CHAPTER THREE

'Boasting of silence': women readers in a patriarchal state

Heidi Brayman Hackel

A late sixteenth-century treatise on marriage prescribes each spouse's role in a harmonious household: 'The dutie of the man is, to bee skillfull in talke: and of the wife, to boast of silence.'[1] Taking this oxymoronic ideal of displayed silence as emblematic, this essay examines the silence of early modern women readers – both literal and figurative, prescribed and performed. Certainly, reading in late medieval and early modern England was as often public and social as it was private and silent, and gentlewomen's reading, in particular, frequently took an oral form. Women's experiences as readers, however, were nevertheless circumscribed by legal and cultural injunctions for silence. For women's reading, like women's writing and speaking, aroused controversy and attracted comment throughout the period,[2] and the pressures of the patriarchal state on female readers can be felt in legal statutes, educational practices and conduct books. While legal and institutional practices demonstrate the workings of a partriarchal state, early modern conduct books reveal the assumptions of patriarchy in its 'domestic form', which Kathleen Brown defines as the 'historically specific authority of the father over his household'.[3] This essay considers three prescribed forms of female readerly silence – restraint from public reading, limitations on linguistic proficiency and abstention from vocal criticism – as the context for women's habitual silence in the margins of their books. As readers' marginalia have emerged as a central archive for the history of reading in early modern England, that history has focused on goal-orientated, professional and contestatory readings, and it has largely elided women readers.[4] For the cultural and material practices that discouraged women from annotating their books have also made it difficult for modern scholars to write them into the emerging history of reading. If women as readers are not to remain inaudible, we must shift the fields of evidence and listen very closely.

In concert with the urgings of conduct books, English laws provided little room for women's public performance of reading. The application

of benefit of clergy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries acknowledged and rewarded the oral performance of reading by men but not by women. Until 1624, benefit of clergy, which required public oral reading, was available as a legal loophole only to men (and also, before the Reformation, to professed nuns). By the early seventeenth century, the privilege had been eliminated for many felonies, including murder, rape, stabbing, piracy, horse theft and burglary.[5] While serious crimes were increasingly exempted throughout the period, Cynthia Herrup has demonstrated the widespread reliance upon this privilege as a compromise between acquittal and capital punishment for first-time offenders, during a time when all felonies were punishable by death.[6] Benefit of clergy was granted at startlingly high rates during the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods – at rates between 80 and 100 per cent of convictions and confessions of clergyable felonies in Sussex. Even as it was more strictly enforced during Charles I's reign, benefit of clergy was still extended to well over half of those convicted of or confessing to clergyable felonies between 1634 and 1640.[7] By contrast, David Cressy reports that only 29 per cent of people living in Sussex in 1641–4 signed their names rather than making a mark on state documents.[8] Herrup's figures, therefore, suggest both the leniency of the test for benefit of clergy and the possibility of far more widespread reading literacy than studies of signature literacy have indicated. But not until 1691 could women claim this privilege for anything beyond petty theft. Pregnant women could exercise benefit of belly, which might be demonstrated by a silent display of the body, but this privilege merely delayed execution.[9] Whereas benefit of clergy saved the life of the criminal, that is, benefit of belly saved the life of the criminal's child.

During this period when the courts did not reward female literacy, Henry VIII criminalized reading aloud by women with his 1543 Act for the Advancement of True Religion. While cultural ideals of feminine modesty might demand silence outside the domestic sphere, the reading of the Bible was so charged that this Henrician act required female readers' silence at home as well.[10] A response to the perceived abuses following the wide availability of the Bible, this act prohibited the printing, importing, selling, keeping and using of all Tyndale translations of the Bible, along with other 'pestiferous and noysoome' books.[11] The act criminalized the reading of the Bible by most women and by men beneath the rank of yeomen. Gentlewomen were permitted to read the Bible to 'themselves alone' but, unlike their husbands, they were forbidden from reading Scripture aloud to their families.[12] All other women were grouped with men of the 'lower Classes' and prohibited altogether from reading the vernacular Bible. To justify its

hierarchy of readers, the act points to the varying reception of the vernacular Bible, which has been used 'to good effecte' by subjects of the 'highest and moste honest sorte' but 'abused' by the 'lower sorte', who 'have therbye growen and increased in divers naughtie and erronyous opynions'.[13] The act is revealing for a number of reasons: first, it equates habits of reading with social status, assigning 'naughtie and erronyous' reading with the lower ranks; second, it foregrounds gender over class in grouping all women together despite its careful gradations of rank for men and in forbidding public reading for all English women, regardless of rank; and finally, it emphasizes the prevalence of aural reading in sixteenth-century England. For the act allows

> everye noble man and gentleman being a householder to reade or cause to be red by any of his famylie or servantes in his house orchard or gardeyne, and to his owne famylie, any texte of the Byble or New Testament, so the same be doone quietlie and without disturbaunce of good order.[14]

This provision extends the scene of devotional reading from the prayer closet or the great hall out to the grounds of an estate, and it significantly allows the householder to assign the task of reading to someone – daughter, wife, servant – who could not otherwise lawfully read the Bible aloud.

While this 1543 act was repealed early in King Edward VI's reign, the gender distinction it codified persisted throughout the period both in educational practices and in conduct manual prescriptions. Eve Sanders argues that the Reformation and the humanist educational program issued in a gendering of reading, a departure from the gender-neutral reading practices of the medieval period. The Reformation eliminated many educational possibilities for girls and women, closing down both convent schools and confraternities.[15] Prohibitions against the admission of girls to grammar schools continued to appear in statutes from the Reformation to the English Civil War, registering, as Sanders argues, an ongoing debate about girls' education.[16] While far fewer girls than boys attended school, even those girls enrolled in schools followed a different curriculum from their brothers: as boys were taught to read and write and add, girls learned to read, sew and spin.[17] 'Unlike boys . . . whose access to education was narrowed mainly by economic, geographic, and demographic circumstances, girls of all social backgrounds were the object of purposeful, concerted efforts at restricting their access to full literacy.'[18] Silenced by a curriculum and gender ideology that taught them to read but not write, early modern girls who did not learn to write disappear as readers from the historical record as well, for it only captures reading accompanied by writing.

The emphasis on reading-only literacy for girls is consistent with the value placed upon silence in contemporary domestic conduct manuals. Like a schoolgirl able to read but not write, the ideal woman constructed in these books listened without speaking, observed without commenting. In their persistence over the course of a century and in the uniformity of their doctrine, these domestic manuals articulated and institutionalized a set of cultural ideals. Beginning with the English translation of Juan Luis Vives's *Instruction of a Christen Woman* (*c.*1529) and continuing until the English Civil War, these manuals advocated the ideals of silence, chastity and obedience with consistency to the point of cliché.[19] Vives encouraged the chaste woman 'in company to holde her tonge demurely. And let fewe se[e] her and none at al here her'; Richard Brathwait, echoing Vives a full century later, asserted that 'all women . . . should be seene, and not heard'.[20] Like the sixteenth-century treatise that assigned to women the duty to 'boast of silence', Brathwait transformed silence into an act of virtuous display: his English Gentlewoman will 'tip her tongue with silence' when in company in recognition that 'Silence in a *Woman* is a mouing Rhetoricke, winning most, when in words it wooeth least.'[21] Citing St Paul's injunction in Corinthians as their authority, domestic manuals equated women's public speech with unruliness, shame and insubordination. Daniel Rogers, for instance, in his *Matrimoniall Honour* (1642) condemns women who display themselves by speaking: 'Such immodesties and insolencies of women, not able to containe themselves within boundes of silence and subjection, I am so farre from warranting, that I here openly defie them as ungrounded, and ungodly.'[22] Rather than subsiding, the pressure on women to be silent seems to have increased in the early seventeenth century.[23]

Though silence was persistently gendered as feminine in domestic manuals throughout the period, these treatises were prescriptive polemics, and, despite their prevalence and consistency, they failed to contain all women's behaviour within the 'boundes of silence'. Many scholars – Ann Rosalind Jones, Barbara Lewalski, Hilary Hinds, Tina Krontiris, Mary Ellen Lamb and others – have documented early modern women's resistance to these patriarchal constructions of femininity.[24] Certainly, there were individual women who did not 'tip their tongues with silence', choosing instead to speak in church, preach in marketplaces, or refute in print the Pauline injunctions for female silence.[25] While many women, therefore, did not internalize these constraints, the treatises nevertheless usefully delineate the dominant view of the accepted scope of feminine behaviour.

The contest between the prescriptions in conduct books and the actions of individual women shows up vividly during the 1650s in an exchange of

letters between a ten-year-old girl, her father and her godfather. Sir Ralph Verney draws upon the rhetoric of contemporary conduct books when he advises his long-time friend Dr William Denton to exclude from Anne Denton's training both classical languages and shorthand – verbal skills that would threaten her eventual happiness:

> . . . the pride of taking Sermon noates, hath made multitudes of woemen most unfortunate . . . if she would learne anything, let her aske you, and afterwards her husband, *At Home*. Had St. Paul lived in our Times I am most confident hee would have fixt a *Shame* upon our woemen for writing (as well as for theire speaking) in the Church.[26]

Expanding upon St Paul, Verney significantly defines virtuous silence to preclude both speaking and writing in public. Taught to write, Anne Denton was nevertheless discouraged from learning to write quickly or publicly; the skill of rapid transcription, especially if used in a church, Verney feared, would ruin her. Fast writing, after all, might become fast living. For Verney then, like the authors of conduct books, appropriate literacy for women was one that was limited in its fluency and its use. His Pauline insistence on the containment of Anne's education '*At Home*' and Anne's subsequent boldness illustrate the debate about female literacy and learning in the period, particularly as the correspondence moves beyond a discussion of religious practice to address secular reading and linguistic proficiency.

Perhaps encouraged by her father's more progressive attitudes towards girls' education, Anne Denton expresses an interest in learning the classical languages. Still orthographically clumsy even by early modern standards, the young Anne Denton declares to her godfather her intellectual acquisitiveness: 'i know you and my coussenes wil out rech me in french, but i am a goeng whaar i hop i shal out rech you in ebri grek and laten'.[27] Not only does this young girl aspire to learn Hebrew, Greek and Latin, but she seeks to *outreach* her godfather in these skills. The letter also hints at an awareness on Anne's part that such aspirations will goad her godfather; she seems to know, that is, on just what grounds to bait him. Such awareness in a ten-year-old girl suggests that the opposing views on girls' education were clearly enough drawn as to be accessible to a clever child.

Surprised by the young girl's ambitions, Verney tries to dissuade her by appealing to the accepted scope of feminine education:

> Good sweet hart bee not soe covitous; beleeve me a Bible (with ye Common prayer) and a good plaine cattichisme in your Mother Tongue being well read and practised, is well worth all the rest and much more sutable to your sex; I know

your Father thinks this false doctrine, but bee confident your husband will bee of my oppinion.[28]

Invoking Anne's as yet hypothetical husband, Verney alludes to the legal reality that Anne's identity and care will one day pass from her father's to her husband's hands. Verney first parrots the view of contemporary conduct manuals that devotional texts are the most appropriate reading for women, but he goes on to recommend secular French books to the young girl, bribing her with the promise of a small French library and including in its contents precisely those books so often characterized as 'light' and 'undecent':[29]

> In French you cannot bee too cunning for that language affords many admirable bookes fit for you as Romances, Plays, Poetry, Stories of illustrious (not learned) Woemen, receipts for preserving, makinge creames and all sorts of cookeryes, ordring your gardens and in Breif all manner of good housewifery. *If* you please to have a little patience with yourselfe (without Hebre, Greeke, or Lattin) when I goe to Paris againe I will send you halfe a dozen of the french bookes to begin your Library.[30]

Verney's offer of seed books for Anne's library is an instructive reminder that the prescriptions of conduct books were not an unbreakable set; rather, someone like Verney might endorse much of the doctrine of feminine conduct literature while ignoring other aspects. For Verney, at least, the modesty that was threatened if Anne Denton wrote in church was not similarly imperilled if she read French plays and romances.

Did Anne Denton settle for a library of French literature and housewifery manuals? How many of the many early modern gentlewomen's libraries of herbals, romances and French New Testaments represent compromises and second choices finally accepted by girls who gave up on their 'ebri grek and laten'? Scholarship does not yet have full answers to the questions raised by the provocative Denton–Verney exchange; however, the frequent presence of French books and the corresponding absence of Latin books in the collections of early modern gentlewomen suggest the dominance of Verney's view that classical learning had no proper place in a woman's life.

Verney's expectation of a girl's silence in church is predictable within the contemporary gender ideologies that equated silence with modesty, piety and femininity. Women's silence in the margins of their books, however, is more puzzling, for manuscript marginalia would seem to offer a place for women's voices uttered silently and privately 'At Home'. But, in general, very little early modern marginalia can be definitively attributed to women

readers.[31] Frances Egerton (1585–1636), who catalogued her London library of 241 books, did not annotate any of the surviving copies that bear her marks of ownership on the bindings and flyleaves. Frances Wolfreston (1607–77) wrote 'Frances Wolfreston hor book' on the flyleaves of ninety-five books that have survived, thereby establishing both her ability to sign and her willingness to mark her books, but she almost never annotated her books.[32] Elizabeth Puckering (*c.*1621–89), whose initials or signature have been identified in nearly one hundred volumes, was 'not in the habit of annotating her books as she read'.[33] Even in a book such as *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, which was addressed both generically and explicitly to women, no known examples of substantial annotations can be attributed to female readers. In one sample of one hundred copies of Sidney's *Arcadia* printed between 1593 and 1638, for example, 60 per cent of the sample bears readers' marks, yet none of these can be linked paleographically to the women who wrote their names in twenty-two of these books.[34]

The scarcity of women's marginalia poses an obstacle in the recovery of women's reading practices and highlights the methodological limitations inherent in this form of evidence. Many of the early modern readers we know best – such as Gabriel Harvey and John Dee – remain visible and vocal because of their marginalia, which Carol Meale has called the only 'incontestable evidence' of reading.[35] Such a reliance upon marginalia as evidence does, of course, leave many early modern readers invisible: those whose books have not survived, those who never owned books, those who could read but not write, those who simply never felt inclined to annotate their books, and indeed those who read their books to pieces.[36] Of these many invisible readers, I will pursue here the likely reasons behind the silent margins left by women who owned books and wrote their names in them.

While the subject of marginalia is not often addressed in conduct books, a few statements about the propriety of women's writing in books suggest the narrow confines of permissible annotation.[37] Vives counsels the Christian woman to copy religious passages rather than 'voyde verses' as handwriting practice, and Anne Boleyn is said to have scolded a gentlewoman in her household for scribbling 'idle posies' in a prayer book.[38] Boleyn herself reportedly annotated Tyndale's *Obedience of a Christian Man* for the king with her fingernail.[39] The curious nature of such a marking – at once nearly imperceptible and provocatively physical, both demure and bold – suggests an ambivalence towards marginalia. Annotating without a pen, Boleyn makes literal the pointing fists of contemporary manuscript and printed marginalia. Boleyn's fingernail annotations nicely represent

accepted feminine marginalia: non-interpretive (even non-verbal) fingering of key passages in a religious work. And yet while no annotations remain that we can *read*, Boleyn clearly made a gesture of deep engagement with this text as she quite literally left her impression upon it.

Anne Boleyn's method of inkless marking is included in a discussion of annotations in John Brinsley's book of pedagogy, *Ludus Literarius, or The Grammar Schoole* (1612). Urging schoolmasters to train students to mark both the difficult and excellent bits in their books, Brinsley suggests three methods of annotation:

> it is best to note all schoole books with inke; & also all others, which you would have gotten *ad unguem*, as we use to say, or wherof we would have daily or long practice because inke will indure: neither wil such books be the worse for their noting, but the better, if they be noted with iudgement. But for all other bookes, which you would have faire againe at your pleasure; note them with a pensil of black lead: for that you may rub out againe when you will, with the crums of new wheate bread.
>
> The very little ones, which reade but English, may make some secret markes thus at every hard word; though but with some little dint with their naile; so that they doe not marre their bookes.[40]

Ink, pencil, or the impression of a fingernail: Brinsley characterizes each method as suitable to a particular reading practice. Both the book *and* the reader must warrant ink annotations; lesser books and lesser readers should produce erasable or nearly imperceptible marks. Curiously, Brinsley's use of the Latin phrase 'ad unguem' (literally 'to the fingernail', figuratively, 'perfectly') works counter to his hierarchy of annotation methods, for it is imperfect readers who should annotate by nail. As one might expect in a pedagogical treatise, Brinsley emphasizes the 'use' to be made of reading. Ink annotations by competent readers, rather than marring a book, will make it more useful and hence more valuable. Brinsley counsels schoolmasters to 'have the choysest bookes of most great learned men, & the notablest students all marked through thus, in all matters eyther obscure, or of principall & most necessary use'.[41]

Unlike the reading of 'schoole books' or devotional works, gentlewomen's secular reading was constructed in opposition to such 'necessary use' as trivial and passive, though sometimes morally perilous. These notions surely encouraged women's silence in the margins. Further contributing to this discourse of women's reading as passive was the practice of aural reading, popular among the elite from the fourteenth to the eighteenth centuries in England.[42] The lack of readers' marks in their books may, therefore, be a practical consequence of such a reading habit, for the

arrangement sets up a degree of physical and vocal – if not intellectual – passivity. Lady Margaret Hoby, who regularly wrote notes in her Bible, also recorded her habit of listening to a reader, as she did in a diary entry for November 21, 1599: 'after dinner I wrought and h[e]ard Mr Rhodes Read tell all most supper time'.[43] Though she often wrote notes in private, it is needlework, not writing, that accompanied her aural reading. Lady Anne Clifford, too, frequently recorded 'hearing of reading'. In her diary of 1616–19, she writes twenty-three times about a specific moment of reading, nineteen of which are scenes of aural reading. Two records exemplify this practice: 'M[r] *Dumbell* read a great part of the History of the Netherlands . . . Upon the 9th I sat at my work and heard *Rivers* and *Marsh* read Montaigne's Essays which book they have read almost this fortnight'.[44] Often only an awareness of this convention establishes Clifford as a participant – rather than a mere eavesdropper – in these readings.

Notations in extant books, both secular and devotional, also document this reading practice and provide further clues about the dynamics between readers and listeners. A careful record of one reading of *Barclay His Argenis* survives from the early seventeenth century: 'I began to reade this booke to yo[r]: Ladiship the xvjth day of January: 1625: and ended it the xxvth of the same moneth.'[45] This now anonymous pair – a reader and a noblewoman – read through the romance, therefore, at the fairly voracious pace of forty folio pages a day. It seems wrong to label as passive a noblewoman who orchestrated such a reading, particularly if we think of the authority given to the householder in Henry VIII's 1543 act, who may 'cause [the Bible] to be read'.[46] Certainly, the arrangement challenges our definition of the term 'reader' itself. While it is the lector of the book not the female listener who has recorded the reading history in this case, the inscription addresses the lady in the second person, thereby suggesting the possibility of scribal annotations. And, indeed, a recently identified set of marginal annotations in a copy of *A Mirror for Magistrates* testifies to precisely this practice in Lady Anne Clifford's household.[47] Written between 1670 and 1673, these marginalia form 'a detailed reading diary' of the octogenarian Clifford's encounter with this volume, which she both heard read aloud and read to herself.[48] Representative annotations record the mix of voices and hands inscribed in the margins of this book: 'some part of this I red over my selfe and rest of [it] Wm. Watkinson read to me the 30: 31[st] of March 1670 in Brough Castle', 'this I red over in Pendragon Ca: the 15: of May 1670', and 'part of this Chap[ter] was read over by yo[r] La[dyship] and the rest by some of yo[r] mense[r]vants in Pendragon Ca[stle]: in Westmoreland the 20 of May'.[49] A reader needs to handle a book in order to annotate it in her own

hand, but, as this extraordinary record of Clifford's reading demonstrates, a listener might dictate marginal commentary or alternate between aural and solitary reading. However, unless a compulsive reader such as Clifford leaves such a reading diary in the margins, scribal annotations disappear into the hand of the scribe.

It was not just aural reading that interfered with and complicated the practice of annotating: the habit of reading away from a desk or table also would have made it difficult to annotate a book during the era of quill pens. Many contemporary literary accounts – both those that satirized and those that solicited female readers – envisioned ladies reading with books in their laps. This imagined posture not only trivialized and eroticized women's reading, but it also made annotation unlikely. Reading with a book in one's lap would have made annotation messy, if not wholly impractical, for in addition to a quill pen, the reader would need to balance a penknife, inkpot and perhaps a sachet of pouncing powder.[50]

For the women constructed in these literary accounts, secular books were diversions, interchangeable with trifles, needlework and lapdogs. This trivialization of women's reading surely discouraged women from marking in their books, an activity, John Brinsley reminds us, that made books useful. In an epistle to the female readers of *Euphues and His England*, John Lyly conjures up a conventional scene of reading and suggests how gentlewomen might treat his book: 'I am content that your Dogges lye in your laps, so *Euphues* may be in your hands, that when you shall be wearie in reading of the one, you may be ready to sport with the other.'[51] The poet Francis Quarles uses language almost identical to Lyly's when he addresses his readers: '*Ladies* (for in your silken laps I know this book will choose to lye) . . . my suit is, that you would be pleased to give the faire *Parthenia* your noble entertainment.'[52] In both letters, the female reader is clearly figured as a gentlewoman – a lady holding a lapdog or dressed in silks who is in a position to bestow favours.[53] So too a current of distinctly sexual language moves through both letters as the female reader is solicited to 'sport with' and 'entertain' the book in her fair lap.

While Lyly and Quarles use this sexualized language as prefatory rhetoric, Richard Brathwait participates in the same discourse to dissuade the English gentlewoman from such secular reading: '*Venus* and *Adonis* are unfitting Consorts for a Ladies bosome. Remoue them timely from you, if they ever had entertainment by you.'[54] Like Lyly and Quarles, Brathwait refers to Shakespeare's poem by its title characters, heightening the sense of the physical involvement of the woman's body in her reading, for he imagines the characters themselves – not merely the octavo – at the lady's bosom.[55]

Thomas Middleton eroticizes the female reader even more explicitly in *A Mad World, My Masters*, when his courtesan advises Mistress Harebrain on her reading:

> If [your husband] chance to steal upon you, let him find
> Some book like open 'gainst an unchaste mind,
> And coted scriptures, though for your own pleasure
> You read some stirring pamphlet, and convey it
> Under your skirt, the fittest place to lay it. (1.2.86–90)

A woman might finger such a 'stirring pamphlet' under her skirt, but she certainly couldn't annotate it. On the one hand, these constructions of women's reading trivialized it so that marginalia would seem ridiculous; however, conduct books also voiced the anxiety that women might be overly attentive to their reading and seek to make use of it. Brathwait, for example, advises the English gentleman to throw any books of love 'to the darkest corner of our studies', and he then imagines women readers attending excessively to such books as they carry 'about them (even in their naked Bosomes, where chastest desires should only lodge) the amorous toyes of *Venus* and *Adonis*: which Poem . . . they heare with such attention, peruse with such devotion, and retaine with such delectation'.[56] Attending, perusing and retaining: these habits of reading were urged by humanists and often facilitated by annotation. Brathwait is alarmed, it seems, by the intensity of women readers' attention to love poetry, and he worries that they will read it as one should read a school text or Bible.

Though not in the eroticized language of these prefaces and conduct manuals, entries in women's diaries similarly cast secular reading as a pastime often performed concurrently with another activity, much as Lyly imagines. The context in which Anne Clifford presents much of her reading advances this notion of feminine reading as play and as a diversion. In entries from 1617 and 1619, she wrote: 'The 12th and 13th I spent most of the time in playing at Glecko and hearing *Moll Neville* read the Arcadia . . . The 30th and 31st I spent in hearing of reading, and playing at tables with the Steward.'[57] In these diary entries, Clifford presents card-playing and reading as nearly interchangeable (and perhaps concurrent) activities. Even the bibliophile Christina of Sweden, who at one time commanded a royal library of 8,000 volumes, reportedly found Tacitus 'as interesting as a game of chess' and read Plato before picnics and games of charades.[58] For men, too, reading was, of course, sometimes a diversion. But reading as a diversion was generally cast as feminine, and books read in this way were characterized as 'trifles' or 'toyes'.

Conventional early modern portraits present male and female sitters in different relations to books. In a portrait that includes books, a male sitter typically demonstrates an active connection and engagement with the text; often seated in a study, he is frequently surrounded by books, many of them opened, and by other signs of learnedness, and he often marks his engagement by writing. Even in portraits of less scholarly men, the subject often fingers a book, keeping his place as he is interrupted by the gaze of the painter or viewer. This physical contact with the book visually defines the literate man, and it appears in literary accounts as well. Bernard André praises the intellectual accomplishments of a young prince by listing the books that the boy has read and handled by age sixteen: Arthur, the son of Henry VII, 'had either committed in part to memory or had at least *handled* and read . . . *with his own hands and eyes* all of the following'.[59] In *The Forrest of Fancy*, the scholarly man is happiest when he has precisely this immediate, physical access to books: 'setled in his study, there to tosse and turne his bokes, perusing the workes of auncient wrighters'.[60]

In his letter to the female readers of *Euphues and His England*, Lyly echoes this gendered convention as he defines his desired female audience: '*Euphues* had rather lye shut in a Ladyes casket, then open in a Schollers studie.' Contemporary portraits of early modern women typically depict closed books as props or mere decoration.[61] Unlike analogous portraits of men, female sitters often do not even make physical contact with the books within the frame. Open books – books in use – are masculine; clasped books, like chaste women, are feminine. The extraordinary portrait of Mary Neville, Lady Dacre, by Hans Eworth plays with this convention by posing its subject much like her male contemporaries: interrupted by our gaze, Lady Dacre pauses with a quill poised over an open book as she holds her place in another book with her left hand. This portrait may be unique in sixteenth-century English portraiture for its depiction of a contemporary woman writing, for 'writing and reading, particularly in a pictorial context, are usually associated with a man'.[62] A significant departure from this convention is the iconographic tradition of the Virgin Mary pictured as a reader, especially in paintings of the Annunciation. Even as Protestant iconography moved away from such depictions of Mary, an Englishwoman's virtue might still be announced – as Middleton's courtesan suggests – by her handling of an open devotional text. Even the solid, manly Lady Dacre holds her place in a devotional book, signified by the illuminated letter visible on the open verso.[63]

Conduct books urged women to be silent, self-contained, 'solitarie and withdrawne'.[64] While such admonitions most directly relate to women's

interactions with their husbands and other men, they might also apply to women's interactions with books. Voracious female readers often read on the sly; both Elizabeth Cary and Lucy Hutchinson, for instance, read covertly throughout adolescence, Hutchinson sometimes resorting to 'steal[ing] into some hole or other to read'.[65] It was not only patriarchal conduct manuals and meddling mothers that produced such covert readings; prefaces to women's books also constructed women readers as silent. John Lyly pairs his letter 'To the Ladies and Gentlewomen of England' with one 'To the Gentlemen Readers' of *Euphues and His England*. While the two prefatory epistles are clearly companions, they invite different, gendered readings of the text. Lyly first asks women for their silence as readers:

> crauing this only, that hauing read, you conceale your censure, writing your iudgments as you do the posies in your rings, which are alwayes next to the finger, not to be seene of him that holdeth you by the hands, and yet known to you that wear them on your hands.

Lyly encourages his 'Gentlemen Readers', on the other hand, to 'say that is best, which he lyketh best', and he urges them to 'correcte [any errors] with your pennes'. Though Lyly asks both gentlewomen and gentlemen for their complicity as readers, masculine complicity produces collaborative corrections, while female complicity yields silence.

Lyly does not deny that his female readers will form critical opinions of his work, nor does he discourage them from 'writing [their] iudgments'. He begs of them only to conceal these opinions. In doing so, he continues to eroticize female readers and their responses as he casts the woman as promiscuous, presumably concealing the posies of one lover from the one who holds her hand. While only an analogy, this passage offers the tantalizing prospect that early modern women did record their reactions to their reading, but that they kept them, like the engraving inside a gold ring, hidden from public view, hidden indeed even from those who held their hands. If so, we must learn to turn these rings inside out, as it were, by searching for records of women's private responses in their correspondence and in their journals. Alternatively, we might stop looking for engraved records of reading and turn our attention instead to the rings themselves – that is, towards records of consumption.

As Lyly's attention to concealment suggests, the margins of early modern books may not have been the private spaces we might suppose they were. Perhaps, instead, as books circulated within households, the margins were a fairly public space, inviting the marks of many hands, but also putting those hands on display. Certainly, the palimpsests of ownership marks so

common in early modern books indicate the many hands through which books passed. One 1627 copy of the *Arcadia*, for example, bears sixteen contemporaneous signatures on its flyleaves and in its margins (along with lines of poetry, resolutions of debts, school exercises, mottos, drawings, even a legal summons and a laundry list).[66] Marginalia, therefore, like personal letters, may never have been fully private. In a letter urging her daughter to 'keep your resolutions with silence', Margaret Clifford counseled her daughter, Anne, to be cautious when writing: 'Dear heart be very wary what you say but most wary what you write.'[67] This wariness that Margaret Clifford urged upon her daughter and that conduct books insisted upon may well have discouraged women from writing in their books. Annotations, after all, leave evidence not just for the modern historian of reading but also for a reader's contemporaries in a household where books circulated through many sets of hands.

The women whose traces I have tried to uncover may seem to have been passive and silent if we assume that active reading requires a written record or response, but women often demonstrated otherwise that books played an important role in their lives. Many gentlewomen displayed the importance of their book ownership in elaborate bindings, careful catalogues, commissioned portraits, gift exchanges and final bequests. Frances Egerton passed many of her books to her son, the future earl of Bridgewater; Anne Clifford allowed her servants to choose books from a small collection quarterly and commissioned a portrait of herself flanked by books;[68] and Anne Boleyn dinted a copy of Tyndale's devotional work and gave it to the king. Frances Wolfreston, who inscribed her books 'Frances Wolfreston hor book', arranged for the continued integrity of her collection even after her death. In her will, Wolfreston makes the bequest of her books to her son conditional upon his willingness to loan books to his siblings and then return them 'to their places againe'.[69] For many women, it was perhaps in their physical control of books (what we might call their consumption) – in their organizing, cataloguing and bestowal – that they demonstrated to others their engagement with the world of books. Books, after all, may have been accommodated more easily as household objects than as discursive texts. Anne Clifford's eulogist offers an insight to the modern historian of reading when he asserts that books do reveal something about their owners: 'She much delighted in that holy Book, it was her Companion, and when persons, or their affections, cannot so well be known by themselves, they may be guessed at by their Companions.'[70] Like this seventeenth-century clergyman, I would argue that the books that women inscribed

and stamped and catalogued were their 'Companions', and that they tell us about their 'persons' and 'their affections'. And what we may 'guess' is that books and reading were central and serious matters for these women – not to be exchanged on a whim for a lapdog and not to be slipped under one's skirt.

NOTES

I am grateful to Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker for providing the initial occasion for this essay and for arranging such a productive, exciting exchange of ideas at the Huntington Library. For their careful readings of an early version of this essay, I am indebted to Frances Dolan, Ian Moulton, Eve Sanders, Katherine Scheil, and Steven Zwicker.

1. R. Cleaver, *A Codly* [*sic*] *Form of Householde Governement* (London, 1598), p. 169.
2. For analyses of reading as a contested activity, see M. Ferguson, 'A Room Not Their Own: Renaissance Women as Readers and Writers', in C. Koelb and S. Noakes, eds., *The Comparative Perspective on Literature* (Ithaca, 1988), p. 115; M. E. Lamb, *Gender and Authorship in the Sidney Circle* (Madison, Wisc., 1990), p. 19; F. E. Dolan, 'Reading, Writing, and Other Crimes', in V. Traub, M. L. Kaplan and D. Callaghan, eds., *Feminist Readings of Early Modern Culture: Emerging Subjects* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 142–67; J. Pearson, 'Women Reading, Reading Women', in H. Wilcox, ed., *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500–1700* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 80; K. Walker, *Women Writers of the English Renaissance* (New York and London, 1996), pp. 15–20; and E. R. Sanders, *Gender and Literacy on Stage in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 3.
3. K. Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1996), p. 4. In their studies of patriarchy in early modern England, Margaret J. M. Ezell (*The Patriarch's Wife: Literary Evidence and the History of the Family*, Chapel Hill, N.C., 1987, pp. 3–8) and Anthony Fletcher (*Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England, 1500–1800*, New Haven, 1995, pp. xv–xvi) usefully insist upon the historical specificity of this subject.
4. For the most important work in this field centred on marginalia, see L. Jardine and A. Grafton, '"Studied for Action": How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy', *Past and Present*, 129 (1990), pp. 30–78; W. H. Sherman, *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance* (Amherst, Mass., 1995), and 'What Did Renaissance Readers Write in Their Books?', in J. Andersen and E. Sauer, eds., *Books and Readers in Early Modern England: Material Studies* (Philadelphia, 2002), pp. 119–37; and S. N. Zwicker, 'Reading the Margins: Politics and the Habits of Appropriation', in K. Sharpe and S. N. Zwicker, eds., *Refiguring Revolutions: Aesthetics and Politics from the English Revolution to the Romantic Revolution* (Berkeley and London, 1998), pp. 101–15. Kevin Sharpe, whose study relies instead upon some sixty manuscript volumes,

provides an efficient survey of this emerging field (*Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England*, New Haven and London, 2000, pp. 274–7). See also H. J. Jackson, *Marginalia: Readers Writing in Books* (New Haven and London, 2001) for a learned survey of the practice from 1700 to 2000.

5. C. B. Herrup, *The Common Peace: Participation and the Criminal Law in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 48; Dolan, 'Reading, Writing, and Other Crimes', pp. 145–56; *Statutes of the Realm*, vol. 3 (London, 1817), passim. For a discussion of the unequal application of the privilege both before and after the closure of the convents, see Sanders, *Gender and Literacy on Stage*, p. 17.
6. Herrup, *The Common Peace*, p. 48.
7. Ibid., p. 49, table 3.5.
8. D. Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1980), p. 201.
9. Dolan, 'Reading, Writing, and Other Crimes', pp. 145–6; Herrup, *The Common Peace*, p. 143.
10. 34 and 35 Henry VIII, chapter 1, *Statutes*, pp. 894–7.
11. Ibid., pp. 894–5.
12. Ibid., p. 896.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. Sanders, *Gender and Literacy on Stage*, pp. 18–19. Margaret Ferguson has characterized recent feminist work as demonstrating that 'if women did not have a Renaissance, they did at least have a Reformation' ('Moderation and Its Discontents: Recent Work on Renaissance Women', *Feminist Studies*, 20 (1994), p. 352).
16. Sanders, *Gender and Literacy on Stage*, pp. 21–2.
17. M. Spufford, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular Fiction and Its Readership in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 22, 34–5.
18. Sanders, *Gender and Literacy on Stage*, p. 170.
19. Jacques Du Bosc, in a late example, identifies the three perfections of *The Compleat Woman* (London, 1639) as 'Discretion, Silence, and Modesty' (p. 18). Suzanne W. Hull names her useful book on prescriptive literature after this triad: *Chaste, Silent, and Obedient: English Books for Women, 1475–1640* (San Marino, Calif., 1988). For more on the ideal of silence, see L. Jardine, *Still Harping on Daughters: Women and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare* (New York, 1983), pp. 37–67, 106–13; M. P. Hannay, ed., *Silent but for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works* (Kent, Ohio, 1985), pp. 1–14; K. U. Henderson and B. F. McManus, eds., *Half Humankind: Contexts and Texts of the Controversy about Women in England, 1540–1640* (Urbana, Ill., 1985), pp. 53–5; P. Stallybrass, 'Patriarchal Territories: The Body Enclosed', in M. W. Ferguson, M. Quilligan and N. J. Vickers, eds., *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe* (Chicago, 1986), pp. 126–7; and Walker, *Women Writers*, pp. 8–15.

20. J. L. Vives, *A Very Frutefull and Pleasant Boke Called the Instruction of a Christen Woman*, trans. R. Hyrd (London, 1529?), facsimile edn in D. Bornstein, ed., *Distaves and Dames: Renaissance Treatises for and about Women* (Delmar, N.Y., 1978), sig. E2v; R. Brathwait, *The English Gentlewoman* (London, 1631), p. 41.
21. Brathwait, *The English Gentlewoman*, pp. 89–90.
22. D. Rogers, *Matrimoniall Honour* (London, 1642), p. 285.
23. A. R. Jones, 'Nets and Bridles: Early Modern Conduct Books and Sixteenth-Century Women's Lyrics', in N. Armstrong and L. Tennenhouse, eds., *The Ideology of Conduct: Essays on Literature and the History of Sexuality* (New York, 1987), pp. 60–1.
24. Jones, 'Nets and Bridles'; B. K. Lewalski, *Writing Women in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993), p. 3; H. Hinds, *God's Englishwomen: Seventeenth-Century Radical Sectarian Writing and Feminist Criticism* (Manchester, 1996), pp. 38–42; and T. Krontiris, *Oppositional Voices: Women as Writers and Translators of Literature in the English Renaissance* (London, 1992). For women's resistance as readers specifically, see Mary Ellen Lamb, who characterizes the constructions of female readers in these manuals as 'finally only caricatures, distorted by ideological functions' ('Constructions of Women Readers', in S. Woods and M. P. Hannay, eds., *Teaching Tudor and Stuart Women Writers*, New York, 2000, p. 32); and S. Roberts, 'Reading in Early Modern England: Contexts and Problems', *Critical Survey*, 12/2 (2000), pp. 2–5. For other compelling accounts of the disjunctions between such prescriptions and practice, see Sanders, *Gender and Literacy on the Stage*, pp. 6–7; A. L. Erickson, *Women and Property in Early Modern England* (London, 1993), p. 236; and Fletcher, *Gender, Sex, and Subordination*, pp. 101–25.
25. Hinds discusses a pamphlet written by two Quaker women in jail, *To the Priests and People of England* (London, 1655), which explicitly refutes the Pauline injunctions for silence (*God's Englishwomen*, pp. 182–4).
26. M. M. Verney, *Memoirs of the Verney Family*, vol. 3: *During the Commonwealth, 1650 to 1660* (London, 1894), p. 72.
27. Ibid., p. 73.
28. Ibid., pp. 73–4.
29. Thomas Salter excludes books of love and 'undecent bookes' from the reading list of virtuous women (*A Mirrhor Mete for All Mothers, Matrones, and Maidens*, London, 1579, sig. C3r), as do Vives (*Instruction of a Christen Woman*, sig. B2v, sig. F2r), H. Bullinger (*The Christen State of Matrimonye*, Antwerp, 1541, sig. K4v), and Brathwait (*The English Gentlewoman*, p. 139; *The English Gentleman*, London, 1630, p. 28) in their conduct manuals.
30. Verney, *Memoirs*, vol. 3, p. 74, emphasis mine.
31. I draw here on my surveys of early English printed books in the British Museum and the Huntington, Folger and Bodleian libraries, and I exclude non-verbal marks that cannot be dated or attributed. For an analysis of a more general survey and a lucid discussion of methodological challenges, see Sherman, 'What Did Renaissance Readers Write?'. His study focuses on 'more substantial

annotations', providing figures for the presence of 'early manuscript notes' rather than ownership marks and non-verbal markings (pp. 120, 122).

32. For a description and edition of Frances Egerton's library catalogue, see my essay 'The Countess of Bridgewater's London Library', in Andersen and Sauer, eds., *Books and Readers*, pp. 138–54. The ninety-five books signed by Wolfreston have been identified by Morgan as remnants of what may have been a library of more than 400 volumes. A few of Wolfreston's books carry brief appraisals or summaries on the flyleaves, and four tracts have been inscribed with her verses on the blank pages, but most of the located copies have no annotations (P. Morgan, 'Frances Wolfreston and "Hor Bouks": A Seventeenth-Century Woman Book-Collector', *The Library*, 6th series, 11 (1989), pp. 204, 207). In contrast, Lady Margaret Hoby frequently recorded in her diary that she 'wrett my notes in my testement' and transcribed bits from a sermon 'in my Comune place book' (*Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby, 1599–1605*, ed. D. M. Meads, London, 1930, pp. 70, 144, and passim). Hoby's practice, which is unusual in the survival of its careful documentation, is notably part of her religious reading. For an astute analysis of her diary, see M. E. Lamb, 'Margaret Hoby's Diary: Women's Reading Practices and the Gendering of the Reformation Subject', in S. King, ed., *Pilgrimage for Love: Essays in Early Modern Literature in Honor of Josephine A. Roberts* (Tempe, Ariz., 1999), pp. 63–94.
33. D. McKitterick, 'Women and Their Books in Seventeenth-Century England: The Case of Elizabeth Puckering', *The Library*, 7th series, 1 (2000), p. 372.
34. Contemporary ownership signatures appear in forty-five of these books, of which twenty-two are signed by at least one woman. Sixty-two books contain contemporary readers' marks of some kind; twenty of these are substantial. This sample, which consists of copies at twenty-five archives, is part of my ongoing survey of contemporary owners' and readers' marks in copies of the *Arcadia* printed between 1590 and 1674. For a discussion of readers' marks in thirty-two copies printed by 1739 and now held by the Folger Shakespeare Library, see P. Lindenbaum, 'Sidney's *Arcadia* as Cultural Monument and Proto-Novel', in C. C. Brown and A. F. Marotti, eds., *Texts and Cultural Change in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke and London, 1997), pp. 84–7.
35. C. M. Meale, '"...alle the bokes that I haue of latyn, englisch, and frensch": Laywomen and Their Books in Late Medieval England', in Meale, ed., *Women and Literature in Britain, 1150–1500* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 134. Other indisputable forms of evidence survive as well for the early modern period in women's diaries, letters and translations.
36. Sherman speculates that the practice of annotation 'must have been more widespread' than his figures suggest because readers' handling of books contributes to their deterioration and because later readers and booksellers often effaced early marks ('What Did Renaissance Readers Write?', p. 122).
37. For a more general statement of the anxieties prompted by women's writing, see Walker (*Women Writers*, pp. 20–5), who points to conduct books' collapsing of the distinction between immodest speech and writing.

In *The French Academie*, for example, de La Primaudaye asserts that 'the same rules and precepts that belong to speaking, agree also to writing' (*Women Writers*, p. 21).

38. Vives, *Instruction of a Christen Woman*, sig. E2r, discussed by V. Wayne, 'Some Sad Sentence: Vives' Instruction of a Christian Woman', in Hannay, ed., *Silent but for the Word*, pp. 21–2. For Boleyn, see J. Boffey, 'Women Authors and Women's Literacy in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century England', in Wilcox, ed., *Women and Literature*, p. 174.
39. M. Dowling, 'Anne Boleyn and Reform', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 35 (1984), p. 36.
40. J. Brinsley, *Ludus Literarius, or The Grammar Schoole* (London, 1612), pp. 46–7.
41. Ibid., p. 45.
42. J. Coleman, *Public Reading and the Reading Public in Late Medieval England and France*, (Cambridge, 1996); R. Chartier, 'The Practical Impact of Writing', *A History of Private Life*, vol. 3: *Passions of the Renaissance*, trans. A. Goldhammer (Cambridge, Mass., 1989), pp. 147–52.
43. *Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby*, p. 85.
44. *The Diary of the Lady Anne Clifford*, ed. V. Sackville-West (London, 1923), p. 41. See also *The Diary of Anne Clifford, 1616–1619: A Critical Edition*, ed. K. O. Acheson (New York, 1995).
45. Huntington Library Rare Book 97024. On the basis of paleographic analysis and a comparison with the notes and hands in the Orgel volume discussed below, I have since identified her 'Ladiship' as Anne Clifford. For a full discussion of this volume and its annotations, see my forthcoming book on early modern readers.
46. Pearson characterizes listening as 'passive reading' ('Women Reading', p. 82), and she argues persuasively that women were not encouraged to be active readers or writers (p. 84). Alberto Manguel reports a modern version of the reader as chauffeur when he recounts his job as a reader to the blind Borges (*A History of Reading*, New York, 1996, pp. 17–19).
47. Stephen Orgel owns this copy of the 1610 *Mirror*, which he very kindly allowed me to examine. A preliminary description of the volume and several reproductions appear in Orgel, 'Margins of Truth', in A. Murphy, ed., *Renaissance Text: Theory, Editing, Textuality* (Manchester, 2000), pp. 95–9. Orgel's revised interpretation of the marginalia, some of which he has now identified as Clifford's own hand, will appear in a forthcoming essay entitled 'Marginal Maternity: Reading Lady Anne Clifford's *Mirror for Magistrates*'.
48. Orgel, 'Margins of Truth', pp. 95–6.
49. Ibid., pp. 95, 97.
50. Michael Finlay discusses the range of tools used in conjunction with the quill pen, including the pounce-pot or sander, advised particularly for the preparation of margins of printed books for the more fluid ink used in writing (*Western Writing Implements in the Age of the Quill Pen*, Wetheral, Carlisle, 1980, pp. 32–4).

51. J. Lyly, 'To the Ladies and Gentlewomen of England', *Euphues and His England* (London, 1586).
52. F. Quarles, *Argalus and Parthenia* (London, 1629), sig. A3v.
53. Women below the rank of gentry are more often described – and satirized – as readers than addressed directly. See, for example, Thomas Overbury's portrayal of 'The Chambermaid' in his collection of characters, *A Wife, Now a Widowe* (London, 1614).
54. Brathwait, *The English Gentlewoman*, p. 139.
55. Sasha Roberts juxtaposes the popular trope of the eroticized female reader of *Venus and Adonis* with records of seventeenth-century female owners of this poem in 'Shakespeare "Creepes into the Womens Closets about Bedtime": Women Reading in a Room of Their Own', in G. McMullan, ed., *Renaissance Configurations: Voices/Bodies/Spaces, 1580–1690* (New York, 1998), pp. 39–52.
56. Brathwait, *The English Gentleman*, p. 28.
57. *The Diary of the Lady Anne Clifford*, pp. 76, 112.
58. C. I. Elton, 'Christina of Sweden and Her Books', *Bibliographica*, 1 (1895), pp. 14–15.
59. Cited and translated in D. R. Carlson, 'Royal Tutors in the Reign of Henry VII', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 22 (1991), p. 256, emphasis mine. The original text is in Latin: 'vel memoriae partim commendasse, vel certe propriis manibus oculisque tum volutasse tum lectasse'.
60. H. C., *The Forrest of Fancy. Wherein Is Conteined Very Prety Apothegmes, and Pleasaunt Histories, Both in Meeter and Prose* (London, 1579), dedicatory epistle.
61. In his study of seventeenth-century Dutch 'images of domestic virtue', Wayne E. Franits discusses portraits of women in the context of domestic manuals, which like their English counterparts celebrate the feminine virtues of chastity, silence, obedience and diligence (*Paragons of Virtue: Women and Domesticity in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art*, Cambridge, 1993, p. 19). For an overview of eighteenth-century portraits of women novel readers, who are represented as deeply engaged in their books, see W. B. Warner, 'Staging Readers Reading', *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 12 (2000), pp. 391–416.
62. E. Honig, 'In Memory: Lady Dacre and Pairing by Hans Eworth', in L. Gent and N. Llewellyn, eds., *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture, c. 1540–1660* (London, 1990), pp. 62 and 250 n. 7.
63. Ibid., p. 61.
64. Cleaver, for example, distinguishes between male and female gender roles: 'The dutie of the husband is, to deale with many men: and of the wiues, to talke with fewe. The dutie of the husband is, to be entermedling: and of the wife, to bee solitarie and withdrawne' (*A Godly Form of Householde Governement*, p. 169).
65. L. Hutchinson, 'The Life of Mrs Lucy Hutchinson', *Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson*, ed. J. Hutchinson (London, 1965), p. 14.
66. Folger STC 22547, copy 3.

67. Dated 22 September 1615, this letter is excerpted in Lewalski, *Writing Women*, pp. 134–5.
68. For discussions of Anne Clifford's commissioned portrait, see M. E. Lamb, 'The Agency of the Split Subject: Lady Anne Clifford and the Uses of Reading', *English Literary Renaissance*, 22 (1992), pp. 347–68; G. Parry, 'The Great Picture of Lady Anne Clifford', in D. Howarth, ed., *Art and Patronage in the Caroline Courts* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 202–19; and Sanders, *Gender and Literacy on Stage*, pp. 188–94.
69. Morgan, 'Frances Wolfreston and "Hor Bouks" ', pp. 200–1.
70. E. Rainbowe, bishop of Carlisle, *A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the Right Honorable Anne Countess of Pembroke, Dorset, and Montgomery . . . with Some Remarks on the Life of That Eminent Lady* (London, 1677), p. 61.

READING, SOCIETY AND POLITICS IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND

EDITED BY
KEVIN SHARPE
AND
STEVEN N. ZWICKER

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, United Kingdom

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521824347

First published in print format 2003

ISBN-13 978-0-511-07069-3 eBook (EBL)
ISBN-10 0-511-07069-1 eBook (EBL)

ISBN-13 978-0-521-82434-7 hardback
ISBN-10 0-521-82434-6 hardback