

1. On “dildoes” and the “letany:” Marginalia in Donne’s “Satyre II,” Poems, 1633

Katherine Acheson

Multiple copies of the first printed edition of John Donne’s *Poems*¹ (1633) were supplemented with handwritten additions. This paper focuses on such additions to “Satyre II,” which fill in printed ruled blanks to complete two lines and add two couplets. These words and lines are printed in later seventeenth-century editions and they were well-known from earlier manuscripts.² The scribal additions complete the poem and thereby connect the printed poems with the manuscript tradition in which Donne’s work circulated and the practices of commonplacing so closely associated with Donne and the dissemination of much of his poetry. Some of the sources of the additions are cited, suggesting the marginalists conceived of their work as primarily editorial in nature. The scribes of these additions are not identified but women owned this book, women read Donne’s poetry, and women undoubtedly read examples of this peculiar marginalia. These examples, then, give us another frame in which to consider all marginalia, including women’s, and especially in works which enjoyed sustained and vigorous manuscript circulation alongside print.

2. Thys boke ys myn”: Elizabeth Woodville and Queenly Literary Networks

Michaela Baca

This paper focuses on the lack of a comprehensive record of later medieval English queens’ participation in book collecting and production during the advent of the royal library. Plenty of scholarly attention has been paid to Edward IV’s library because he is credited with starting the royal library in the 1480s. In typical scholarly fashion, we now have various enumerative bibliographies of what was and could have been part of his library. Often his wife, Elizabeth Woodville’s, book ownership is mentioned in passing. Sometimes his daughters, Elizabeth and Cecily, show up listed as book owners. And, with the rise of scholarly attention paid to women’s writing in the 1970s, some historians, most notably Anne Sutton and Livia Visser-Fuchs, began to pay attention to Elizabeth Woodville as a historical figure. This paper pairs descriptive and enumerative bibliography using archival evidence from manuscripts to trace a cycle of queenly marginalia that re-considers queenly book ownership and reading practices. The result of this cycle reveals a network of elite women, from Elizabeth Woodville to Katherine of Aragon, actively participating in both manuscript and print production in the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

3. Centring the Mother: Lucy Hastings’s marginalia in *Lachrymae Musarum* (1649)

Diana G. Barnes

When royalist writers turned to memorialize the experience of civil war lineage is a recurrent theme. This was not simply a matter of recording the experience of the battlefield in realistic eye witness accounts, but developing a rhetoric to articulate the wide spread loss felt by the nation at large. *Lachrymae Musarum* (1649), a commemorative volume of elegies for the recently deceased Henry, Lord Hastings, edited by the playwright Richard Brome, registers this loss in terms of motherhood. It is dedicated to Lucy Hastings, Countess of Huntingdon, the young man’s mother and it includes a frontispiece illustration of the classical grieving mother, Niobe. One of the Huntington Library’s copies (RB102354) contains a range of marginalia including evidence of ownership and Latin

epitaphs. On the front fly leaf is a handwritten elegy signed 'L.H.' This poem, best described as a mother's lament, provides a fascinating supplement to a collection that memorializes grief through the figure of the mother. This paper will consider what this marginal elegy attributed to Lucy Hastings reveals about how a mother might have read and used the text.

4. Reading Shakespeare in Folio: John Milton & Ann Leicester (1710, 1899, 2021)

Claire M. L. Bourne

In this paper, I track the provenance of two Shakespeare folios—a copy of the First Folio (1623) now thought to have been owned by John Milton and a copy of the Fourth Folio (1685) that was once a part of the Sidney family library at Penshurst and is signed by Ann Leicester, wife and widow of Philip Sidney, the fifth earl of Leicester (whose bookplate is also found in the book). Both folios disappeared from the historical record by the early eighteenth century and re-emerged in the 1890s. Both are also now in the Rare Book Department at the Free Library of Philadelphia. The partly intertwined, fragmentary history of these books exposes an engrained bias for “purchasing power” (and by extension the power to relinquish books) as the condition that defines book ownership over alternative, interstitial forms of possession and care.

When news of that Milton might have been the owner and annotator of the Free Library's First Folio broke eighteen months ago, it was consistently framed in the press as a “discovery,” when the book had been known, described, and used for more than a century. It is telling that Caitlin Goodman, the curator of rare books at the Free Library, had to correct this narrative with an op-ed in the *Philadelphia Inquirer*. The part of the story that mattered most to the public was the possibility that Milton owned Shakespeare: “Milton's Shakespeare.” But for me and Jason Scott-Warren, the marginal marks and writing in the First Folio had new context—the source of the scribal interventions and his published and unpublished corpus of writings, yes; but also new clues about the life of the book itself. In the case of the Fourth Folio, the owner(s) are seemingly evident, but how they read remained a mystery given that the book contains no clear evidence of interaction. I work around these gaps by suggesting that the problem of provenance is not always about who owned a book but about how the book (these books together) endured—and continue to be cared for—so that we might pursue their histories in the first place.

5. Biblical Marginalia as Dispersed Authority in Early Modern Women's Writings

Danielle Clarke

Early modern women's writings provide evidence of widespread use of marginal – this is largely though not exclusively scriptural reference. At first glance, this looks straightforward enough – the identification of key sources and an implied capitulation to their authority. Careful examination reveals a more ambiguous relationship to such sources – partly a display of competence, these references demonstrate women's alliance with a specific type of active biblical reading, imitating widespread practice in devotional texts, sermons and other sources and requiring *writing* as evidence of this engagement. Such texts teach women how to utilise textual reference and authority in their own writings, not simply to the end of embodying textually a process of biblical reading as incorporation which positions the writer simultaneously as a reader, and thereby problematises the assumed hierarchy of text and margin, and the relationship between past and present. Marginal scriptural reference positions the writer's work in a typological and iterative frame that suggests that these often most quotidian of texts in fact transcend their own moment in far-reaching ways. What is on display is as much about *process* as it is about *content*, signalling the writer's application of

models of scriptural reading. Key authors include Lanyer, Mouslworth, Southwell, Hutchinson, and Clifford.

6. **Lucy Hutchinson's Mother-in-Law: Marginalia and the Matriarchive**

Mary Learner

An annotated copy of the Scottish poet Sir David Lyndsay's works (1597) includes ownership marks by a "Margret Hutchinson." Her annotations and those in a second hand by "John" are reminiscent of the poet Lucy Hutchinson's family members: her mother-in-law, Margaret Hutchinson, néé Margaret Byron, mother to her husband, Colonel John Hutchinson, the regicide Parliamentarian. Significantly, these inscriptions elucidate Hutchinson's depictions of her mother-in-law—brief vignettes that she terms "scanty epitaphs"—in her *Memoirs*, which memorializes the life of her husband in order to impart virtue to future generations. Thinking with the terms of the matriarchive, I argue in this discussion how book ownership marks and matriarchal relationships provide evidence of how women participated in imagined alternative histories legible in women's writing, including interactive inscriptions on the margins of printed books. Moreover, this paper considers how feminist approaches to even fragmentary evidence of early modern women's marginalia can generate new readings of women's writing and family legacies.

7. **"Given Her by: Gift Inscriptions and Presentation Inscriptions in Early Women's Books"**

Sarah Lindenbaum

"Frances wolfreston hor bouk / geuen hor by hor motherinlaw / maray wolfreston."

Much has been made of this early woman's reader's inscription in a 1550 edition of Chaucer's works. "[L]ittered with manuscript marginalia," in Alison Wiggin's words, the book entered the Folger Shakespeare Library's collections almost sixteen years ago and became the subject of an essay by Wiggins. And while Frances Wolfreston annotated dozens of books, she was not the only woman in her family--let alone of the time period--whose books contain gift inscriptions. Her own granddaughter Anne used her finest hand to note that her copy of Juvenal's Satires was "the Guift of Dr: [Phineas] Fowke" on 15 October, 1694.

As cataloguing practices in rare book institutions continue to improve, marks of early women owners have proliferated. In this paper, I will examine a subset of these markings: early Englishwomen's gift inscriptions and presentation inscriptions. Gift inscriptions are an untapped source of information about women's relationships and their book acquisition. They also put into question the still pervasive notion that women were deterred, both implicitly and explicitly, from reading of romances and other literature. In reality, women's gift inscriptions demonstrate diverse relationships and encompass a wide breadth of genres.

8. **Marking by the Numbers: Early Modern Women's Annotations as Data**

Rebecca Munson

To date, there have been two major trends in scholarship on early modern annotations: the study of remarkable men (e.g. Gabriel Harvey, John Milton) or remarkable books (e.g. the Shakespeare folios at Meisei University and the Free Library of Philadelphia). This first line of inquiry has been especially fruitful for digital projects like the [Archaeology of Reading](#) that concern a relatively small subset of texts annotated by mostly identifiable groups of readers. While many scholars are working to combat the scholarly bias implicit in such an approach, exploring the landscape and potential of

early modern women's marginalia in both print and manuscript, digital projects have lagged somewhat behind in offering a corrective. *The Reception and Circulation of Women's Writing, 1550-1700* ([ReCIRC](#)) has blazed a trail by making datasets drawn from both print and manuscript sources available, but its focus is on texts by female authors rather than reception by female readers.

Two developing projects at Princeton, however, are taking steps to fill this gap. Emma Sarconi (Special Collections, Firestone Library) has been working on a project entitled *Her Book*, which hopes to create a database of women's ownership markings in books held by the library. My own digital project, [Common Readers](#), is dedicated to gathering and analyzing annotations in early modern play texts through a custom-designed relational database. The basic database will consist of two modules, one for bibliographic data and one for annotations data with the potential to add later modules (e.g., one for performance information). *Common Readers* holds the potential to illuminate the reading habits of the less extraordinary, anonymous men and women who read, marked, and commented upon texts.

9. Women's Marginalia in Uncertain Times: Speculations about Frances Wolfreston

Lori Humphrey Newcomb

The Thomason tracts include three 1640s pamphlets whose titles mention "these uncertaine times"; in our own uncertain times, I re-evaluate our scholarly codes for speculative reading of women's use of controversial titles. As our seminar rationale observes, early modern women's "books . . . enabled interactions with the surrounding world." Yet such interactions are difficult to discern from books owned by women, who tend to annotate more lightly than humanist-trained men. I propose that light annotation is itself a considered response, especially in times of tumult. This position, allied with recent work by Americanist book historians that recognizes archival absences as historically produced, counters the caution of earlier provenance studies that have devalued evidence of women's work as readers. Specifically, this paper reconsiders some of the many books that were owned and used by Staffordshire gentlewoman Frances Middlemore Wolfreston between 1631 and 1677. Challenging the past obsession with Wolfreston's literary tastes, it investigates her engagement with topical books, especially given the intensity of First Civil War action in the West Midlands. As one part of a larger survey of her annotations across many historical, controversial, and devotional titles, the paper focuses on her ownership of works from Catholic traditions. What can be deduced about her choices to own and use such books, during and after times of war, and to include them in her bequest to her family? Our speculations, I argue, must attend both to marks left in books and to apparently unmarked ownership.

10. Public action and private doodling: visual and textual marking in early modern women's printed books

Rosalind Smith

This paper examines visual marks made by early modern women in the margins of their books, a category that includes copying, colouring, doodles, manicules, illustrated letters and drawing. Critical interest in early modern women's marginalia has focused upon its textual forms, unearthing a rich corpus that provides new evidence of women's writing, reading and book use. More recently, however, attention to new kinds of marginalia (smudges, tears and stains, objects left within the pages of the book, and pasted material) has expanded our understanding of the forms and functions of annotation and the ways in which scribal, print, material and performative cultures intersect within the covers of a book. This paper adds the category of the visual to these overlapping heuristic frames, suggesting that visual marks are an overlooked and important part of early modern women's

marginal practice. Part of the early stages of a wider project mapping, analysing and digitally visualising early modern women's marginalia, this paper discusses three examples of visual marking linked to women: the imitation of typography, a collection of visual marks including drawings, signature and micrographica found on a blank opening of a 1605 copy of Samuel Daniel's *Certain Small Poems*, and an elaborate illustration of an armillary sphere in a psalter belonging to Elizabeth I as princess. These examples give a sense of the interdependence of visual and textual cultures for early modern subjects and the ways in which their combination form complex interventions, with the power to convert books into new forms.

11. Women's Marginalia in Liturgical Texts and Engagement with the State

Micheline White

Women's marginalia register a range of phenomena: reading practices; modes of ownership; forms of sociability; and strategies of self-representation. To date, studies of women's marginalia in religious books have focused on these phenomena in Books of Hours, sermons, Bibles, and treatises. This paper considers annotations made in a different kind of book – a liturgical book. The thing that interests me is that liturgical books were imposed on readers/hearers by the state. Moreover, the state changed the liturgy frequently, requiring readers to conform themselves to new texts whether they liked it or not. To purchase and write in a liturgical book was perforce to engage with the state, and when seen in this light, even the most basic annotations can take on political meanings.

This paper examines Mary Tudor's inscription in Katherine Parr's copy of Thomas Cranmer's reformed (and anti-Papal) *Litany* issued by Henry in 1544. I argue that Parr's loan of the book to Mary was an act of religio-political aggression, and that Mary's inscription was an evasive *tour de force* in which she: displayed outward submission to Henry's authority; displayed an affective attachment to Parr; refused to acknowledge Cranmer's reformist interventions while subtly recording her commitment to the "traditional" parts of the *Litany* that Cranmer did not revise.