised for her translating abilities, pointing

34. Peterson, ed., The Mirror, pp. 7–8, 10.


36. Peterson, ed., The Mirror, p. 44.

37. The OED explains that the etymology of ‘travel’ and ‘travail’ is the same. From the examples presented in both definitions, it appears that distinctions in spelling emerged in the sixteenth century.

38. In this conclusion, I agree with Peterson that the work as a whole offers a subtle critique of tyranny, which is often linked to the practices of imperialism. The several references to Julius Caesar’s conquest emphasise this connection.

39. Peterson notes how flattering this description of Italy is, particularly in comparison to the faint praise used to describe England, in The Mirror, p. 64.


49. Like Shakespeare in so many plays, Cary does not invent the plot of her play but rather relies heavily on historical accounts. While the story of Herod and Mariam’s tempestuous marriage is detailed in Josephus’ Jewish War and his Antiquities of the Jews, Weller and Ferguson argue that Cary probably relied primarily on book 15 of the Antiquities and point out that she (again like Shakespeare) ‘compresses, amplifies, and transposes material’ for dramatic effect. They also note that while it is certainly possible that Cary was able to read Josephus’ text in the original Greek, there is significant evidence that she worked closely with Thomas Lodge’s 1602 English translation, pp. 17–18.

50. From The Essays of Dryden, vol. 1, p. 237. Translation was also understood more symbolically as physical and spiritual transformation and as metaphor. In a conversation with Derrida, Eugene Vance looks at the etymology of translation and other similar terms and suggests that today ‘we are dealing with a term that has become greatly impoverished’, in The Ear of the Other: Otobiography, Transference, Translation: Texts and Discussion with Jacques Derrida, ed. Christie V. McDonald, trans. Peggy Kamuf (New York: Schocken Books, 1985), pp. 136–7.


54. Shannon notes that Cary’s changes to her source material ‘give more prominences to women’s psychological struggles’, ‘The Tragedy of Mariam’, p. 356.


60. Shell, ‘Elizabeth Cary’s Historical Conscience’, p. 56.


62. The reference to a work set in Sicily supports the existence of an earlier tragedy to which Davies refers in his dedication to *The Muses Sacrifice*, Weller and Ferguson, n. 151.
Women are the frequent, even ubiquitous subject of bawdy poetry in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Examples of female speakers of erotic verse, which is bawdy in varying degrees, include the anonymous ‘Nay phew, nay pish? nay faith and will ye fie’, in which a woman protests against and then succumbs to the sexual advances of her lover, a dialogue between two sisters about an erotic dream, ‘Methought as I lay slumbring on my bed’, and a poem sometimes given the heading ‘The complaint of Mistress A. H. upon her second match to an old rich man’ (‘When I was young scarce apt for use of man’). However, it is very difficult to ascertain whether these anonymous verses voiced by a female speaker were actually written by a woman. As Marcy North points out,

One can speculate about anonymity’s usefulness to women or try to identify female voices and points of view in the body of anonymous literature, but these methods rarely tell us definitively whether women authors lie hidden behind particular anonymous works.

Female-voiced bawdy poetry raises particular interpretive problems in this respect. The voyeurism of the ‘overheard’ female-voiced verse, in the case of ‘Nay phew, nay pish’ and ‘Methought as I lay slumbring’, and the active sexuality ascribed to sexually experienced women in verses such as ‘When I was young scarce apt for use of man’, speak to male fantasy and not necessarily to women’s ‘experience’. It would be highly problematic to see the ‘female author’ constructed within these bawdy verses as necessarily coterminous with a woman writer. Attention to the material cultures of early modern women’s writing allows us to
examine how the figure of the female author is produced and reconstituted as texts are transmitted within the media of manuscript and print. In the case of a pair of bawdy answer poems that are the subject of this chapter – the male flout opens with ‘O love whose power and might’ and the female speaker responds with ‘Your letter I received’ – although one manuscript miscellany identifies both ‘authors’ with ‘real’ individuals, when viewed across extant copies authorship proves much more difficult to pin down. Just as these verses are recontextualised and reworked through the processes of transmission, so too their ‘authors’ are reconfigured and re-embodied, ascribed different identities in different publication contexts. Authorship is not stable, but malleable in these instances, and complicated by the social and material processes of publication. As this set of answer poems makes its way through manuscript verse miscellanies from the late sixteenth to the early seventeenth century, and into the printed miscellanies of the mid-seventeenth century, it is possible to trace the shifting formal frameworks and socioliterary networks within which the ‘authors’ of female-voiced bawdy verse were produced, performed and reproduced.

Female-voiced bawdy poetry tends to be found only in manuscript verse miscellanies in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries in England. Like verse libels, with which it overlaps, bawdy verse can usefully be described as a manuscript genre in that it was similarly too scurrilous and lascivious to appear in print. It shares textual strategies and a misogynist point of view with verse libels attacking women, such as those directed towards Frances Howard, Countess of Somerset, and Lady Penelope Rich; these kinds of verse frequently circulated alongside each other in scribal channels, often copied in close proximity in manuscript miscellanies.6 However, unlike libels, bawdy verse does start to make its way into print in the miscellanies of the mid-seventeenth century, particularly after the Restoration. The path these bawdy answer poems take through manuscript and printed miscellanies over the course of the seventeenth century and the ways in which they are recontextualised testifies not just to the malleability of literary texts, but to the diverse and changing interpretive communities in which they were reproduced and read.

The bawdy answer poems belong to the broader category of ‘erotic writing’. For Ian Moulton, ‘erotic writing’ is best understood as an expansive descriptive category: since it is so ‘widely divergent’ in terms of form and subject matter, it is difficult to codify except in broad terms.7 That said, it is possible to identify particular genres within this broader category. For example, Joshua Eckhardt has recently argued for a genre
of ‘anti-courtly love poetry’, particular to manuscript miscellanies, whose conventions are drawn from the ‘literary game[s] of resisting or rejecting the conventions of Petrarchan verse’. This poetic genre does not so much describe individual poems as sequences of poems produced by the practice of ‘routinely countering or complementing love poetry with erotic or obscene verse’ by manuscript compilers. Literary compilation becomes a mode of composition thereby extending literary agency to compiler-editors. Bawdy verse copied into manuscript miscellanies took a variety of forms, and, as Eckhardt notes, underwent ‘a remarkable set of recontextualizations’ over the course of the seventeenth century. By the Restoration, bawdy verses were reconstituted in printed anthologies within the loose generic category of drollery, which came into vogue in this period.

When copied into manuscript miscellanies, the bawdy answer poems, ‘O love whose power and might’ and ‘Your letter I received’, are instructively promiscuous in terms of how they are contextualised. These verses travel in mixed company and are copied alongside different kinds of verse. Bawdy poetry, more generally, has a generic looseness that enables it to adapt to different contexts. The poems counterpoint love poetry in a mode that Eckhardt has defined as anti-courtly in some miscellanies, while, in others, they are copied among jesting epigrams, some obscene, others not, or form part of a selection of distinctly bawdy verse. When examined as a unit, the answer poems do have a distinctive style, evident in the use of non-sequiturs that characterises the English style of nonsense pioneered by John Hoskins. In fact, the earliest known record of these poems is of their performance at the 1597/98 Middle Temple revels, during which Hoskins delivered his famed nonsense oration, ‘The Fustian answer to a Tufftaffeta speech’. Given the titles ‘A Passion’ and ‘Compassion’, the poems were read as evidence during the arraignment of the discontented lover on the charge of treason, and function within an extended burlesque of Elizabethan neo-chivalric and Petrarchan forms. Their distinctive blending of nonsense, evident in the extensive use of non-sequiturs, with other forms of literary crudity, to travesty the language and conventions of love lyric, makes these poems highly significant and early examples of an English burlesque tradition.

It is likely that the poems were first composed for the 1597/98 Middle Temple revels. The use of nonsensical non-sequiturs points to Hoskins’s hand in their composition, although they were probably composed collaboratively in concert with fellow revellers, such as Charles Best, who took the name of Carolus Asinius Bestia, and both played the role of the discontented lover and delivered the ‘Tufftaffeta Oration’
answered by Hoskins. The male flout begins with ‘Cupid is blind, men say’, and, as such, lacks the seven verses that make up the first half of other extant versions. It should be said, these answer poems are highly unstable texts, and characterised by variants from the sequence of stanzas to internal variation within lines. These are not ‘errors’, but rather the product of deliberate poetic reworkings, as the verse is composed and remade through the processes of performance and transmission. Manuscript poetry is inherently malleable, and verse was often composed with an expectation that it would be reworked by compilers. Such sociable poems were the ‘shared property’ of socioliterary networks and often changed shape as they circulated in scribal channels.¹¹ ‘Love whose power and might’ and ‘Your letter I received’ are highly sociable performance poems. They are often identified as songs in the later printed miscellanies, hence their presence in Giles Earle’s songbook, although no musical setting is identified.¹² The invitation to collaborate is inherently performative and a key element of the dialogic form of answer poem that leaves it open to other voices.

The poems considered here circulate under various names and titles, many generic, although some name individuals. The male flout, ‘O love thy power and might’, is unattributed and given generic titles in a number of miscellanies – ‘A letter from a lover to his beloved’ (BL, Add MS 24665, fol. 81v) ‘To his mistresse’ (Bod. MS Eng.poet.f.9, p. 19, Yale Osborn MS b.148, p. 6), ‘A flout for his mistresse’ (Rosenbach MSS 239/27, p. 93), ‘A mock-song’ (Wit and Drollery, New Academy of Complements), ‘Beast his sonnett’ (Rosenbach MS 1083/15, p. 46) – or without attribution or title in others (BL, Add MS 22601, fol. 107; Bod. MS Jones 58, fol. 50v). The male flout is also attributed to individuals, to a ‘Mr. Poulden’ of New College, Oxford (Bod. MS Ashmole 36–7, fol. 145v), a ‘Mr. Lawson’ of St John’s College (Bod. Rawl.poet.26, fol. 5), and even to John Donne (Folger MS V.a.124, fol. 36). Apart from one miscellany, the female response is unattributed in all other copies and similarly given generic titles: ‘Her Answere’ (Bod. MS Eng.poet.f.9, p. 19; Rawl. poet.26, fol. 5; BL, Add MS 24665, fol. 82; Folger MS V.a.124, fol. 36; Rosenbach MSS 239/27, p. 95, and 1083/15, p. 47; Yale Osborn MS b.148, p. 6), ‘Response sequitur’ (Bod. MS Jones 58, fol. 65v), ‘Her ingenious answer so modestly delivered’ (Folly in Print), ‘Mock-song, in answer’ (New Academy of Complements), or no attribution or title (BL, Add MS 22601, fol. 107v). In only one manuscript miscellany, belonging to the Bowyer family, (BL, Add MS 25303), are both the male flout and the female response attributed to individuals, resulting in the following pairing: ‘John Hoskins to the Lady Jacob’, and ‘Lady Jacob’s answer’.
Each of these witnesses can be understood as a ‘publication event’ in their own right, in other words, as a particular instantiation of the text whose meaning is dependent upon the specific context in which it occurs. In terms of the Middle Temple revels, this includes the wider context of performance; in the case of the manuscript miscellanies, it includes the social and textual company these verses keep in particular collections. Fraistat uses the term ‘contextural poetics’ to describe the complex interplay between ‘the contextuality provided for each poem by the larger frame within which it is placed, the intertextuality among poems so placed, and the resultant texture of resonance and meaning’. The meaning of each instantiation of these poems is contingent upon, if not fully determined by their iteration in other miscellanies and other contexts. Echoes of earlier social and textual interactions therefore resonate across and inform later reproductions.

The attribution of these poems to Hoskins and Jacob in the Bowyer miscellany (BL, Add MS 25303) begs the question of why these specific author functions are paired in this miscellany and the various forms of ‘contextual signification at work’ in this particular act of naming, which materially embodies these poems in identifiable historical individuals. The miscellany, a small quarto volume, belonged to the Bowyer family in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Although it was subsequently rebound and its pages mounted in the early twentieth century, directions for binding are preserved on one of the end-papers: ‘pricked with/blew & vermillion/in Calues Leather and filletts Nutmeg/coullor for Mr John Bowyer’, and underneath ‘for for m r Bowyer’ (fol. 1). Baird Whitlock assumed that ‘m r Bowyer’ was Robert Bowyer, a contemporary of Hoskins at the Middle Temple and in the early Jacobean parliaments. For Whitlock, Robert Bowyer’s presumed ownership of the miscellany therefore gave authority to the poems’ attribution to Hoskins and Jacob. However, the name of the person who commissioned the binding is ‘John’, not ‘Robert’. There is a John who belongs to a different branch of the family from Robert, and who has similar connections to Inns of Court and parliament. A Staffordshire gentleman, John Bowyer was admitted to Gray’s Inn in 1578, practised as an attorney and sat in James’s first parliament. He married Katherine, the daughter of Sir Christopher Yelverton, speaker of the House of Commons, and, like the Yelvertons, had Puritan leanings. Bowyer’s son, William, entered Gray’s Inn in 1604; Yelverton became his guardian following John’s death in 1605, and William sat in parliament for Staffordshire in the 1620s, and in 1640.

The Bowyer miscellany is written in a fair hand throughout, and the mis en page has been composed with some care – typically one poem
is copied to a page, and poems start on new pages. The compilation begins with a lengthy section of religious, devotional works, including two paraphrases of Psalm 104, the first attributed to ‘Rob: fer.’, Robert Ferrar (d. 1555), the Bishop of St David’s and Marian martyr, and the second is an unattributed paraphrase by Thomas Carew, thought to date from the 1620s. These texts have all been copied in the one hand. Given the dating of the Carew paraphrase, if this hand belongs to a member of the Bowyer family, then a likely candidate is John’s son, William. The religious aspect of this material is consistent with the moderate Puritanism of this branch of the Bowyers. A blank page is left after this section of devotional tracts, and the answer poems are copied across an opening, so that ‘John Hoskins to the Lady Jacob’ is faced by ‘The Lady Jacobs Answer’ on the opposite page (fols 70v–71). The following poem, ‘S’ Walter Rawleighs Pilgrimage’ (‘Giue me my Scollop shell of quiett’), begins on a new page. The poems surrounding the answer poem have a distinctly godly cast: Raleigh’s devotional poem, ‘His Pilgrimage’, is followed by a poem sympathetic to Puritans (‘Longe hathe it vext this learned age to scan’), Henry King’s ‘Midnight Meditations’, William Browne’s elegy ‘On an Infante vnborne & the Mother dyinge in Trauaile’, and ‘On a Byble giuen to his M’r’ (fols 71v–74).

The seemingly unusual juxtaposition of bawdy and godly verse may indicate that verse was copied into the miscellany as it came to the compilers. One hand copied the first section of devotional texts, the bawdy answer poems were written in a second hand, and the following poems were written in a third hand, indicating that verse was copied in this opening section over a period of time by different individuals. The rest of the miscellany, following this section, is in one hand, and does include other bawdy poems, such as ‘The complainte of M’r A H’ (‘When I was younge scarce apte for use of man’) (fol. 79) and ‘Vppon one Turbott that marryed M’r Hyll’ (‘What are Deucalions dayes returnd y’ wee’) (fol. 108v), and an array of jesting epitaphs and epigrams (fols 79, 81). The context in which the Hoskins–Jacob poems are copied in the early, predominantly devotional section of the miscellany is very distinctive in comparison to the other extant miscellanies precisely because stylistically they are so out of place. Unlike other miscellanies, they do not make up a section of jesting epigrams or bawdy verse. Rather, their informal relationship to the surrounding verse suggests they were copied for social rather than aesthetic reasons. Here, the naming of the verses is crucial since the attribution implies the verses had value precisely because of their paired association with Hoskins and Lady Mary Jacob.
The main compiler of the Bowyer miscellany had an interest in collecting Hoskins’s verse, given the number of his poems in the collection. Although his ‘One a Dreame’ (‘Yo nimble dreames w th cob web wings’), is copied without attribution (fol. 138v), the majority of Hoskins’s texts are identified with their author through detailed headnotes. His virtuoso nonsense speech delivered at the Middle Temple revels is subscribed ‘Jo: Hos: his Tuffa:’ and introduced with the headnote ‘Refused to answer at extempore beinge importuned by ye Prince & Sr Walter Raleigh began’ (fols 184v–185v). Hoskins was imprisoned following his incendiary and impolitic speeches in the 1614 ‘addled’ Parliament, and his prison verses are similarly given explanatory headnotes: ‘Mr John Hoskins bewailinge his owne his Wifes his Mothers & his childrens wofull case the one borne the other yet vnborne. 1616.’ (‘Mee thought I walked in a dreame’), and ‘His verse addressed to son Benjamin in Latin and in English’ (fols 162–3). The compiler is sympathetic to such dissenting voices in the later parliaments of the 1620s. The headnote, ‘Do: Lewis his foolish inuictiue against the Parlament for proceedinge to censure his Lo: Verulame’, given to William Lewis’s poem championing Sir Francis Bacon following his impeachment in 1621 (‘When yee awake dull Bryttaines & beholdes’) (fols 83–6), makes clear its parliamentary sympathies.

The attribution of the female response to Lady Mary Jacob in the Bowyer miscellany is more intriguing than that of Hoskins, given his early association with the poems’ performance at the Middle Temple revels. It provides evidence for how this particular historical woman was constructed as an author function in this period. North has argued that the anonymous ‘female author’ fashioned within female-voiced erotic poetry often accords with popular stereotypes of the sexually fallen woman who shamelessly advertises her sexual freedom and freedom of speech in verse. The female author’s ability to speak openly about her sexuality is predicated on her anonymity. What then happens when the female author is named? The ‘Lady Jacob’ cited as the author of the female-voice bawdy poem in the Bowyer miscellany is put into circulation alongside other versions of this figure in the early seventeenth century. Lady Mary Jacob did, in fact, achieve a certain notoriety in this period. Married to Sir Robert Jacob, Solicitor General to Ireland, she probably moved to Ireland from London in 1602. Barnaby Rich wrote a damning, possibly slanderous indictment of the couple in a report on corruption within the Irish administration. He constructed Mary Jacob as a scandalous, riotous woman, ‘a lusty wyfe’ who corrupts her husband through her ‘exessyve bravery, hyr pompe, hyr pryde, hyr
prodigylyte, hyr roystynge, hyr rampynge, hyr revelynge, hyr feastynge, hyr gamyngge and other hyr idell & inordynat expendynge'. After Robert Jacob died in 1618, Lady Mary returned to London and married Christopher Brooke, taking a house on Drury Lane. Arthur Wilson’s entry on 1620 in his history of James’s reign depicted Jacob as the embodiment of the ‘Vanity of this Age’, a woman, ‘of no good Fame’, who was one of the ‘Ladies, pretending to be Wits… which drew great Resort to their houses, and where company meet, the discourse is commonly of the times’. When read in relation to her circulation within these channels of rumour and report, the author function attributed to ‘Lady Jacob’ in the Bowyer miscellany both draws on and shapes her reputation as a woman of ‘no good Fame’. Arguably, her naming as author is a means of shaming, constructing her as a fallen woman, in a comparable manner to the verse libel on the death of Penelope Rich (‘The Diuell men say in Deuonshire dyed of late’), also included in the compilation.

Such misogyny recalls the poems’ early performance at the Inns of Court revels, where the verses were part of an institutional and communal set of rhetorical practices belonging to an all-male environment. Misogyny went hand-in-hand with the libertinism of these revels in defining a masculine institutional identity. And yet, the sexual politics of this early performance of ‘A Passion’ and ‘Compassion’ are more complex than this outline suggests. The two poems are part of a flighting, in which the discontented lover and his wronged mistress are evenly matched, that ends with the lover convicted of treason partly on the evidence of the ‘leud contempt’ expressed in his flout. Behind this wit combat is a burlesquing of the forms of querelle des femmes, the praise and dispraise of women, which may have played to the presence of noble women in the audience, albeit in a jesting fashion. Within this framework, performances deemed too distasteful by this audience could shame the male speaker: Benjamin Rudyerd wrote scornfully of the drunken and disgraceful oration of one ‘Milorsius Stradilax’ who ‘repeated his old comparison of Pork, to the dispraise of noble Women there present’. The performative structure of the mock trial underpins the witty exchange attributed to Hoskins and Jacob. It is likely they are coupled as authors because they were known to be close acquaintances. Mary’s husband, Robert, was a contemporary of Hoskins at the Middle Temple from the late 1580s, and possibly even part of his social circle in the 1590s, before the couple went to Ireland in 1602. Jacob served in the Irish administration with Sir John Davies (probably ‘Milorsius Stradilax’ in the revels). With Lady Jacob’s marriage to Brooke in late
1619, she gained access to his social circle, which included his life-long friends, Hoskins and John Donne. Lady Jacob and Hoskins may well have performed a version of the ‘A Passion’ and ‘Compassion’ from the 1597/98 Middle Temple revels at social gatherings and to audiences that would have included many of those who took part in the original event. In any case, the coupling of Hoskins and Jacob as burlesque and bawdy author functions in the Bowyer miscellany jointly identifies them with a culture of wit that, rather than exclusively masculine, is open to both men and women. ‘Lady Jacob’ floats between the authorial identities of ‘fallen woman’ and ‘female wit’, which, in any case, are not poles apart, foregrounding the fundamental instability of the ‘female author’ in the highly charged context of the bawdy poem.

The compiler of the Bowyer miscellany seems to have customised his copy with an eye to its performance qualities. The most significant variation is the sandwiching of couplets to make one verse line, which means that, in a couple of instances, the compiler overrides the internal rhyme to produce variants extant only in this copy. Given there was certainly space for the male flout to have run over onto the following page, a stylistic decision appears to have been made to fit the male flout on the one page so that the female response then faces it across the opening – the rhetorical confrontation between the couple thereby also becomes a visual and material one, functioning at the level of the design of the mis en page. Other miscellanies similarly customise their version of the poem. The copy of the female response in Henry Brockman’s miscellany (NAL Dyce 44) includes a stanza that survives only in this miscellany and is remarkable for its crudeness:

Youre loue yow say is fayre
As is the lillie white
Come kisse her ar hole bare
For now she goes to shite.

As Claire Bryony Williams notes, this stanza was probably added by Brockman, and is part of a deliberate reworking of the piece. The bawdy answer poems are copied in another miscellany (BL, Add MS 22601) connected to the Bowyer family via William’s grandfather and guardian, Sir Christopher Yelverton. The poems were probably copied soon after the 1597/98 revels, given that the miscellany is thought to have been compiled over a twenty-year period from 1586 to 1606. Here, the answer poems are copied without title or attribution and form part of a distinct section of love poems, both bawdy
and courtly, resulting in an eclectic mix of high and low styles (fols 98–107v). The level of variants is too high for the poems in the Bowyer miscellany to be a direct copy of Add MS 22601. Nonetheless, these different, and yet related instantiations across the two miscellanies provide evidence for their circulation within a wider Inns of Court and parliamentary milieu. Another early witness is in a miscellany (Rosenbach MS 1083/15) whose early compiler was connected to the Middle Temple in the 1590s, given his access to Davies’s verse and very rare Rudyerd epigrams. The title this compiler gives to male flout, ‘Beast his Sonnet’, as well as the running title ‘Beast to his mistris’ (pp. 45–7), recalls the beastly construction of the discontented lover during his arraignment at the 1597/98 Middle Temple revels and may pun on ‘Carolus Asinius Bestia’. The poems are surrounded by a sequence of jesting epitaphs and epigrams associated with the Middle Temple, many penned by Davies and Rudyerd.

Like Add MS 22601, there is also a stylistic coherence to the collection, which suggests a deliberate effort to collect low comic and bawdy verse. Scattered among these *facetiae* are bawdy verses: the collection opens with ‘Nay pish, nay pue, nay faith’ (p. 2v), there is an epigram by John Heywood, ‘I bought thee late an old rich widow to woo’, followed by Marlowe’s translation of one of Ovid’s erotic elegies (‘In summer’s heat at midtime of day’) (p. 43), and the anonymous ‘A lady fair two suitors had’ (p. 44). The answer poems are frequently copied into miscellanies that make a point of collecting bawdy verse and jesting epigrams. In Rosenbach MS 238/27, for example, the answer poems are followed by a sequence of bawdy poems: ‘The wooing of a Puritan’ (p. 98), ‘The maid’s dream’ (‘Slumbering as I lay one night within my bed’), ‘On a faint-hearted lover’ (‘Once I stole to my sweet heart’s bed’), and ‘The definition of a maidenhead’ (‘What’s that you call a maidenhead’) (pp. 104–6). The interplay between bawdy verse and jesting epigrams works within the contextual poetics of these miscellanies to give shape to a style of low comic and burlesque poetry that will subsequently be established as a new print genre – ‘drollery’ – in the printed miscellanies of the 1650s and 1660s.

As this suggests, when the answer poems appear in miscellanies, they are typically part of a grouping of texts that share stylistic features, encouraging their reading as part of ‘a shared textual project’. The Champernowne miscellany (Bod. MS Eng. Poet f. 9), was owned by a Devonshire gentleman, Henry Champernowne (1599–1649), and is dated 1623. The miscellany is known for its large number of poems by
Donne; the frequency of its ascriptions of poems to the initials ‘J.D.’ suggests the miscellany has an investment in collecting his verse. The answer poem is copied after a section in which Donne’s poems – ‘Love’s Diet’ (pp. 9–10), ‘The Mummy’ (pp. 13–14), ‘Elegy’ (‘ffond woman wch would’st haue thy husband dye’) (pp. 14–15), and ‘The Dampe’ (p. 17) – are interspersed among those of his friends, with whom he shared verse: an epistle now attributed to Henry Wotton (‘Tis not a coat of gray or sheapheards life’), although here attributed to ‘J. D.’ (pp. 10–11); Ben Jonson’s ‘An Epistle to a Friend’ (pp. 12–13), and an epistle attributed to Thomas Woodward (‘Thou sendest mee prose & rimes’) (p. 16). The social textuality of this section of verse, described in part by its contextual poetics, simultaneously points beyond its pages to a network of friends and associates gathered around Donne. This grouping therefore assumes a coherence and a distinct identity through the material and formal processes of compiling a collection.

Immediately prior to the set of burlesque answer poems, a different generic note is introduced through the selection of jesting epigrams. ‘An English lad had long wooed a lasse of wales’ (p. 18) is attributed to ‘J. D’, although Sir John Harington is a more likely candidate. The second epigram, ‘Marcella now growne old; hath broke her glas’ (p. 18), introduces the theme of ugliness, here with a distinct misogynist inflection, within the facetious framework of the jesting epigram. Both epigrams were printed by the literary magpie, Henry Parrot, in his collection, Laquei Ridiculosi (1613), whose title locates it within a tradition of facetiae. This misogynist epigram on female ugliness contrasts with the following song, an aubade occasioned the loveliness of the mistress, ‘Stay oh sweete and doe not rise’, which again is attributed to ‘J. D.’, and was printed in John Dowland’s songbook A Pilgrim’s Solace (1612). This contrast sets up a pattern of counterpointing in terms of form and subject matter that is carried through in the set of burlesque answer poems. In formal terms, these are ‘ugly’ poems in that non-sequiturs are used for deliberately disruptive semantic and formal affect to travesty the courtly love lyric. That said, the versions in the Champernowne miscellany are not as violently crude as others. For example, the male flout lacks the quatrain:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Regard my strange mishapte} \\
\text{Joue father of the thunder} \\
\text{Send downe thy thunder clapps} \\
\text{and rent her smock asunder}
\end{align*}
\]
Nor does the female answer include her riposte to this sexual threat:

If ever I returne  
Great Queene of lightning flashes  
Send downe thy fyre & burne  
His cod-peice into ashes.

These comparatively more refined versions appear to be part of a stylistic counterpointing of ‘ugliness’ and ‘beauty’. Hence, the ‘ugly’ answer poems are followed by Aurelian Townshend’s epistle in praise of the noble and ‘Victorious beauty’, the Countess of Salisbury (pp. 20–1). Such contextual poetics support Eckhardt’s thesis that habits of counterbalancing and complementing love lyrics with bawdy verse helped to fashion a new genre of anti-courtly love poetry.\(^{28}\) Eckhardt credits Donne with playing a critical role in the formation of this genre; a point that appears to be substantiated by the way this burlesque verse exchange is embedded within a collection of his verse, to the extent that the subscription of the song ‘Stay oh sweete’ with the initials ‘J. D.’ is located on the page alongside the title to the male flout ‘To his mistresse’ – this collocation may explain why the male flout is given the title ‘Mr. Dun to his Mrs that scorned him’ in another miscellany.\(^{29}\) The Townshend epistle is followed by Donne’s ‘Valediction: of Weeping’ (pp. 20–1), then ‘The Ecstacy’ (pp. 22–4), and, just to make the point, Joshua Sylvester’s anti-courtly ‘To yonge gentlewomen at Court’, which begins with the warning ‘Beware faire mayde of musky Courtiers oathes’ (p. 25).

As we have seen in relation to the Middle Temple revels, one environment in which this genre of bawdy verse took shape was in the all-male societies of the universities and the Inns of Court. The answer poems are written in the margins of a scribally produced book of Petrarch’s \textit{Quatour Invectivarum Libri} – his four letters of invective addressed to Boccaccio – along with a couple of other little erotic verses (Bod. MS Jones 58). Petrarch’s book of invective is an appropriate generic context for this low style of bawdy verse, and may have encouraged the compiler to embellish Petrarch’s invective with contemporary erotic poetry. This little book was probably owned by a university student, who practises his name, ‘Roger Martin’, in the margins of his book. The copyist writes the first stanza of the male flout, but is then apparently distracted by another erotic poem, ‘Rosa’ (‘The rose is sweet and women like in smell’) (fol. 57v), before returning to finish copying the male flout across the bottom of the pages of his book (fols 59–65). The female
The response, given the title ‘Response sequitur’, is a truncated version, possibly because the copyist was running out of space in the margins of the book (fol. 65v), or it may be that the copyist’s primary interest was in the male flout, which often travels by itself, without ‘Her answer’, in this masculine environment of the university miscellanies. This shorter version minimises the vulgarity of the female response, particularly in comparison to the crudeness of the male flout:

Yo' letter i receued  
    bedecked wth florishing quarters  
so women are deceived  
go hange you in your garters

my beautie wch is none  
yet fain as you protest  
Doth make you sigh and grone  
fy fy you doe but iest

I cannot chuse but pittie  
yo' restlesse morning teares  
Because yor plaints are wittie  
you maie go shak yo' yeares. (fols 65v–66)

The woman’s part, while less vulgar, is diminished. The female respondent simply dismisses the suitor’s ‘praises’, rather than answering insult with insult, and taking an equal part in the battle of wits. The female author is less ‘fallen’ and shameful, but also takes a lesser part.

The contextualising of the answer poems among bawdy and jesting epigrams is particularly noticeable in those miscellanies that advertise their university affiliations. A case in point is Bod. Rawl.poet.26, a miscellany copied over many years, from around 1615 to 1660, and by a number of different hands. The burlesque answer poems appear early in the miscellany, after a series of verse relating to Jacobean politics, in a section that probably dates from the 1620s to 1640s. The page preceding the answer poems is populated with university poems – ‘Upon D' Corbet Deane of Christs-Church Oxford 1621’ (‘A reuerend Deane’), ‘Upon D' Bainbridge Mathmatick Professo' in Oxford’ (‘When Doctor Bainbridge’), and two further epigrams on Bainbridge this time ‘of Cambridge’, and jesting epigrams, some of varying degrees of misogyny, such as ‘Of a very woman’ (‘Shee that will eate her breakfast in bed’) (fol. 4v). It is perhaps not surprising that, in this context, the
burlesque answer poem becomes a university poem, and given the title ‘Mr Lawson of S' John’s College his verses to his mistresse’ – the female speaker is anonymous and generic (fol. 5).

In contrast to the mode of masculine wit showcased in Champernowne miscellany, this university culture of wit is deliberately lower and more aggressively misogynist. Following the answer poem are a series of epigrams attacking Puritan women: two variants of a Harington epigram on ‘Robin, Will, and Davy’, both taking to task the ‘daughter Gillion’, who the father wishes ‘were wele bolted with a bridle’ (fol. 5v) because ‘She-ministers’ should not ‘disputen on the Bible’ (fols 5v, 6), and the popular epigram attributed to Harington, ‘The conference of six puritanical wenches’ (‘Sixe of the weakest sexe, but purest sect’). The reworking of these earlier anti-Puritan and misogynist Harington epigrams in this later context speaks to the politics of the civil war. Hence, the misogynist jest finds a particular and repeated target in ‘puritanical wenches’ and ‘she-ministers’. The female author of the bawdy answer poem within these contextual poetics is cast in aggressively misogynist terms. The anonymity of the female author, who threatens her sweetheart with the pox and asks him to kiss her arse, means that she becomes interchangeable with the puritanical daughter ‘Gillion’ in the following verse, who should be bridled for her unruly speech. The war between the sexes that structures the answer poems is arguably more combative and divisive when read in this context of sexualised religio-political conflict.

The copy of the answer poem in Rawl.poet.26 is a text in transit that captures a verse as it passes through the pages of different miscellanies. The leaf on which the answer poem has been copied has been tipped in – it is in a different hand and on different paper from the surrounding leaves. It suggests that the poem was either given to or solicited by the compiler after this section was copied, and added at this point to complement the other, surrounding bawdy, misogynist verses. Hence, it has been carefully integrated into the miscellany both physically and thematically: on the verso of the inserted leaf is the misogynist anti-Puritan epigram on ‘Gillion’, which is written in the main hand that copies this section, and a line has been drawn across to the variant of this epigram on the facing page (fols 5v–6). There are also signs that the answer poem is about to head off elsewhere, to another miscellany. In the white spaces around the poem its first line is copied repeatedly, as if someone practised the first line of his own transcription before copying it into his own miscellany.

The answer poem is found in number of university miscellanies. A little booklet that appears to be a deliberate collection of nonsense, jesting
and misogynist verse survives in a *samllebande* in the Bodleian Library (MS Ashmole 36 & 37). The booklet is missing leaves at the end, hence the male poem is incomplete, and it is not clear whether the female response was also included, but it does illustrate the ways in which these bawdy verses were recontextualised and remade across the seventeenth century. The booklet begins with a set of nonsense verses: ‘A sonnett to couer myne Epistles taile peece’ (‘Lo I the man whome Fates haue seru’d on Sopps’), ‘Exceeding faire non sequiturs of ye Makers meete/to line ye braine pann of any sows’d Gurnord liueing’, ‘When Charing Crosse ye sonne of Summers legg/Had kittend in ye eye=lids of an Noune’ (fol. 140r). It has a similar set of university epitaphs and verses (‘On Williams ye Cleark in Merton Coll:’ and ‘On ye Christchurch men yt were forc’t to bee gonn in Parliament time’) and anti-Puritan epigrams (‘Say Puristry if it came to pass’) (fols 144–144v), alongside other jesting verse, in a similar fashion to Rawl.poet.26. The male flout in this environment is similarly read as a university poem, this time given the title ‘Mr Poldens delight of N: Coll: Oxf:’ (fol. 145v). Within this masculine milieu, it is also paired with a poem notable for its violent misogyny – a libellous epitaph on Lady Lake (‘Heere lies ye Preise of badnes, vices nurse’) – which has lost its precise historical connection, in that Lady Lake becomes Lady Wake, and is presumably copied not for its topicality, but for its nastiness, its linguistic and sexual violence: ‘A Bitch at court, a cunning stinging snake,/Woorse then all these heere lies my Lady Wake’ (fol. 145v). This mode of contextual poetics is typical of the university miscellanies of the 1640s, and illustrates how the sexual politics of this very masculine culture of wit took a distinctly violent turn as the civil wars were played out through gender and genre.

The sexual politics of the university miscellanies compiled during the civil wars are reconstituted in the royalist printed miscellanies of the 1650s. The answer poems were printed alongside verses such as ‘Nay phew, nay pish’ in *Wit and Drollery* (1656), a royalist miscellany that made a political point of printing ‘scurrilous and profane’ bawdy verse in opposition to the ‘reformation of manners’ sponsored by the Protectorate. A second edition of *Wit and Drollery* was published in 1661, following the Restoration, and again in 1682. The poems were also printed in two other post-Restoration miscellanies, *Folly in Print* (1667) and *The New Academy of Complements* (1669). A new print genre, ‘drolleries’, which encompasses burlesque, lampoons and other low literary forms, takes shape in these miscellanies. As we have seen, this genre had emerged in the manuscript miscellanies, which began consciously collecting bawdy and jesting verses earlier in the century – John
Phillips, the editor of *Wit and Drollery* (1656), claimed his anthology derived from ‘*a collection from the best Wits, of what above 15. yeares since*’. The epistle advertises *Wit and Drollery* as an antidote to an exhausted lyric tradition, ‘*stuffed with reiterated Hyperboles, or else other more pitifull whining passions of Loue*’, which the discerning ‘*ingenious*’ reader can no longer tolerate. The answer poem, now ‘*A mock-song*’, is prefaced by two epigrams, ‘On Luce Morgan a Common-Whore’ and ‘An Epitaph on a Whore’, and followed by a mock-panegyric, ‘*In praise of his Mistrisses beauty*’, and a scatalogical love song, with the refrain ‘*come kisse mine -----*’, and final line ‘*For I am all besitten*’ (pp. 19–30). Here, the anonymous ‘female author’ of the answer poem is a type of ‘*fallen woman*’, an analogue of the whore who occupies a structurally asymmetrical position to the libertine; only from this lower place of sexual licence, can she become a signifier for literary crudity and a libertine poetics. The answer poems are accommodated within the confrontational profanity of this new poetics. There is no tempering juxtaposition of the bawdy and polite; instead the emphasis is on collecting the forms of literary crudity.

Not all the new collections of drollery were as deliberately shocking as *Wit and Drollery*. The *Marrow of Complements* (1655) directed itself to young male urban audiences and offered a range of genres from ‘*Amorous Epistles*’, ‘*Instructions for Wooers*’, ‘*Songs and Sonnets*’ to ‘*Facetious Dialogues*’. This anthology does juxtapose polite and mildly bawdy lyrics. The answer poems are preceded by a series of love lyrics by Beaumont and Carew that are then followed and counterpointed by a set of *facetiæ* – a mock-Ovidian song, ‘*Hero and Leander*’, signals the shift in style and introduces the answer poems, which are then followed by a set of mildly bawdy and jesting songs on coy maidens, restless lovers and tobacco (pp. 164–77). The poems have been reworked in this context and the crudity of the female response is moderated – she merely sends her ‘*fiery flame*’ to ‘*burn thee into ashes*’ rather than targeting his cod-piece.

This is the version, with a few minor variants, also printed in *The New Academy of Complements* (1669), a miscellany marketed to a mixed-gender audience of ‘*Ladies, Gentlewomen, Courtiers, Gentlemen, Scholars, Souldiers, Citizens, Country-men, and all persons, of what degree soever, of both Sexes*, and which also mixed the ‘*Amorous and Jovial*, polite love lyrics and bawdy ballads. Here, the poems are collected among a section of royalist ballads, celebrating the Queen’s old soldier, then her old courtier, and remembering the ‘*good House-keeping*’ that ‘*is now adays grown so cold*’ (p. 228).
The earlier royalist anthology, *Prince d'Amour* (1660), begins with the account of the 1597/98 Middle Temple revels, which includes ‘A Passion’ and ‘Compassion’, as part of the republication project of the Restoration, that sought to give the new regime cultural stability through its nostalgic revivification and re-imagining of an older festive court culture.\(^\text{34}\) Neither miscellany shares the aggressively libertine politics and poetics of *Wit and Drollery*. Instead, the mix of ‘Amorous and Jovial’ verse fashions modes of sociability in which participants are imagined as bound together through shared pleasures, tastes, appetites, and modes of play and recreation. The female author is reconstituted in these comparatively more refined answer poems into a type of female wit who embodies both the ‘Amorous and the Jovial’, although the traces of her bawdy associations mean that this authorial identity is inherently unstable.

As these answer poems travel across the seventeenth century, they are recast within shifting generic frames and interpretive communities. In some miscellanies, the female-authored bawdy poem is produced for and marketed to primarily masculine audiences, even though the readership of these miscellanies was not necessarily restricted to this set of consumers. The university miscellanies of the 1640s and royalist printed miscellanies such as *Wit and Drollery* use aggressive modes of literary crudity and sexual politics to define a libertine and masculine culture of wit that sets itself against a godly ‘reformation of manners’. Yet, the answer poems also speak to and for a culture of wit that is comparatively more open to both men and women. This is one reading suggested by the attribution of the answer poems to John Hoskins and Lady Mary Jacob in the Bowyer miscellany; by the Restoration, the songs were marketed to a readership of ‘both Sexes’ and of ‘what degree soever’, in words of *New Academy of Complements*. Women are imagined as participating in the urbane culture promoted by the Restoration anthologies, and the figure of the female author engendered by the answer poem within this environment gives shape to a mode of female urbanity. Even so, as previously noted, the line between the ‘fallen woman’ and the ‘female wit’ is lightly drawn in this period. The multivalency of the author function attributed to the female-voiced answer poem, as it is reworked and recontextualised in a range of media across the seventeenth century, will not finally disclose a stable and ‘real’ female author. What the transmission of this verse does illustrate, however, is the complex processes of imagining and negotiating female authorship, particularly in bawdy verse, and the importance of attending to the layers of signification – both material and textual – when tracing the figure of the female author in her many historical and generic guises.
Notes

2. See Joshua Eckhardt’s transcription of ‘Nay, phew nay pish?’, in *Manuscript Verse Collectors and the Politics of Anti-Courtly Love Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 173–4. ‘Methough as I lay slumbring on my bed’ is in Folger MS V.a.345, p. 153; and ‘When I was young scarce apt for use of man’ is found in a number of miscellanies, including BL, Add MS 25303, fol. 79.
12. BL, Add MS 24665. The answer poems are included in a small collection of verse that is copied after the songbook, which is dated 1615.
15. The phrase is Cohen’s, see *Networked Wilderness*, p. 15.
18. Two rare anti-Bacon satires are also found only in this miscellany: ‘Blame not the poet though he makes such moane’ (fols 83–6) and ‘Heare lyes Veale whome death hath late taken’ (fol. 93v).
22. *Prince d’Amour*, pp. 69–77. According to Bartholomew Yong’s dedicatory epistle before *Diana of George of Montemayor* (1598), Lady Penelope Rich was present at these revels along with ‘many noble Lordes and faire Ladies’ (sig. A2r).
29. See Folger MS V.a.124, fol. 36.
30. This leaf carries the pot watermark and the rest of this section of the miscellany is made up of paper with the grape watermark.
Katherine Philips, ‘Philo-Philippa’ and the Poetics of Association

Kate Lilley

I first read Katherine Philips’s poems in Minor Poets of the Caroline Period (3 vols, 1905–21), a modernist compendium issued by the Clarendon Press, edited by the indefatigable tory man of letters, George Saintsbury, Regius Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature at the University of Edinburgh from 1895 to 1915.1 Philips appears in Volume 1 along with a trio of men now far more obscure than her: William Chamberlayne, Edward Benlowes and Patrick Hannay. Across the three volumes of Minor Poets, Saintsbury’s aim is to provide a reliable text of largely unavailable and, in different degrees, forgotten poets, very lightly modernised and annotated, ‘for the student and lover of literature’ (p. xvi). Most particularly, Saintsbury’s anthology is designed for potential readers who do not have access to early modern books in major libraries and whose interest is centred on the poems rather than ‘the extreme collector’s mania’ for rare books (p. iv). Besides, he writes, copies of most of these poets are so hard to come by that they are ‘not to be obtained on the asking even at [] fancy prices’ (p. iv).

Distinguishing between the ‘mania’ of the collector and the motives of the ‘student and lover of literature’, as well as between more and less privileged readers, Saintsbury also uses his introduction to critique a foreshortened and overly selective canonical model of literary history. His aim is to keep in view the ‘minor’ and to represent ‘filiations and groups and milieux’ (p. ix) as fully as possible. To this end, Saintsbury positions his own editorial labour in assembling Minor Poets as a comparatively minor supplement to Alexander Chalmers’ mammoth, 21-volume Works of the English Poets, from Chaucer to Cowper (1810), itself an expansion of Samuel Johnson’s original project. Such projects, Saintsbury argues, in their smaller and larger versions (he was a prime mover in many of both kinds), not only contribute to a richer and better understanding
of literary history than ‘a few examples, however brilliant and famous’ (p. iv) could ever afford but, at least as crucially, open the literary archive and, as a corollary literary debate, to non-specialist readers:

Nor is it enough that the historian, as he too seldom does, should have made an examination, more or less exhaustive, for himself; it is desirable that the opportunity for controlling, checking, illustrating that examination should be in the hands of the student. (p. iv)

Katherine Philips is the only woman whose poems are included in *Minor Poets* (Aphra Behn and Anne Finch are also mentioned favourably). Chalmers’ 12 volumes had included no women at all. For Saintsbury, Philips’ ‘mild muse’ is a case in point of a poet ‘much more talked of than read’ (p. 486), although he acknowledges the recent efforts of the Hull publisher and bookseller, J. R. Tutin. Tutin had published a limited edition chapbook of 15 Philips poems in 1904, the year before Saintsbury’s *Minor Poets*, selected from a 222-page octavo autograph manuscript of Philips’ poems, which he owned (and later sold to the National Library of Wales). Tutin’s limited edition ‘Orinda booklet’ is, of course, a modest product of the very trade in rare books and manuscripts from which Saintsbury distances himself, and a collectable in its own right. In marked contrast to Tutin, Saintsbury republished the full ‘authorized’ text of Philips’ *Poems* [1667] from the 1678 edition, but remarks of the unauthorised 1664 edition that ‘the delinquent book is a prettier volume’ and hardly less textually reliable. The canonising memorial edition of 1667, *POEMS by the most deservedly Admired Mrs KATHERINE PHILIPS The matchless ORINDA*, printed by the King’s printer, H. Herringman, is a handsome folio volume complete with William Faithorne’s engraved frontispiece bust of Philips (now often lacking in extant copies), a substantial ‘Preface’, and seven commendatory poems and elegies. The octavo Marriott edition of 1664 is, by contrast, smaller, leaner and plainer with a simple ornament of laurel leaves on the title page, only two commendatory poems, and an errata notice. Important as they are, these generic differences in scale and interior composition alone do not give an adequate sense of how dissimilar these books are to handle and read, or of how distinctive individual exemplars of the same edition can be. Identical multiples, entered into circulation as commodities, are privatised and customised by individual owners in a way that makes them potentially almost as individualised as manuscripts.

The nature of the binding is a critical feature of personalisation of early modern books, as are any signs of the book’s history of ownership,
circulation and use. In what follows I discuss two quite different examples relating to copies of Philips’ Poems. Peter Beal draws attention to a particularly fine association copy of the 1667 Poems containing the bookplate of the scandalous modernist lesbian socialite woman of letters, Violet Trefusis, listed for sale for £18,500 by the London antiquarian firm, Maggs Bros, in 1996. As fascinating as the association of Philips and Trefusis is (Beal notes but does not discuss it), this copy derives its high value as a collectable not principally from its author or owner but rather the quality and provenance of its binding. As the catalogue describes it:

A magnificent contemporary binding of red goatskin, the covers with a border of a gilt flower and strawberry roll, the corners onlaid in dark-blue goatskin tooled with floral volutes and a lozenge tool, central pointed panel of a triple fillet enclosing a large central lozenge quartered and onlaid in dark-blue and light brown goatskin tooled with massed volutes including a pair incorporating a distinctive eagle’s head, the intervening spaces tooled with flowers, pyramids of semi-circles, fronds and large tulips onlaid with white paper. Spine divided into seven panels, lettered in the second on a blue goatskin label, two other panels also onlaid with blue goatskin and tooled in gilt with volutes, scrolls and flower tools, comb-marbled end leaves.

My second example is a copy of the 1669 printing of Herringman’s edition, now at The Victoria and Albert National Art Library (misidentified in the catalogue as deriving from the ‘first edition’ of 1664), stamped with the armorial monogram of Anne Tighe (née Lovett, later Coote). Though far less magnificent than the copy owned by Violet Trefusis, it too has been singled out because of the interest of its binding. According to the National Art Library catalogue, Anne's copy of Katherine Philips was bound in Ireland in red calf:

Covers panelled with gold fillets and large corner ornaments. The back is panelled in gilt between six raised bands with the monogram of Anne Tighe stamped in all panels except the second which is lettered with author and title. Marbled endpapers; gilt edges; headbands.

This copy of Philips’ Poems (and another example of Anne’s armorial monogram, Thomas Fuller’s Holy State, 1633) is indexed in the online catalogue of British Armorial Bindings (http://armorial.library.utoronto.ca) along with those bearing the arms of her first husband, William Tighe. Anne,
the daughter of Sir Christopher Lovett (Lord Mayor of Dublin 1676–7) married William Tighe, the son of Richard Tighe (Mayor and High Sherriff of Dublin in the 1650s) in 1675. Books listed as belonging to William in the Catalogue of Armorial Bindings include Ben Jonson’s *Works* (1616), various titles by Francis Bacon and Hooke’s *Micrographia* (1667).

When William died in 1679, after only four years of marriage, Anne quickly remarried one Thomas Coote, a Judge of the King’s Bench in Ireland, and ancestor of the Earls of Bellamont. Here, the plot thickens: a 24-line poem, ‘The Teares of the Consort for Mr Tighe Writt by My Lord Blessington 1679’, is inscribed on the lower binder’s leaf with the transcriber’s signature, ‘Ann: Tighe: August ye 26th 1680’, and later annotated, ‘Copy’d by ye: never enough valued Mrs: Ann Coote. July ye: 25th 1700 Saturday’. The poem is attributed to Murrough Bligh Boyle, First Viscount Blessington (1648–1718), governor of Limerick and the son of Michael Boyle, Lord Chancellor of Ireland. In 1672, Murrough had married his second wife, Lady Anne Coote, kinswoman of Anne Lovett’s new husband, Thomas. Through a complex web of associations, materially witnessed in armorial devices, signatures and attributions, this 1669 copy of Philips’ *Poems*, stamped with the marital monogram ‘ANTIGHE’ (the binding must postdate the marriage of Anne and William in 1675), becomes the bearer of a manuscript elegy inscribed on the binder’s leaf, written, it seems, on Anne’s behalf (‘The Teares of the Consort for Mr Tighe’) by one of the Boyles, the family to whose Irish patronage Katherine Philips owed so much of her literary success, to whom Anne Tighe is now related through her second marriage. In keeping with the binding, and the subject of the poem, Anne signs her transcription, ‘Ann: Tighe: August ye 26th 1680’, but by this time the widow is already remarried. This catachrestic, elegiac name is, in turn, glossed and corrected twenty years later by an unknown hand: ‘Copy’d by ye: never enough valued Mrs: Ann Coote. July ye: 25th 1700 Saturday’.

Whilst Saintsbury was charmed by what he sees as the ‘delinquent’ yet modest (and, thus, feminine) 1664 edition, Philips was, famously, horrified by this same delinquency, appealing urgently to her friends and allies in London to suppress this uncontrolled breach of ostensibly controlled manuscript circulation. Her well-known letter reviling Marriott’s edition (without, according to her, ever having seen it at that time) was subsequently incorporated into the ‘Preface’ of the posthumous Herringman edition, along with an account of the difficulty of fulfilling Philip’s wish:

> When the false Edition of these Poems stole into the light, a Friend of that incomparable Ladys that made them, knowing how averse
she was to be in print, and therefore being sure that it was absolutely against her consent, as he believed it utterly without her knowledge, (she being then in Wales above 150 miles from this Town) went presently both to the Gentleman, who licens’d it upon the Stationer’s averment that he had her leave, and to the Stationer himself for whom it was printed, and took the best course he could with both to get it suppress’d, as it presently was (though afterward many of the Books were privately sold) and gave her an account by the next Post of what he had done. (‘Preface’, Poems, 1667)10

Like Philip Souers, almost three decades later, whose biography, The Matchless Orinda, was published by Harvard University Press in 1931, Saintsbury was intrigued by Philips’ standing as a woman of letters as well as her literary agency. He is, however, generally much more respectful of Philips’ poetry than Souers.11 Although, in Saintsbury’s view, Philips’ poems lack ‘the clench and grip’ of Dryden they have some of the ‘strange throb and pulse’ of Marvell. He prefers Philips’ lyrics to her odes (who doesn’t?) and praises her facility with the ‘common measure’ (p. 488). In effect, Saintsbury acknowledges Philips precisely as a ‘student and lover of literature’, an author-reader: ‘Nor will the reader who really cares for poetry fail to find other things in the Matchless Orinda which will please him; nor would she have been very sorry not to please the reader who does not so care’ (p. 489). Saintsbury recognises in Katherine Philips an admirable, early example of his ideal audience: ‘the reader who really cares for poetry’. According to Aubrey’s Brief Lives, Katherine ‘tooke sermons verbatim when she was but 10 yeares old’ and was noted for her literary precocity: ‘Loved poetrey at schoole, and made verses there. She takes after her grandmother Oxenbridge … who was an acquaintance of Mr. Francis Quarles, being much inclined to poetrie herselfe.’ Aubrey cites his cousin, Mary Aubrey, Philips’ ‘Rosania’, a close friend since their time together at Mrs Salmon’s Presbyterian school for girls in Hackney, to the effect that Katherine ‘wrote out verses in innes, or mottos in windowes, in her table-booke’.12 Aubrey’s sources are personal and, perhaps, manuscript: Mary Aubrey (‘my cozen Montague’), Katherine’s ‘cosen Blacket who … taught her to read’, and Elizabeth, Countess of Thanet:

Memorandum: — La Solitude de St. Amant was englished by Mrs Katherine Philips. ’Tis 20 stanzas — I thinke not yet printed — I had them from Elizabeth, the countesse of Thanet, 1672.

Quaere what shee wrote? (155)13
Aubrey's life of Philips, though brief, is valuable in its documentary intimacy, especially as a witness to Katherine's early life, and also in its revelation of his loose, piecemeal relation to his subject. It is, however, Philips' own posthumously published letters – in concert with her other writings – that provide the most detailed picture of a life occupied, and preoccupied, with reading and writing. Philips' letters to her well-connected friend and mentor, the courtier Charles Cotterell, Charles II's Master of Ceremonies, 'Poliarchus' to her 'Orinda', show that Philips' literary activity, broadly understood (including the writing of many highly stylised letters such as these), as well as being a matter of pleasure and obligation, is also her modus operandi: her means of negotiation on behalf of herself, her work, her husband and her friends, in changing and difficult times. The 48 letters spanning 1661 to 1664, published as *Letters from Orinda to Poliarchus* in 1705 (Cotterell died in 1701), clearly represent a selection from a more substantial correspondence. They record the constant production and circulation of letters, along with manuscripts and sometimes printed books, by post or, on occasion, in person (directly or through an intermediary). Texts are exchanged, commented upon and variously thematised, as is the unreliability and untrustworthiness of all possible means of dissemination, including the susceptibility of originals to (more or less accurate) reproduction. Various kinds of linguistic and literary subterfuge are entered into when the material is judged to be sensitive, such as referring to Anne Owen as 'Calanthe' rather than 'Lucasia' and communicating in other languages.

In 'Letter II' (9 December 1661) Philips writes:

> I am persuaded that I need not desire your Care in concealing your having seen any of Calanthe's Letters to me; and add this Caution, lest you should unawares write any thing to her that might give her the least Cause to suspect you have. (B5r)

And in 'Letter VI' (5 April 1662):

> I most humbly thank you for all your News, and for your Italian Postscript, which I perfectly understand, but am not yet able to answer you in that Tongue; in time I may, and till then be pleas'd to make use of it in whatever you intend should be private; for if I should be importun'd by Calanthe or the Uncle, to shew your Letters, I might then explain them as I thought fit. I writ something to you in French concerning her, and if I could tell you all that pass'd between her and me, I should make you at once smile, frown and wonder. (C5r–v)
One senses that these precautions and their rhetorical elaboration are motivated as much by the enjoyment of such secretive measures as any real need. In any case, they inscribe the interlacing of play and risk. For instance, Cotterell’s resort to Italian in compliance with Philips’ instructions, not only gives her another opportunity to improve her linguistic skill and impress her interlocutor, but discursively instantiate the reciprocal bond between them as at once literary and intimate. In ‘Letter XI’ (4 June 1662), in the context of their shared distress over Lucasia’s recent marriage, Philips writes, from Lucasia’s house:

If you have written any thing to me to Cardigan relating to this Affair, pray write it again to me to Dublin in Italian. ... The chiefest Comfort I have left is to converse with you. (E1r–v)

Throughout Letters from Orinda to Poliarchus, news of events and persons of mutual interest intermingle with Philips’ requests and thanks for help in revising drafts and translations, and in circulating her work at court. When Marriott’s 1664 edition of Philips’ Poems was published in London, Philips enlisted Cotterell once again as her agent, enclosing a letter within a letter, denying her consent or involvement. That letter was later reproduced in full as an authorial prosopopoeia within the ‘Preface’ to the posthumous 1667 edition. Philips documents her constant involvement in reading, writing, editing and translating, alongside her anxieties about the reliability of the post or intermediaries, the quality of her work, and its reception among friends and at court. She sends word of manuscripts and books acquired or sought, and makes reference to plays she has seen and songs she has heard in Dublin and in London. The letters record and enact the movement of texts, while at the same time offering an anxious commentary on the occasions for, and contexts of, reading, writing and performance; on genre; and on the porousness of manuscript and print. Poems are folded inside letters, take the form of verse epistles, and reply to other poems or letters. Letters and more conventionally literary forms in manuscript, print and performance cross and refer to each other, disclosing the discursively and generically complex network within which Philips, her ‘Society’ and their texts circulated, offering a finely grained sense of the textual imbrication of Philips’ daily life.¹⁶

Most of the substantial evidence we have of Philips and her milieu comes from print and manuscript writings by her, or connected with her, but other textual-material remains are also suggestive.¹⁷ Beal’s Index lists a small, intriguing set of association copies known to have been part of
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Philips’ library, under the heading ‘Books and Manuscripts Inscribed by Katherine Philips’: a manuscript of Florio’s *Giardino di recreazione* (1582), now at the British Library; Fulke Greville’s *Certaine Learned and Elegant Workes* (1633) inscribed ‘Katharine Philips her book’, now at Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge; William Chillingworth’s *The Religion of Protestants, A Safe Way to Salvation* (1638), inscribed ‘Kath: Philips Gift of Mrs. E, Lloyd of Trevagh’, mentioned in a Bristol bookseller’s catalogue of May 1859, now ‘untraced’; and Sucklings’s *Fragmenta Aurea* (2nd edition, 1648), also inscribed, ‘Katharine Philips her book’, now at Harvard. All of these different kinds of remains materially impact our understanding of the author-reader variously known as ‘Katherine [‘Katharine’] Phil[ll]ips’, ‘Kath: Philips’, ‘Orinda’, and her ‘Society of Friendship’, as well as the texts she wrote, revised, translated, copied, read, inscribed, wrote about, gifted and received.

If Philips’ ‘care’ for her own and others’ texts represents one version of Saintsbury’s ideal, my own encounter with Philips’ poems in *Minor Poets*, in a university library in Sydney, Australia, some 75 years after its first Clarendon publication, exemplifies the potentially long-term significance of such an undertaking. On the other hand, how unsuccessful Saintsbury’s call for a more inclusive literary history had been in the intervening years, at least with respect to these poets, is witnessed by the fact that *Minor Poets* had not been superseded by then. Indeed, a second edition had been issued in 1968. No separate edition of Philips’ poems had appeared, or would appear, until the publication of a version of Patrick Thomas’s 1982 University of Wales PhD thesis in 1990 by Germaine Greer’s tiny Stump Cross Books imprint. At the time of writing, there is still no book-length critical study of Philips, no contemporary biography and no modern *Selected* or *Collected*: a striking situation given the growing amount of scholarly publication on her in the last thirty years or so.18

When the explicitly feminist, paradigm-shifting Virago anthology, *Kissing the Rod: An Anthology of 17th Century Women’s Verse* (1988), edited by Germaine Greer, Susan Hastings, Jeslyn Medoff and Melinda Sansone, came out, I was already a year into a postdoctoral project on seventeenth-century women’s writing at Oxford (having recently completed a University of London PhD on elegies by men). As exciting and often bewildering as reading seventeenth-century women’s writing in original editions in the Bodleian Library was, I was at least as excited to be able to buy *Kissing the Rod* and take it home. It wasn’t simply that the apparatus and annotations helped me to understand poems I had already read, and introduced me to others I had not, though both were
true; I felt interpolated by it, one of the subjects of its address: *Kissing the Rod* was, it seemed to me, in some sense for me. I wrote my name in it, and over the years, bought more copies, mostly second-hand or, later, remaindered – as gifts, or to pass on to students – repeating and trying to repay and replay that sense of recognition and excitement it had first aroused in me. Whereas Philips had been the only woman in Saintsbury's Caroline anthology, she was now one of 50 spanning the seventeenth century in *Kissing the Rod*. Other specialist anthologies followed, including Katharina Wilson and Frank Warnke's *Women Writers of the Seventeenth Century* (Georgia, 1989), James Fitzmaurice's *Major Women Writers of Seventeenth-Century England* (Michigan, 1997), Paul Salzman's *Early Modern Women's Writing* (Oxford World's Classics, 2000), Stephanie Hodgson-Wright's *Women's Writing of the Early Modern Period 1588–1688* (Columbia, 2002) and Jane Stevenson and Peter Davidson's important *Early Modern Women Poets* (Oxford, 2001). The latter includes 297 poems by 87 women, including a substantial number from manuscript sources, never before published.19

A few years after the publication of *Kissing The Rod*, the contours of major period anthologies also started to shift. Philips was strongly represented in two important and influential revisionist anthologies. Alastair Fowler's *New Oxford Book of Seventeenth Century Verse* (1991) included eight poems and an extract from her verse translation of Corneille's *Pompey* (of Saintsbury's other ‘Minor’ Caroline poets, Chamberlayne and Benlowes – not Hannay – make the cut with one poem each). David Norbrook's 1992 *Penguin Book of Renaissance Verse 1509–1659* included seven Philips poems. Philips' inclusion in these differently constrained, revisionist canonical period anthologies marked an important turning point in the reception of her work and in the legitimation of early modern women's poetry generally. A decade later, Robert Cummings' author-driven *Seventeenth-Century Poetry: An Annotated Anthology* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2000) gives a fairly generous 10 of its 500 plus pages to Philips, while Vaughan and Cowley, the only represented members of her extended circle, occupy 15 and 20 pages respectively. The less canonical, more wide-ranging *Broadview Anthology of Seventeenth-Century Verse and Prose* (2001) includes a dozen Philips' poems. The current *Norton Anthology of Poetry* (the fifth edition) includes four poems by Philips.

In this context of widespread anthologisation, the lack of a modern print edition of Philips is especially noticeable. The three-volume *Collected Works of Katherine Philips* (Vols I: *Poems* [1990] and II: *Letters* [1992], edited by Patrick Thomas and Vol. III: *Translations* [1990],
edited by Germaine Greer and Ruth Little) is still the standard edition for scholarly purposes, despite being effectively out of print. The website for Stump Cross Books lists only ‘a few soiled copies available at half-price’ of Volumes I and II and none of Volume III. So, while critical interest in Katherine Philips has never been greater, access to her complete oeuvre depends on anthologies and, beyond that, library copies, the second-hand market and, of course, an impressive set of recently developed digital resources, available under licence. Between them, Early English Books Online (EEBO), Perdita Manuscripts 1500–1700, Eighteenth Century Collections Online (ECCO) and Women Writers Online (WWO) offer licensed readers a great deal in the way of access to most of the major manuscript collections and early modern printed books, but much less in terms of scholarly apparatus and commentary. Tellingly, a reader without ready access to the new digital resources might still need to turn to Saintsbury, this time to the open access digitisation of Minor Poets, in an uncanny repetition of the problem Saintsbury first set out to address.

I linger on these questions of how, in what form, and in what company, Philips is, and has been, made available, in a material and scholarly sense, because they are central to an analysis of the material culture of early modern women’s writing and the history of its transmission up to the present and beyond. It is an effect of revisionist feminist and materialist scholarship that Philips and a few other early modern women, once considered ‘minor’ or extra- or counter-canonical, now serve as exemplary witnesses of a revised understanding of literary history itself and how to do it. My interest lies at the intersection of the material and affective Philips, especially in the poetics of association as they can be traced from the genesis of her texts in particular occasions and relationships to their transmission and afterlife in manuscript compilation and circulation, and in print editions and individually owned books. All of the critical, biographical and editorial work on Philips belongs to that history (Saintsbury’s ‘filiations and groups and milieux’ [p. ix]). ‘Association’ is defined in the OED as ‘the action of conjoining or uniting one person or thing with another’ (OED 5a); ‘an idea or recollection linked in the mind or memory with some object of contemplation, and recalled to the mind in connection with it’ (OED 8). In relation to textual objects, this ‘conjoining’ is, in essence, an erotised aesthetic and haptic experience of proprietorial intimacy, which carries with it both pleasurable excess – call it hypercathexis, love, investment – and also the threat of loss or disappointment. The multifarious history of acquiring, binding, marking, annotating, treating or otherwise
doing things with and to texts, suggests that, at least for readers who ‘care’ enough in Saintsbury’s terms, it is not sufficient simply to possess the object: it must be perpetually reanimated or risk becoming a melancholic dead letter.

I have already used myself as one such example of this hypercathexis in relation to *Kissing the Rod* as just one instance of this experience of powerful attachment known to every ‘student and lover of literature’. Katherine Philips’ compelling perseverations on loss, desire and textuality belong to a cognate discourse. She writes of her ‘incorrigible inclination to that folly of riming’ (A2v), in the letter embedded in the 1667 ‘Preface’. The unknown author of this ‘Preface’ (once assumed to be Cotterell) draws attention to Philips’ ‘way of writing familiar Letters, which she did with strange readiness and facility, in a very fair hand, and perfect Orthography’ as well as ‘the excellent Discourses she writ on several subjects’ (a1r). In so doing he gestures towards a more expansive and complete text of Philips as a woman of letters, surpassing even the limits of the impressive volume his remarks serve to introduce: ‘they would make a Volume much larger than this, and no less worth the reading’ (a1r). This intimation of more to come is partly fulfilled by the publication of the *Letters* in 1705, and incrementally augmented by the addition of one letter to the second edition of 1729. On the other hand, the ‘authorized’ 1667 folio’s supersession of the more humble edition of 1664, so forcefully repudiated by Philips before her death, has elicited expressions of regret or ambivalence from some readers, such as Saintsbury and Loscocco. In her ‘Introductory Note’ to the Ashgate facsimile edition of Philips, Loscocco writes:

If the 1667 folio was a major event in women's literary history, however, it is a major problem in Philips scholarship, given its success in obscuring her lifetime achievement of major works published through coterie transmission, stagings, presentation copies and print ... its preface turns her highly conventional apologetic response to the 1664 piracy into a portrait of the artist as a hyper-feminized young woman; and its hagiographical tributes portray her as royalist patriarchy’s favourite daughter. (p. xvi)

Against what she regards as the deficits of a print-bound Philips, Loscocco posits the remediating effect of the manuscript-centred scholarship on Philips already under way. In so doing, she partly distances herself from her own labour in representing the canonical Philips in these deathly facsimiles confined to ‘printed writings’, rhetorically and
critically aligning herself with the greater openness and liveness of the manuscript Philips to come.

It is true that these are exciting times for lovers of Philips. Now widely recognised as central to any consideration of the literary ambitions and achievements of women in the early modern period, and women’s literary history as such, work on Philips is emerging across the spectrum of disciplinary ‘turns’: feminist, queer, affective, material, political, philosophical, archipelagic. Without a doubt, this critical juncture in Philips’ reception is an effect of the development of early modern women’s writing as a field of specialisation by many hands over the last 35 years or so. More than a generation of scholarly labour in research and teaching, and in the development of print and digital resources, alongside other widespread changes in the academic study of literature and other humanistic disciplines, has brought us to this place.

As interest in Philips has ceased to be confined to specialists in early modern women’s writing, she has become a striking figure of critical convergence and generational rereading. For instance, Hammill’s fascinating essay, ‘Sexuality and Society in the Poetry of Katherine Philips’, in *Queer Renaissance Historiography* (2009), revisits and revises Carol Barash’s landmark study, *English Women’s Poetry 1649–1714: Politics, Community, and Linguistic Authority* (1996), finding in Philips’ ‘Lucasia’ poems of the 1650s the ‘search[] for a new political vocabulary of pleasure’ (p. 194) in ‘mutual benefit’ (rather than self-interest) (p. 188) and ‘self-governance’ (p. 202): ‘replacing the model of erotic friendship based on the monarch’s rights over life and death that she displays in the earlier Rosania poems with a model of erotic self-governance whose norms are embodied by a natural order of harmony and unity’ (Hammill, p. 197). Hammill stresses Philips’ ‘subtle’ inscription of Neoplatonist discourses, and her commitment to ‘forms’/‘Forms’ and harmonious aesthetics as a mode of textually, sexually, socially, politically and generically imbricated negotiation.

From the standpoint of book history, Peter Beal has described the publication of Philips’ posthumous *Poems* (1667) as ‘one of the great milestones in the history of women’s literature’ (*Scribes*, p. 172). Following Beal, Gillian Wright, in *Producing Women’s Poetry, 1600–1730* (2013), stresses the ‘generic variety’ and ambition of Philips’ oeuvre and celebrates her literary success as an ‘extraordinary personal achievement’ (pp. 98–9), but also argues, in the same vein as Loscocco, that it is the print-based ‘post-Restoration image of Philips which continues – to an often unrealised extent – to determine how her writing is read and perceived, even in the twenty-first century’ (p. 100).
From a variety of literally and figuratively threshold positions, Katherine Philips skilfully and self-consciously negotiated competing claims in a high stakes environment. Philips’ mobile – even labile – position with respect to overlapping cultures and practices of gendered textual production and circulation make her a fascinating and consequential figure for a material analysis of early modern authorship. As well as the material forms and genres of writings by and associated with Philips, the circumstances of transmission command attention in themselves. Philips’ writings were transmitted directly and indirectly, by letter and by hand, in scribal and autograph copies; through public and private performance; in print anthologies and single-authored volumes. The shift in Philips’ status from a predominantly manuscript poet in the 1650s to an icon of female access to the prestige of a posthumously established and celebrated oeuvre was accelerated by her untimely and rapid death from smallpox in June 1664. However, the passage from manuscript to print, writer to author, was equally the consequence of Philips’ literary celebrity and consolidation of elite connections during and after her sojourn in Ireland; especially the success of her free translation of Corneille’s *Pompey* in Dublin and London stagings and print editions. Importantly, the canonising 1667 Herringman edition of Philips’ works includes both poems and plays, with separate title pages for each of the plays, and its commendatory apparatus emphasises *Pompey* as Philips’ crowning achievement, both thematically and materially, memorialising the cultural capital Philips derived from the Irish court. In effect, *Pompey* was completed, performed and published as a play commissioned by Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery. The commendatory apparatus of 1667 likewise decisively connects the 1667 edition, and the value of Philips’ entire oeuvre, to the genesis and performance of *Pompey* in Dublin. In that sense, coterie manuscript production and circulation is inscribed in the apparatus of print as the cynosure of its prestigious origin. By the time Philips’ reputation was sealed in the posthumous edition, manuscript and print, public and private, written and performed modes of transmission, were thoroughly entwined.

I want to conclude this chapter with a reading of ‘To the Excellent Orinda’ as an association poem; one that decisively unsettles any understanding of *Poems* (1667) as entirely conservative. Saintsbury’s *Minor Poets* must have literally introduced me to this anonymous commendatory poem, along with the other tributes that make up the front matter of the posthumous *Poems*: Cowley’s ‘Upon Mrs. Philips her Poems’ and ‘On the death of Mrs. Katherine Philips; ‘The Earl of Orrery to Mrs. Philips’; ‘The Earl of Roscommon to Orinda’; James Tyrrell’s ‘To
the memory of the excellent Orinda'; and Thomas Flatman's 'To the memory of the incomparable Orinda'. It was not until I reread 'To the Excellent Orinda', now separated from the rest of the front matter and recontextualised in *Kissing the Rod*, that it really caught my attention.

The enigma of the anonymous 'Philo-Philippa's identity and her ambitious poem certainly piqued Philips' curiosity and has never been established. Philips introduced 'To the Excellent Orinda' to Cotterell as quite distinct from the quantity of run-of-the-mill tributes to which she refers as an undifferentiated, uninteresting mass:

I have had many Letters and Copies of Verses sent me, some from Acquaintance, and some from Strangers, to compliment me upon Pompey, which were I capable of Vanity, would even surfeit me with it; for they are so full of Flattery, that I have not the Confidence to send them to you. One of them, who pretends to be a Woman, writes very well, but I cannot imagine who the Author is, nor by any Inquiry I can make, have hitherto been able to discover. I intend to keep that Copy by me, to shew it you when next we meet, which I heartily wish may be soon, it being one of the greatest Felicities I propose to my self in this World, and which I will endeavour to compass once before I die with all the Contrivance and Assiduity I am capable of, being more than all the World besides, &c. ('Letter XXVI')

Interestingly, she does not offer to send a copy of the poem to Cotterell, as she usually does, promising to reveal it only in person. At once secret- ing and disclosing, Philips' insistence on proprietorial physical proximity to the manuscript – it is hers, addressed to her, for her – suggests its pow- erful, unsettling effect. She defers its circulation while teasing Cotterell and exciting herself. The projected unveiling of this triangulating poem in one sense amplifies its erotic promise but also associates its proximate revelation with the meeting of Philips and Cotterell in real time and space and the end or suspension of the epistolary romance of 'Orinda' and 'Poliarchus'. Of course, the triangulating effect of the anonymous poem also works in another direction: as 'Orinda' prepares to leave Dublin and finally separate herself from her lost love-object 'Lucasia', the manuscript of 'To the Excellent Orinda', as a token of its putatively female author, 'Philo-Philippa', stands surety for the possibility of finding a new object or at least being a loved object for another woman (writer).

Besides being a declaration of love, 'To the Excellent Orinda' also announces the appearance of an unknown rival to Orinda's 'bold work' – another highly accomplished female poet writing through and
about Philips’ ‘more than masculine pen’, and claiming to be ‘rear’d’ by her:

That Sex, which heretofore was not allow’d
to understand more than a beast, or crowd;
Of which Problems were made, whether or no
Women had Souls; but to be damn’d, if so;
Whose highest Contemplation could not pass,
In men’s esteem, no higher than the Glass;
And all the painful labours of their Brain,
Was only how to Dress and Entertain:
Or, if they ventur’d to speak sense, the wise
Made that, and speaking Oxe, like Prodigies,
From these they morfe than masculine Pen hath rear’d
Our Sex; first to be prais’d, next to be fear’d.
And by that same Pen forc’d, men now confess,
To keep their greatness, was to make us less. (lines 25–38)²¹

Intertextually inscribing her intimate familiarity with Philips’ writing and its reception at the Dublin court, Philo-Philippa’s poem establishes her credentials as a passionately engaged reader of Philips and intimates an uncanny physical proximity to her. The stalkerish redoubling of attention and closeness, evidenced in and as Philo-Philippa’s epideictic poem, makes sense of Philip’s reaction: her ambiguous desire to keep the poem ‘by her’. The fact that the poem entered print circulation as part of the front matter of Philips’ posthumous Collected – indirectly through Philips’ eventual transmission of the manuscript – installs Philo-Philippa and her poem in this proximate, coupled, transitive relation as a material witness to the hinge between pseudonymous and signed female authorship in manuscript and print. More than this, so far as we know, both Philo-Philippa and her poem find their textual substance in the discursive address and figuration of precisely these gendered questions between women only in this unique text.²² Whereas Philips produced and, to varying degrees, circulated, a self-consciously literary, multi-genre oeuvre over a substantial period, as well as a cache of letters commenting on that ‘incorrigible’ activity (also incorporated into her literary oeuvre) the fact that ‘Philo-Philippa’ never did come forward, and no other text known to be by her has ever surfaced, makes this one-off encounter all the more extraordinary:

Thus pleasingly the Bee delights to die,
Foreseeing he in amber tomb shall lie. (lines 119–20)
Even here, however, Philo-Philippa's 'more than masculine pen' is drawing its own matter from its object, intertextually reprocessing the amber-tombed bee of Philips' 'My Lucasia'.

Over and over again Philo-Philippa's poem produces this kind of reflexive, intertextual, metacritical *mise en abyme*, a simultaneously positive and negative genealogy, both claiming and disclaiming. The final lines of 'To the Excellent Orinda', ostensibly praise Orinda's modest 'unconcern' with praise:

> But why all these Encomiums of you,  
> Who either doubts, or will not take as due?  
> Renown how little you regard, or need,  
> Who like the Bee, on your own sweets doth feed?  
> There are, who like weak Fowl with shouts fall down,  
> Doz'd witgh an Army's Acclamation:  
> Not able to induce applause, they fall,  
> Giddy with praise, their praises Funeral.  
> But you, Orinda, are so unconcern'd,  
> As if when you, another we commend.  
> Thus, as the Sun, in your Course shine on,  
> Unmov'd with all our admiration:  
> Flying above the praise you shun, we see  
> Wit is still higher by humility. (lines 179–92)

Here, Philo-Philippa's praise of Philips/‘Orinda’ implicitly extolls her own anonymity as exemplary ‘unconcern’ even as she celebrates Philips' crossing into unambiguously public view. This paradox ambiguously memorialised, entombed, in the substance of the posthumous 1667 edition, literally binds Philips and Philo-Philippa together in a textual crypt reminiscent of the double burial imagined by Philips in the final stanza of ‘To Mrs. Mary Awbrey at parting’:

> A dew shall dwell upon our tomb  
> Of such a quality  
> That fighting armies thither come  
> Shall reconciled be.  
> Wee'l ask no epitaph, but say  
> Orinda and Rosania.23

‘Philo-Philippa’s ‘To the Excellent Orinda’ frames her address to, and reading of, Katherine Philips specifically as a mediated textual encounter between female author-readers. Although ‘Philo-Philippa’
addresses Philips by her *soi disant* coterie name, ‘Orinda’, the pseudonymous name she devises for herself precisely troubles the distinction between historical proper name and literary persona, named author and anonymous reader, producing a perpetual frisson between subject and object as the sign of the doubled female author-reader. The radical transitivity of the signature ‘Philo-Philippa’ positions ‘her’ and her panegyric as textual effects both of loving Philips–Orinda’s writing and the love of writing itself. The poem’s structure of address absorbs or engrosses the person of the embodied, historical female *author*, Katherine Philips, imitating Philips’ own rhetorical strategies on the occasion of the decorously masked ‘Orinda’s emergence into public view with the successful public performance and subsequent printing of her free translation of Corneille’s *Pompey*. The ambiguous rewards of authorial claiming – both sought and disavowed by Philips – are thematised and restaged in Philo-Philippa’s poem as a form of knowing, dramatic irony.

Philo-Philippa’s skilful play on the force and meaning of textual naming and signature for writing women is characteristic of the poem’s sophisticated negotiation of the imbricated relationship of manuscript and print, reading and writing. Rather than attempting to place herself directly as another self-nominated member of Philips’ ‘Society of Friendship’, ‘Philo-Philippa’ emulates Katherine Philips’ singular authorial status, signalling her desire to write as ‘Orinda’ does – ‘Thee I invoke, Orinda, for my Muse’ – while erasing her own name in a mode of imitation that problematises the relationship between historical and literary identification. Teasing out Marie-Louise Coolahan’s suggestion that, in marked contrast to Philips, ‘Philo-Philippa’’s ‘determined anonymity’ is ‘strangely at odds with the poem’s celebration of women’s writing’, I suggest that ‘Philo-Philippa’ is precisely galvanised by the problematic of female literary encounter and its attendant practises, writing and reading, textual exchange and address, while revelling in the erotics of secrecy.24 If the performance of Philips’ *Pompey* in Dublin in early 1663, and Philips’ own residence in the city at that time, was the ostensible occasion for ‘Philo-Philippa’s poem-gift, she also shows herself to be a politically and sexually inward reader of Orinda’s earlier manuscript verses. Her excited, eroticised tribute is engendered by her witnessing of this transitional passage in the emergence of Philips/‘Orinda’ into public view as a celebrated woman of letters, proficient across genres and languages. The fact that ‘To the Excellent Orinda’ was introduced into coterie circulation by Philips herself suggests that there was something at stake on both sides of this anonymous encounter. The language
of Philips’ letter to Cotterell registers the intensity of her attachment to this manuscript poem from an unknown female admirer: ‘I intend to keep that Copy by me, to show it to you when next we meet’; an attachment commensurate with the charged nature of the poem itself. Like Philips’ print debut in the memorial Cartwright volume, ‘Philo-Philippa’ is the lone woman among the mourners in Philips’ Poems, the odd one out in various ways, but her novelty is also diminished in proportion to the becoming-monumental of the posthumous authorial signature, ‘Katherine Philips’. The always-unattributed ‘Philo-Philippa’’s bold poetic gift ends up as a kind of purloined letter, a relic of an encounter that is, and must remain, textual.

This elaborately anonymised poem in praise of a named female author, assimilated into the production of the posthumous Philips’ exceptional status, persists as a highly visible and eloquent witness to the problematic of early modern female signature and the poetics of association. As Philips wrote, in ‘Not to oblige Lucasia by my voice’: ‘they admire best who dares imitate’.25

Notes

2. Katherine Philips (‘Orinda’), *Selected Poems*, ed. Louise Guiney (Hull: J. R. Tutin, 1904, The Orinda Booklets No. 1). Tutin printed 1,000 copies of this limited chapbook of 47 pages. It must have sold well since he issued a second edition in 1905 of 666 copies, styled as Extra Series No. 1. Tutin published many such limited editions, devoted to sixteenth-, seventeenth-, eighteenth- and nineteenth-century poets, including *Four early English Poetesses*. Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle, Katherine Philips (“Orinda”), Aphra Behn (“Astraea”), Anne, Countess of Winchilsea (“Ardelia”), The Hull Booklets. no. 7. [1908]. The Philips manuscript is now known to scholars as the ‘Tutin Manuscript’, NLW MS 775B. For a detailed description of this and other Philips manuscripts, and their provenance, see Peter Beals’ invaluable online *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*. <http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/authors/philipskatherine.html>. For an extremely helpful overview and discussion of Philips in manuscript and print, see Gillian Wright, *Producing Women’s Poetry, 1600–1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 97–145.
generally much indebted to Beal’s magisterial discussion of the material history of Philips’s texts in chapter 5 of *Scribes* and its related appendices.

5. Beal’s detailed note describes the binding and this copy’s history at auction, including its association with Trefusis, *Scribes*, p. 178, n. 68. He also reproduces as Plate 97 another ‘sumptuous contemporary binding’ of Herringman’s 1667 edition, now at the Huntington Library, p. 179.

6. As an added bonus, the Faithorne engraving is also intact. A full-page colour photograph follows in the catalogue. *Bookbinding in the British Isles: Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century*, Part 1 (London: Maggs Bros, 1996), p. 86, item 46. ‘Association copy’ is a well-known term of trade, part of the bibliophiles’ language of enhanced interest and value. The earliest citation for this sense of ‘association’ given by the OED is from the *Gentleman’s Magazine* of 1882: ‘Speaking of books with an association reminds us of that most destructive craze of the present day, the collection of book-plates’ (no. 252, p. 92). Definitions of association copies, whether commercially or bibliographically motivated, focus on the provenance and transmission of individual copies, and tend to centre on literal, material traces of the hand of the author and authorial intent. Books simply signed by the author are usually less valuable than authorially inscribed copies, but the value of authorial marks can also be equalled or trumped by those of significant owners. In the end, of course, the vicissitudes of the market are shaped by many factors, especially the desires of collectors and the perceived rarity of the item.

7. The Victoria and Albert National Art Library also holds copies of Philips’ *Pompey* (1663), *Poems* (1667) and *Letters from Orinda to Poliarchus* (1705) donated by Alexander Dyce, the distinguished nineteenth-century literary editor and scholar, as part of the extensive Dyce Collection. Dyce’s notable anthology, *Specimens of British Poetesses* (London, 1827), includes four poems by Philips. For details of all this material, see the online catalogue of the National Art Library of the Victoria and Albert Museum, <http://catalogue.nal.vam.ac.uk>.


10. As Hilary Menges aptly reminds us: ‘the letter in which [Philips] claims to be “so little concern’d” for her reputation was itself crafted as a public document, which she explicitly asked Cotterell to display to others at the recently restored Court. This compelling fact goes unmentioned in most discussions of the 1664 publication.’ Hilary Menges, ‘Authorship, Friendship, and Forms of Publication in Katherine Philips’, *SEL [Studies in English Literature]*, 52.3 (2012): 517–41, at 529.

11. Philip Webster Souers, *The Matchless Orinda* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931). The print biography was based on Souers’ 1928 Harvard dissertation. He finds in Philips ‘an interesting personality’ whose poems and, especially, letters are ‘real’, ‘intimate’ and ‘detailed’ (pp. 4–5), ‘with an interest quite apart from their literary worth’ (p. 5); her friendships
are ‘always genuine’ and ‘unaffected’ (p. 263), a model of ‘true feeling’ (p. 264). These qualities notwithstanding, he writes, ‘for us, she is merely a minor poet of the seventeenth century, whose glory has departed, though her couplets have remained’ (p. 3), ‘at best no better than the best of any minor poet at any time’ (p. 4).


13. Elizabeth Boyle, Countess of Thanet, Philip’s ‘Celimena’, was part of the Dublin court. She was the occasion of several Philips poems, including one of her last, ‘To the Countess of Thanet, upon her Marriage’. Interestingly, Aubrey does not seem to have had a copy of the posthumous edition of Philips (or at least does not have it with him at that time) in which ‘La Solitude’ is included in the French original and Philips’ translation, pp. 170–83. He may have had a copy of *Poems, by the Incomparable, Mrs. K.P.* (1664), which did not include ‘La Solitude’.


17. In his Index to *English Literary Manuscripts*, Beal records 10 primary Philips manuscripts. Some of these have been digitised and described by the Perdita Project. For the most detailed current critical consideration of the manuscripts and scholarship on them, see Gillian Wright’s enormously helpful *Producing Women’s Poetry, 1600–1730*, chapter 3: ‘The extraordinary Katherine Philips’, pp. 97–145. Beal’s *Index* offers the most up-to-date and comprehensive assemblage of information on Philips’ material history and the scholarship on it.

18. Thomas published a short 70-page study of Philips in the ‘Writers of Wales’ series, funded by the Welsh Arts Council: Patrick Thomas, *Katherine Philips* (*Orinda*), (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1988). A facsimile edition of *Poems* (1667), edited by Travis Dupriest, was published by New York Scholars’ Facsimiles and Reprints in 1992. Three facsimile Philips volumes, edited by Paula Loscocco, appeared as *Early Modern Englishwoman. Printed writings, 1641–1700*, Series 2, Part 3, Vols 1–3 (Ashgate: Aldershot, 2007). A search of the MLA bibliography gives a tally of 124 items, with more than 30 scholarly chapters and journal articles in each of the 1990s and 2000s, and 10 so far in the current decade. The MLA lists 15 dissertations on Philips. This is by no means a complete list but gives a good indication of the exponential increase in scholarly publications on Philips in recent decades. Publication and scholarly interest are, of course, not exactly the same thing: the first not only suggests how much work has been being done on Philips but how viable that work has been in the scholarly venues indexed by the MLA Bibliography.

19. This is by no means a complete list of anthologies of Renaissance and Early Modern Women’s Writing but it does cover some of the most important interventions and teaching texts produced in the period following *Kissing The Rod* by scholars in Britain, North America and Australia. For a nuanced discussion of this topic, see Alice Eardley, ‘Recreating the Canon: Women Writers and Anthologies of Early Modern Verse’, *Women’s Writing*, 14.2 (2007): 270–89.

20. Rebecca Lyn Tate’s 1991 edition of Philips’ *Poems* is available as a free pdf but does not seem to have been much taken up by scholars as yet. Catherine Cole Mambretti’s ‘A Critical Edition of the Poetry of Katherine Philips’ (unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 1979) has been quite widely cited but is comparatively difficult to access.


22. Wright and others have speculated that the identity of ‘Philo-Philippa’ may have been known to the editor of the posthumous edition of 1667.


25. Alone among the many poetic tributes to Philips, this poem has remained firmly attached to Philips and the transmission of her poems. ‘To the Excellent Orinda’ is included, along with Philips, in Saintsbury, Greer, Broadview, and Stevenson and Davidson. Its only printing independent of Philips, so far as I have been able to determine, is in Andrew Carpenter’s anthology, *Verse in English from Tudor and Stuart Ireland* (Cork: Cork University Press 2003), where it figures, in part, the tantalising possibility of discovering further texts by ‘Philo-Philippa’ or other highly literate early modern Irish women like her.
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Late Seventeenth-Century Women Writers and the Penny Post: Early Social Media Forms and Access to Celebrity

Margaret J. M. Ezell

In the eighteenth century, Susanna Centlivre (c. 1669–1723) was the most performed English playwright after Shakespeare. In the late 1690s, however, she was an obscure young woman with a chequered past trying to make her way in London’s commercial literary world. She made her London literary debut in 1700 by having a selection of her ‘private’ letters published in a miscellaneous collection of prose and verse collected by Tom Brown, *Familiar and Courtly Letters, Written by Monsieur Voiture ... to which is added a Collection of Letters of Friendship, and other Occasional Letters, Written by Mr. Dryden, Mr. Wycherley etc.* This chapter will explore two features of this event: the strategic use of Centlivre’s letters as autobiographical documents in an initial step towards the creation of a commercial persona, one modelled on the posthumous marketing of Aphra Behn’s works, and how Centlivre and other women embraced new technologies for conveying their material texts to London printers and booksellers at the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning decades of the eighteenth century to enter the public literary market place, for celebrity, profit or both. The strategic publication of personal and familiar letters by Centlivre and her contemporaries such as Catharine Trotter call into question how we typically classify writings as being intimate, private or familiar; it also raises issues about the impact of new technologies of textual transmission, in this example the Penny Post, on our perceptions of the nature of such textual artefacts. Finally, the literary products created by these writers through their manipulation of the intimate and the social document, I will argue, affected scenarios of authorship in ways that resemble what we are currently experiencing with social media and online publication.
Booksellers well understood and responded to the reading public's desire for other people's letters during the latter part of the seventeenth century. As literary historians have noted, the printed epistle was an ubiquitous genre during the period.\(^1\) In the decade of the 1690s, when the bookseller Samuel Briscoe began publishing Aphra Behn’s love letters as part of her collected works, there were, according to Early English Books Online (EBBO), nearly 400 items published that feature the word ‘letters’ in their titles. In contrast to the modern response to letters as documents offering a window into the individual soul that writes them, Eve Bannet and Janet Todd have convincingly argued that for readers in the 1690s and the early eighteenth century, the letter as format and as object would always signal multiple possible purposes. On the one hand, physical letters served as legal evidence to establish identity and truth in court cases, and their contents represented first-hand information about people and events; on the other, printed letters offered readers witty entertainment, often suggesting access to a social group probably a level above one’s own status, and they also proclaimed their value not as objects but as models for self-improvement through social fashioning. And, as Bannet has observed, as late as the eighteenth century, there was a clear expectation that even the ‘real’ material personal letter was an object for display and ‘would be read aloud to family, friends and acquaintances, and/or shown around, to give everyone something to talk about’.\(^2\)

Even given that domestic audience, it may still seem problematic to us that a seventeenth-century woman would seek to print her private or ‘familiar’ correspondence. Our model of early modern female authorship is constructed on a premise that stresses the transgressive nature of print publication as being a violation of modest feminine decorum and the supposed desire for privacy to retain one’s reputation. In this context, the publication of texts that had a prior concrete existence as personal communications between friends or lovers, texts whose very physical layout on the page conveyed intimate meaning, would indeed be putting a piece of one’s self on the market.\(^3\) However, exploring the ways in which some women self-consciously used the transformation of seemingly personal artifacts into purely textual ones as a mechanism for entering print causes us to reconsider terms such as ‘familiar’ and private in this public commercial space.\(^4\) Todd has gone so far as to argue that the modern understanding of ‘the authenticity of private writing … [which] mean[s] that we value letters because they have the appearance of genuine, modern subjectivity’ is strongly at odds with a seventeenth-century perspective on the nature of letters.
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and of their contents. Her argument is that Restoration period letters in general are inherently public and textual in nature, designed to be both entertaining and encoded, and they are spontaneous only through artifice.

Todd attributes this simultaneous public/private aspect in Restoration correspondence in part to the publication of Charles I’s private correspondence with Queen Henrietta Maria, a turning point in the shaping of public opinion during the English Civil War, and the subsequent use of the government post office service as a means of political intelligence-gathering during the Interregnum. During the politically turbulent years of the Exclusion Crisis (Parliament’s attempt to block the succession of the Catholic James, duke of York), the time during which Behn was writing and Centlivre and Trotter were growing up, personal letters were sometimes the only evidence produced in the very public treason trials, particularly in the fictive Popish Plot in 1678 and the very real Rye House Plot in 1683. Todd concludes that ‘the eighteenth-century sense of the private letter was foreign to Behn’s period not only when it was in a legal context’, and ‘it would be a naïve person indeed who could assume a right to privacy in the Restoration’, she concludes (‘Fatal Fluency’, p. 426).

The very title of Brown’s miscellany in which Centlivre’s letters were published highlights the variety of types of letters it contains – ‘familiar’, courtly, ‘letters of friends’ and ‘occasional letters’ – some of which would seem to suggest an expectation of privacy and material existence prior to publication and others a self-conscious display created solely for the entertainment of prospective readers, whoever they might be. We can find numerous examples of the latter in other publications contemporary with Centlivre’s debut, such as the 1699 The Beau’s Academy, Or the Modern and Genteel Way of Wooing and Complementing; this volume includes sample letters as part of its editors’ larger efforts to entertain their readers with ‘the Misteries of Love and Eloquence’, offering the ‘Theatre of Courtship’ and ‘Love’s Library’ for their readers’ assistance in composing their own letters. Thus the artificial, artfully composed printed letter supposedly could enable the reader to create their own private, intimate objects of exchange.

One example of such a letter book targeted specifically for women is the volume by Henry Care, The Female Secretary (1671), whose title page assures the purchaser that ‘each degree of Women may be accommodated with a Variety of President for the expressing themselves aptly and handsomely on any Occasion proper to their Sex’. Care, who would go on to be more well known as a journalist, asserts in his
preface that the purpose of the volume of practical sample letters is to ‘Guard [the] trembling Authors from the Lashes of Censure’.Listing his reasons for publishing it, he brushes aside the ‘hackney’ explanations of printing at the urging of friends and for the good of the public, admitting that there is a ‘pleasing vanity of seeing his Name (and Picture too if he could have got it,) in the Front of a Book for Folks to gaze at on a Stall’ in addition to the ‘refreshing Profit of the Copy’ (A4r). Interestingly, he suggests that another possible motive was that he had it published ‘at the Command of a Mistress, who had (with our Modern Poetesses) resolv’d to own it her self; till on a second Reading she grew asham’d on’t’, and thus he took over that role for her.

The letter format as a genre also commanded, or perhaps seduced, particular responses from their readers, responses which were well understood and utilised by printers and publishers. A personal letter, as opposed to an announcement or epistolary declaration, expects a letter in return. Seventeenth-century readers of the handwritten subscription newsletters of this period, such as Muddiman’s or Williamson’s, were urged not just to read the news, but also to write back from their particular location. It is noteworthy that by the end of the century, printed versions of newsletters such as Dawks’s Newsletter, begun in 1696, mimicked the format of a personal letter by using italic font to imitate handwriting and leaving a blank space at the top headed ‘Sir’ for a handwritten personal salutation, continuing that effort to create familiarity and reciprocity between publisher and purchaser. The material on which it was printed likewise heightened the impression that one was receiving a personal letter from London: the newsletter advertised that it was done ‘upon good writing paper, and blank space left that any gentleman may write his own private business’ in addition to the news, and it is noted that the printed italic text ‘will be useful to improve the younger sort in writing a curious hand’.10

Physical letters, whether Dawks’s printed version or handwritten ones exchanged between friends, travelled from writer to reader through various means, from a friend visiting London to a servant employed to carry documents. After the 1680s, however, writers had a new method for conveying their letters, the Penny Post. Publishers and booksellers were quick to see the possibilities for this new mechanism for transporting material texts for print publication in London. The entrepreneurial bookseller John Dunton’s first independent venture into publishing in the 1690s was the creation of an interactive journal, The Athenian Gazette, in 1691, later styled The Athenian Mercury. It was published twice a week and its contents were based on questions submitted by
readers by the new venture, the Penny Post, to be answered by a group of learned gentlemen:

All Persons whatever may be resolved gratis in any Question that their own satisfaction or curiosity shall prompt 'em to, if they send their Questions by a Penny Post letter to Mr. Smith at his Coffee-house in Stocks Market in the Poultry, where orders are given for the reception of such Letters, and care shall be taken for their Resolution by the next Weekly Paper after their sending.\textsuperscript{11}

Copies sold for a penny; in his autobiography, Dunton notes happily that with the announcement of the scheme, ‘we were immediately overloaded with Letters; and sometimes I have found several hundred for me at Mr. Smith’s Coffee-house in Stocks Market’.\textsuperscript{12} Significantly, a large enough number of women sent their letters that in 1693 Dunton published \textit{The Ladies Mercury} separately for four weeks.\textsuperscript{13}

Dunton’s specific mention of a new communication network for the conveyance of material texts, the Penny Post, begun by William Dockwra in 1680 and taken over by the crown in 1682, highlights the ways in which booksellers and publishers soon capitalised on this new textual technology and used it to obtain access to groups of readers and writers in the 1690s. The Penny Post also brought access to the London commercial literary world for individuals who previously might not have even considered offering their writings for publication. These included genteel, pious young middle-class women such as Dunton’s ‘Pindaric Lady’, Elizabeth Singer, as well as those aspiring writers who resided a sufficient distance from central London to have made physical access to the booksellers and coffee houses problematic before.\textsuperscript{14}

Readers of letter manuals, or compendiums of model letters, were also encouraged to be writers as well as readers, and to write their own letters modified to suit their particular situation; readers of collections of other’s letters are frequently admonished in the prefaces to please send their own witty missives or ones received from friends to the publisher for printing.\textsuperscript{15} For example, in his letter from ‘the bookseller to the Reader’ opening his 1693 \textit{Letters of Love and Gallantry … All Written by Ladies}, Behn’s publisher Samuel Briscoe explains he must now bring it out in two volumes: ‘The Report of my going to print the Adventures of Olinda, written by her self, in some Letters to a Friend’, he reveals, ‘having Rais’d an Emulation in some other Ladies, several others were sent me by the Penny Post in unknown Hands, while the first were in
the Press, with a desire to have them also publish'd. I joyfully embrac'd the Proposition,' he concludes.16

Unfortunately, these young ladies sent their letters too late to meet the publication deadline, but Briscoe announces that he has ‘resolved to print ’em in another Volume not doubting in the least but the Ladies letters will meet with a very favourable Reception, since Letters are so much in Vogue’ (p. 3). He produced it in 1696, the same year as his publication of his initial volume of Behn’s fictions. Such ladies who are reading volume one and who are ‘desirous to promote this Undertaking, and to favor the World with any Letters in prose of Verse upon all manner of Subjects, to be inserted in the next Volume, are desired to direct them to my Shop in Russel-Street, Covent-Garden, over against Will's Coffee-House’. This example highlights how not only the publisher but also the readers were aware of the potential of a new technology of textual transmission and how it might affect who might be able to become a print author.

The letters by Olinda that made up Volume 1 subsequently were revealed in Briscoe’s 1718 publication *Familiar Letters of Love, Gallantry, and Several Occasions* as being the first publication of Catharine Trotter (1674?–1749). Trotter would subsequently go on to have several successful plays produced, including *Agnes de Castro* (1696) and *Fatal Friendship* (1698); her verses on the death of John Dryden appeared in *The Nine Muses* (1700), the same volume as did Centlivre’s first known published poem. Trotter’s literary interests and energies expanded, and in 1702 she anonymously printed her *A Defence of the ‘Essay of Human Understanding’, Written by Mr. Lock*, to refute charges that it advocated deism. The young teenaged Trotter, however, began her negotiation of the commercial London literary world, as would Centlivre, by her success as a seemingly artless, although witty, correspondent writing to a friend, not by writing letters as a poet or dramatist seeking a patron.

In doing so, Trotter and Centlivre were not suggesting that their letters, material or invented for the press, had been published without their knowledge or consent. In some other popular publications featuring women’s correspondence, however, the appeal was clearly that these letters were material texts not intended for general consumption, and that they are based on documentary artifacts. The precedent for the publication of women’s supposed intimate correspondence can be found in the wildly successful fiction *Lettres portugaises*. *Lettres portugaises* was originally published in French in 1669 and was translated into English by Roger L'Estrange in 1678 as *Five Love Letters from a Portuguese Nun to a Cavalier*; the original text enjoyed some forty
editions before the end of the century and was translated into multiple languages, with spurious sequels and responses proliferating to such an extent that the term ‘portugaise’ came to signal a particular type of emotional discourse found in love letters written at the height of passion.\textsuperscript{17} Controversy ranged over the identity of the author, and throughout the nineteenth century many argued that they were genuine letters of the nun Mariana Alcoforado (1640–72), although twentieth-century critics have mostly agreed that it is a work of fiction by Gabriel-Joseph de la Vergne, Comte de Guilleragues.\textsuperscript{18} However, as critics have noted, it was the air of authenticity, the voyeuristic sensation that one was reading the private words of a real woman in the throes of intimate passion, that propelled interest in the story.

The publication of Aphra Behn’s love letters by Briscoe in the series of editions printed in the 1690s also invoked for the reader a sense of sharing intimacy without the contrivance of the author, and it also provoked critical controversy among readers over whether indeed they were by her, or as in the case of the Portuguese letters, by a male writer attempting to mimic female passion. Briscoe had started publishing Behn’s collected ‘histories and novels’ in 1696, seven years after her death. The title page to his 1698 collected edition and the part issued in 1700, however, are noteworthy in the ways the material included inside has been repackaged. The title pages of the 1698 and 1700 editions draw attention in ways that previous collected works had not to the information that this volume contains not only Behn’s ‘never before printed’ short fictions, but it also tempts the reader by alerting them that Behn’s own witty letters to her Dutch suitors are now embedded in a narrative of her life by a female acquaintance, with an added enticement of including Behn’s own highly personal ‘Love-Letters to a Gentleman in England’.

Behn’s works were clearly money-spinners – over thirty titles with her name were published in the decade after her death. This appears particularly true for Briscoe, who since beginning his trade in 1691 two years after Behn’s death, had already issued multiple formats of her works during the decade.\textsuperscript{19} In Briscoe’s marketing of Behn, unlike Dunton and his own publications of unknown, anonymous and probably unpaid Penny Post young women writers, it is clear that one of Briscoe’s intentions is to keep the name and image of his author fresh in his readers’ eyes, touting her celebrity and literary fame both during her lifetime and continuing after her death – one wants to read them because they are by the famous, witty Aphra Behn. In his dedications and prefaces to the readers of these volumes, he repeated refers to her as the ‘celebrated’ Mrs Behn: in his dedication of \textit{The Wandering Beauty}
to Edward, earl of Darwentwater, Briscoe likewise stresses that in his efforts to publish ‘the last remains of the Celebrated Mrs. Behn’, that even a decade after her death, while the general reputation of ‘Novels is so sunk for some Years, that it shews an extraordinary desert in Mrs. Behn, that they are still in general esteem’.20

For subsequent critical readers, the attribution of pieces in Briscoe’s volumes, especially the short fiction, has been a topic for debate in similar terms as was the authenticity of the Portuguese nun. Critics have pondered whether the love letters were ‘real’ letters or even whether by her or a paid hack writer, questioning whether Briscoe was simply a parasitic exploiter of Behn’s genuine reputation at the time.21 We know little about Briscoe, other than from the information he includes in his letters to readers and on his title pages, and for a fleeting appearance in fellow bookseller John Dunton’s autobiography. For biographers of Behn such as Janet Todd, Briscoe figures as a somewhat villainous figure, ‘eager to exploit and sensationalize the dead author’ (The Secret Life, p. 12). In her complete edition of Behn’s fiction, Todd is at pains to point out the posthumously published short fiction involving eight short stories including ‘The Adventure of the Black Lady’, ‘The Unfortunate Bride’, ‘The Dumb Virgin’, and ‘The Unhappy Mistake’, that ‘it is impossible to say how many of these texts were written in their entirety by Behn, and, if they were, whether they were in a state intended for publication’ (The Works, 3, x). A leading candidate for the authorship of the short fiction is Charles Gildon, who wrote a brief memoir of Behn’s life included in the posthumous publication of her play The Younger Brother: Or the Amorous Jilt (1696) and who penned the dedicatory ‘Epistle’ to Simon Scroop that opens Briscoe’s third edition.

The perplexities involving Briscoe, Gildon and Behn’s posthumous texts and the various repackagings of Behn’s life and works during the 1690s prompt some interesting questions. Not only do they raise the perennial puzzle of what we know about Aphra Behn and how we know it, but also the various configurations of the posthumous editions of her works serve as an occasion to consider the ways in which commercial publication practices were involved in creating audience desire. Leaving aside the issues raised by attribution of the pieces and attempting to establish which letters are or are not by Behn, however, in the context of commercial publishing in the decade of the 1690s, these posthumous volumes of Behn’s collected writings seem to fit neatly in the company of the other collections featuring ‘real’, as in actually transmitted material letters to and from actual named individuals, as found in Brown’s miscellany.
Part of the appeal of reading published love letters or a collection of familiar letters both in the seventeenth century and today is the implicit offer of the possibility of establishing a sense of familiarity or intimacy between writer and the completely unknown print reader, who thus vicariously has access to their social world. This depends on a belief that the printed version is based on an actual material text that had been in circulation, whether through the Penny Post or by hand, in other words, an object with an aura of materiality and authenticity. Unlike the commercial letter manuals to be imitated or the witty academies of complementary letters to be read aloud and shared, Briscoe’s composite volumes are advertised to the reader as the ‘never before published’, letters that are offered as real exchanges between real people, that is, letters by people with recognisable names, often to people with recognised names, that exist independently of the printed text as material documents. Behn was well known during her lifetime for her hospitality and network of literary and theatrical acquaintances: letters by Aphra Behn thus would seem to offer a reader access to her celebrity friends, a visit to that private world and that previously closed social network.

The permeability of this distinction between handwritten letters gathered and shared and those written expressly to be converted to print for imitation or entertainment is highlighted in the revised title page of the 1698 edition of Behn’s prose. This accents the addition of different types of letters, and strategically resituates the ‘Love Letters to a Gentleman’. The supposed letters exchanged between Behn and her Dutch suitors Van Bruin and Vander Albert and her exchanges with a young university admirer began part of the narrative of the expanded memoir, and no biographer subsequent to the eighteenth century that I have read thinks that these were actually letters by Behn. The letters to Hoyle, however, have been viewed by many of Behn’s biographers and critics as important sources of information about her private life.

These printed letters served as the foundation for Ruth Salvaggio’s early 1993 argument for Behn as a pioneer in the expression of women’s desire. Salvaggio characterises Behn as ‘a woman writer who was deeply dissatisfied with the plot of the conventional love story – as she both wrote and lived this narrative’. Her unconventional heroines purse their passions, Salvaggio argues, because of Behn’s own problematic love life as captured in her letters:

Yet a crucial aspect of Behn’s dissatisfaction with the love story is also to be found in her letter writing, specifically in a series of letters that her biographers believe she wrote and addressed to John Hoyle.
These epistolary expressions of desire afford an intriguing example of what Linda Kauffman calls the ‘doubling’ of ‘letter as literature, literary as a letter’. But because for Behn these letters were not by any means purely literature, they also force us to come to terms with the letter as ‘female autograph’, to use Domna Stanton’s term – in this case, the letter as direct expression of a woman writer’s own experience of desire.23

Although Salvaggio has generations of earlier biographers of Behn including Woodcock, Vita Sackville-West, Maureen Duffy and Angeline Goreau to support her view that these were genuine love letters to Hoyle, this initial critical representation of these letters as autobiographical by critics, both as being personal letters from Behn to Hoyle and as being a direct, transparent expression of the experience of female desire, has more recently been questioned by critics.

With the inclusion of these ‘real’ letters, the memoir is altered, and it begins to read very much like passages from the short fictions. The revised memoir with its letters to and from comic suitors, includes romantic slapstic-style adventures using the bed swap trick, and Dutch admirers who send her love letters couched in the language of trade, shipping and piracy:

Oh, Fair English Woman! [Or Fire ship] ... for thy Eyes indeed are like that, destructive, tho’, like Brandy bewitching: Alas! They have grapp’d my Heart, my Fore-castle’s on fire, my Sails and Tackling are caught, and my upper Decks are consumed. (Histories, p. xviii)

The expanded memoir, indeed, offers a compendium of how not to write love letters. The unknown female friend who serves as the memoirist in the revised 1696 version recounts how ‘I went to visit her one Day, and found with her a young brisk pert Fop very gaily dress’d, and who after an Abundance of Impertinence, left us’ (p. xxxi). ‘Aphra Behn’ herself then shares with her his attempts at fine letter writing. The two women laugh heartily over his ‘academic’ style, and the narrator comments,

You have, indeed, reply’d I, a most extraordinary Lover of him, but whose folly is too gross to be so long entertaining has he shall think fit to be impertinent. Why truly (reply’d Astrea) he is grown so troublesome now, that I shall be forced to use him as bad as his Wife has done in my own defense. (p. xli)
With the addition of these letters and the expanded narrative, including the dialogues between the narrator and Aphra Behn in which the fictional letters are embedded,Behn has become a witty heroine acting very much like those in one of her texts. Simultaneously, the movement of the love letters supposedly to Hoyle from being the last item in the 1696 volume to being the end of the memoir section in 1698, as several critics have noted, serves to heighten the perception of them as being authentic and as being material documents forming part of Behn’s biography.

In contrast to Trotter’s own creation of the artless pseudonymous correspondent through her letters, this construction of Aphra Behn’s posthumous persona by her publisher through the strategic deployment of letters as both biographical documents as well as artful fictive entertainment suggests the ways in which the manipulation of personal materials could lead to the establishment of a celebrity-type persona.

Cultural critics such as Joseph Roach and Felicity Nussbaum have convincingly pointed to Charles II’s restoration court culture and the new London theatres and their actresses as the beginning of celebrity culture. Until Twitter at least, such critics have tended to think of media ‘celebrity’ as a largely modern phenomenon driven by iconic visuals. In the example of Behn and Briscoe, however, booksellers were deeply involved with creating and commodifying female literary celebrity based on letters, not pictures, offering the reader not an image, but a familiar voice. Nussbaum has pointed out how Restoration actresses such as Nell Gwyn and Elizabeth Barry sought celebrity as they ‘openly, even ostentatiously displayed and circulated’ private information about their lives and passions, thus encouraging their spectators to ‘invade their privacy’. Furthermore, these actresses also cultivated followers ‘[by] actually performing a version of that privacy on stage’, with the effect that, ‘the early actresses manipulated privacy into a construction of an imagined offstage personality’. In his 2005 book Messages, new media critic Brian Winston likewise wishes to refute the idea that ‘celebrity is … a modern obsession’, and he also uses the example of Nell Gwyn. As Winston notes, her well-known offstage affair with her onstage acting partner Charles Hart gave their audience ‘an entirely modern frisson’ – through her performances, her circulated images in paintings and engravings, her notoriety as the King’s mistress. ‘Who knows not her name?’ he quotes the Earl of Rochester as speaking of her. Winston’s comment, of course, leads one to ask whether social media such as Twitter are giving contemporary users a completely Restoration frisson, a point to which I shall return later.

The actions of actresses such as Barry and Gwen, both ‘public women’, both friends of Behn for whom she wrote, seems not unlike Behn’s
posthumous image being constructed in part on her work, but also in part on the strategic display of her preserved handwritten letters and the crafting of memoirs by her ‘private friends’. Creating a marketable female literary name and presence was achieved in this example not through an image or bodily performance but through text, a manipulation of print to create an artificial sense of intimacy through reading purportedly real personal correspondence that had passed from hand to hand among friends. Letters as a genre have had a very long tradition of being appealing reading, but creating interest in a writer or in oneself through the public release of previously private artifacts seems to be a newer application.

Against this backdrop of the beginnings of celebrity culture, we find more women entering into the commercial literary marketplace at the turn of the eighteenth century than ever before. Centlivre, who, like Behn, arrived in the London literary world with a highly ambiguous personal past, also turned to print publication and the stage to support herself. Details of her early life, like Behn’s, are still murky. Abel Boyer (1667?–1729), the future royal lexicographer, declared in the biographical note done at her death that Centlivre came from humble origins and had received little formal education; stories also circulated that she had run away from home to join a strolling acting company, was married and widowed by the age of fifteen, and even perhaps that she had lived disguised as a young man in Cambridge.28 As mentioned earlier, after arriving in London, she made her literary debut in 1700 by having a selection of her ‘original’ letters published in Brown’s miscellaneous collection of prose and verse, *Familiar and Courtly Letters, … to which is added a Collection of Letters of Friendship, and other Occasional Letters, Written by Mr. Dryden, Mr. Wycherley etc.*, a volume that has been described by Brown’s biographer as a way of assisting the again nearly bankrupt Sam Briscoe with his financial difficulties.29 The same year saw the production her first play, the tragedy *The Perjur’d Husband*. The five letters by her in this volume are headed ‘Mrs. C-----ll’ after her first married name, Carroll, and are a witty exchange holding off an importunate suitor.30 They are a good indication of what would become one of her trademarks in the comedies she wrote, clever women fending off not very clever but persistent men, and, like Trotter’s first publication, while perhaps these letters were ‘real’, they read very much like conventional witty dialogues found in letter guides for women.

The following year, Abel Boyer published *Letters of Wit, Politicks and Morality … to which is added a large collection of Original Letters of Love and Friendship* (1701). Unlike her initial contribution to Brown’s collection, those by Centlivre do appear to be ‘original’ in the sense that they
are part of a series of exchanges between named individuals. Literary criticism has not always had completely positive responses to writers who request their friends to return their personal letters so that they may be edited for publication, – as seen, for example, in the backlash against Alexander Pope’s decision to do so. It is clear, however, that this is precisely what the young Susanna Carroll did for this volume and that some friends obliged and some did not, resulting in odd gaps and abrupt breaks in any narrative flow. Letters 15–46 form a sequence between Centlivre, Boyer, the playwrights George Farquhar and Jane Wiseman, and others, dated as being written in 1700, some of which make direct reference to the contents of the previous year’s miscellany.

In her letters, Centlivre, still styled Carroll, uses the name Astraea, and one of her correspondents takes the name Celadon, the sobriquet of Behn’s fellow spy William Scott. As her biographer observes, ‘Mrs. Centlivre no doubt desired to attract attention by imitating Mrs. Behn in calling herself Astraea and her correspondent Celadon’ (pp. 19–20). One could argue that she is also self-consciously attempting to create a public persona for herself as a professional woman of letters by permitting the general reader tantalising glimpses of both herself and her social network through the publication of their private correspondence. She is thus participating in a process so artfully exploited on stage and off by Restoration actresses, the creation of a type of celebrity persona derived from the commodification of personal artifacts and documents. She was simply ‘Mrs. C------l’ in her first appearance in a volume containing established professional writers whose names, such as Dryden and Wycherley, would sell the work; by her second appearance, she has made the change from presenting herself as unknown if witty young woman sharing her letters to that of a professional writer with a circle of interesting acquaintances, one who deliberately invokes Aphra Behn as her model.

Periods of transition between different types of media for communicating information, whether scientific, social or for entertainment, enable the commercial hosts of that media to have multiple roles. Such transitional times offer readers new ways to access to known ‘celebrity’ writers such as Dryden and Behn, but they also create new literary spaces – miscellanies and interactive periodicals – that draw in a new group of amateur participants, some seeking to become celebrities, some simply seeking social contact. As with the publication of miscellanies whose contents feature a combination of authors with name recognition, with gentlemen and ladies writing under their initials or a pseudonym, recent new publishing practices today such as blogs and
social media sites likewise permit and encourage the involvement of an entirely new group of participants, who may – or may not – go on to seek commercial benefit.

The young ladies sending their letters by Penny Post to Sam Briscoe, it seems to me, may have modern counterparts in the young women in Japan who create novels transmitted by their cell phones and posted on the Internet in social media spaces such as Maho-ise-land or ‘the Magic Island’. Like the letters from young ladies, the Keitai shosetsu or cell phone novels are primarily written ‘by and for young women’, and ‘purport to be autobiographical’. Much like Briscoe’s Olinda, Urania and Eugenia, the authors of cell phone novels adopt one-word names such as ‘Mika’, whose novel Love Sky made the transition from the Internet into print and was number one on the literary bestseller list in 2007, or ‘Mone’ whose Eternal Dream was then published as a three hundred-page hardback novel. The first novel to make the transition from the Magic Island to print was Yoshi’s Deep Love (2002), which sold over 2.5 million copies and become, in the words of the critic Rita Raley, ‘a discourse network including manga, a television series, and a film’. Focusing on love, pregnancy, betrayal, incurable diseases and sexual danger, the cell phone novels have been described as important ethnographic documents for Japanese sociologists, preserving the ways in which young Japanese women talk about and create narratives of their fictional selves, and as unutterable trash by serious literary authors. Unlike traditional commercial novels, keitai shosetsu are unedited, direct submissions from the writer to the audience, a practice described by Dana Goodyear as ‘revolutionary, opening the close ranks of the literary world to anyone who owns a mobile phone’ – perhaps revolutionary in the age of mass commercial media, but replicating a space for publication familiar to those readers in the 1690s responding to Dunton and Briscoe’s requests for materials for miscellanies and gazettes.

Another feature of current social media publication that shares characteristics with the London literary landscape in the 1690s is highlighted by Raley in her 2010 article on ‘Mobile Narrative as Composed Experience’, when she observes that the key feature of successful keitai shosetsu is interactivity between readers, writers and media hosts. Once a segment of the narrative is posted on a shared media space such as the Magic Island, readers then comment, make suggestions and create their own narratives in response to what they read, an enticing possibility that Sam Briscoe and John Dunton with his periodical publications had already mastered. One of the few Americans venturing into this new electronic environment, Barry Yourgrau, an established short story writer...
writer whose fictions had been translated into Japanese, attempted his own *keitai shosetsu*. Although over 100,000 readers accessed his novel, it was nothing compared to the 3.25 million readers of *Tomorrow’s Rainbow*, and Yourgrau realised it was because of ‘interactivity. My lack of it, that is.’ ‘I wrote my stories in the old, author-as god way: me writer, you reader. *Keitai shosetsue*, however,’ Yourgrau notes, ‘exist in vast online pools where writers and readers engage each other.’38 As part of this engagement, the conventional defining boundaries between amateur and professional writer, between personal, familiar, public, formal and commercial become permeable, much in the same way that the periodical and miscellany publications offered space for aspiring young writers, and their publishers also suggested models of creating a public literary persona by playing with and manipulating such distinctions.

The early careers of Centlivre and Trotter shed light on to the changing nature of the London commercial literary environment, with the development of new methods to convey material manuscripts to the booksellers and publisher. Their careers also raise issues about the ways in which the available technologies for textual transmission can affect both the type of literary product in demand as well as who writes and who reads it, issues that continue today. Seen against the context of modern social media, Centlivre’s and Trotter’s use of autobiographical documents to construct celebrity personas hardly seems unusual. Our generation has the example of ‘lonelygirl15’ who in 2006 posted a series of video blogs on YouTube, sharing her thoughts and supposedly, ‘the story of her first kiss’.39 This led to a MySpace page where ‘lonelygirl15’ in 2007 had over 17,000 ‘friends’. Even after it was revealed that she was neither 15 nor lonely, but a mature actress creating publicity about her movie project, the fans kept following.

Furthermore, as social media critics have observed, it is not only those who are actively seeking to make a living by advertising themselves in this way who respond to social media sites by creating a persona. Much like the pastoral pseudonyms associated with seventeenth-century coterie texts in circulation among friends being used to both mask and amplify identity, the nature of modern social media, like participation in coterie social writing, propels us towards artistic self-fashioning.40 Through the manipulation of multiple types of social media to create online identities, elaborate journalistic ‘hoaxes’ have unsettled traditional print news sources, such as the blog run in *The Guardian* supposedly written by ‘a gay woman in Damascus’ reporting on contemporary upheavals in Turkey, which was revealed to be a male academic living in the UK. More recently, ‘TheIneffableSwede’ writing about misogyny
in online gaming was revealed in the Swedish newspaper *The Metro* as being an elaborately constructed persona created through six years of contributing hundreds of online comments on political stories in traditional news sources (in effect, electronic letters to the editor), reinforced with a Facebook presence, YouTube accounts and website containing photographs (not) of her. Of her activities, one commentator who tracked ‘her’ Facebook persona Veronika Larsson noted ‘Veronika never seems to have been after money or other profit in her stunts. All she wanted was to tell her story, exact, cohesive and with lots of detail, over and over again, in many different places’ (Werner, ‘Who is Veronika?’). ‘Contemporary communication technologies also facilitate our becoming public exhibitionists,’ Baron declares bluntly; ‘users of information technology not only spend their hours reading blogs and watching YouTube videos but also packaging themselves however they please to put out on the Net, reality be damned’ (*Always On*, pp. 214–15). This is a sentiment that might well resonate with Henry Care and his model letters for women to adopt for their own purposes, as well as Trotter’s and Centlivre’s creation of fictional personas Olinda and Astraea through the publication of their handwritten letters.

Such correspondences between the young women seeking to publish the details and the physical documents of their private lives during the end of the seventeenth century to create a fictional identity, whether for sheer celebrity or for profit, and to use the new technology of Penny Post to convey their writings to a wider audience with those writers making use of new media today suggest how complicated and unstable terms and issues governing authorship and publication practices actually are. The comparison of these early forms of what I see as forerunners of social media with examples from today’s highlight how issues of public/private, celebrity/commercial are also linked to the technologies of textual transmission. What elements are shared between the seemingly disparate concepts of personal, professional, shared among friends, followed by millions, pseudonyms, celebrity, and the individual writer?

The two collections in which Centlivre’s letters appear suggest some answers. They include the publication of both formal letters displaying the writer’s literary wit along with ‘personal’ letters; the two types of texts give the purchaser/reader the synthetic experience of participating in the social network of celebrity writers and also of reading writers whose lives might resemble their own, a group they might even be able to join through sending their own letters to a London bookseller. The new types of interactive publication formats in the 1690s were made possible in part by the mechanism of the Penny Post, which provided
a means of access especially for young women to the world of London printers and booksellers. This new technology for transmitting material texts in combination with new types of publication ventures also seemingly offered membership into a type of social network. Those aspiring young literary men and women who eagerly sent their letters and those of their friends to Briscoe’s shop next to Will’s Coffee House in hope of publication today appear to have their counterparts sending their supposedly autobiographical writings to ‘the Magic Island’, studying how to keep their followers up to the minute with their amusing tweets, and becoming active and visible participants in larger cultural discussions through their fictional personas supposedly based on material artifacts.

Notes
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14. For further history of the Penny Post and the British Postal system during the early part of the eighteenth century, see George Brumell, The Local Posts of London 1680–1840 (1938) and T. Todd, William Dockwra and the Rest of the Undertakers: The Story of the London Penny Post (1952).


22. All the Histories and Novels Written by the Late Ingenious Mrs. Behn, Entire in One Volume … Together with The History of the Life and Memoirs of Mrs. Behn. Never before Printed. By one of the Fair Sex, 3rd edn (London: Samuel Briscoe, 1698).
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On 19 November 1845, Henrietta Halliwell-Phillipps started to transcribe a manuscript of an early modern play, noting in her diary: ‘I began to copy another MS. Play sent him [ie her husband, James Orchard Halliwell] by Mr Larking called “Love’s Victorie” found among Sir T. Dering’s MSS’ (240). Henrietta was a highly skilled copyist, trained by her father, the obsessive early nineteenth-century book collector Sir Thomas Phillipps. Henrietta’s is a rather romantic story, especially if you have the sensibility of a bibliophile. Her irascible, eccentric father had amassed a remarkable collection of books and manuscripts when, in 1842, he entertained James Orchard Halliwell, who had first written to him as a precocious Cambridge undergraduate. Halliwell and Phillipps’s eldest daughter Henrietta fell in love, and subsequently eloped after Phillipps’s anger was roused over the issue of Henrietta’s dowry. Phillipps’s fury continued unabated after Henrietta and James married, and he directed a great deal of it against Halliwell, who had most probably engaged in some slightly shady practices in relation to the theft of certain Cambridge manuscripts. Phillipps constantly tried to ruin Halliwell’s budding career as a professional man of letters, and he cut off virtually all contact with his daughter until his death in 1889. (In something of a nose-thumbing gesture, albeit scarcely a brave one, upon Phillipps’s death, James and Henrietta changed their last name to Halliwell-Phillipps.)

The year that Henrietta transcribed Love’s Victory was a particularly trying one for her husband. He was accused by the Keeper of Manuscripts at the British Museum of stealing the Trinity College Cambridge scientific manuscripts that gave him an entrée into Thomas Phillipps’s collection. For the whole of 1845 this turned into a cause célèbre, although Halliwell was eventually declared innocent. In the
midst of this difficulty, Halliwell produced a voluminous amount of work, much of it editions of early modern and medieval manuscript material. He was beginning to focus his attention on Shakespeare, and would in time become a significant Shakespeare scholar. His *Outlines of a Life of Shakespeare*, which he worked on between 1881 and 1887, is still regarded as a milestone in the field.

What we might call the *Love’s Victory* project grew out of James Orchard Halliwell’s engagement with the library of early modern plays collected by Edward Dering in the 1620s and 1630s, which in 1844 was still housed in his estate of Surrenden in Kent. A local clergyman, the Reverend Larking mentioned by Henrietta in her diary, excited Halliwell’s interest with a manuscript adaptation of *Henry IV* found at Surrenden, and which Halliwell promptly edited for the Shakespeare Society. In his slightly laboured and self-serving introduction, Halliwell establishes that this manuscript was an adaptation for performance at Surrenden by Dering and his friends, as evidenced by the cast list found within the manuscript. The edition of the *Henry IV* manuscript was a real coup for Halliwell, and he was clearly hoping that further treasures to enhance his reputation would be found lurking among the Surrenden/Dering collection. In 1846, Halliwell edited another Dering manuscript located by Reverend Larking, an interlude called *The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom*. During this time Henrietta was working intermittently on her transcription of *Love’s Victory*, noting on 2 December 1845 that she ‘copied some of Love’s Victorie’ – while also trying ‘my new song “Love’s Serenade”’ (p. 242). Her relatively slow progress was surely in part due to the busy life she led at the time, as she was engaged in a substantial amount of proofreading, and was transcribing other material. Just to note some examples from around the same time as her work on *Love’s Victory*, Henrietta did extensive work on James’s *Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words*, which was published in 1846; she transcribed *The Man in the Moon* (BL, Harleian 2253) in 1847; and she transcribed *Sir Triamour* from Cambridge MS Ff2.38, which James published in 1848 in *Specimens of Early English Metrical Romances*.

Neither Henrietta nor James had any idea who wrote the play. James evidently asked John Payne Collier for his opinion about the authorship of *Love’s Victory*. Collier at that stage was a reputable authority on early modern drama, and was yet to be exposed for compulsive forgery, an exposure in which Halliwell himself was to take part. Collier’s response to James’s query about the manuscript is in a letter sent on 16 May 1846, in which he writes ‘the play of “Love’s Victory” which
you have in MS must be, I suppose, R. Chamberlain’s, printed, if I am not mistaken in 1638’. As Arthur Freeman explains, this speculation of Collier’s, while understandable, was wrong on a number of counts, including the misdating of Chamberlain’s play, and the conflation of it with James Shirley’s The Doubtful Heir, or Love’s Victory. It is impossible to tell exactly what Henrietta and James made of this attribution, but by the time James published extracts from the play in 1853, he had presumably checked Henrietta’s transcript against Shirley and Chamberlaine’s plays and realised that it was different. He and Henrietta still had not found out who the author was, and the extracts were described as being from an ‘unpublished MS. Drama of the Seventeenth Century’ (p. 212). Ironically, Henrietta’s father Thomas Phillipps owned the manuscript of Mary Wroth’s ‘Pamphilia to Amphilanthus’, which he had bought in 1836. It is impossible to know if Henrietta and James ever even looked at this manuscript, or if they had, whether they would have identified the hand as the same as that in the Dering Love’s Victory manuscript – probably unlikely given that ‘Pamphilia to Amphilanthus’ is written in Wroth’s most careful italic hand and looks at least at first glance quite different to the Dering (but not to the Penshurst) Love’s Victory. The manuscript transcribed by Henrietta was in fact what is now known as the Huntington Library Manuscript of Mary Wroth’s pastoral play, Love’s Victory.

I have written elsewhere at length about the complex transmission history of the two extant, autograph manuscripts of Wroth’s play. Here I want to concentrate on the implications of Henrietta’s creation of a third manuscript of Love’s Victory, but it is worth noting to begin with that when Henrietta transcribed the Dering manuscript of Love’s Victory, two manuscripts were in circulation. Perhaps it would not have altered Halliwell’s ultimate dissatisfaction with the play, but had he and Henrietta come upon the Penshurst manuscript, which was offered for sale by Puttick and Simpson in September 1850, they might have moved closer to solving the riddle of the author – although Puttick and Simpson mistook it as a work by Mary Wroth’s famous aunt, Mary Sidney. Where the Penshurst manuscript is a highly polished, extremely beautiful presentation manuscript, ornately bound, the Huntington Manuscript is bound in plain vellum, and contains numerous corrections, as well as lacking a final part of Act V. While Wroth wrote her two surviving presentation manuscripts, the Penshurst Love’s Victory and the ‘Pamphilia to Amphilanthus’ manuscript held by the Folger Library, in her clear, formal italic hand, the Huntington/Dering manuscript of Love’s Victory is a mix of this hand and her less formal italic
hand. Figure 8.1 shows the first page. It is also faded and blotched and at times comparatively difficult to decipher, and was probably in that state when Henrietta was transcribing it, given that it has been in the care of the Huntington Library since some time early in the twentieth century.

When Henrietta completed her transcription of the manuscript, James, rather oddly, deposited it in the Plymouth Library. Over the course of his life, James was to make numerous donations to a number of libraries, including quite obscure ones, such as Penzance. This was part of his ambitious establishment of himself as a scholar, but also someone who made a living from his scholarly and quasi-scholarly activities, including the sale and resale of books and manuscripts, as well as his own publications. Henrietta’s transcript of Love’s Victory was to sit in the Plymouth Library for around seven years until James decided to publish a catalogue of the eclectic collection of manuscripts that he had himself presented to the library, including the Love’s Victory transcript. The catalogue, entitled A Brief Description of the Ancient and Modern manuscripts Preserved in the Public Library, Plymouth, lists this as manuscript number 102: ‘Love’s Victorie, a Play, copied from the original MS. In the possession of Sir E. Dering, Bart. 4to.’ (p. 21). As well as a catalogue, the volume contains a heterogeneous set of transcripts (they are scarcely editions as they have no notes), including some material relating to Simon Forman, the whole of a tragi-comedy attributed to James Shirley called The General, which takes up the greater part of the volume and makes one wonder if this might be another of Henrietta’s transcriptions, a poem by Nicholas Breton, a woodcut of Mother Shipton, summaries of two tracts, and extracts from Love’s Victory. The Love’s Victory material consists of about a fifth of the entire manuscript of the play, with the extracts presumably chosen for their poetic value, though James offers no explanation for his choices.

James begins by explaining that while the Love’s Victory manuscript appears in the catalogue listing as number 102, he has in fact substituted another manuscript for it, and that ‘The exchange was made under the impression that the play was worth printing. … but it was not found to be of sufficient interest for publication, when minute examination came to be made’ (p. 212). This implies that Henrietta’s transcript was deposited at Plymouth along with a miscellaneous batch of manuscripts from James’s collection, and then retrieved later for publication. Unfortunately, Henrietta’s transcript has not been traced, and we have only the printed extracts. However, the tangled situation with substitute manuscripts, and James’s confusing explanation, had
Figure 8.1  Love's Victory, Huntington Library, HM 600, fol. 1

Source: Reproduced by permission of the Huntington Library, San Marino, California.
the effect of producing an illusion that there might be a third *autograph* manuscript of Wroth’s play. I want to suggest here that we can consider Henrietta’s transcript and the publication of extracts from it by James as a significant ‘publication event’ in the life of what has traditionally been seen as Mary Wroth’s least visible work.\(^\text{17}\) The misconception that Henrietta’s transcript was an original manuscript was provoked by James’s description of it as being in quarto, while the Huntington manuscript is in folio. Accordingly, when Michael Brennan came to edit the Penshurst manuscript of the play in 1988, he treated the Plymouth manuscript as if it might have been Wroth’s, and queried the existence of an autograph manuscript held by Dering.\(^\text{18}\) This quite understandable confusion was cleared up by Arthur Freeman, but the fact remains that we need to acknowledge a Henrietta Halliwell Phillipps version of *Love’s Victory* in circulation in the nineteenth century, preserved now, unfortunately, only within the published extracts edited by her husband. There was therefore an intermediary between Henrietta’s text and the extracts, but I think it is well worth considering how we might read the version of *Love’s Victory* presented to the public in 1853, and that we should begin by reading it as the Henrietta and James Halliwell Phillipps text.

*Love’s Victory* as represented most fully in the Penshurst manuscript is a five-act pastoral play. In the full version the action is presided over by Venus and Cupid, with Venus urging Cupid to take revenge on the group of characters who scorn Cupid’s power. While the play is both lyrical and full of lyrics, it displays an impressive control over plot, especially from someone who, while a performer in masques and a person with a strong sense of theatre and the theatrical, wrote no other plays that have survived, so *Love’s Victory* is most likely her first. Six pairs of lovers are matched, mismatched, rearranged, paired off and left forlorn at various times and in various combinations. The central plot device involves a variation on the *Romeo and Juliet* scenario, but with a happy ending, which allows the crossed lovers Philisses and Musella to be resurrected from apparent death and happily united. In the Huntington/Dering manuscript, Venus and Cupid play a less prominent role, and the play opens (as it does in the Halliwell Phillipps published extract) with Philisses’ monologue, ‘You pleasant flowery mead’, rather than with Venus and Cupid’s exchange about the characters foolishly scorn ing the power of desire. The Huntington manuscript finishes early on in Act Five, which is complete in the Penshurst manuscript; therefore Huntington does not contain the dramatic apparent death and resurrection of Philisses and Musella. This truncated conclusion may well have
influenced the way Henrietta and James treated the text for the printed extracts, as it changes the overall structure into something rather more like a series of scenes, and less like a perfected five-act play.

However, Henrietta and James’s version does reproduce what I would see as the significant core of the play: a variation on the *questioni d’amore* in which the characters quiz each other over desire and its affects. In fact, while James states that only brief extracts are worth printing, there is a version of the play, however truncated, within the extracts as they have been put together. Given Henrietta’s key role in the transcription of the play, and, as I will go on to discuss below, the way that the play as presented in this extracted form adds to a general unsettling of accepted gender roles in the mid-nineteenth century, I am renaming it as ‘Henrietta’s Version’. Henrietta herself, as an amanuensis who shifts from being her father’s trained transcriber to her husband’s trusted research assistant, stands in for the whole process of editing/transcribing as a process of reinterpreting and rewriting – a process that is now seen as a key aspect of the transmission and reshaping of texts in the medieval and early modern periods. Henrietta’s version of *Love’s Victory* is accordingly a third representation of Wroth’s text that appeared in the mid-nineteenth century, at a time when Wroth herself was at her least visible.

This version of the play begins by following the Dering manuscript with Philisses’ monologue, then jumps about 40 lines to an exchange between Lissius and Silvesta. As printed, Henrietta’s version indicates these jumps and cuts with a dotted line (see Figure 8.3), which helps to reorient the reader at least partly to the dramatic shifts in the play. Similarly, Henrietta’s version also follows the manuscript’s rather sparse stage directions, which are basically limited to indicating exits. After some monologues from the early part of the play, Henrietta’s version jumps to the first long *questioni d’amore* section in Act Two. This is relatively self-contained, though again truncated, and the text then jumps to Act Three, which is reproduced almost in its entirety, before the extract concludes with a scene between Venus and Cupid from the end of Act Four. Venus and Cupid’s appearance for the first time in the extract reflects their diminished role in the Huntington manuscript version of the play, but in Henrietta’s version they function quite effectively as a reprise of the theme of desire and an envoi from Cupid at the very end – a passage that Wroth runs deletion marks through in the manuscript (see Figure 8.4).

By focusing on Act Three, Henrietta’s version delivers a play, or portion of a play, that centres on women’s experience of desire and
Butt hee itt found; soe, as I well may say,
Had hee bin blind, I might haue stolne away;
Butt soe hee saw, and rul’d with reason’s might,
As hee hath kil’d in mee: all my delight.
Hee wounded mee, alas! with double harme,
And non butt hee can my distess vncharme.
Another wound must cure mee, or I dy.
But stay,—this is enough; I hence will fly,
And seeke the boy that strooke mee. Fare you well!
Yett make nott still your pleasures prove my hell.

LISSIUS.

Philisses now hath left us; lett’s goe back,
And tend our flocks, who now our care doe lack.
Yett would hee had more pleasant parted hence,
Or that I could butt iudg the cause from whence
Thes passions grow! itt would giue mee much ease.
Since I parseaue my sight doth him displease,
I’le seek him yett, and of him truly know
What in him hath bred this unusuall woe;
If he deny mee, then I’le sweare hee hates,
Or else affects that humour which debates.

.SILUESTA.

Silent woods, with desart’s shade,
Givings peace,
Wher all pleasures first ar made
To increase,
O deerest deere! lett plaints which true felt are
Gaine pitty once; doe nott delight to proue
Soe mercyles, still killing with despaire,
Nor pleasure take soe much to try my loue;
Yett if your triall will you milder make,
Try, butt nott long, least pitty come to late.
Butt O! she can nott, may nott, will nott take
Pitty on mee,—she loues and lends mee hate.

PHILISSES.
They that can nott stedy bee,
To them selues the like must see.
Fickle peple fitly chuse,
Slightly like, and see refuse.
This your fortune, who can say
Heerin insticr bears nott sway?
In troth, Dalina, fortune is prou'd curst
To you, without desert. Dalina, this is the wurst
That she can doe. 'Tis true, I haue fickle bin,
And soe is shee; 'tis, then, the lesser sin.
Lett her proue constant, I will her obserue;
And then, as shee doth mend, I'le good deserue.

ARCAS.
Who chooseth next, Lissiues? Nott I, least such I proue.

SILUESTA.
Nor I; itt is sufficient I could loue.


Figure 8.4  Love’s Victory, Huntington Library, HM 600, fol, 22v
Source: Reproduced by permission of the Huntington Library, San Marino, California.
its consequences. This act also accentuates Wroth’s wit, her dextrous
delineation of different characters, and it contains some of the most
sprightly poetry in the play. In particular, this part of the play is espe-
cially centred on what Joyce Green Macdonald has described as ‘Wroth’s
attempt to engage with and defuse the sexual and emotional danger
that the pastoral mode could pose for women.’20 A range of female
characters engage in debate, analysis and dispute, beginning with
Silvesta, who has taken on a vow of chastity and sings a moving song
about abnegation and self-worth. A series of debates about the cost of
desire ensue, first between Silvesta and Musella: a complex negotiation,
because it is Musella’s love Philisses who has broken Silvesta’s heart and
led her to her vow of chastity. Their mutual respect contrasts with the
fraught discussion later on between Simeana and Climeana, who are
fighting over none other than that ubiquitous heart-breaker, Philisses.
Philisses himself at this stage of the play is at cross purposes with
Musella, and believes he is the victim of ‘all-conquering love’ (line 223).
After Philisses’s exit, four women compare their experiences in what
begins as a formal questioni d’amore, but ends with an amusing clash
between Climeana and Simeana over who loves Philisses the most and
who is most deserving. Their spat provokes a speech from Dalina con-
demning women’s propensity to allow themselves to be ruled by desire:
‘Fy! What a lyfe is here about for loue! / Never could itt in my hart thus
moue.’21 Dalina offers some bracing advice about the consequences of
female abjection:

Rather then too sune wunn, bee too presise.
Nothing is lost by being carefull still,
Nor nothing soe soune wun as louer’s ill. (line 230)

Ironically, in the full version of the play (but not the Dering version
with its truncated Act Five), Dalina ends up paired with the rich but
yokel-ish Rustic; but at this stage of the play, Dalina rejoices in the
fact that Cupid has struck at the scornful Lissius, who is experienc-
ing a shadowed version of the women’s pain. Henrietta’s version ends
with an exchange between Venus and Cupid from Act Four and a brief
speech by Cupid from the abbreviated Act Five. These speeches form a
quite satisfactory conclusion to what remains a dramatically effective
version of the play, however truncated.

The question of how Henrietta’s version of Love’s Victory was read is
intriguing, and cannot really be answered except speculatively. It was
the most substantial representation of Mary Wroth’s writing generally
available between the publication of *Urania* in 1621 and Gary Waller's 1977 edition of ‘Pamphilia to Amphilanthus’. Only two of Wroth’s poems were in circulation when the Halliwellers tackled *Love’s Victory*, either in Alexander Dyce’s excellent 1825 anthology *Specimens of British Poetesses*, which prints two songs, one from within *Urania* and one from the appended ‘Pamphilia to Amphilanthus’ sequence, or in Frederic Rowton’s popular 1848 *Female Poets of Great Britain*, which cheekily reproduces the Wroth songs without acknowledgement, along with a great deal else from Dyce. Of course, the Halliwellers remained unaware that Wroth was the author of *Love’s Victory*, and the Victorian readers of Henrietta’s version were told again that the play’s author was unknown, with the ascription to James Shirley now discounted by James in a brief note (p. 236).

The emphasis on *questioni d’amore* and female responses to desire in Henrietta’s version of *Love’s Victory* opens up the possibility of a mid-nineteenth-century reading of the play as a quite radical interrogation of Victorian norms. What does it mean, exactly, in Henrietta’s 1845 transcription, and the 1853 publication of her version of *Love’s Victory*, to have a character like Silvesta, near the beginning of this text, launch into a critique not so much of desire, but of its consequences for a woman:

> I with Dian stand  
> Against loue’s changing and blind foulery,  
> To hold with hapy and bless’d chastity;  
> For loue is idle – happiness ther’s none  
> When freedome’s lost and chastity is gone (line 214)

This theme is picked up in the detailed *questioni d’amore* sequences and in the interrogation of desire by Dalina, as noted above. This is of course not to say that Henrietta, who eloped with James and became his lifelong partner, would have identified directly with Silvesta’s praise of chastity. However, Henrietta’s own literary activities, her role in the creation of this text of *Love’s Victory*, as well as some of the themes in this version of the play, add a further dimension to the analysis of the production of gender difference in the middle of the nineteenth century in Mary Poovey’s classic, groundbreaking study, *Uneven Developments*. Poovey shows how the binary opposition of difference by the Victorian middle class was mapped ‘onto the “natural” difference between men and women’, but that this binary was in fact unstable and liable to internecine challenges from within. At the same time, what Poovey describes as competing ‘articulations of difference’ produced the cracks that allowed for various forms of challenge and resistance.
In Henrietta herself, and in her reconstruction of Love’s Victory, we can see an excellent example of how tensions within a dominant ideology could be played out. Henrietta’s resistance to her autocratic father could perhaps only occur through her move to an alternate male figure, but one with whom she shared intellectual labour, if not a joint place on James Halliwell Phillipps’s multitudinous title pages. Love’s Victory is itself a narrative of female solidarity and also female competition, and it is a tragi-comic depiction of resistance to parental power, although ironically in the Huntington manuscript, which Henrietta read and transcribed, the success of the resistance is truncated by an abbreviated ending, so that instead we have in this new version the questions without the resolutions.

Nevertheless, these very questions – about female desire, about a proper or improper female sphere, about women’s role in literary endeavours – were potent challenges to ideological norms in the 1840s and 1850s. They echo some of the challenges inherent in the play when Wroth wrote it, probably around 1619/20, at a time when she seems to have been using her formidable literary endeavours, which included the writing and publication of Urania, to present a series of counter-positions to dominant culture and ideology. As far as Love’s Victory was concerned, this was especially evident in relation to female autonomy, and a revisioning of genres such as pastoral and tragicomedy to allow them to accommodate Wroth’s familial, political and personal concerns. Love’s Victory, from this perspective, was in circulation as a performance text in the 1620s (as evidenced by the Huntington/Dering manuscript), which restaged courtly encounters as part of Wroth’s ongoing analysis of the intersection between the position of women in King James’s court and power in general – an analysis made all the more timely after the death of Queen Anne in 1619, and the dissolution of her own court and its disappearance as a space that offered some counter to the court/space/power of the king.

In 1853, Henrietta’s version, with its stress on games and the clashes of desire, might well have appealed to the readers of a challenging series of novels that covered similar themes and were published in 1847/8: Jane Eyre, Wuthering Heights and Agnes Grey. Henrietta’s transcript created a version of Love’s Victory that was both readable and, potentially, performable. It does seem fairly clear that no such performance occurred, so that the play’s stage history has a gap stretching from the Dering performance some time in the 1620s through to the student production directed at Sunderland University by Stephanie Hodgson-Wright in 1999. Henrietta’s version of Love’s Victory may not have
been widely read, but I think it should be seen as marking a significant moment in the circulation of Wroth’s work, and in the potential for this text of the play, even unattributed, to challenge nineteenth-century concepts of gender and power, just as on its first appearance it challenged early modern ones.

Notes

I would like to thank Ros Smith for her insightful suggestions for the revision of this chapter.


4. The greatest part of Dering’s collection was acquired between 1619 and 1624; for a detailed account, see T. N. S. Lennam, ‘Sir Edward Dering’s Collection of Playbooks, 1619–1624’, Shakespeare Quarterly, 16 (1965): 145–53.
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In a letter to Charles Cotterell on 18 March 1662, Katherine Philips reported her reception of an elegy in French by Henriette de Coligny, relating that it was: ‘One of the finest Poems of that nature I ever read’. She identifies for particular praise the ideas and style of the French original: ‘the Thoughts are great and noble, and represent to the Life the vastness of her excellent Soul; the Language is pure, and hardly to be parallell’d’.

Philips’s letter unfurls two layers of international reception: Cotterell’s receipt and endorsement of the poem as well as her own. This is a single case of the cross-channel circulation and critique of a woman poet. But we know that Coligny was widely read in other countries. Her *Poésies* (Paris, 1666) is listed in 10 per cent of the eighteenth-century Dutch library catalogues analysed by Alicia Montoya. The *WomenWriters* database (described below) yields further references: her authorial reputation is alluded to in one eighteenth-century Russian, one Dutch and five French sources; her *Poésies* in one eighteenth-century and one early twentieth-century source.

This chapter proposes some preliminary methodologies for researching the reception of early modern women’s writing on a large scale, in order to open up a transnational perspective on its circulation and influence. Writing of this period was not confined within borders; writing by women was translated and received in locations beyond as well as within national literatures – and national boundaries themselves fluctuate in history. The chapter considers the value of quantitative research and analysis, and the challenges of maintaining a balance between the quantitative and the qualitative in this field. Finally, it interrogates the ways in which the study of reception can open up broader questions about the perception of gender and authorship in the period.
The chapter stems from my involvement in the ‘Women Writers in History’ research network, which is focused on the reception of women’s writing across Europe prior to 1900. This network began with the work of the Dutch scholar, Suzan van Dijk, on the reception of women’s writing in the Netherlands. From 2009 to 2013, it expanded, thanks to EU funding under the COST programme, to include over 100 researchers from 25 countries. The project seeks to share records of the transmission, translation and reception of women’s writing across Europe in an online, open database, called WomenWriters (online since 2001 and subject to ongoing development). The emphasis here must be on ‘open’, because ‘database’ often connotes conclusion, a closed repository of information. This online digital tool is constantly in flux, never comprehensive nor complete, and the information it contains is eclectic because it depends upon the time and research interests of those who input their data. Current coverage of English women writers is not at all comprehensive, but that of women writers who were read in the Netherlands is. The online tool is intended as a starting-point for research, not a definitive resource from which statistics should be extracted. Furthermore, its capacious timeframe highlights the pitfalls of a solely national focus; the shifting, contingent frontiers of sovereign boundaries underline the value of a transnational approach to reception in Europe.

The ‘Women Writers in History’ project is concerned with questions of reception, rather than the recovery of women writers, or the history of women’s reading (although both are recorded). Which women were read? Where and how were they read? Its quantitative focus, and concentration on literary reception rather than production, aim to move beyond case-studies, which – although yielding excellent results in qualitative terms – are not so efficient in accessing the bigger picture of women’s participation in, and impact on, the literary field across Europe. The original research project was designed by scholars working primarily on the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The increasing dominance of print in this later period, combined with the twenty-first-century electronic distribution of sources such as periodicals and library catalogues, mean that a range of resources focused on those centuries is useful and available and, furthermore, that methodologies for handling such material are being developed.

But there are particular problems, specific to the early modern period, in researching reception on a large scale. Current methods of accessing, retrieving and analysing large quantities of data on reception have been skewed toward the later period. For example, Continuum’s ‘The
Reception of British and Irish Authors in Europe’ series, edited by Elinor Shaffer and ongoing since 2002, has been a landmark in making literary scholars aware of the importance of reception and also of the European contexts for anglophone authors. Of 20 monographs now published, only two have female subjects (Virginia Woolf and Jane Austen, with a volume on George Eliot under way). The series begins with the eighteenth century; none of its authors pre-date 1700. Therefore, while this is an excellent large-scale scholarly project, it highlights the gap in our knowledge about reception in the earlier period.

The Reading Experience Database (RED) has developed an inventive approach to mixing the qualitative with the quantitative. RED has a sophisticated system of data entry that is not unlike ‘crowdsourcing’, although with scholarly safeguards built in. Volunteers contribute reception data (defined by RED as ‘a recorded engagement with a written or printed text – beyond the mere fact of possession’) by filling out a structured form, which is then verified by a member of the team and added to the online database. But RED also reflects the greater accessibility of later sources for this kind of research. Promising coverage from 1450 to 1945, the figures reflect the greater ease of accessing information about reading experiences in later periods. Hence, as of September 2014, a period search for 1450–1499 produced only four records; for 1500–1599, 241 records; and for 1600–1699, an exponential leap to 1,196 records (RED currently stores over 30,000 records in total). Of course, this is partly due to the expansion of print culture over time but it is also a matter of methodology. While the data-gathering aims for quantity – in harvesting large numbers of records – the sources are more qualitative and individual. They break down into two kinds: relatively well-known diaries (e.g. Margaret Hoby, Samuel Pepys) and accounts of individuals’ readerly annotation practices (e.g. Gabriel Harvey); and secondary sources on the history of reading (e.g. Stephen Dobranski’s Readers and Authorship in Early Modern England). These sources, although relatively few, are well chosen and systematically mined. The results are reliable but not yet representative of the wide range of reading practices for which there is surviving evidence.

How, then, might we begin to meet the challenges of conducting quantitative research on the reception of early modern women’s writing? Digital resources have much to offer beyond simply surrogate facsimiles and transcriptions of texts. An electronic resource like Early English Books Online–Text Creation Partnership (EEBO-TCP) can throw up new perspectives. Anders Ingram has used George Sandys’s A Relation of a Journey (1615) as a case study in order to outline the
possibilities. Ingram discusses the limitations of conventional research strategies in achieving ‘the accumulation of any significant quantity of evidence’, outlining the obstacles posed by searching for annotations or marginalia as well as the serendipity often involved in locating contemporary references to having read the text.\textsuperscript{12} Notwithstanding the great strides made by scholars like Heidi Brayman Hackel and William Sherman, we might well concur with Ingram’s impatience: ‘One is left with persistence, chance, or perhaps the direction of a colleague working in a related field.’\textsuperscript{13} Supplementing these methods, Ingram exploited the Text Creation Partnership’s provision of full-text search capability in EEBO, using the search-term ‘Sandys’, in order to show that a greater breadth and quantity of near-contemporary references can recalibrate our understanding of a text’s reception. Noting some important caveats – neither digital resource is yet complete; only explicit uses of the search-term are permitted; only print sources are digitised and the digital artefact cannot capture material features – Ingram’s experiment nevertheless produced surprising references and cross-references. These allowed him to reframe the contemporary reception of Sandys’s travel narrative according to three distinct categories: as genteel literature; as an authority on countries Sandys had visited; and as a source of accurate, current information on those countries.\textsuperscript{14}

Following Ingram’s method, if we enter ‘Orinda’ (the pseudonym by which Katherine Philips was known) as a search term in EEBO-TCP, 252 matches are produced in 55 works printed between 1667 and 1700. (By comparison, Ingram’s search for ‘Sandys’ produced 692 hits including 50 contemporary works referring to his \textit{Relation}.) We might discount the more obvious hits such as those occurring in Philips’s own \textit{Poems} (1664 and 1667), Cowley’s 1663 \textit{Verses, written upon several occasions}, and Thomas Flatman’s 1674 \textit{Poems and Songs} (these latter are well-known admirers of Philips who wrote poems in her praise). Among the more intriguing of the matches is a 1686 listing of ‘Orinda’ as one of the ‘Other good Tulips’, in the section on ‘Agriculture and Husbandry’ in Blome’s \textit{The Gentleman’s Recreation}.\textsuperscript{15} More significantly, her poem to James Butler, ‘To my Lord Duke of Ormond … on the discovery of the late Plot’, is cited by Richard Lawrence in his 1682 treatise on the economy and government of Ireland, \textit{The Interest of Ireland}. Here, Philips is cited as support for Lawrence’s contention that Ormond (commander of royalist forces in 1640s Ireland) had been resolutely loyal to the king:

\begin{quote}
Fighting for a Prince in no capacity to support him, much less to reward him; yet when his Princes State and Affairs were at the lowest
\end{quote}
Marie-Louise Coolahan

ebb his Loyalty was at hihgest [sic], at full Sea, rejecting the greatest proffers of Liberty and Estate from the Parliament, and chose Poverty in Exile with his Prince before it; as is elegantly express’d by Orinda, fol. 150.

You who three potent Kingdoms late have seen
Tremble with fury, and yet stedfast been,
Who an afflicted Majesty could wait
When it was seemingly forsook by Fate,
Whose settled Loyalty no storms dismayed,
Nor the more flatt’ring mischiefs could disswade.\(^{16}\)

Evidently, Philips’s poem remained in Irish circulation as late as 1682. Moreover, it was considered of sufficient authority to warrant citation as historical evidence. The mutual benefits of networking in Restoration Dublin are revealed as Lawrence trades on Philips’s reputation in order to bolster that of Ormond (in the process, reversing the gender and social hierarchies of their own time). This subtly alters our understanding of Philips’s reception; rather than engaging with her writing on an aesthetic level, Lawrence uses her poem as a primary historical source. It is clear, then, that EEBO-TCP can generate new references for further research, notwithstanding the caveats raised above. In this case, it adds value by producing new contexts for our understanding of Philips’s reception.

Sticking with electronic resources, we might consider how national library catalogues now facilitate quantitative data-retrieval – for example, information about print translations of women’s writing. Although the translation of a text into another language can offer only a partial view (it does not account for the multilingual competencies of early modern readers), translation is one proof of a text’s reception and penetration of the literary field beyond the author’s country of residence. An electronic resource like the Universal Short Title Catalogue – a union catalogue of all books printed in Europe, 1450–1600, recently awarded funding to extend coverage into the seventeenth century – can be useful, in conjunction with national library catalogues, in identifying early modern print translations. As examples, the USTC records two Italian translations (1588 and 1594) of the religious rule (the text that prescribes monastic life) authored by St Clare (originally composed in 1253), John Bale’s 1548 Wesel edition of Elizabeth I’s translation of Marguerite de Navarre’s Le Miroir de l’Ame pécheresse, and a 1518 Portuguese translation of Christine de Pizan’s Le livre des trois vertus.\(^{17}\)
As national libraries move toward digitisation, links can be created, as with that to the Portuguese Pizan translation. The current WomenWriters list of 13 receptions for Teresa de Jesu's La vida [Life] (derived from a pilot-search in these catalogues) includes translations into English, French, Italian and Latin. The range of publication locations – English translations published in the Low Countries, a Latin translation in Germany – reminds us of the transnational complexion of catholic vernacular translation, in particular. These examples are suggestive; information relating to such well-known figures as Elizabeth I and Teresa can be found in scholarly publications, but new possibilities open up as the coverage offered by such catalogues expands.

One print genre with great potential as a large-scale source for studying reception and the reputations of women writers is the bio-bibliographical compilation – the large-scale work concerned with women as cultural producers. Boccaccio’s fourteenth-century De mulieribus claris (Famous Women) was the originator of this genre. In an English context, Renaissance catalogues of learned women are generally considered to begin with Thomas Bentley’s Monument of Matrones (1582), which included Queen Elizabeth’s translation of Marguerite de Navarre’s Miroir and her prayers, Katherine Parr’s Lamentation of a Sinner and Prayers or Meditations, Lady Jane Grey’s Exhortation to her sister Katherine, Elizabeth Tyrwhit’s Morning and Evening Prayers, and Dorcas Martin’s translation of An Instruction for Christians from the French. Such works aim to balance the qualitative with the quantitative, the exceptionalist view of the eminent woman with the impulse to present her in the plural.

Thomas Heywood’s Gunaikeion: or, Nine Bookes of Various History Concerning Women (1624) is consistent with Boccaccio in including learned women from classical myth, scripture and documented women of antiquity. He reserves versifiers for a chapter revealingly subtitled, ‘Of Poetresses and Witches’. A work like this is both a reception document in itself – attesting to named women’s reputations in England in 1624 – and an archive of classical women’s earlier reception by male poets; Heywood quotes from Martial’s poetic appreciation of Sulpitia, from Ovid’s poetic locution of Sappho and his verse in praise of Perhilla.

By the time of publication of Bathsua Makin’s Essay to Revive the Antient Education of Gentlewomen in 1673, such compilations were themselves undergoing generic change. Makin’s anonymous work advanced a clear agenda to present named women’s intellectual achievements as support for her broader social and pedagogical argument for female education. Although she is international and historical in scope, her emphasis is patriotic. Among those eminent in ‘Arts and Tongues’,
she includes Lady Jane Grey, Margaret Cavendish, Lucy Hastings and Princess Elisabeth of Bohemia. She updates Heywood’s list of poets to include contemporary women writers. Her list of 16 English poets (Anne Bradstreet, Katherine Philips, Mildred Cecil, Ann Bacon, Elizabeth Hoby Russell, Katherine Killigrew (‘the four daughters of Sir Anthony Cook’), Mary Sidney Herbert, Jane Grey, Arabella Stuart, Queen Elizabeth, Elizabeth Cecil Wentworth and Ann Cecil de Vere [identified as Lord Burghley’s daughters]) substantially outweighs the two Italians named (Lorentia Stoza and Vittoria Colonna).21

But this kind of source is not transparent. The bio-bibliographical compilation is itself a genre produced in a particular context. By the eighteenth century, there was a new vogue for celebrating ‘eminent ladies’, George Ballard’s work being the best-known English exponent.22 Danish, German and English catalogues were engaged in what Hilde Hoogenbaum terms ‘national preening in the international competition for notable and learned women, especially writers and women learned in languages’.23 The evolution of the genre is equally a history of Enlightenment ideas and their envelopment in constructions of the nation-state. The prestige accruing to nations that could boast scholarly women engendered an international battleground fought out in such works. There is a competitive edge, in these compilations, to the claims made for numbers of learned women; a named female author could serve as a metonymic figure for a particular country, its enlightened and civilised milieu, and its international standing.

Early modern auction and private library catalogues constitute another rich resource for the reception of women writers.24 The distinction between reading and ownership is an important one; unfortunately, to own a book is not necessarily to have read it. Nevertheless, provenance and possession offer important evidence of a text’s circulation. Book ownership can tell us where a text ended up, who purchased it, who had it copied and what company it kept in an early modern book collection. The 1686 printed auction catalogue, Bibliotheca Baconica: or, A Collection of Choice English Books … formerly belonging to Mr. Francis Bacon, lately deceased, is arranged alphabetically, without the genre, format or language divisions often found in library catalogues. It includes works on theology, history, natural history and travel as well as poetry and romance. Interspersed are a translation of Madeleine de Scudéry’s Clelia (1655), four works by Margaret Cavendish (Plays, Poems, Grounds of Natural Philosophy [all 1668] and World’s Olio [1671]), and Katherine Philips’s Poems (1678).25 The manuscript catalogue of books owned by Frances Egerton, Countess of Bridgewater, itemises Mary Wroth’s
Urania (1621), Anna Wigmore’s A Ladies Present to a Princesse or Godly Prayers (1627), Diana Primrose’s A Chaine of Pearle (1630), and Mary Sidney Herbert’s translation, A Discourse of Life and Death (1592), in addition to Heywood’s Gunaikeion. But we may not like the statistics produced by such research. Female-authored works represent six of 183 (3.27%) listed in Bibliotheca Baconica; four of the 241 books (1.66%) in the Countess of Bridgewater’s catalogue. A 1575 list of 62 books (55 print and seven manuscript) belonging to the Coventry mason, Captain Cox, includes a single female-authored work: ‘The castle of Ladiez’, Christine de Pizan’s City of Ladies (1.6%). Of the total 106 located copies of books that were once part of the Staffordshire gentry-woman Frances Wolfreston’s collection, only two (1.89%) are by women writers: Catherine of Siena’s 1519 Here Begynneth the Orcharde of Syon and Dorothy Leigh’s The Mothers Blessing (c. 1619/20). By comparison, Tatiana Crivelli’s work on the eighteenth-century Italian literary academy, the Accademia degli Arcadi, finds that women made up 4 per cent of the membership and, when we consider that the approximate female membership of the Royal Society stands at 5 per cent, the figures may not look so out of kilter.29

These catalogues also raise important questions about authorial attribution and the perceived significance of gendered authorship. Titles provided in auction catalogues are often ‘heavily abbreviated and sometimes garbled’, so the absence of a female author’s name may not reflect ignorance on the part of the bookseller as to her identity. A further obstacle to the identification of female authors is presented by summary descriptions of packets and parcels of books. These constitute just over half of Montoya’s corpus of 254 catalogues; she suggests that such parcels comprised ‘the non-prestigious literary genres which were often the domain of women writers … novels and other inexpensive reading matter (unbound plays, for instance)’. The Bridgewater catalogue does not name any of these four female authors; in fact, Sidney Herbert’s translation is attributed to the author of the French original: ‘A Discourse of life & death by Morney [Philippe du Plessis-Mornay]’. Excluding this attribution, of the 241 titles, 123 are attributed. The sample of female-authored titles is too small to draw conclusions, but it is clear that titles took precedence over authorship. About half the books in the catalogue are listed with authorial identifications, suggesting that authorship in itself was not its predominant focus.

Whether texts are anonymous, pseudonymous or accurately attributed, early modern practices raise important questions about gender, authorship and reception. In some cases, it may well be that the author's
gender is not necessarily an issue for the early modern reader at all. Social proscriptions, of course, could be an inhibiting factor and some women who ducked identification were received as male authors. Perhaps the best-known seventeenth-century example is Madeleine de Scudéry, a translation of whose Célia is listed anonymously in Bibliotheca Baconica (Cavendish and Philips are named authors). Dorothy Osborne, whose letters show that she enjoyed Artamène, sending it to her fiancé William Temple and directing him to forward those copies to Lady Diana Rich when finished with them, also read Scudéry’s Ibrahim. But the author’s practice of publishing anonymously or under the name of her brother, the dramatist Georges, complicated her reception. Despite Osborne’s consistent references to the books’ author as male, she was aware of the rumours of female authorship, writing in September 1653: ‘They say the Gentelman that writes this Romance [Artamène] has a Sister that lives with him as Mayde and she furnishes him with all the litle Story’s.’

Montoya’s study finds that her Ibrahim ou l’illustre Bassa (1641), Clélie (1656–62), Artamène ou le Grand Cyrus (1649–53), Les Femmes Illustres (1642) and Conversations sur divers sujets (1680) are all titles frequently found in eighteenth-century Dutch library auction catalogues, but attributed in a gender-neutral way to ‘Scudéry’. Manuscript culture, as we shall see, further complicates the issue.

The resources hitherto discussed (with the exception of Bridgewater’s manuscript catalogue) represent only print culture. Most texts that are being digitised and made electronically available are printed texts. Though understandable – digitisation of manuscripts is expensive and more labour-intensive – this presents a partial and skewed picture, privileging print culture to a level not warranted by the realities of textual transmission in the period. Current digitisation practices run the risk of replicating the one-sidedness of earlier generations of scholar-editors. We know that women’s writing of this period circulated more often in manuscript than print. Indeed, manuscript circulation in itself can be a measure of reception. On a basic level, the quantity of manuscripts in which a woman’s work is compiled is a useful gauge of its having been read. Accordingly, Katherine Philips is considered by Peter Beal the most successful woman writer of the seventeenth century. Likewise, the scribal publication of the Sidneian psalms – the latest tally at 18 surviving manuscript copies – testifies to their influence.

Manuscript miscellanies are rich in reception context. The juxtaposition of a woman’s text with others is suggestive of the ways in which it was read or used. The mode of copying – excerpting, revising, splicing together with other texts – can change the female-authored text
in ways that reveal how it was valued and what it communicated to contemporary readers. The formal presentation manuscript dedicated to Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, in 1572 contains both Bartholo Sylva's Italian encyclopaedia, the 'Giardino cosmografico coltivato' and Anne Vaughan Lock's Latin poem in praise of Sylva, demonstrating (as Susan Felch writes) that the female author's reputation 'carried some weight at court as well as in her reformist community'. On a less elite level, the manuscript miscellany of Anna Cromwell Williams, a member of the gentry and distant relative to Oliver, contains poems by her mother, Elizabeth Cromwell, and mother-in-law, Battina Cromwell, alongside verse by Francis Quarles, many prayers and other genres of religious prose. This manuscript is predominantly religious in character and compiler-centred; these female-authored poems are preserved for their familial connections and juxtaposed with the popular devotional texts of the day.

The copying of a text into a manuscript is itself an act of reception; the contexts in which it is copied can illuminate the dynamics within which women's writing made an impression. For example, the English parliamentarian Robert Overton put his political allegiances to one side when, in 1671–2, he adapted poems by the Anglo-Welsh and royalist author, Katherine Philips. As a memorial for his deceased wife, Ann, Overton compiled a manuscript testament in which he cut-and-pasted poetry by Philips (as well as John Donne), recasting its political orientation as well as redirecting its subject matter of friendship and loss. His reception and recycling of Philips's verse is an act of engagement on both aesthetic and practical levels.

The early modern reader's sense of the usefulness of a woman's writing is often foregrounded when we study manuscripts. An anonymous catholic prayer manual of 1685, probably compiled by a priest, includes among Latin and liturgical texts, and 'An Act of contrition translated out of Portuguese', a quotation from St Teresa's Life supplied in English and Latin and introduced: 'S. Teresa was wont to use this aspiraon w. she heard ye clock strike'. Another English manuscript containing Catholic spiritual exercises was written for a specific reader – possibly the Katherine Digby whose signature is dated 1657 on the flyleaf – as evident from the frequent marginal notes addressing the reader with instructions. Again, La vida is cited here: 'In the life of S Tiresia we reade how ye when she heard the Priest in the Creede of the Masse recite the wordes, Cuius regni non erit finis, of whose kingdome there shall be no ende ... she did excedinglie ioye in her soule to heare it.' The compilation in seventeenth-century English devotional manuscripts...
of extracts from Teresa’s writings points to their transnational utility. Here, the unusual degree of authority and celebrity mean that the very name, Teresa, signals devotional piety. For the recusant reader, the female author’s name and the pragmatic purpose of her writing are commensurate.

The nature of the miscellany – a collection of various works by different writers – presents its own challenges. Prime among them is attribution. The authors of constituent texts are sometimes noted in the host library’s catalogue but rarely are they advertised on the opening pages of the early modern manuscript: the miscellany must be read in order to find authors’ names. But for most manuscript compilers, authorial attribution is inconsistent. Entirely anonymous texts are frequent, suggesting again that gender consciousness may not be a feature of early modern reception. The lack of an attribution to a woman may suggest that female authorship in itself was not important to that compiler-receiver. Even women writers may not have been interested in the connection of a female author to a work. Elizabeth Ashburnham Richardson’s adaptation of and meditation on Mary Sidney Herbert’s translation of Philippe de Mornay’s *A Discourse of Life and Death* (printed 1592) is titled ‘A discourse of ye teadiousnes of life and profitt of death’, neglecting any acknowledgement of Sidney Herbert’s role as author/translator. Without such an acknowledgement, we cannot know that this is the reception of a woman’s writing by another woman writer – and were it not for the eagle eyes of modern feminist scholars, we would not know that it is.

In certain print contexts, such as the pseudonymous Joseph Swetnam/Esther Sowernam contribution to the *querelle des femmes*, gendered attribution was central to the dynamic of debate. The rhetorical value of positing or ventriloquising the female voice has aroused scholarly scepticism. The more neutral pseudonymous attribution, ‘by a Lady’, of three Philips poems in a 1663 Dublin miscellany signals coterie relationships. The volume itself, it has been argued, mimics manuscript practices. Clearly, different agendas are at play in the politics of authorial attribution. We should bear in mind that, just because female authorship is a category of interest to us, that does not necessarily mean it was a category of interest to early modern readers. Ultimately, however, this is an argument for more quantitative research in order to approach more definitive answers.

The *modus operandi* of manuscript culture can hamper the search for women’s texts and their reception, but it is rich in the kind of contexts that tell us much about how women’s writing was used and received.
Print culture is becoming ever more amenable to this kind of study, as exemplified by Michelle O’Callaghan’s *Verse Miscellanies Online*, Adam Smyth’s *Index of Poetry in Printed Miscellanies, 1640–82*, or the *Digital Miscellanies Index*, which is focused on the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. There are ways of tracking poetry in manuscript; we might look to the Folger’s *Union First-Line Index of English Verse* or Margaret Crum’s ever-useful *First-Line Index of MS Poetry in the Bodleian Library* to learn about the compilation, recycling and adaptation of verse. Supplementing May and Ringler’s index of Elizabethan poetry, the enhanced digital version of Peter Beal’s *Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts 1450–1700* facilitates the tracking of how particular texts were transmitted and altered in manuscript. What’s more, the digital version includes 79 female authors. A resource such as the Folger’s *Union First-Line Index* can produce new juxtapositions. The connections between texts can be more immediately apprehended. For example, ‘How vain a thing is man’ (the first line to Philips’s poem, ‘The Soul’) produces 14 results, only four of which are by Philips. The refrain, ‘Ask me no more’, most associated with Thomas Carew, yields 68 records – 38 attributed to Carew but another 30 to various authors, including anonymous authors, and Hester Pulteney.

Network analysis offers a fruitful methodology for tracking the manuscript circulation of prose, particularly letters. Some digital projects are coming onstream that will support this kind of analysis. The Beta version of *Early Modern Letters Online* (EMLO), a union catalogue of correspondence relating to John Aubrey, Jan Comenius, Samuel Hartlib and others, is publicly available. This supplies metadata and is not comprehensive with regard to women’s letters. However, its calendars supply information about those who are mentioned in letters, making it particularly useful for the study of reception. The ‘Circulation of Knowledge and Learning Practices in the Seventeenth-Century Dutch Republic’ project launched, in June 2013, an innovative digital corpus (‘ePistolarium’) of 20,000 letters written by and sent to seventeenth-century scholars who lived in the Dutch Republic. This also promises to allow scholars to visualise in inventive ways the networks traced by those letters. These projects are promising resources for researching the circulation of women’s writing. Hartlib’s circle, for example, included women, and it is currently enjoying a considerable renaissance in terms of scholarly attention.

Correspondence can not only provide evidence of a writer’s reception but also of the connections between writers. For example, the Dutch scholar Anna Maria van Schurman wrote in Hebrew from Utrecht to
Dorothy Moore in Dublin in 1640, placing her in a specifically English female scholarly tradition:

I am delighted to have heard about you and your reputation ... I thought that no clever woman had remained in England after the death of Jane Grey and Queen Elizabeth. ... and I am determined after hearing about you to establish contact between us for the sake of wisdom and exchange of knowledge.52

As de Baar has noted, van Schurman's singling out of Elizabeth and Jane Grey as illustrious women of England was presaged in a letter she had written to Princess Elisabeth of Bohemia – exiled in The Hague – on 7 September 1639.53 Carol Pal also notes this letter and points further to van Schurman's citation of Jane Grey as 'exemplum in her debate with [theologian, André] Rivet over female learning', in a letter of 6 November 1637.54 From the perspective of reception, van Schurman's letter to Moore is evidence of Grey's reputation; moreover, it actively perpetuates it. It also attests to Moore's international standing. Pal (whose study of van Schurman's cultivation of a community of female scholars maps her connections with Marie de Gournay, Marie du Moulin, Katherine Jones, Lady Ranelagh and Bathsua Makin as well as Princess Elisabeth and Moore) speculates that van Schurman initiated the contact on reports from her mentor, the theologian Gisbertus Voetius, Princess Elisabeth and John Dury. She shows that it was on van Schurman’s specific recommendation that Moore was included in Johan van Beverwijk's Van de Wtnementheyt des Vrouwelicken Geslachts (On the Excellence of the Female Sex) (1639). 55 Certainly, the letter to Moore demonstrates the determination to forge intellectual connections with other women. Its positioning of Moore in a socially elite genealogy of women's intellectual achievement, and in a national frame that elides the finer points of identity in seventeenth-century Ireland, is instructive. I have argued above that we should be wary of imposing our own categories of interest on the circulation of writing in the period (and that applies equally to the post-independence interest in Irishness) and alert to the possibility that gendered authorship should not be assumed an issue for early modern reader-compilers. But clearly, for van Schurman, gender is an issue. She draws here on a rhetoric of exceptionality as the basis for her construction of female scholarly community.

Moore (later Dury) operated in internationalist Protestant circles, but Catholic networks are equally rich in evidence of the reception and transmission of women’s texts from manuscript to print. Moreover, they can shed light on these questions of gender and authorship. Female-authored texts that were useful to the Counter-Reformation
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project were translated and circulated across Europe. For example, the large-scale martyrological history published by the Spanish bishop of Tarazona, Diego de Yepes, includes Elizabeth Sanders’s account of the Bridgettine nuns’ expulsion from Syon Abbey – evidence of textual circulation far beyond England. But Catholic networks were not engaged with women’s writing as a category of interest in itself. The earliest circulation of the first-hand accounts of martyred priests authored by Dorothy Arundell and Elizabeth Willoughby was anonymous. The first attribution to Arundell of her narrative of the death of John Cornelius (d. 1594) occurred over 70 years after it had been written, in the Italian Daniello Bartoli’s Dell’istoria della Compagnia di Giesu: L’Inghilterra. Willoughby’s narrative of Hugh Green’s (d. 1642) execution was first attributed to her a century after the martyr’s death in Richard Challoner’s 1742 Memoirs of Missionary Priests.

It is worth considering here the relationship of text, author and function. Van Schurman consciously identified learned women in order to make connections between them; for her, gendered authorship was a category of interest. Similarly, the agenda pursued by authors of bio-bibliographical compilations is a gendered one: to retrieve eminent women from history. But the auctioneer aims to shift books; the Catholic martyrrologist gathers testimonies of religious persecution; the manuscript compiler wants to make new texts, or create a new collection of texts. For those who prioritise function, gender is unimportant; for those who are interested in gender, it is important that the quality of the woman’s text (or scholarship) be established.

As long ago as 2000, Sasha Roberts asked:

To what extent can the history of early modern reading be more than anecdotal? Given that histories of reading are constituted by the study of particular examples of reading practices, readers, and their books, how do we argue from the case study to larger trends?

Her answer was that we need both, quantitative analysis ‘to reveal patterns’, qualitative case studies as the ‘building bricks of cultural history’. The tension is not a new one; Hoogenbaum’s longitudinal study of bio-bibliographical compilations of women’s writing finds that German and Russian compilers preferred quantity, whereas English and French writers plumped for quality. She interprets the distinction in national terms:

nations that were still building their national literatures chose quantitative narratives to measure the growth of their domestic versus imported literature, while the two nations at the center of literary
production argued mainly with each other on the merits of selected women writers.\textsuperscript{59}

This anxiety over how to weigh quantity against quality perseveres in relation to academic scholarship today, as it experiences concerted moves toward quantitative modes of measurement. The issue for us, as scholars in the twenty-first century, is designing appropriate metrics for establishing both the quantity and quality of our research. It seems to me that this is analogous to the methodological challenges I’ve been outlining here. Should research be evaluated according to the volume of publications or the depth of their influence, and how is the latter to be measured? The assessment of impact often cannot be reduced to numbers: as Montoya cautions, widely read books ‘may have exerted little literary influence or may have been less influential than little-read but particularly prestigious individual titles’.\textsuperscript{60}

What is the promise entailed in a project like ‘Women Writers in History’? What new knowledge can be produced by quantitative research on the reception of women writers? On a basic level, such research aims to aggregate case studies, to accumulate information about reception. We might be mindful here of the concerns of digital humanities scholars that there must be an added value beyond simply presenting ‘big data’. Quantitative research is always aimed at qualitative analysis; at harvesting greater amounts of data in order to generate new research questions, perceive new patterns and interpret them in new ways. ‘Distant reading’ as advocated and practised by Franco Moretti (who has arguably done more than any other literary scholar to pioneer quantitative literary research) has aimed to harness data in order to understand overarching currents – whether the causes for cycles in novelistic production or the meaning of the gradual shrinking of novel titles over time.\textsuperscript{61} This kind of research offers the possibility of defining both the typical and the exceptional in early modern women's writing. By collecting all kinds of data regarding the reception of women's writing, and subjecting it to, first quantitative, then qualitative analysis, we may be able to see more clearly what is ordinary and throw into relief the extraordinary. The case for quantitative research rests on the production of new evidence of reception, in larger numbers, in order to begin to sift through and evaluate it. This is also a means to examine the impact of women writers in different regions and countries and across different time-periods. The woman writer's sphere of influence could be more culturally, geographically and temporally diverse than the disciplinary contours of national
literature suggest. We need to find methods of harvesting quantities of evidence in order to understand the ways in which writing produced by women, as a collective category, was received – whether positive, negative, or one of the shades in-between.

Notes


3. WomenWriters database, http://neww.huygens.knaw.nl/works/show/7937, http://neww.huygens.knaw.nl/works/show/2669 [accessed 1 August 2013]. All references, in WomenWriters, to Dutch private collections are excluded here as they are presumed to duplicate Montoya’s findings, cited above.


5. For information about the COST phase, see http://www.womenwriters.nl/index.php/COST_Action and http://www.costwwih.net/ [accessed 1 August 2013].

6. The database can be found at http://neww.huygens.knaw.nl/. It is currently being redesigned as a virtual research environment; see http://www.womenwriters.nl/index.php/COBWWWEB [accessed 1 August 2013].


10. The three-volume The History of Reading, eds Rosalind Crone, W. R. Owens and Shafquat Towheed (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), although inclusive of the early modern period, illustrates the point. Volume II is limited to the period 1750–1950. Of twelve essays in Volume I, one each is apportioned to the medieval and early modern periods; two of the eleven essays in Volume III are applicable to the early modern period.
11. EEBO-TCP: http://www.textcreationpartnership.org/tcp-eebo/ [accessed 1 August 2013].
17. Universal Short Title Catalogue; www.ustc.ac.uk, USTC Citation Nos 822816, 822817, 659959, 344392, respectively.
18. Link provided at http://neww.huygens.knaw.nl/receptions/show/24612 [accessed 1 August 2013]. See also Gallica, the digital library created by the Bibliothèque nationale de France: http://gallica.bnf.fr/ (in French); http://gallica.bnf.fr/?lang=EN (in English).
254 Dutch auction catalogues analysed by Montoya, almost 600 titles were identified, authored by 126 French, 62 English, 11 Italian, eight Spanish, five German, one Spanish-Mexican, and one Circassian-French women writers (‘Dutch Library (Auction) Catalogues’, pp. 194, 210–11). However, as the global figure of total number of titles is not provided, it is not possible to calculate the overall proportion of female authors.


32. Hackel, Reading Material in Early Modern England, p. 278.


40. Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington DC, MS V.a.488, Part II, fols 17v, 4v.

41. For example, the anonymous scribe notes, in a separate box inserted in the margin: ‘both this, and that which followes I haue colected out of a holy and aproued Author not seeking to hould any order, but choosing heere and ther out of many bookes what I thought might be most profitable to you.
and if ther be falts they are mine in the writing'; Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington DC, MS V.a.473, p. 115.

42. Folger MS V.a.473, p. 34.


53. Mirjam de Baar, ‘“God has chosen you to be a crown of glory for all women!” *The International Network of Learned Women Surrounding Anna Maria van*
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