Elizabeth Grymeston's *Miscelanea, Meditations, Memoratives* and the Commonplace-Book Culture of Sixteenth-Century English Women Writers

by

Jane Goulding

A thesis submitted to the

School of Graduate Studies

In partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of English

Memorial University of Newfoundland

June 2024

St. John's

Newfoundland

Abstract

Elizabeth Grymeston's *Miscelanea, Meditations, Memoratives* (1604) has generally been considered one of the earliest and most polished examples of late sixteenth- and seventeenth-century mother's legacy genre. Written between 1601 and 1603 and published posthumously in four reprints (1604, 1606?, 1608?, 1618?), Grymeston's work is routinely compared to that of seventeenth-century mother's legacy writers Dorothy Leigh and Elizabeth Joceline. However, despite being dedicated to Grymeston's only son, Bernye Grymeston, *Miscelanea* is not only a tract of motherly advice but also a survey of Grymeston's life events, biblical knowledge, religious loyalties, and reading materials. In fact, as I will argue, Grymeston's compilation displays the reading, extracting, and gathering characteristic of early modern commonplace books and can be compared more effectively to devotional collections such as Lady Frances Abergavenny's prayers, published in Thomas Bentley's anthology *The Monument of Matrones* (1582). In this thesis, I reconsider, therefore, Grymeston's compilation within the context of the humanist educational practice of commonplacing and compare her work to the female-authored commonplace books of Katherine Parr and Elizabeth I. By recontextualizing Grymeston's *Miscelanea* and applying a more flexible definition of the mother's legacy genre especially in regards to its sixteenth-century representatives, I intend to redefine Grymeston's place within the commonplace-book culture of early modern English women writers.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to express my immense gratitude to Dr. Ágnes Juhász-Ormsby of the English Department at Memorial University of Newfoundland and Labrador. As my professor, supervisor, and mentor throughout my studies at Memorial University, Dr. Juhász-Ormsby's tremendous wealth of knowledge and expertise has been imperative to the development of my research. Her endless support and feedback made this thesis possible, and I am overwhelmingly thankful for the opportunity to learn from her.

I would also like to thank the English Department at Memorial University of Newfoundland and Labrador, as well as the School of Graduate Studies, for their financial support through graduate fellowships and conference funding. Their generosity has contributed significantly to my work and provided me with the resources to further my studies.

I extend my appreciation to everyone who attended my conference presentations and offered valuable encouragement and feedback on my writing: Dr. Joseph Khoury of St. Francis Xavier University at the 2023 Atlantic Early Modern and Medieval Association Conference and both Dr. Glenn Clark of the University of Manitoba and Dr. James Doelman of the University of Western Ontario at the 2024 Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies Conference. I would like to thank my examiners, Dr. Sarah Crover from the University of Vancouver Island and Dr. John Geck from Memorial University of Newfoundland and Labrador, as their feedback added immense value to my work. I am incredibly thankful for the additional guidance from Dr. John Geck, as well as Dr. Robert Ormsby at Memorial University of Newfoundland and Labrador throughout both my undergraduate and graduate studies, as their continued support has made an incredible impact on my education. I am also gratefully indebted to Dr. Edith Snook of the

University of New Brunswick and Dr. Victoria Burke of the University of Ottawa, whose respective scholarship on Elizabeth Grymeston and women's commonplace books has provided the foundation and inspiration for this thesis.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their continuous love and support, as well as my dearest friends, Olivia and Eilish, who have always encouraged and celebrated my interests as if they were their own.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Elizabeth Grymeston's *Miscelanea, Meditations, Memoratives* has generally been considered one of the earliest and most polished examples of the seventeenth-century mother's legacy genre. Written between 1601 and 1603 and published posthumously in four reprints (1604, 1606?, 1608?, 1618?), Grymeston's work features her own dedicatory epistle "To Her Loving Son" and a collection of prayers, meditations, and poems, composed with the intention of guiding her son, Bernye Grymeston, through "the houre of thy marriage, and the houre of thy death" (A3). Through her authorship of the motherly advice text, Grymeston used "the most authoritative function open to her in early modern English society" (Travitsky, *Nondramatic Writers* 164) not only as an account of motherly love but as an expression of her own societal limitations and Catholic religious defiance after the English Reformation. In each edition, Grymeston includes an adaptation of Catholic priest and poet Robert Southwell's *Saint Peter's Complaint* (1595), while also extracting and adapting verses from Catholic poet, editor, and commonplace-book writer Robert Allott's *Englands Parnassus* (1600) and Catholic printer-publisher Richard Verstegan's *Odes in imitation of the seuen penitential psalmes, vvith sundry other poemes and ditties tending to deuotion and pietie* (1601). Grymeston modifies these sources to advise her son on conduct and self-discipline centred on the importance of religious loyalty. Although Grymeston's work included clear Catholic references, Megan Matchinske finds that upon being entered for the first time in the Stationers' Register, the *Miscelanea* was "given a second stamp of approval by the wardens of the Stationers' Company—and as such contained nothing subversive or heretical—nothing, that is, that professed the Catholic faith" in Protestant England ("Gendering Catholic Conformity" 329–330). While there is reason to believe the initial fourteen chapters of Grymeston's *Miscelanea*, printed after her death by Melchisidec (Melch) Bradwood

for Felix Norton, may have undergone changes, including the addition of Simon Grahame's prefatory poem, the 1606 edition, printed by George Elde for William Aspley, features even more substantial additions, including six new "Meditations" promoting subjects associated with the Catholic faith, which Matchinske identifies as commentary on "oath taking, royal authority, and personal sacrifice" ("Gendering Catholic Conformity" 331). The third and fourth printings of the miscellany include additional material, as indicated by the title change to *Miscellanea, Prayers, Meditations, Memoratives*. Both of these editions were printed for the publisher Aspley, one in 1608 by Bradwood and the other in 1618 by Edward Griffin. By considering the rich printing history and various altered editions of Grymeston's miscellany, it is evident that not only did it have great success as a mother's legacy tract but also as a Catholic text which only grew in its controversial religious content as more editions were printed.

In spite of its obvious Catholic allegiance, scholars tend to compare Grymeston's miscellany to representative works of the mother's legacy genre belonging to Protestant women writers such as Dorothy Leigh and Elizabeth Joceline, even though the *Miscelanea* has little in common with either of these women's work other than their authors' position as mothers. Despite being dedicated to Grymeston's only son, *Miscelanea* is not only a tract of motherly advice but a survey of her life events, biblical knowledge, religious loyalties, and reading materials. In fact, Grymeston's compilation can be compared more effectively to devotional collections such as Lady Frances Abergavenny's prayers, published in Thomas Bentley's anthology *The Monument of Matrones* (1582) and commonly identified as the first mother's legacy text. Furthermore, Grymeston's work displays the reading, extracting, and gathering characteristic of early modern commonplace books such as Robert Allott's *Englands Parnassus*, from which she directly borrows in her own writing. In "Memorial Books: Commonplaces,

Gender, and Manuscript Compilation in Seventeenth-Century England," Victoria Burke refers to the commonplace book as a "storehouse of knowledge," arguing for the genre's direct correlation with early modern anxieties about the loss of memory and knowledge (121–124). By compiling and editing her own learned material to prevent its loss under the circumstances of imminent death, Grymeston is participating in the practice of commonplacing through the guise of the mother's legacy. For this reason, my study will expand the analysis of Grymeston's work beyond the constraints of the mother's legacy genre, proposing that her *Miscelanea* exhibits traits of both the mother's legacy genre and commonplace-book culture that warrant a revised analysis of and new approach to her published work. In this thesis, I reconsider, therefore, Grymeston's compilation within the context of the humanist educational practice of commonplacing and compare her work to the female-authored commonplace books of Katherine Parr and Elizabeth I. By recontextualizing Grymeston's *Miscelanea* and applying a more flexible definition of the mother's legacy genre, especially in regards to its sixteenth-century representatives, I intend to redefine Grymeston's place within the commonplace-book culture of early modern English women writers.

Despite the popularity of her published text, the majority of Grymeston's life (*b.* in or before 1563, *d.* between 1601 and 1603) remains undocumented. She was the daughter of lawyer and substantial landowner Martin Bernye of Norfolk, meaning that her family would have held gentry status (Travitsky, *ODNB*). This is also reflected in Grymeston's level of literacy and the literary sources in her writing, as she was able to reference and rework large sections of Southwell's, Allott's, and Verstegan's works. Grymeston's knowledge may also be a product of her marriage to the highly educated Christopher Grymeston of Yorkshire, who was a fellow and bursar at Caius College in Cambridge from 1578 until 1592 (Travitsky, *ODNB*). Christopher

Grymeston's departure from the college and entrance into Gray's Inn of the Inns of Court in 1592 may have been motivated by a number of factors. It may have been partly due to his marriage, since Caius College strictly forbade the marriage of fellows, and partly to his family's connection to Catholicism during a time when Cambridge was strongly anti-Catholic (Travitsky, *Nondramatic Writers* 164). Records suggest that Elizabeth Grymeston shared her husband's Catholic leanings, as an Elizabeth Grymeston of Yorkshire (the home of Christopher Grymeston) was fined for recusancy in 1593 (Travitsky, *ODNB*). During her marriage, Grymeston gave birth to nine children, eight of whom did not survive, leaving one son, Bernye Grymeston, the addressee and intended reader of her *Miscelanea*. In the introductory epistle of *Miscelanea*, Grymeston brings up the challenges recusancy has brought upon her family: her conflict with her Protestant mother and the "eight sinister assaults" her husband received that prompted her to write to her son that she is "doubtful of thy fathers life" (A3). Additionally, Grymeston remarks that she has fallen critically ill amongst her other misfortunes, lamenting that she is "a dead woman amongst the living" (A3). From the position of a dying mother estranged from her family and concerned about the fate of her child's father, Grymeston used her advanced reading and writing ability to produce a work that exhibits all the traits of a mother's legacy tract, while containing subversive religious material that separates her from the primarily Protestant writers of the genre.

As is revealed by the religious nature of her work, Grymeston's education would have been directly influenced by the humanist movement, whose authors favoured morally, philosophically, and practically oriented religious teachings over the late medieval scholastic education that emphasized dialectic, logic, and theology. This shift in the disciplines was beneficial to broadening the educational program and even advanced the education of women

such as Grymeston. Leading humanists and educational theorists, such as the English humanist Thomas More and the Spanish humanist Juan Luis Vives, believed in women's education as a way to promote more informed Christian values (Smith 11). Since women were not allowed to attend grammar schools, Grymeston's education would have primarily taken place in the home or church, likely under the guidance of a family member or private tutor (Charlton 159). Grymeston undoubtedly acquired the extensive biblical knowledge that was commonly approved for women by humanist teachers and scholars, yet much of the material cited in her text reveals that not only did she know English and possibly some Italian and French but also Latin and Greek, which were less common subjects of a woman's education (Hughey and Hereford 68). Although the humanist movement highly valued these subjects, the study of classical languages tended to be restricted to boys' grammar schools, with exceptions for women who held higher social standing or had exceptional parental encouragement (Salmon 95). Vives, for example, declared that "because women do not participate in public affairs, they need less education and that of a different nature, omitting logic and rhetoric" (Gibson 12). Nevertheless, women of higher social classes were usually motivated by their parents or spouses to learn "fashionable languages," especially if they held ties to the Court or the universities. In Grymeston's case, it is likely that her husband's affiliation with Caius College, Cambridge, shaped her linguistic development. However, the attitude towards women's linguistic education in the sixteenth century remained negative, especially for those who ventured past their vernacular language into the "father tongue" of the classical languages (Gibson 14). In comparison to other learned women writers of her time, Grymeston displays a uniquely extensive breadth of knowledge in the *Miscelanea* through her ability to read and adapt a variety of source texts in different languages, challenging

the common conception that linguistic education was strictly a male acquisition during the sixteenth century.

Considering Grymeston's impressive education, the quality of written and adapted material in her *Miscelanea* is much overlooked due to its classification as a mother's legacy. Because Grymeston is one of the few authors of the genre with Catholic ties, the majority of the limited literature on her focuses on her Catholic recusancy, primarily due to the scandal of her husband's departure from Cambridge. The first extensive study on Grymeston and her *Miscelanea*, by Ruth Hughey and Philip Hereford (1934), provides a survey of the printing history of the text, a brief background on the Grymeston family, and some analysis on the tract's paratext and source material. Hughey and Hereford identify the printer and the date of publication of each edition of the *Miscelanea*, as well as the ornaments and initials belonging to Bradwood and "three pertinent mistakes deriving only from Elde's edition" (64). However, Hughey and Hereford make only vague statements about her knowledge of Italian, Latin, and Greek and suggest that amongst her reading materials there was "probably a copy of Ariosto's poems" in her husband's library (89). They also make disapproving comments on her alteration of her sources, stating that she "weakens the force of the [ideas]" and "violently [disturbs]" the original material (87). While the article offers a variety of important details and context about her miscellany, Hughey and Hereford's reduction of Grymeston as a "clumsy" writer and "a little confused" invalidates her work (88).

Additionally, the majority of scholarship on Grymeston in the last twenty years positions her work in the context of the mother's legacy genre, considering her alongside such writers as Elizabeth Joceline, Elizabeth Clinton, and Dorothy Leigh, despite their work appearing long after Grymeston's. However, these studies focus on historical influences that would have impacted

those mother's legacy authors who followed Grymeston during the peak of the genre in the seventeenth century. In her chapter in *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500–1700*, Valerie Wayne views Elizabeth Stuart, daughter of King James I, as the primary figure for "new mothers," who served as the driving force for the popular mother's advice text. Wayne writes, "in 1616, Dorothy Leigh dedicated her *Mothers Blessing* to the Princess Elizabeth…and the three remaining mothers' advice books…appeared in 1622, 1623, and 1624, when Elizabeth's plight was worsening" (62). The years listed in Wayne's chapter represent the work of Elizabeth Clinton and Elizabeth Joceline, leaving out the work of Elizabeth Grymeston as an author of the genre, since the latter could not have been influenced by Elizabeth Stuart, who did not become a mother until 1614. This exclusion of Grymeston in the contextual discussion of the genre is continued in Elizabeth Mazzola's article "Elizabeth I's Coronation Robes and Mothers' Legacies in Early Modern England," which discusses mother's legacies specifically through the relationship between mother and daughter as displayed in Clinton's work, thus shedding little light on Grymeston's writing, its historical context, or possible literary influences. Alternatively, the more useful recent studies on Grymeston and her work are Jennifer Heller's *The Mother's Legacy in Early Modern England* (2011) and Edith Snook's *Women, Reading, and the Cultural Politics of Early Modern England* (2005). Heller describes the mother's legacy genre as "capacious" in nature and admits that Grymeston's miscellany is "unique" amongst other legacy texts, not only for its unusual learnedness and Catholic positioning but its gathering and reworking of material that "suggests the influence of the commonplace book" (183). While Heller does not elaborate further on this assertion, Snook dedicates a chapter of her book to Grymeston and the *Miscelanea*, including a section specifically addressing the *Miscelanea*'s similarities to the commonplace book, which offers indispensable insight for my study. She

asserts that "Grymeston's writing shares both purpose and method with the practice of commonplacing, even though *Miscelanea*…is neither, strictly speaking, a commonplace book nor a verse miscellany" (253). In making this comparison, Snook's study especially highlights Grymeston's position as a reader and her exclusion from formal education, which I build upon in my close analysis of the *Miscelanea*'s sources and its likeness to other female-authored works of the sixteenth century, such as those by Lady Frances Abergavenny, Katherine Parr, and Elizabeth I.

Despite their shared emphasis on religious material and positioning as early maternal legacies, no study exists which includes a focused and in-depth analysis of Grymeston's work in relation to the first mother's legacy text: Lady Frances Abergavenny's collection of prayers to her adult daughter (1575) as printed in Thomas Bentley's *The Monument of Matrones* (1582). Bentley's anthology predates Grymeston's miscellany, providing an important source for her historical and literary influences, unlike the seventeenth-century works to which Grymeston is routinely compared. Additionally, Katherine Parr's *Prayers or Meditations* (1545) and MS Harley 2342, her unpublished personal prayer book, as well as Queen Elizabeth I's commonplace book, *Precationes Priuate, Regiae E[lizabethae]. R[eginae]*, will be compared to Grymeston's as examples of early modern commonplace books written by women that exhibit high levels of learnedness and political knowledge. I will analyze Grymeston's work in the context of sixteenth-century women's commonplace books aided by Adam Smyth in his chapter in *Women and Writing c. 1340–c. 1650*, titled "Commonplace Book Culture: A List of Sixteen Traits." In addition to Smyth's study, my discussion of early modern commonplace book culture is supplemented more broadly by Burke's aforementioned study on the genre and Ann Moss's *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (1996) in order to

provide a thorough recontextualization of Grymeston within commonplace book culture. In "Notions in Garrison: The Seventeenth-Century Commonplace Book," Peter Beale makes the distinction between the genres of miscellany and commonplace, admitting that while both exhibit displays of compilation, the former tends to privilege what is "pleasurable" and the latter what is "useful" (142–143). The genre, most commonly associated with the educational practices of early modern schoolboys, can be more strictly defined as "a collection of well-known or personally meaningful textual excerpts organized under individual thematic headings" (Havens 8). For this reason, surviving commonplace books provide valuable insight into both the personal perspectives of their writers and the broad "material, social, and cultural contexts" in which they were created, aiding in our contemporary understanding of early modern reading and writing practices (Schurink 456). Unsurprisingly, the majority of written and extant commonplace books are the work of male writers who benefitted from easier access to humanist rhetorical training than women during the early modern period. As is pointed out in Burke's study of commonplace books, women's literacy rates were remarkably low during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, resulting in a much smaller volume of commonplace books authored by women. Similarly to women's education, these commonplace books were highly dependent on class, status, and connections ("Ann Bowyer's Commonplace Book" 28–29). While the commonplace books of both Katherine Parr and Queen Elizabeth I serve as crucial examples of women's writing within the genre, as aristocratic women they both benefitted from a rare and highly specialized education that was not accessible to non-aristocratic women. By re-contextualizing Elizabeth Grymeston as a female author of a commonplace book and comparing her work to that of Katherine Parr and Queen Elizabeth I, the cultural, social and political contexts of non-elite early modern women's education and readership can be

significantly broadened. Through my research and extensive comparative analysis, I aim to expand on the limited scholarship surrounding Grymeston's *Miscelanea*, arguing that it is not only a rich display of early modern motherhood but an interdisciplinary text that bridges theories of motherhood, gender, and commonplace-book culture through which a woman author could express her religious and political discontent.

Chapter I: The Publication History and Sources of Grymeston's *Miscelanea*

While it remains largely unknown whether Grymeston intended her *Miscelanea* to be published, the release of her work in four editions attests to its popularity with an audience much wider than her one surviving son to whom it was addressed. Contending with the social and political stigma of female authorship in the early modern period, Grymeston's motherhood serves as what Patricia Pender would call an "authorial alibi" or pretext for her authorship that deems both her and her work appropriate for public consumption (3). Women like Grymeston were granted access to the authorship under the pretense that they would uphold gendered expectations of obedience and piety, producing more "good mothers" out of their female audience (Heller 15). Although Grymeston profited from the rise in popularity of the mother's legacy genre, the analysis of her *Miscelanea* still requires the consideration of patriarchal structures that would have shaped women's education, readership, and authorship during the sixteenth and early seventeenth century. This is especially pertinent when considering the effects of male print agents, publishers, printers, and editors on the creation and reception of the female author figure (Wright 19). In *Producing Women's Poetry, 1600–1730: Text and Paratext, Manuscript and Print*, Gillian Wright acknowledges the "gender-specific difficulties of self-authorization, especially in literary genres and in print" (19). While the factors that control female authorship could be familial, educational, social, or cultural, they were ultimately enabled or inhibited by male figures within the author's life. Although Grymeston could benefit from writing within a genre accessible to women, the success of her work otherwise relied on male-authored references, male-written paratext, and male publishing, as a Catholic, non-elite, female author.

Grymeston's work was first printed under its original title, *Miscelanea*, in 1604 by Bradwood for publisher Felix Norton. After a nine-year apprenticeship, Norton operated as a

bookseller from 1600 until his death in 1603 (McKerrow 203). *Miscelanea* was attributed to Norton posthumously in the Stationers' Register, recorded as one of the last works to appear under his name amongst two male-written tracts, Sir Francis Bacon's *Apologie in certaine imputations concerning the late Earle of Essex* (1604) and Roger Fenton's *A sermon of simonie and sacriledge preached at Pauls Crosse* (1604) (Hughey and Hereford 61). Despite his rather short-lived career, Norton published several works reflecting allegiance to state politics and the Protestant Church, including an edition of King James I's *A Meditation upon the 27th and 28th Verses of the 17th Chapter of Saint Luke* (1603) and another of Bacon's works titled *The Happie Union of the Kingdomes of England and Scotland Dedicated in priuate to his Maiestie* (1603). Since Norton's surviving publications do not appear to include any other legacies, miscellanies, or female-authored works, his interest in Grymeston's *Miscelanea* was likely motivated by its religious material rather than by the novelty of its genre. As is apparent in the Stationers' Register, the first edition of *Miscelanea* was approved "under the hands of Master Pasfield and the Wardens"; that Pasfield was an ecclesiastical member of the Stationers' licencing panel indicated that Grymeston's work, at the time of Norton's publishing, contained no controversial religious material (Smith, *A Transcript of the Registers* 104; Matchinske, "Gendering Catholic Conformity" 330). Meanwhile, *Miscelanea* still faced the controversy of being written by a female author and its success in print would have been heavily reliant on its male contributors.

The first edition's printer, Bradwood, was a highly successful member of the esteemed London printing office Elliot's Court from 1584 to 1618, known for many notable titles, including a 1602 translation of Plutarch's *Moralia*, an edition of Ortelius's *Theatre of the Whole World*, and many Greek texts "obtained from abroad" (McKerrow 48). Like Norton, Bradwood did not seem to have any history working with female-authored texts, but his reputation as a

printer would play a significant role in the proclamation and reception of Grymeston's authorship, specifically through the mode of paratext (Coldiron 66–67). Even though the paratextual materials of a text are often interpreted as extensions of the author's work, they additionally serve to reveal the intentions of the printer or publisher, especially in the case of a female-written and posthumously published text such as Grymeston's (Smith and Wilson 5–7). Considering the ideology that "gender is something that is enacted, rather than simply stated" (Clarke 134), these intentions are particularly important in analyzing the relationship between paratext and female authorship, as is apparent in the aesthetic choices made by printers to signify or conceal gender for the purpose of marketing. The title page of Bradwood's first edition printing of Grymeston's *Miscelanea* is fashioned with similar ornamentation and typography to many of his male-written works, indicative of the "crucial role [paratexts play] in constructing and determining how a reader might position [a gendered speaker]" (Clarke 150). Bradwood's 1607 *Articles to be inquired of by the church-wardens*, printed for the Church of England, is one of many examples that feature a wide floriated border, a popular ornament used in early modern printed books, along with roman and italic type on its title page that appear nearly identical to that of Grymeston's. Additionally, the *Miscelanea*'s title page contains an imprint including both Bradwood's and Norton's names, as well as a simplified version of one of Bradwood's early printer's devices, appearing on printed works such as William Leighton's *Vertue triumphant* (1603) and Thomas Cogan's *The haven of health* (1605). Whether intentional or not, by printing Grymeston's miscellany to include his name, printer's device, and paratextual features recognizable from his other male-written works, Bradwood is presenting her as an equal amongst her male peers and granting her his valued approval as a successful male figure in the printing world.

Moreover, Grymeston's full name appears on the miscellany's title page, rather than appearing in gender-ambiguous initials as many other printers of female-authored texts during the period used. In *Renaissance Women: A Sourcebook*, Kate Aughterson articulates that the paratextual materials of women's texts such as title pages and prefaces "display a consciousness of the masculine control of discourse, in all its areas: genre; interpretation; reading; style; and publication," an assertion that can be especially applied to Grymeston's text due to its posthumous release (225). For this reason, the inclusion of her full name must be viewed as a strategy that would have benefitted Bradwood, either for the novel performance of femininity often used to sell printed works in the complaint genre or to cater to a wider and emerging female readership (Coldiron 65–67; Clarke 134). Concurrently, Grymeston's name on the title page seems to call little attention to itself, appearing no larger than the male names in the imprint, suggesting that while Bradwood sought to use her authorship as a selling point, he was still cognizant of the stigma of female authorship and thus denies her any significant authorial agency (Pender 1–3; Aughterson 226). Danielle Clarke addresses the phenomenon of this contradictory presentation of female authorship by proposing that since paratextual elements can provide "clues" to suggest a female speaker, it must be considered how specific circumstances contribute to the reader's identification, resistance, or ignorance of these clues (133). Taking into account these variables, the use of Grymeston's name on the *Miscelanea*'s title page is not necessarily an indication of her authorial agency but an implication that a printer can simultaneously present and discount female authorship to appeal to a wider readership with differing perspectives.

The presentation of Grymeston's authorship is additionally set up by the use of what French literary theorist Gérard Genette would identify as a *parageneric* title, combining a

commonly used or "homonymic" term such as "Miscellanies" with lesser used distinctions "Meditations" and "Memoratives." The title *Miscelanea, Meditations, Memoratives* is effectively generic enough to conjure specific expectations about its contents, while simultaneously "[displaying] a sort of genre innovation" by combining multiple literary designations (Genette 86). In her chapter in *Renaissance Paratexts*, Clarke applies Genette's theory to her analysis of gendered paratext, revealing how works that identify themselves within the complaint genre through their title, such as Shakespeare's *A Lover's Complaint* (1609), imply the presence of the female voice, even when their title "does not appear to suggest anything about the gender of its speaker" (136). This theorization can also be applied to the title of Grymeston's work, which, when compared to a tract such as Joceline's *The Mothers Legacie to Her Unborn Child* (1624), does not reveal any kind of association with the mother's legacy genre or the female voice more broadly. The title *Miscelanea, Meditations, Memoratives* instead signifies an association with the male-dominated genre of miscellany, only further revealing Bradwood's strategy to conceal Grymeston's authorship within the popular miscellany genre rather than marketing it as a rare account of a mother's legacy.

While Grymeston's work is presented as a miscellany through its title, other paratextual elements such as epigraphs reveal its more specific categorization as a religious work. On its title page, the *Miscelanea*'s first epigraph is "Non est rectum, quod à Deo non est directum," meaning "It is not right, which is not directed to God," likely serving as a biblical quotation or verse adaptation despite its lack of specific reference (A2). The same Latin phrase was used by Puritan preacher Thomas Adams in his book of sermons entitled *Lycanthropy Or The Wolfe Worrying The Lambes*, which was printed alongside his other religious works in 1615, a few years after the initial printing of Grymeston's miscellany. This adaptation suggests that either Adams may have

been a reader of Grymeston or the phrase was widely used (McGee 2). Despite the uncertain origin of the phrase, its appearance in the work of a prominent Church of England clergyman points to its association with Puritan values, allowing the phrase's usage on Grymeston's title page as a method to conceal her ties to Catholicism and market her work without controversial religious barriers. Furthermore, Grymeston's work includes a second epigraph hidden deeper within the text, following her written epistle. The second epigraph, "En Ma Foy Je Sufre Tout," translated from the original French means "In My Faith I Suffer Everything." In their study on Grymeston's editions, Hughey and Hereford suggest that the phrase is a familial motto, as it was used on "a flyleaf of a vellum manuscript volume which at one time belonged to Christopher Grymeston" containing philosophical tracts from Guillaume de Conches, Petrarch, and Alanus de Insul (82). While, like the epigraph on the title page, this motto does not explicitly reference one specific religious affiliation, the phrase *for one's faith* suggests sentiments of Catholic recusancy, doubly strengthened by its association with Grymeston's presumably Catholic husband. The *Miscelanea*'s epigraphs not only reveal the emphasis on religious themes in the text but also exemplify what Matchinske identifies as Grymeston's "covert *and* conciliatory Catholicism," which relies on furtive religious signalling combined with performative compliance rather than "radical Catholic advice" to avoid persecution by English reformers while maintaining her practice of Catholic faith ("Gendering Catholic Conformity" 332–333). Grymeston's epigraph in her first edition only foreshadows the suspiciously religious augmentations that appear hidden throughout her later editions. Moreover, Grymeston's covert religious and political commentary reveals her practice of creating "legacy and longevity" in her work, thus avoiding dangerous displays of public Catholicism (Matchinske, "Gendering Catholic Conformity" 333).

Beyond Grymeston's table of contents which, similar to the title page, contains no specific identification of her tract as a mother's legacy, the *Miscelanea*'s first indication of Grymeston's motherhood appears in the form of a self-authored preliminary epistle, "*To her loving son* Bernye Grymeston" (A3). While male-written paratext remained the most successful way to market a work of female authorship, Grymeston's introductory epistle directly addressing her son would have likely helped her emerge into the genre with a work that otherwise contained little evidence of a mother's legacy. Initially exhibiting a likeness to other epistles featured in the mother's advice tradition, Grymeston's letter begins by lamenting the "force of [her] love" and responsibility as a mother to "[advise] her children out of her owne experience" (A3). Yet in the same line, Grymeston describes her work as a "portable *veni mecum*," closely resembling the term "*vade mecum*," which translates directly to "come with me" or "go with me" respectively, and was aptly used as an alternative term for the commonplace book because of its often-convenient size (Moss 103; Snook 85). In her article "Rhetoric and the Evolution of Ideas and Styles in the Renaissance," Moss "[refers] to the commonplace-book, [as] the notebook which was the essential *vade mecum* of the student and also of the mature reader," suggesting that Grymeston's epistle foreshadows her work as a survey of her reading and life experiences akin to that of a commonplace book rather than a mother's advice book (103). This is first exhibited by Grymeston's cryptic initial advice to "do that which is good" in order to keep oneself from criminal offences, a line that seems to echo her own criminal offence, documented through a fine under her name for recusancy in 1593 (Travitsky, *Nondramatic Writers* 165). Grymeston continues by lamenting "her mother's undeserved wrath," her "languishing consumption" (an alternative name for tuberculosis), and the unknown status of her husband's life, shifting the contents of the epistle from advisory to lamentory (A3). Ironically, Grymeston

writes that she intends to advise her son on the topics of marriage and death, both of which seem to be areas of her own life in which she is experiencing extreme misfortune. She advises him on marrying too young, maintaining chastity, and relying on "*Reason* as thy Counseller…[and] *Will* as an absolute Prince" for the selection of a proper and loyal wife (A4). However, the brief sentiments Grymeston does offer here on marriage are never revisited in the body of her work, with the epistle containing the only instance of domestic advice throughout the entire text. It is an unusual feature amongst traditional mother's legacies that suggests "more [concern] with representing a 'register' of the meditative mother than with providing genuine maternal advice" (Anselment 433). In her study on the *Miscelanea*'s political equivocation, Matchinske theorizes this sole inclusion of marital advice as another example of Grymeston's embedded Catholic politics, suggesting that

> Employing a standard analogy between prince and husband, the *Miscelanea*'s early and pointed references to proper authority (suitors who marry young, stick to their promises, and do not deceive) can be understood not only as good advice to an unmarried son, but also as a reminder to both state officials and Church fathers of what good "controlment" ought to mean in relations between husbands and wives, princes and subjects, priests and penitents. ("Gendering Catholic Conformity" 351)

As Snook has noted, Grymeston's preliminary epistle can be read as enacting the parallel between her life as an obedient wife and a loyal Catholic, both positions which align her identity with the private, rather than public, sphere (78).

Furthermore, Grymeston seems to enact a paradoxical apology in her epistle, using an amalgamation of several unreferenced philosophical quotations to justify the validity of her literary form despite the previous self-deprecating commentary about her authorship.

Grymeston's authorship would have been shaped by the constraints of modesty tropes, like early modern women published before and after her, specifically when considering her authorial agency (Pender 1). This practice of modesty can be exemplified by many notable female figures of the period, including Anne Bradstreet in her "Prologue" to Sir Walter Ralegh's *The History of the World* (1650), where she writes: 'To sing of wars, of captains, and of kings, / .... For my mean pen are too superior things,' and Queen Elizabeth in her 1566 speech at Oxford University, which she began by stating "unaccustomed as I am to public speaking" (1). Grymeston is no exception to this use of *occupatio* or apology, in which a woman writer dismisses her authorship and claims inadequacy (7). Throughout her writing, Grymeston identifies her "fruitless brain" and "broken style," admitting that her sentiments would be "better expressed by a graver author" and that she is ultimately without the "ability to afford further discourse" (A3, A3v, B). Meanwhile, Patricia Pender asserts that "the sheer range, variety, and durability of modesty tropes testify to the remarkability of the literary formula," bringing to attention the differing levels at which paratextual apologies were made and maintained (22–23). In her article on gender representation during the English Renaissance, Mary Beth Rose identifies writers of mother's legacies as being especially capable of practicing paradoxical *occupatio*, stating

> The Renaissance mother-authors mimic dominant sexual discourses with a vengeance. In particular, they elaborate and clarify, by taking to an extreme, the equation of maternal love with sacrifice and transgression, an equation that is embedded more discreetly in male conceptualizations. These characteristics of motherhood are associated with the act of writing itself, perceived as public and thus, for women, as deviant. Despite the intense apologia with which each mother begins her book (a common trope in works by Renaissance women), none quite succeeds in exorcising the demon of lawlessness (311)

Therefore, Grymeston, as both mother and author, can simultaneously practice modest womanhood and trangressive authorship, creating her complex authorial identity. Snook notes a particular quote from an early copy of Joshua Sylvester's translation of the sixteenth-century French poet Guillaume de Salluste Du Bartas, which Grymeston uses to describe herself as "a wit's Camelion, / that any authors colours can put on" (A3v). Snook asserts that by comparing herself to a chameleon via Sylvester's quote, Grymeston acknowledges that she is able to write using the work of other authors, yet "she also implies that she may not be exactly as she appears" (77). The use of this metaphor hints at Grymeston's ability to "change colours" as a Catholic during the Reformation but can also be read as an indication of her performative positioning in the mother's legacy genre; "it is as a chameleon that Grymeston negotiates the problems of being a woman writer and an English Catholic" (Snook 77). Grymeston continues to defend her writing with another "pervasive metaphor for commonplace book compilation," writing, "the spider's web is neither the better because woven out of his own breast, nor the bees honey the worse, for that gathered out of many flowers" (Snook 86; A3v). The seemingly proverbial phrasing is used to instill that her borrowing of material does not diminish the value of her work, contradicting her previous apologies in an act of seemingly partial disavowal.

Apart from Grymeston's self-authored paratext, the final preliminary work before the body of her text, Simon Grahame's "To the Author" (Bv) functions as a dedication and "proclaims a relationship, whether intellectual or personal…and this proclamation is always at the service of the work, as a reason for elevating the work's standing" (Genette 135). The appearance of Grahame, a Franciscan friar, in the *Miscelanea*'s paratext does, however, suggest Catholic ties, presuming that Grymeston or her husband knew Grahame in some capacity as a Catholic figure and fellow writer. As an author of poetry himself, Grahame's short sonnet and

largely printed full name provide similar paratextual value to that of the *Miscelanea*'s male-edited title page (*OED*). Grahame's prefatory sonnet challenges Grymeston's prior disavowal:

> In heaven and earth for ever to remain.
>
> Her pondrous speech, her passion and her paine,
>
> Her pleasing style shall be admir'd ilke where.
>
> The fruitfull flowing of her loftie braine. (Bv)

Here Grahame employs a kind of contradictory parallelism, presenting Grymeston's brain as "fruitfull" rather than "fruitless," and her style as "pleasing" rather than "broken." Grymeston's epistle and Grahame's sonnet may at first appear to produce a confusing authorial presentation for the *Miscelanea*'s readership, yet their opposing positions on Grymeston's authorship allow her to appear as a modest and humble female figure by her declaration, while simultaneously having her work publicly approved and her authorship augmented by a male authority (Coldiron 67; Pender 51–52). Although Grahame's sonnet functions to protect Grymeston's identity, even posthumously, from the public perception of vain female authorship, it does little to position her within the gender-appropriate mother's legacy sphere, with only brief mention of "a mother's matchless care" (Bv). Despite the performative function of his sonnet as a form of paratextual marketing, Grahame was seemingly a genuine fan of Grymeston's tract, including a slightly altered version of an analogy of the silkworm that appears in an explicitly Catholic chapter of her later editions, in his text *Anatomie of Humours* (1609) (Hughey and Hereford 80). As the preliminary sonnet, "Simon Grahame to the Author," exemplifies the market value of male-written paratext for Grymeston's *Miscelanea*, Grahame's commendation of her authorship, sidelining her maternal voice and later repurposing of one of her most overtly Catholic passages,

suggests his participation in broadening the *Miscelanea*'s genre identity and readership beyond that of a mother's advice book.

In 1605, *Miscelanea* appeared in the Stationers' Register as having switched hands from Felix Norton to William Aspley, indicating that a new publisher had paid for the rights to reprint the original text, as he would in three editions over the following twelve years (Matchinske, *Writing, Gender, and State* 290). Aspley worked with multiple accomplished printers for the production of Grymeston's text, namely George Elde (1606), Bradwood (1604 Norton edition; 1608 Aspley edition), and Edward Griffin (1618), all of whom were common names in the early modern printing press with reputations for working with highly successful material. As a bookseller at the sign of the Tiger's Head and eventually The Parrott in St. Paul's Churchyard, Aspley was a highly valued and entrusted member of the Stationers' Company who would come into fame largely for his association with the publishing of Shakespeare's first (1623) and second folios (1632). Yet earlier in his career, Aspley was no stranger to the Shakespeare canon, publishing first edition quartos of *Much Ado about Nothing* and *Henry IV Part Two* in 1600, as well as other notable dramas such as *The Malcontent* (1604) and *Eastward Ho!* (1605) (Travers, *ODNB*). Aspley was well known for publishing the work of playwrights, yet he was perhaps most successful in the realm of popular religious works such as John Boys's *An Exposition of the Last Psalm* (1615) and John Norden's *Pensive mans practise* (1609). Like Felix Norton, Aspley was not a publisher of women writers or legacies in particular, and while the devotional aspect of Grymeston's text made it not unlike his prior works, its increased Catholic material in later editions contrasts his publishing of an anti-Catholic political tract addressed to King James VI following his ascension. In 1604, Aspley anonymously published *The supplication of certaine masse-priests falsely called Catholikes directed to the Kings most excellent Majestie*, which has

since been identified as the violent anti-Roman polemicist Matthew Sutcliffe's reply to Catholic priest John Colleton's *A supplication to the king of Great Britain for a toleration of the catholic religion* published by the English secret press earlier that year (Cranfield 2). Aspley's interpretation of the amended editions of Grymeston's text remains unknown, yet considering Grymeston's aptitude for conciliatory Catholicism in her work, it is possible that he saw her work as similarly anti-Catholic in sentiment. Hughey and Hereford have noted that, in 1845, The Parker Society printed an excerpt from Verstegan's *Odes* in a collection of selected poetry from the Elizabethan era under the name of Elizabeth Grymeston, attributing it to the work of a Protestant reformer and suggesting that the *Miscelanea* existed and survived in some circles as an anti-Catholic work (79). Though this particular claim is merely speculation, it is certain that the association with a well-known bookseller and the appearance of Aspley's name on the cover of Grymeston's 1606, 1608, and 1618 editions contributed to its wide reception and success in print, consequently aiding in its ability to overcome the legal limitations that hindered English Catholic writers of the period.

Yet, this new edition of *Miscelanea* includes nothing to advertise the significant addition of new material which would make up a third of the whole text. On the title page of the 1606 edition, the line "augmented with addition of other hir Meditations" appears centred on the page to market the miscellany's six new chapters, a strategy commonly used by early modern publishers to urge readers to purchase reprinted texts. Meanwhile, Matchinske asserts that the addendum, like the register entry, does little to reveal "the extent to which the revised tract differs from its predecessor" ("Gendering Catholic Conformity" 330). The new chapters themselves begin mid-page towards the end of the book but stop before the proverbial maxims so as not to conclude the edition. Consequently, some of the new chapters appear under the numbers

of the original ones in the table of contents, with Chapters XIII and XIV of the first edition being changed to Chapters XIX and XX. Additionally, Grymeston's newly added Chapter XVI appears in the text under the heading "Majestie is the daughter of Honour and Reverence, against Traytors," yet the table of contents lists the chapter as "Majestie is the daughter of Honour and Reverence," omitting the mention of traitors not to draw unnecessary attention or provoke questions about the section's content (Matchinske, "Gendering Catholic Conformity" 338). Matchinske suggests that these strategies were employed for the avoidance of censorship, stating that the chapter placement is a particularly "interesting choice in light of early seventeenth-century book regulation" ("Gendering Catholic Conformity" 330). During Elizabeth I's reign and into James I's, regulations on the censorship of printed texts were strictly enforced for printers and publishers of potentially subversive Catholic material and anything that defied the beliefs, governance, or policy of the Church of England, with the most extreme of consequences being imprisonment and execution (Matchinske, *Writing, Gender, and State* 62). While it remains unclear who was responsible for the addition of the new chapters and why they were omitted from the originally printed version, the appearance of the Grymeston family arms on the reverse title page of the second edition suggests that the reprint was approved by a member of her family, most likely her husband (Hughey and Hereford 80). Not only did the augmented edition of Grymeston's miscellany escape censorship but it must have also proved somewhat financially successful, warranting Aspley's publishing two subsequent editions in 1608 and 1618 containing the same twenty chapters, with the only notably significant change being the title of the tract.

Both the 1608 and 1618 editions, which appear nearly identical in print, feature a new title including an altered spelling of *Miscelanea* to *Miscellanea* and the addition of the word

Prayers, despite containing the same content as the 1606 version, which contrastingly claims its amended material to be meditations. Since the title page is such a crucial element of paratext in attracting buyers, the change to *Miscellanea, Prayers, Meditations, Memoratives* may have worked as a marketing strategy similar to the note of augmentation from the 1606 copy, as even the *Short-Title Catalogue* mistakenly lists the 1608 edition as an entirely different text from its previous editions due to the title change (Hughey and Hereford 62). Within the genre of miscellany, titles and prefatory materials often "reinforce the fluidity of their structure and organization" and are used to highlight the heterogeneity of a book (Wall 103). With the addition of *Prayers* to the title of Grymeston's text, the new editions advertise the tract as having more variety, while also revealing its high volume of devotional material and emphasizing it as an appropriate work to have been written by a female author and to be read by a female audience.

The new editions of Grymeston's text maintain the unassuming theme of the original, yet "diverge markedly in announcing their spiritual allegiances and proclaiming their political targets" (Matchinske, "Gendering Catholic Conformity" 331). Although the six new chapters still feature borrowings from her usual sources, Grymeston adopts a sermon-like prose style, replacing poetry with frequent Latin quotations (Snook 208). In the first amended chapter, "A Good-fridayes exercise," Grymeston ambiguously exemplifies and discusses martyrdom, explicitly writing about "martyrs of the Catholicke Church" and their "torments suffered for the Catholicke faith" (D6–D6v). Hughey and Hereford attest that, while her discussion of things "Catholicke" is not directly polemic, "she glorifies as martyrs those whom a Protestant would have called traitors" and romanticizes the moment of death, even as a consequence for high treason (78). In Chapter XVI, Grymeston expresses her opinion on the controversy between practicing Catholics and their allegiance to a Protestant king, exemplifying tyrannical figures

such as Nimrod, Belus, and Ninus before insisting "we must obey Princes (being fingers of that great hand that governes the world) not for feare, but for conscience sake" (E6–E6v). Even though Grymeston vouches for State loyalty, she does not suggest that kings are always just, but that they are "Gods of the earth," who must be treated as such despite their cruelty (E7). She ends this politically charged chapter by addressing increasing anxiety for Catholics shortly after the Gunpowder Plot, writing "by which foote you may gesse what a body of sinne H. treason is," admitting that while her English loyalty is rooted in her allegiance to God, the threat of treason is also a pressing motivator for compliance (E7).

Developing the topics of martyrdom and treason, Grymeston's political commentary continues throughout the amended chapters, specifically through Chapter XVII's discussion of legal authority and oath-taking. Grymeston considers the work of judges and lawyers in multiple instances throughout the added material, including the seventeenth chapter, titled "Of willful Murder." Here she writes, "a Magistrate, tough he bee Gods Deputie heare on earth, yet is hee no (*Cardiagnostes*) to search the corners of the heart, he must judge *Secundum allegata, probatu*: as things appear upon him, so must hee seeme them" (E8v). While Grymeston seems to be alluding to the inability of the legal system to fully assess all aspects of a prosecuted individual, the line echoes her practice of covert Catholicism. Analyzing this line in her work, Snook states that "the subject is not only what he appears to be but what he holds in the corners of his heart. He possesses both a public and private self, both visible and secret loyalties" (210). In this way, Grymeston's prose offers a metaphor for her miscellany as a whole, which, like the subject, can only be judged for its literal content, while its hidden meaning remains protected by secrecy. Additionally, the quote reveals Grymeston's opinion on oath-taking: "hee hath to fearche the truthe, is by oath, which is *Uinculum anima*, a courfe warranted by *Abrahams* example. 24.

Gen…, hee calles God to witneffe, a fafehood [*sic*] hee deceaues the Judge (who is Gods deputie) and murthers the caufe of the poore plaintiffe" (E8v). The line is extended to literally consider the oath of true legal testimony, yet she directly references Genesis 24 and the biblical Abraham who made "his servant swear an oath before God to return to Haran and seek a wife for Abraham's son" (Matchinske, "Gendering Catholic Conformity" 341). As is suggested in Matchinske's study, Grymeston's emphasis on oath-taking applies fittingly to recusancy statutes that required Catholics to take the Oath of Supremacy (1559), but also the Oath of Allegiance (1606), pledging loyalty to the Church of England and the king, and denouncing the Catholic faith to avoid persecution and the forfeiting of various rights and freedoms ("Gendering Catholic Conformity" 341–343). Grymeston's stance in the chapter is to honour the sanctity of the oath, which, like her other conformist opinions, serves as a means of protection over the longevity of her private faith, a strategy that also allowed for the further transmission of her covert yet politically transgressive tract within the Catholic readership.

Grymeston's published work, in both its original printing and later editions, functions as a successful female-authored tract of religio-political commentary, exemplifying the method of her own private defiance in favour of covert loyalism and longevity over public martyrdom. In *Women in Early Modern England 1550–1720*, Sara Mendelson and Patricia Crawford stress the importance of women's roles in religious activism and the Counter-Reformation, comparing their resistance to icebergs, "whose greatest bulk remains hidden from view" (388). Through her practice of equivocation, Grymeston's miscellany remains one of few surviving works attributed to a Catholic woman, written and published during the Reformation. The *Miscelanea* encompasses the beliefs and values of a non-elite early modern woman not only through what she wrote but what she read, what she experienced, and with whom she was affiliated. Amongst

early modern historians, women's voices continue to be removed from the traditionally masculine history of political change, yet Grymeston's ability to manipulate an "appropriately feminine persona, subject, and form" to influence readers' responses to anti-Catholic legislation displays an impact that, while extra-institutional, was capable of altering public opinion and saving Catholic lives (Beilin, *Redeeming Eve* 269). Through its manipulation of sources, proto-feminist tone, and political strategization, Grymeston's miscellany presents a subversive personal reading history in the form of women's legacy.

Chapter II: Grymeston's *Miscelanea* and the Mother's Legacy Genre

During the late sixteenth century, the mother's advice book emerged as a subgenre of humanist advice writing used to promote and guide mothers in the religious and moral education of their children (Anselment 431; Heller, "The Legacy and Rhetorics" 603–604; Travitsky, *Mother's Advice Books* ix). Advice writing was considered the primary and most financially successful genre within the wider scope of Renaissance conduct literature, reaching its peak during the mid-seventeenth century; some of the genre's more commonly known English advice books include Sir Walter Raleigh's *Instructions to his Sonne and to Posterity* (1632) and Sir Francis Osborne's *Advice to a Son* (1656) (Sizemore 41). Despite the fact that the majority of published advice books were written by male authors, four representative works of the genre preceding those of Raleigh and Osborne were penned by women: Elizabeth Grymeston's *Miscelanea* (1604), Dorothy Leigh's *The Mothers Blessing* (1616), Elizabeth Clint's *The Countess of Lincoln's Nursery* (1622), and Elizabeth Joceline's *The Mothers Legacie to Her Unborn Child* (1624). These woman-authored publications exist as some of the most popular stand-alone works within the branch of advice writing known as the mother's legacy genre, with each being directed to children in the maternal voice and providing religious guidance in the event of a mother's death (Heller, *The Mother's Legacy* 1–3; Matchinske, "Gendering Catholic Conformity" 330). Even though the advice book is often dismissed as a minor genre of unrefined writing, especially those by female writers, in *The Mother's Legacy in Early Modern England*, Heller argues for the importance of the subgenre as it uniquely captures women's "concerns about the connections among mortality, authority, and maternity" (3). Additionally, mother's advice books can offer new perspectives to the understanding of women's literary practices and

education even beyond the experiences of motherhood in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, more broadly representing female authorship.

More specifically, these advice books tend to reverberate the educational principles formulated in some of the period's most popular pedagogical manuals for women by the Spanish humanist Vives and the Dutch humanist Desiderius Erasmus, who both believed that women should ultimately be instructed for the purpose of educating their children and obeying their husbands. This emphasis on religious and moral lessons originated from expectations imposed on women; as wives and mothers they were to live piously and obediently and to raise children in a way that they would reflect their mother's behaviour and exhibit the same virtuous traits (Cousins 225). Thus, women were required to take responsibility for their children's moral and spiritual guidance, a vocation also emphasized in conduct literature. In particular, books concerned with motherhood reinforced the importance of mothers educating their children as an extension of their own salvation. By adhering to the dictates of conduct books, early modern mothers held command over their children in a way that mimicked the command their husbands held over them, granting women a new sense of agency in the household. Valerie Wayne asserts that "the subject position of a mother was a more empowering place from which women could speak and write than the subject position of a wife" (69). Consequently, the responsibility of motherhood created opportunities through which women could develop a sense of personal fulfillment and write for both their own children and other mothers.

Despite the genre's importance in the development of female authorship, mother's advice literature continued to instill female inferiority, as the genre advocated women's domestic and material roles, keeping them out of social and political discussion. Betty Travitsky stresses that "writers of mother's advice tracts…were uneasy at transgressing the prohibition on writing and

expressed this uneasiness in print, penning apologies and explanation for their temerity" (*Nondramatic Writers* 166). Travitsky's observation is exemplified by the work of Joceline, Leigh, and Grymeston, who all resorted to "traditional [apologies] often expressed by essay writers for their unpolished work" (Sizemore 41). It is also crucial to note that these female-written advice texts echoed many of the same sentiments about women's chastity, modesty, and obedience to their husbands as those found in conduct books written by men, all of which reiterate women's inferiority. In comparison to paternal advice books such as Raleigh's, which "adopt a much more secular viewpoint," the mother's advice book is almost entirely reliant on religious content, preventing women from advising their children in many non-religious matters (Travitsky, *Nondramatic Writers* 166). Although the authors of the mother's advice genre faced many of the same obstacles in their writing, their work differs in tone, style, and content specific to their individual lives. Joceline's work, written for her daughter, advises that women should pursue a life of limited education and without social resistance, the opposite of what she herself engaged in through writing, thus promoting a behavioral pattern that publishers of conduct books would have deemed suitable for female readers. Further promoting women's subservience, Leigh is clear about her opinions on the roles of women, using her text to affirm that women should not have sexual desires or autonomy in their marriage and should rather "want nothing but what they are supposed to want according to their husbands and God" (Wayne 67). Unlike other mother's legacy writers, Grymeston deals with women's conduct the least; instead, she opts for "literary conventions of the period which were predominantly masculine," while still maintaining the aspects of the genre that permitted her to write (Sizemore 48). Notwithstanding these differences, in the scholarly literature Grymeston's miscellany continues to be placed within the context of seventeenth-century

examples of the mother's legacy genre. In "The Legacy and Rhetorics of Maternal Zeal," Heller states that "writers of mother's legacies were enmeshed in a complex network of ideas on maternity," stressing the importance of religious, political, and economic influences when considering the "pervasive nature of early modern thought on motherhood" (604). Additionally, in *Disjointed Perspectives on Motherhood*, Catalina Florescu identifies motherhood theory as an ideology interlinked with feminist theory and preoccupied with the "societal definition, expectation, and assessment" of women by men which differs largely according to culture and time period (xi). In the mother's legacy genre, this relationship between men and early modern motherhood is especially displayed by way of paratextual representation, which allows the male printers and publishers of legacies to emphasize maternal identity in texts otherwise lacking in maternal content. Whereas this practice is revealed in the paratext of Grymeston's *Miscelanea*, it is first displayed through the printed prayers of Lady Frances Abergavenny, printed in Thomas Bentley's *Monument of Matrones*, the only mother's legacy tract to precede the *Miscelanea.* For this reason, Bentley's anthology serves as a possible source of inspiration for Grymeston's own writing, as her text bears similarities to Abergavenny's prayers not only in their paratextual representation but in the religious and political context in which they were written.

Lady Abergavenny's collection of prayers appears in Bentley's *The Monument of Matrones*, a 1,500-page anthology considered to be one of the largest and earliest devotional books consisting of women's writing catered to a female audience (Atkinson and Atkinson 193). As her only possible preliminary influence on the practice of maternal legacy writing, it is not entirely out of the question that Grymeston, an avid and advanced reader, would have been exposed to *The Monument*, and resultantly, Abergavenny's prayers. Bentley's anthology features prayers for the various stages of women's lives with an emphasis on childbirth, biographies of

biblical women from the Old and New Testaments, and multiple female-authored works borrowed from various sources, which range from the political writing of Reformation queens to the meditations of anonymous ladies. The reception of Bentley's *Monument* has been notoriously difficult to assess, yet the fact that multiple copies, both in whole and in part, have survived into the modern day confirms that it was not only purchased but highly valued (327). The survival of these copies makes sense within its broader context; despite being written for "simple women," *The Monument* would have been quite costly to own due to its size, especially if the owner had purchased it in just one volume, rather than a few sections at a time (Atkinson 326). Meanwhile, alongside Verstegan's *Odes*, which appears as a major source text in Grymeston's writing, Suzanne Hull lists Bentley's *Monument* as one of eighteen influential devotional books prescribed to English women readers published between 1475 and 1640, suggesting that the anthology had captured a readership in some capacity (Snook 107; Atkinson and Stoneman 193). Notwithstanding their generic similarity, comparatively less scholarship groups together Lady Abergavenny with *Miscelanea* or considers, in any capacity, its possible influence upon Grymeston's legacy writing. In order to consider Abergavenny's work as an indirect source of Grymeston's *Miscelanea*, the broader context of Bentley's anthology must also be considered for its major role in shaping the birth of the mother's legacy genre.

Despite the remarkable endeavour of producing the first anthologized prayer book for women, little is known about *The Monument*'s compiler, Thomas Bentley (Atkinson and Stoneman 193). He was admitted to Gray's Inn in 1563 and married Susan Maynard, the orphan daughter of a rather wealthy mercer, around 1572 (Atkinson 326). Additionally, Bentley seemed to have been a generous member and compiler of records at St. Andrew's Holburn, where he was elected as churchwarden in 1582, only three years before his death in 1585 (Atkinson 327).

While Bentley may have been the probable author of other devotional books published before 1582, *The Monument* remains his only extant contribution, combining various forms and sources ranging from anonymous women writers to Biblical verse. As in the case of Grymeston's *Miscelanea*, scholars have identified Bentley's propensity for reworking his compiled material, altering biblical excerpts, and attributing male-written quotations to female authors/speakers to "direct women toward submissive, subordinate behaviour" (Horton 5; Atkinson 415). Although Bentley's anthology survives as an important source for early modern women's literacy in England, its tone and intention are less progressive for the period than they may seem. Specifically, in his treatment of biblical women and emphasis on female misconduct, Bentley's *Monument* acts as a pseudo-conduct book, tasked with upholding the patriarchal values of reformed England that relied on obedient wives and mothers as quintessential to the Protestant family unit (Atkinson and Atkinson 291).

Considering the popularity of John Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* (1563) as an instructional model for Protestant Englishwomen (which exhibits some overlap of material with Bentley's *Monument*), it was likely the intention of Bentley and his publisher/printers to benefit from the demand for exemplary texts targeted to female readers and fuelled by political and nationalist ideals. Unlike Bentley, his publisher and printer, Henry Denham, was well known as a printer of religious texts, particularly reputed for his skilled application, regularity, and wide variety of lettering (Brewerton 1; McKerrow 88–89). Prior to publishing Bentley's work, Denham had printed numerous impressive devotional treatises, "[acquiring] the privilege of printing the Psalter and all books of private prayers both in Latin and English from the printer William Seres," in 1574 (Atkinson 325; McKerrow 89). He also seemed to have a particular interest in female devotional writing, publishing Anne Wheathill's *A Handfull of Holesome Hearbs*,

thought to be the first prayer book written by a gentlewoman directed to a female readership, just two years after publishing *The Monument* (325). Additionally, nearing *The Monument*'s completion, Denham seemed to enlist the help of Thomas Dawson, another highly successful printer who was primarily responsible for the task of the final two sections or chapters, which Bentley called "Lamps." Even though Dawson was comparatively less known than Denham, he also worked with many notable religious texts, including the majority of Calvin's works and Erasmus's *The Praise of Folly* (326). Both Denham's and Dawson's participation in the lengthy creation of *The Monument* suggests an anticipated market for its content that would make the endeavour worthwhile, in the hope that Bentley's name and connections would guarantee the book's success (Atkinson 326). A book's association with multiple entrusted male names of the literary trade would have contributed to its reception as an anthology consisting of such a high volume of female-authored texts. Yet, Bentley's name is certainly not a focal point of the compilation's paratext, with its title page, borders, and initials exhibiting some of Denham's most extraordinary work, causing the physical anthology and its compilation of authors to benefit from a paratextual representation, which was far more elaborate than the generally simplistic printed mother's legacy books that followed it.

In Bentley's *Monument*, the most important and influential figure for Protestant readers is, unsurprisingly, Queen Elizabeth, as is revealed by both the anthology's paratext and main content. Lamps 1–5 of Bentley's *Monument* contain Denham's skilled black letter type, detailed woodcut borders, and decorated initials; the aspect which has warranted the most scholarly attention is the woodcut representing Queen Elizabeth, appearing on the book's title page and various chapter introductions. Throughout the work, Elizabeth I is depicted in relation to other Reformation queens and prominent biblical figures, demonstrating the practice of Tudor

iconography to praise Queen Elizabeth as a model figure for the pious early modern woman (Atkinson 325; King, "Queen Elizabeth I" 71). The use of both emblematic and literary "Lamps" in *The Monument* provides several important instances of representation and symbolism. Due to the text's date of publication coinciding with "the end of the Queen's final round of marriage negotiations and the beginning of an esoteric cult that celebrated her steadfast virginity," the most obvious of these representations is Bentley's breakdown of the text into seven "Lamps of Virginitie," which allude to Elizabeth I's unmarried status (King, "Thomas Bentley" 217). John N. King identifies the "iconographic lamps" depicted in the woodcut of the title page as symbolic of the lamp imagery in Christ's parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins, which refer to the five maidens who filled their oil lamps in preparation to meet Christ. The image recurs in the book of Revelation, where the seven-branched lampstand or menorah symbolizes heavenly prophecy ("The Godly Woman" 70). The title page also features the royal arms at the top, representing Queen Elizabeth, and the Spouse of Canticles at the bottom holding the menorah and an open Bible, implying a connection between the two figures and presenting Queen Elizabeth as a contemporary icon of pious devotion, guidance, and spiritual love ("The Godly Woman" 71). Additionally, the uppermost insets of the page feature depictions of Eve and Mary, while the lower ones picture the Five Wise Virgins meeting with Christ (as represented by the Bridegroom in the Canticles) and engulfed in celestial flames ("The Godly Woman" 71). King asserts that the iconographic lamps and references to biblical lamps on the title page "symbolize divine illumination and, possibly, prophetic vision" ("The Godly Woman" 72). Following the title page is Bentley's lengthy dedication to "the most vertuous Ladie and Christian *Princesse, Queene* ELIZABETH," which presents the text as a gift to the queen, containing "the admirable monuments of [her] owne Honourable works, and some other noble Queenes, famous Ladies,

and vertuous Gentlewomen" (A2–A3). As noted in the dedication, Elizabeth I's own translations are included in Bentley's second Lamp, which contains the majority of his female-authored entries. *The Monument* also contains an entire third Lamp comprised of prayers, meditations, and psalms "*to be said of* our most vertuous and deere Souereigne LADIE *Queene* ELIZABETH, *as at all times at hir Graces* pleasure" (Aa3). The iconography used to represent the queen is further employed in the introductory page to Lamp 3, including images that compare her to biblical women such as Judith and Deborah, which appear illustrated and labelled in insets. As has been suggested by King, Bentley's *Monument*, with its extensive Tudor iconography, dedication, and entire Lamp of psalms, prayers, and meditations, likely functioned as not only a handbook for women's Protestant obedience but an overt appeal for court patronage by Bentley ("Thomas Bentley" 220). Yet, unlike Bentley's intended audience of "simple" and subordinate women, Queen Elizabeth served as a significant figurehead for women's education and literacy, a contested topic throughout the Reformation due to its association with women's emergence into the dangerously public and politicized sphere of reading and writing (Pearson 80; Charlton 158–159). Therefore, the paratextual emphasis on the Queen of England during the Protestant Reformation also works to embed the book's included female authors, such as Lady Abergavenny, and its intended audience of female readers, such as Grymeston, within a nationalist and religio-political context.

While the similarities between Grymeston's and Abergavenny's writing warrant textual comparison, the most pertinent similarity between the two authors is their treatment within the study of the mother's legacy genre, which Louise Horton asserts is "highly reductive" and obscures their broader religio-cultural agency (4). Abergavenny's prayers are appended to Bentley's "Second Lampe of Virginitie," which features a collection of devotional prayers,

meditations, and treatises written by "famous Queens, noble Ladies, vertuous Virgins, and godlie Gentlewomen of all ages," which he asserts have been "worne cleane out of print" (B1). While many of the entries are reprinted from pre-existing sources, the collection of fifty prayers attributed to Lady Abergavenny (*d.* 1576) is commonly believed to have been printed only once in *The Monument*, suggesting that Bentley had somehow acquired access to its unpublished manuscript copy for his own use (Horton 3). Amongst modern scholars Abergavenny's work has received considerably less critical attention than the works of her contemporaries Katherine Parr, Elizabeth Tyrwhitt, and Anne Askew. In her recent study on the forgotten collection of prayers, Horton notes that due to the limited scholarly attention to Abergavenny's work, it has been deemed a collection of "formulaic utterances" and "utterly devoid of literary merit," not intended for wider readership (5). Bentley titled the work "The Praiers made by the right Honourable Ladie Frances Aburgauennie, and committed at the houre of hir death, to the right Worshipfull Ladie MARIE Fane (hir onlie daughter) as a Iewell of health for the soule, and a perfect path to Paradise, verie profitable to be used of euerie faithfull Christian man and woman," which has led to its reception and study as the earliest example of the mother's legacy genre. Other than their generic categorization in scholarship, Lady Abergavenny's *Prayers* and Grymeston's *Miscelanea* share some notable similarities in content and tone, yet their most outstanding common feature is the explicit gendering and domestication of their work as "maternal" through paratextual means.

In her introduction to *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production 1500–1625*, Micheline White stresses the importance of considering women writers "by locating them within specific literary, confessional, and kinship networks and by reading them in relation to a dense web of social and literary documents" (3). This strategy is doubly important for the study of anthologized women's writing since factors such as class status, religious affiliation, and familial

ties can be blurred by contextualizing them within a larger text rather than within their own personal "religio-political matrix," as is often done with individual published work (5). Lady Frances Abergavenny (born Frances Manners) was the daughter of the first Earl of Rutland, Thomas Manners, and was married to the fourth Lord Abergavenny, Henry Neville, in 1554, with whom she had a single daughter, Mary [Fane], in the same year (Beilin, *ODNB* 1–2). As has been established by Horton, Abergavenny's parents, Thomas Manners and Eleanor Paston, were close friends of the Duchess of Suffolk, Katherine Willoughby, who was a Protestant patron, friend of Katherine Parr, and outspoken reformer (Horton 6). The Abergavenny family held equally extreme reformist beliefs, as Lady Abergavenny's brother Henry, the second Earl of Rutland and friend of John Dudley, was imprisoned in 1553 for his allegiance to Lady Jane Grey (6). Additionally, as was recorded in the *Sidney Family Psalter*, Lady Abergavenny was listed as the godmother of Robert Sidney in 1563, the son of Sir Henry Sidney and Mary Sidney [Dudley], a lady-in-waiting to Queen Elizabeth (6). While Abergavenny's familial network held strong Protestant beliefs and connections, her husband, Henry Neville, seemed to have been a supporter of Mary Tudor, since he was present at her coronation in 1553, although later he played a role in the Protestant resistance of Wyatt's Rebellion, recorded in John Protor's *The historie of wytes rebellion* (1554) (Horton 6). Therefore, Abergavenny was connected to a web of complex religious and political figures during the Reformation, suggesting that her series of prayers would have been influenced by such an environment, even if only implicitly.

To further recontextualize the work, Horton additionally contests theories that suggest *The Monument of Matrones* to be the only site of Abergavenny's published work, even though some scholars claim that Bentley's anthology consists almost exclusively of previously printed materials, establishing his unreliability as a compiler (Narveson 12). Building on this uncertainty,

Horton notes that five years before *The Monument*'s publication date, there appears an entry in the Stationers' Register for a text titled *Precious Pearles of perfecte godlines* (1577), "begonn by the lady Frunces Aburgavenney, and finished by John Phillips" (7). Phillips was a producer of elegiac texts, one of which was an epitaph on the death of Philip Sidney; he seemed to have also had some relationship to Katherine Willoughby, indicated by his dedication to her in *A Friendly Larum* in which he is identified as "Sonne of [her] poore seruant" (7). This connection points to the possibility that Phillips completed *Precious Pearles* after Abergavenny's death for publication as a commemorative commission (8). Although it is not possible to confirm that *The Precious Pearles* and *The Monument* contain the same collection of Abergavenny's prayers, an additional published work of Phillips titled *The Perfect Path to Paradise* (1580), which partially survived in a later edition from 1588, contains nearly every prayer attributed to Abergavenny in Bentley's anthology. Horton furthermore asserts that it is most likely that *The Precious Pearles* and *The Perfect Path* were more or less the same co-authored text by Lady Abergavenny and John Phillips, reprinted in seven editions from 1577 to 1626. Summing up her findings, Horton states that "[the] idea that the prayers were previously unpublished reinforces underlying notions about the purpose, origin and quality of work," all of which contribute to the interpretation of her writing as inherently maternal (5). By considering both Abergavenny's religio-political connections and publishing history, the nature of her writing and authorship can be better contextualized outside of *The Monument of Matrones* and the mother's legacy genre more broadly.

While the given title of Abergavenny's prayers in *The Monument* aligns the work with a mother's legacy, its primary content features only three out of fifty prayers that directly address maternal subject matter. Since the title is presumed to have been added by Bentley or one of his

printers during the production of *The Monument*, Lady Abergavenny's prayers are caught up in one of the most pressing issues of early modern women's writing identified by Clarke as the "[mediation] by male 'authors' at a number of levels" (18). When considering the role of male printers, publishers, and compilers as mediators of early modern women's voices, it is imperative to note that women's writing was often manipulated and restructured to fit gendered norms or alternative frameworks (18). By presenting Abergavenny's prayers as having been "committed at the houre of hir death, to the right *Worshipfull Ladie* MARIE Fane (*hir onlie daughter*)," Bentley presents her writing as a dying mother's legacy to be read by her surviving daughter, positioning it as a biographical domestic tract justified by motherhood and death, which leaves little room for alternative representation. A similar strategy appears in Grymeston's paratext, as her preliminary epistle is given the title "*to her loving sonne* Bernye Grymeston," likely applied by her printer or publisher posthumously, as indicated by the pronoun choice "her" (A3). While the epistle is clearly written by her and addressed to her son, the addition of the title, which further emphasizes her maternal positioning, evokes questions regarding how much of Grymeston's writing was altered before its appearance in print. Beyond the paratext, the contents of both Grymeston's and Abergavenny's prayers were rarely explicitly feminine or maternal. Like Grymeston's morning and evening prayers, Abergavenny offers prayers for various times of day, "at the going to bed," and before common prayer, which she prescribed to "everie Christian," suggesting the tract's purpose for personal or even public use (141). Additionally, Abergavenny's prayers are concerned with resisting vices, overcoming sickness, and obtaining mercy, subjects that are equally as prevalent in Grymeston's *Miscelanea*. In her "praier for the remission of sinne, and to *obteine a vertuous life*," Abergavenny writes, "Be mercifull vnto me a sinner: light thou the dull sighted eies of my mind," which bears an uncanny resemblance to Grymeston's line

"Lord be mercifull / to me a sinner. My abject countenance witnesseth my distressed minde," which appears in a self-authored section of her "Morning Meditation" (145; D4v–D5). Additionally, Abergavenny addresses a wide range of readers who find themselves:

> [b]eing tempted by the ghostlie enimie (as all that feare God are) to doubt in anie article of the Catholike faith, to despaire in Gods mercie, to yeeld to melancholie fansies, to be vexed with vnkindnes of friends, or the malice of enimies, to be troubled with sicknesse, or anie other waies oppressed with griefe of bodie and mind: saie deuoutlie as followeth. (191)

Her description of the dangers of temptation is comparable to Grymeston's chapter detailing "A patheticall speech of the person of *Diues* in the torments of hell," in which she writes that "her joy was turned into mourning," "friends [forsook her]," the enemy was "alwaies in readinesse to take advantage," and she was tormented "with oppression of eternall punishment," reverberating the same general themes. Like Grymeston's *Miscelanea*, Abergavenny's writing also exhibits a level of heteroglossia, enacting multiple different forms through her prayers in prose, poetic metre, and acrostic style, signifying her literary ability and learnedness. While her writing was certainly indicative of her piety, the evidence of maternal advice or legacy is significantly less obvious. Scholars who align her work with the mother's legacy genre give special attention to the declaration of Bentley's given title and her few written prayers concerned with childbirth, skewing the broader image of her work as a devotional treatise written during a period when politics, religion, and print were inextricably intertwined.

In his fifth Lamp, which is almost entirely concerned with prayers for motherhood, pregnancy, and childbirth, Bentley has included "Another godlie and earnest praier to be said of euerie Christian and faithfull woman, in the time of hir trauell or child-birth, vsed of the vertuous

Ladie, Frances Aburgauennie" (107). Separate from "The Praiers made by the Right Honourable Ladie Frances Aburgauennie" which are contained in the second Lamp, the short verse bears similarities to the other prayers on this topic, lamenting the pain and danger of childbirth and praying for a "safe deliverance" for both mother and child (107). Alternatively, Abergavenny's prayer also uses childbirth as a metaphor for the punishment of sin and contemplation of death. She compares the difficulty of childbirth to God's "promised punishment," which she will faithfully "endure and abide" for the "gilt and transgression of [her] progenitors" (107). As the prayer continues, its subject matter is taken up more with her concerns for salvation than the dangers of childbirth, vowing to be "constant and faithfull in thee [God]…whether [she] die or liue" (107). Once again, considering the association of her kinship network with strong political ties and conflicting religious affiliations, Abergavenny's writing can be interpreted as suggesting the consequences of Protestant martyrdom under the guise of a mother's prayer, a subject that would have been of relevance to the Willoughby-Dudley-Abergavenny plexus (Horton 6). This technique of using childbirth for devotional representation has also been noted in Grymeston's work, and while direct influence cannot be confidently suggested, their shared use of maternal metaphor exemplifies both women's ability to use subject matter prescribed as appropriate to their gender as a means to increase the impact of their devotional writing. Whereas Grymeston uses the figure of a pregnant woman knowing she may die in childbirth as a metaphor for the fearless acknowledgment that "life is but a way to death" (C2v), Abergavenny writes about the "bitter pangs" of childbirth as "a cruell and sharpe conflict betwixt death and life" (106–107). While the two texts seem to differ in religious affiliations (one Catholic and the other presumably Protestant), both exemplify their piety through a display of selflessness and willingness to suffer for eternal salvation, which is indicative of the devotional *memento mori* or *ars moriendi*

tradition, placing them within a literary culture that is not dependent exclusively on their maternal positioning.

In her introduction to *The Mother's Legacy in Early Modern England*, Heller notes that "contemporary genre theory asks questions of purpose and power, considering why a genre emerges, in whose interests it operates, and what role it plays within its culture" (3). Applying these questions to the mother's legacy text, it can be determined that while the genre gave way to a "socially sanctioned" mode of women's authorship, it also brings forth an association with women's identity that prioritizes their role as mothers first and authors second, and as Heller suggests, "naming has a price" (*The Mother's Legacy* 3). The price of the genre's distinction is exemplified in the study of Lady Abergavenny's prayers, which, Horton asserts, have been long ignored as an extraliterary work for domestic use, excluding the work from the social and political context in which its writer was immersed. While Grymeston's *Miscelanea* has been established as exceedingly literary, the majority of scholarship on her work is unable to separate her from her motherhood, almost exclusively suggesting that her authorship, her education, and her religious and political loyalties are an extension and result of her maternal responsibility. Therefore, while in the case of Grymeston's and Abergavenny's published works genre acts as a "mode of communication," guiding the reader's interpretation of the text, the signifier "mother" does the same, thus establishing the author of the mother's legacy as a "[writer] without further identity" (Colie vii–viii; O'Reilly 25). As the print history and bibliographical features of Grymeston's and Abergavenny's works demonstrate, their unique authorial agency as early modern women writers disrupts their unequivocal place within the mother's legacy genre.

Chapter III: Grymeston's *Miscelanea* as Commonplace Book

Despite appearing as a mother's legacy, Grymeston's *Miscelanea* maintains a thematic organization indicative of the commonplace books and reflects a contemporary commonplacing categorization that honours various kinds of reading and writing as "educational" practices in their own right, including women writers who have been notoriously excluded from this genre (Schurink 455–456). The existing body of scholarship on commonplace books offers a variety of different perspectives on what constitutes the genre, relying on different degrees of organization, levels of education, and types of source material, only contributing further to the notion that "commonplace books rarely conform to such neat templates" (Smyth 90). Moss writes that although the history of commonplace books "stresses their classroom context," the genre and its surviving examples "[are] not bounded by that context" (viii). The origin of the "commonplace" is most frequently attributed to the "philosophers and orators of Greek and Roman antiquity," namely initiated by Aristotle's *Topics* or *Topica* (384 BCE–322 BCE), which took shape as a series of logical arguments determining truth from falsehood and considered within a series of "basic categories or 'topics'" (Havens 13; Allan 35). Aristotle's commonplacing was closely followed by the ancient Roman orator and philosopher Cicero (106 BCE–43 BCE), who "carried the commonplaces into the Latin intellectual world," through his own *Topica* and rhetorical treatises *De inventione* (84 BCE) and the *De oratore* (55 BCE). Cicero advocated for the "careful harvesting of selected quotations and useful examples from existing sources" as valuable to public speakers who could compile a collection of quotations from authoritative "philosophers, statesmen and poets" to "sway the jury or the mob" (Allan 36; Havens 13–14). Cicero's use of *sententiae* would then be reframed into a pedagogical tool by Quintilian (c. 35–c. 100 CE), the author of the highly influential manual for rhetorical education, *Institutio oratoria*. Quintilian's

Institutio established the commonplace book as an aid to the student's memory, rendering the compiler a master of both his tongue and mind (Havens 14). Noting Cicero's valuation of the commonplace for orators, Quintilian advised that a rhetorical education, including the collecting and deploying of *sententiae*, would prepare students to defend and deliver persuasive orations whether in the law court or the senate (Havens 15). This ideology was then followed by Seneca the Younger (c. 4 BCE–65 CE), an orator and statesman himself, as well as a leading Roman intellectual figure of his time (Havens 14). His *Epistulae morales* is taken up with the difficulties and questions of morality, particularly regarding the imitation of other authors, through which Seneca fashioned one of the most prevailing metaphors of the commonplace book that permeated the practice throughout its Renaissance continuation: "that of the flower and the honeybee" (Havens 14). The concept of the commonplace book was fully formed by late antiquity when the sixth-century scholar Boethius took to translating and synthesizing the work of Aristotle in his own writing, *De differentiis topicis*, to formulate the classical canon of commonplacing, which favoured logical and rigid Aristotelian categorization over Seneca's bees and flowers (Havens 16). David Allan in his "A Very Short History of Commonplacing" asserts that Boethius "largely ignored the broader and more creative visions of Cicero and Quintilian—those practical-minded forensic orators concerned with achieving elegant and successful persuasion"—opting instead for a narrowed discussion of the note-taking practice book, which resulted in the halt of innovative thinking about the commonplace book (37–38). The Middle Ages experienced a significant decline in the use of commonplacing for rhetorical discourse, focusing on moral philosophy and the form of *florilegia* or "books of flowers" (Havens 19). Instead of organizing excerpts from classic orators and philosophers, these *florilegia* were largely theological and used the traditional

rhetorical form of the commonplace book to contain biblical quotations and the doctrine of early Church Fathers as their primary sources of authority (Havens 19).

Facilitated by the growing preference for Greek and Roman classical authorship and the humanist reinvigoration of pedagogy in the high Renaissance, the rhetorical use of the commonplace, as proposed by Quintilian and Cicero, shifted back into popularity (Allan 39). As a method of study, the commonplace book was considered the ideal vessel for the learning of languages, with Latin at the forefront (Allan 39). In his influential *De Copia* (1512), Erasmus suggested that students should categorize their notes into a list of subjects or "places," which would be divided into more specific "subordinate types," and further divided to include commonplaces, maxims, or other quotations of interest pertaining to these subdivided headings, making up a tripartite structure of organization (Smyth 92; Havens 28). Erasmus's popular method was adopted and adapted by many, with Philipp Melanchton's *De locis communibus ratio* (1521) helping to "carry [the] torch to a new generation of northern European grammar school students" (Havens 28). Melanchton, whose guide was published throughout the sixteenth century, simplified Erasmus's structure to include only the general thematic headings, which he called "commonplaces," and broadened the variety of suitable subjects to include classical reading, religious verse, and even the most "mundane elements of everyday life" (Havens 28–29). This model became the most widely used strategy for study amongst humanist grammar students of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, allowing for commonplace books to serve as not only examples of popular educational practices but also records of general literary interests during the period which have survived in both print and manuscript form.

Meanwhile, the practice of commonplace book writing differed significantly between early modern men and women in both frequency and content, reflecting the gendered differences

in availability of and access to formal education. Humanist training equipped men with moral, political, and rhetorical lessons from the ancients and the Scriptures to prepare them for positions in local politics, legal office, and royal government, and in the governance of their families (Smith 10). In "Humanist Education and the Renaissance Concept of Woman," Hilda L. Smith writes:

> While women were a part of the intellectual and social changes tied to the spread of humanist ideas, they were always on the periphery. In theory, humanism was an education that had as much to offer women as men, but in practice, it was situated in universities, from which women were excluded, and applied to the governance of families and public office, positions outside their responsibility. (10)

Despite these structures that excluded women from specific branches of study, the humanist movement embraced Christian values and aimed to strengthen them through education, causing leading humanist scholars such as More, Erasmus, and Vives to encourage women's learning, but only as an extension of traditional feminine piety (Cousins 214). Amongst a long list of prescribed humanist readings for women are Vives's *Instruction of a Christian Woman* (1529) and *Plan of Study for Girls* (1523), the primary source for the instruction of noble women. Vives's educational treatise stressed the importance of learning Scripture and maintaining chastity, with the intention of preparing women for the roles of wife and mother and the responsibilities of the domestic realm (Ljungqvist 145; Smith 11, 16). Additionally, women's education continued to rely heavily on class status, even throughout the educational revolution of 1580–1640, which promoted the education of men across a wider class spectrum (Smith 10). In *Printed Commonplace Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*, Moss points out that "except in a very few, extraordinarily socially privileged cases involving private instruction,

women, being excluded from the Latin school, were not among the makers of commonplace-books" (viii). Instead, the majority of women were restricted to a "mental community of the commonplace book," largely written out of the genre's history (viii). While the daughters of More benefitted from lessons in Latin, Greek, mathematics, and astronomy under the instruction of their private tutor William Gonell, this level of education was not customary amongst even aristocratic women, let alone those of lesser status (Michalove 62). Due to women's association with the private sphere and the lack of female grammar schools, the general early modern consensus on non-aristocratic women's education was that basic religious and moral instruction could be facilitated by their fathers and husbands within the home (Cousins 214). As a result, women rarely compiled the traditional Latin commonplace book using the methodology taught in boys' grammar schools, replacing the rigidity of classical *sententiae* with prayers, poetry, recipes, letters, and personal commentary (Burke, "Memorial Books" 131).

In his "Commonplace Book Culture: A List of Sixteen Traits," Smyth acknowledges that defining the commonplace book is a particularly pressing issue in scholarly discussion and library catalogues, generally relying on categorization that is either too broad or too pointed (91). Smyth's proposed list of sixteen traits incorporates the previous work of scholars, such as Moss, Burke, Peter Beale, Earle Havens, and Mary Crane, while also prioritizing "significant evidence of women's activity" in the genre, which will serve as the primary reference point through which Grymeston's *Miscelanea* will be recontextualized (91). Smyth first suggests that the term "commonplace book culture" be used rather than "commonplace book" to include all aspects of theory, process, and text (94). His sixteen traits emphasize the presence, variety, and purpose of active reading and its greater relationship to writing, which are particularly relevant to the positioning of women in early modern literary culture, as established by Jacqueline Pearson in

her study of women's reading in the period. Both Pearson and Snook assert that reading was a politicized and subversive act in the period, causing particular controversy around women's literacy, which had the potential to open doors to public discourse. The small percentage of literate early modern women were encouraged to read specifically from the Bible or women's conduct books, resulting in a lack of evidence about women's reading practices outside these categories. Pearson contends that "women tended not to record recreational reading because they had absorbed the conservative anxiety about it," making the identification and analysis of women's existence in commonplace culture essential to the study of early modern women's reading practices, as is suggested by Smyth (83). Smyth additionally provides several traits characteristic of commonplacing, which prove particularly significant to Grymeston's *Miscelanea*, one of which is "a multiplicity of ways of being read or navigated" (103). Moreover, Snook suggests that the *Miscelanea* was implicit in a reading culture that "[insinuated] secrets" within women's social sphere, representing the multiplicity of the text through its ambiguous religious leanings (192). Finally, Smyth's comprehensive list includes "a connection between commonplacing and improvement" as indicative of the genre's culture, reminiscent of the commonplace book's role in boys' grammar schools yet broadened by the wider definition of improvement as moral, social, financial, spiritual, and educational (108). Exemplifying Pearson's assertion about recorded female reading materials in the early modern period, surviving commonplace books penned by women appeared almost exclusively for the purpose of religious or moral improvement, generally consisting of thematically organized prayers and biblical extractions. Amongst printed commonplaces and other miscellanies by female authors, the use of devotional subjects and sources ensured that "women writers of whatever rank secured cultural

validation for themselves and strengthened their incentive to write and publish" (Mueller, *Katherine Parr* 2–3).

Grymeston's first edition exhibits the structure and content of educational note-taking with a focus on subjects specifically relevant to women, which strengthens the text's categorization as a commonplace book. It contains fourteen chapters: meditations, psalms, contemplations, proverbs, and prose treatises, compiled from both secular and religious sources, ranging from philosophical writers such as the Church Fathers Chrysostome, Ambrose, Gregory, Jerome, and Augustine to the classical authors Terence and Seneca. Grymeston also quotes at length from the writers of Robert Allott's 1600 miscellany *Englands Parnassus* and a variety of contemporary Catholic poets, including Robert Southwell and Richard Verstegan. Like other commonplace-book writers, Grymeston offers material in multiple languages throughout her compilation, providing Latin and vernacular translations side by side from Pindar's *Carmina Pythia*, quoting Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* in Italian, and referencing the New Testament in Greek, displaying a knowledge of languages generally indicative of a grammar-school education (Hughey and Hereford 86). Finally, Grymeston's last chapter, "Memoratives," is a series of proverbial *sententiae* or single sentence prayers called "collects," often seen in commonplace books, which vary in secular and religious themes but are consistent in their use for moral education and improvement. As has been identified by the majority of studies that consider Grymeston's work in any length (Travitsky, Snook, Matchinske, and Heller), the *Miscelanea*'s insistent borrowing from the work of philosophers, poets, and Church Fathers has likely contributed to its exclusion from popular anthologies. Grymeston's ability to both read and edit from a broad range of sources in various forms and languages displays a propensity for uniquely

broad education, making her *Miscelanea* the most eloquent, learned, and "consciously literary" text within the mother's legacy genre (Travitsky, *Mother's Advice Books* x).

Considering the rarity of her case, Heller suggests that rather than questioning Grymeston's authenticity as an author, it is more productive to question "why she draws so freely upon humanistic subjects while other legacy writers almost entirely eschew such subjects" (*The Mother's Legacy* 32). Despite the fact that not much is known about Grymeston's education, her Catholicism reveals the importance of her literary ability for the private preservation of faith within the home. A predominant difference between Catholic and Protestant women during the Reformation period "hinges on the relationship between their private activities and the established church," since the Catholic mother's moral and religious education of her children within the household became separated from the ideology of the state (Snook 141). Advantageously for the recusant family, the privatized lives of women allowed for the practice of covert Catholicism at home, while the male household member enacted the role of church papist (142). Resultantly, for those families unable to send their children abroad to receive lessons devoid of Protestant influence, "education at home was the primary way to pass Catholicism from one generation to the next," a reality that made the success of Catholic sons dependent on the learnedness of Catholic mothers (143). While Grymeston's responsibility for her child's education suggests one possible reason for her impressive intellect, her display of both literary and religious knowledge and avid manipulation of scholarly sources shape her authorial identity as a reader first and as a mother second.

Despite the religious theme of Grymeston's *Miscelanea*, her most used source is *Englands Parnassus* (1600), a collection of modern English poetry identified by Moss as a "radical conversion of the common-place book" for its attempt at rewriting an ancient literary

canon (209–210). The collection features selections from Spenser, Lodge, Daniels, Shakespeare, Chapman, Marlowe, and Davies under a series of alphabetized commonplace titles that highlight the "special matters contained in this book" (A6–A8v), ranging from "Art" to "Theologie" to "Woe." Although the anthology of poetry appeared only in 1600, its reprinting that year at least four times suggests that it was very popular and acquired a wide readership as a secular text during that time (Klein 378). Nevertheless, the appearance of *Englands Parnassus* in the homes of higher-class families would not have been an extraordinary case. Grymeston's access to the compilation was likely acquired easily through her highly educated husband or another male member of her family. Yet, Hughey and Hereford have identified that "there is hardly a single stanza which appears exactly as it was printed in *Englands Parnassus*," and in many cases, Grymeston's writing features composite references that seem to be made up of a mix of lines and stanzas from different poets (84). Chapter III of Grymeston's work is a particularly fitting example of her methodology and expertise, as she combines and edits from Spenser, Sir John Harrington, and Daniels to name a few (Hughey and Hereford 86; Beilin, *Redeeming Eve* 269–270). In her "patheticall speech of the person of Dives in the torments of hell," Grymeston quotes Spenser's metaphor from *The Faerie Queene* comparing the wounded Marinell to a "sacred oxe," yet she changes the stanza's final line from "so fell proud Marinell upon the precious shore" (454) to "So downe I fell on wordlesse precious shore" (B4). Grymeston's repurposing of Spenser's metaphor suggests not only a full understanding of the quotation but also an ability to manipulate it in support of her overall theme: the inevitability of death and the depiction of hell (Beilin, *Redeeming Eve* 269). Her alteration of *The Complaint of Rosamund* is particularly impressive, as she edits the two lines from a larger passage into a rhyming couplet, following a parallel structure and ten-syllable pattern (Hughey and Hereford 86–87). Even

though *Englands Parnassus* is not a religious text, Grymeston draws from headings such as "Soule," "Death," "Life," and "Good Deeds" to fulfill the aspects of morality that characterize her devotional writing, allowing her traditional masculine intelligence to coexist with her pious femininity revealed by her topics and themes (Beilin, *Redeeming Eve* 270).

Grymeston exhibits a unique authorial positioning within the mother's legacy genre, yet she is not the only female legacy writer to have drawn from *Englands Parnassus*. Elaine Beilin identifies that the anonymous mother's advice book writer M. R. includes verses taken from the anthology in her treatise *The Mothers Counsell* (1630?), but unlike Grymeston, she does nothing to edit or manipulate the quotations to fit her work, making the two texts vastly different in their display of literary skill (*Redeeming Eve* 283). Despite their differences, the tracts' common references reveal that *Englands Parnassus* had somewhat of a female readership during the seventeenth century, likely deemed appropriate for its sections on "Care of Children" and "Marriage," but perhaps for its nationalist sentiments as well. In its offering of "The Choysest Flowers of our Moderne English Poets," Allott's compilation is presented with an overall patriotic tone, with one of its many loyalist quotations being "this royall throne of Kings, this sceptered isle," the famous excerpt from Shakespeare's *Richard II* for its representation of England (348). Grymeston's use of *Englands Parnassus* develops her combined identity as an English loyalist and covert Catholic by interlacing England's best poetry with the work of Catholic recusants and her self-authored religious prose.

Furthermore, *Miscelanea* makes reference to Robert Southwell's *Saint Peter's Complaint* (1595), a highly influential example of England's "literature of tears," popular amongst both Catholic and Protestant readers, and reprinted in over a dozen editions, which follows the journey from apostasy to repentance through the character of St. Peter (Corthell 58; Chenovick

1). The initial publication of the poem closely followed Southwell's death, who was hanged, drawn, and quartered as a Catholic martyr at Tyburn on February 21, 1595 (Chenovick 1). The popularity of *Saint Peter's Complaint* initiated a trend amongst publishers looking to make their own success working with new texts similarly characterized by Southwell's "prosopopoeia of Biblical figures" (1). This is exemplified through Catholic works such as Richard Verstegan's "St Peeters Comfort" (1601), as well as more mainstream Protestant tracts such as Samuel Rowland's *The Betraying of Christ* (1598) and Gervaise Markham's *Saint Petters Teares* (1597) (1). The fact that Grymeston read *Saint Peter's Complaint* is not necessarily surprising, since it was popular for devotional practice, yet her relationship to Southwell was not that of common reader. Through her father's side of the family, Grymeston was, however, related to the Catholic poet, and since her husband remained at Gray's Inn in 1595, she would have been in London and likely in attendance at Southwell's public execution (Hughey and Hereford 78). Although her first chapter, "A short line how to levell your life," suggests the influence of Southwell's "A Short Rule of Good Life" and several stanzas throughout her following chapters borrow from his lesser-known poems "Loss in Delay" and "What Joy to Live," yet *Saint Peter's Complaint* is her most frequently cited work by Southwell (Hughey and Hereford 79). Despite seldom mentioning the original authors of her source material in the text, Grymeston's eleventh chapter is titled "Morning meditation, with sixteene sobs of a sorowfull spirit, which she used for mental prayer, as also an addition of sixteen staves of verse taken out of *Peters complaint*, which she usually sung & played on the winde instrument" (D4v). The tense indicates that the title was added by her editor, printer, or publisher; it also provides a rare instance of explicit reference and dismissal of Grymeston's authorial manipulation of the poem that reflects the partial apology of her paratext. In Grymeston's "Morning Meditation," excerpts from Southwell's poetry are isolated,

rearranged, edited, and recontextualized amongst Grymeston's own written prose to the point where they seldom resemble their original source. Although the use of Southwell's poetry, even in its edited form, reflects Grymeston's Catholic affiliation, she refrains from including overly controversial Catholic verses, especially in this first edition, in order to maintain the privatization of her faith, a strategy she continues in her use of Richard Verstegan's *Odes in Imitation of the Seaven Penitential Psalmes* (1601).

Grymeston's Chapter XIII (Chapter XIX in later editions), aptly named "Evening Meditation. Odes in imitation of the seuen poenitentiall Psalmes, in seuen seuerall kinde of verse," is entirely composed of Verstegan's writing with comparatively little change to her other sources, suggesting that Grymeston may have been too sick when she received the text to offer any edits other than a reordering of his psalms (Hughey and Hereford 84). The writer, publisher, and smuggler of clandestine Catholic literature Richard Verstegan (formerly Rowlands) printed his *Odes* in Antwerp and addressed it to "the vertuous ladies and gentlewomen readers of these ditties," whose "sweet voyces or virginalles might voutsafe so to grace them" (A2). Despite presenting women as "the singers of the text," Verstegan's humble psalm translations are accompanied by rather contentious poetry, such as "Visions of the Worlds Instabilitie," which serves as an allegory for the shortcomings of the Reformation and features vaguely threatening maxims:

> That thinges which are the cause of others wrong,
> Themselves do often suffer wrack,
> Whereby is seene that sway endures not long,
> And that revenge not alwayes cometh slack. (H2v)

This is not the first appearance of suspicious allegory in Verstegan's writing, as his brief poem "A Resemblance of Martyrs" uses the metaphor of the explosive reaction between flint and steel, referring to the sixteenth-century flintlock pistol as a symbol for the "hidden force" of the seemingly insignificant actions of a single martyr (Polkowski 286). In Suzanne Hull's *Chaste, Silent & Obedient: English Books for Women, 1475–1640*, *Odes* is listed as one of five texts specifically associated with a Roman Catholic female readership because of its "prayers, epithets, lives of female saints, all in simple rhymes" (199). This trend of *simple* devotional literature being sold to Catholic women aligns with the general early modern consensus that the Catholic faith appealed particularly to women over men, due to its popularity amongst the "vain and intellectually weak"; "the Catholic female reader was Catholic largely because she was female" (Snook 179). Conversely, Verstegan's work suggests that he wrote for a learned female readership, like Grymeston, whose understanding of the text's counter-reformation signalling far surpassed the need for "simple rhymes" (Snook 212; Polkowski 286–287). As in her references to Southwell's *Saint Peter's Complaint*, Grymeston avoids Verstegan's most controversial lines, yet her use of his *Odes* connects her with a highly capable and intelligent Catholic female readership and literary culture, unlike any other mother's legacy writer.

Verstegan's *Odes* is an unlikely choice for a mother's legacy to her son, considering that its content was never intended for the male audience. Throughout *Miscelanea*, Grymeston's manipulation of sources and addition of verse prose often takes on a perspective specific to her gendered experience and her circumstances as a dying woman, provoking questions regarding the relevance of the text to her son Beryne. In her study of Ann Bowyer's commonplace book, Burke suggests that while "[women] did not have access to commonplace book culture in its most pervasive form…Bowyer's manuscript reveals how women could alter those quotations

and phrases to make them personally relevant" ("Ann Bowyer's Commonplace Book" 30). Grymeston's *Miscelanea* exhibits this practice first in Chapter IIII, "Who liues most honestly, will die most willingly":

> Life is a bubble blowen up with a breath,
>
> Whose wit is weaknesse, and whose wage is death,
>
> Whose way is wildnesse, and whose inne is penance,
>
> Stooping to crooked age the host of grieuance. (C3)

Her source for the quotation is Spenser's *The Shepheardes Calender*, listed under the heading "Youth" in *Englands Parnassus*, originally beginning with "Youth is a bubble blowen up with a breath" and ending with "and stoope gallant age, the hoast of greeuance" (321–322). Whereas these changes reflect the theme of death in Grymeston's chapter, the alterations from "youth" to "life" and "gallant" to "crooked" are more befitting a dying mother than a young man at the beginning of his life, to which the original text would have applied more aptly. Additionally, the moral teachings within Grymeston's work, supposedly for the edification of Beryne, are heavily focused on traits characteristic of exemplary Catholic womanhood. Matchinske asserts that "all of the attributes detailed in the *Miscelanea*—moderation, self-denial, passive martyrdom—work together to produce and glorify a delineation of ideal Catholic femininity as selfless and long-suffering" ("Gendering Catholic Conformity" 354). The gendered voice of Grymeston's writing only becomes more explicit in her prose. In the same chapter, adapting Spenser, she writes, "the woman great with childe will often muse of her deliuerie," emphasizing the possibility of death in childbirth as a metaphor for facing death without fear (C2v). She continues the metaphor of childbirth in her prose in Chapter VIII, stating that the difficulties of life must be endured for the holiness of death, like "throwes in childe-bed, by which our soule is brought out

of a lothsome body into eternall felicitie" (D2v). Here, Grymeston applies maternal metaphors that her son will never grasp through experience in the way she and her female peers can, suggesting a prioritized personal relevance and appeal to the woman reader rather than the male (Heller, *The Mother's Legacy* 168). This is continued in her exemplification of the maternal figure of Mary in Chapter VI, as she renders the feet of God symbolic of mercy and truth, at which the reader should "fall downe with *Marie* and kisse" (C4v). Grymeston also actively avoids "negative representations of femininity" in her compilation, opting to include Southwell's comparison of Christ to a "mother in tender hart," while omitting his stanza blaming women for the source of men's woe (Snook 205; Southwell 32). Through this alteration of Southwell's text, Grymeston simultaneously works "within dominant masculine discursive parameters [to mimic] their conceptions of the feminine… but also to transvalue, the boundaries of misogyny" (Rose 311). Overall, in both Grymeston's self-authored prose and verse quotations from Richard Verstegan, her first edition exhibits a focus on subjects specifically relevant to women, which only strengthens the text's categorization as a personal commonplace book of Grymeston's own experiences as a woman.

Grymeston's gendered experience in the first edition of *Miscelanea* is continued and even expanded on in her more controversial later editions, suggesting that some of her more proto-feminist verses were omitted from the original 1604 printing. Her fourteenth chapter, "Against Lasciuiousnsse," first appearing in the 1606 edition, contains prose with a strong anti-rape sentiment in the voice of St. Ambrose, shaming men for growing up to see violence against women as a "great game" (D8). She writes, "many of our swaggering youths, that dry their bones with chamber worke are growne to think Lechery no vice, nor Rape no sinne; terming it, *Magnatum Ludum*: when indeed there is not any vice more hatefull to man and odious

to God" (D8). As explained by Snook, Grymeston's figure of St. Ambrose specifically refers to "men connected with the Inns of Court and to their behaviour towards women," which could be interpreted as pertinent to her tumultuous relationship with her husband, Christopher Grymeston, who entered Gray's Inn in 1592 (203–204). Grymeston's *Miscelanea* not only reveals a rich moral, literary, and social education but points to commonplacing practices used throughout the period, as exemplified by the commonplace books of Katherine Parr and Elizabeth I.

Chapter IV: The Commonplace-Book Culture of Sixteenth-Century Women Writers: Grymeston, Katherine Parr, and Queen Elizabeth I

The survey of Grymeston's sources provides ample evidence for its distinction within commonplace-book culture, and her prose reveals her interest in traditional modes of education, suggesting that she compiled her text with the intention of creating a storehouse of knowledge, reminiscent of the commonplace books of schoolboys, yet inclusive of female readers and writers. Grymeston's ninth chapter, an addition to the 1606 reprint, features a metaphor representing the figure of Christ as a book, possibly inspired by the Catholic bishop and martyr John Fisher's use of a similar metaphor in his Good Friday homily from the early 1530s. Grymeston rewrites the metaphor in the ensuing manner: "Let the Mount Calvarie be our school, the crosse our pulpit, the crucifix our meditation, his wounds our letters…his open sides our booke, and *Scire Christum crucifixum,* our lesson" (C3; Snook 206). Snook suggests that by using the allegory and the pronoun "our" Grymeston intends to "create a practice of learned reading inclusive of women" by acknowledging that while women did not have the same access to schooling as men, biblical literacy was encouraged and exceedingly more accessible, making "Christ [a] school which all can attend" (Snook 207). For this reason, an evaluation of Grymeston's *Miscelanea* as a commonplace book requires comparison with works of the genre authored by other women, such as Elizabeth I and Katherine Parr. While these women benefitted from their aristocratic status and private education, comparing their work to Grymeston's *Miscelanea* only further supports that female-authored commonplace books exhibit shared methods and subjects regardless of differences in their social background.

Katherine Parr wrote multiple works indicative of commonplace-book culture, which include her *Psalms or Prayers* (1544), *Prayers or Meditations* (1545), and the unpublished

British Library MS Harley 2342, which has been identified by Janel Mueller as Katherine Parr's personal prayer book, gifted to Lady Jane Grey shortly before Parr's death (1544–1548). Her *Prayers or Meditations* consists of multiple new and previously printed prayers in its third edition (as seen in *Psalms or Prayers)*, as well as a "'60 page abridgement' of the 177-page third book of Thomas à Kempis's *De Imitatione Christi*" as it appeared in the English translation of Richard Whitford's *The Following of Christ* (1531) (Mueller, *Katherine Parr* 372). Additionally, Parr's MS Harley 2342 features prayers, non-narrative scriptural citations, and Psalm verses, with much of her compilation being sourced from primers and psalters published from 1530 to 1540, many of which remain unidentified. Among Parr's writings, the prayer book also contains "a brief exchange of messages of comfort in the handwritings of Guildford Dudley and Jane Grey," reflecting Grey's ownership of the book for a period of time leading up to her execution (Mueller, *Katherine Parr* 489). While, as in the case of Grymeston's *Miscelanea*, existing scholarship on Parr rarely calls these works "commonplace books" directly, Parr's methodology is highly reminiscent of commonplacing through its learnedness, compilation, and organization. It reveals Parr's extensive education in Latin, French, Italian, arithmetic, and basic medical lore, which her mother, Maud Parr, had modelled on the studies of More's children (Mueller, *Katherine Parr* 6). As the single facilitator of her family's estate, her children's education, and her oldest daughter's marriage arrangements, Maud Parr exemplified a woman of rare independence and intelligence that shaped both Katherine Parr and, by extension, her stepdaughter Elizabeth I (James 2). As a result, Parr was known for her extensive scholastic patronage, offering financial support for the publishing of an "ABC" primer for children's education, a variety of affordable books for religious reform, and a translation of Erasmus's *Paraphrases upon the New Testament* (1548) by Nicholas Udall, Thomas Key, and Princess

Mary, among others (James 6–7). Additionally, during her reign, she was able to take on significant roles of authority, signing five royal proclamations dealing with war-related matters in the king's absence and attempting to influence his position in favour of the Reformation, reflecting her extensive knowledge of political matters and influencing Elizabeth I's extensive political education (James 2–3; Mueller 23–24).

As a symbol of intellectual pursuit and women's education, Parr's commonplace writing distinctly influenced her stepdaughter Princess Elizabeth (later, Queen Elizabeth I), who translated Parr's own *Prayers or Meditations* into Latin, French, and Italian during her youth (Collinson 5). Elizabeth was known to have received one of the finest humanist educations of the period primarily facilitated by her tutor, Roger Ascham (Marcus et al. xi). Elizabeth I's instruction combined both domestic training and rhetorical lessons that emphasized public policy, functions of government, and public orations, which were traditionally components of a prince's education (Muller and Scodel 1–3; Crane, "Video et Taceo" 4). Elizabeth I's exceptional learnedness is reflected in her commonplace book, *Precationes Priuate, Regiae E[lizabethae]. R[eginae]*, printed under her name in 1563 by Thomas Purfoot. The composite volume contains her *Precationes Priuate* or private prayers, a collection of Latin prayers arranged under six specific headings that draw from a variety of religious sources including the Psalms, Proverbs, Romans, Ecclesiasticus, Jeremiah, and Luke (Duncan 43). Following these prayers are her *Sententiae*, a collection of 259 sentences composed of quotes and paraphrases attributed to a range of "classical authors, the Bible, Church Fathers, medieval ecclesiastical writers, and contemporary authorities" (Duncan 49). The commonplace books of Elizabeth I and Katherine Parr exhibit similarities indicative of familial influence; they also employ characteristics of the commonplace book such as thematic headings, psalm translations, proverbial maxims, and

compiled secular and religious materials that are shared with Grymeston's commonplacing practice.

Grymeston's *Miscelanea* first participates in the commonplace tradition of strict organization through its use of thematic headings. As prescribed by Erasmus, this strategy was intended to help its compiler "read literature in an essentially extrapolatory manner," dividing a topic such as "Faith" into more specific groupings: "Faith towards God" or "Faith towards Man" (Beale 137). In this fashion, Grymeston's table of contents features specific headings that pertain to more general themes; she covers and exemplifies religious lessons on the broad topics of "affliction" and "repentance" in chapters "That affliction is the coat of a true Christian" and "A Parenthetical discourse persuading repentance" (A2–A2v). Yet she also discusses more secular and political topics of "Honour" and "Law" in chapters "That Maiesty is the Daughter of honour and reverence" and "Of the office of a judge" (A2). As a quintessential aspect of commonplacing, this practice is similarly taken up by both Elizabeth I and Katherine Parr, who implemented categorical divisions in their commonplace books, which would have contributed to their use as educational aids during their private tutoring. Since women's education and literacy relied heavily on religious matters, the headings of all three commonplace books reflect a shared division of prayers for different times and purposes, fulfilling one of the most crucial purposes of commonplacing: moral and spiritual improvement (Smyth 108). Parr uses a quantitative or measurable categorization to organize her prayer in *Prayers or Meditations* with the heading "a devout prayer to be said daily," enacting a subdivision similar to Grymeston's "Morning meditation," "Evening meditation," and meditation for specific use on Good Friday, which all emphasize the time in which the work is applicable. Grymeston also divides her material by situational usage, particularly offering sections for the meditation of her impending death,

implied by her titles “Who lives most honestly, will die most willingly” and “the feare to die, is the effect of an evil life.” Parr’s titles in her personal prayer book hold the same sentiment as her “A prayer for trouble” and “A prayer of the faithful in adversity,” which cover her anticipation of difficult childbirth and her eventual death, demonstrating the shared personal relevance prevalent in the thematic organization of both Grymeston’s and Parr’s work (Mueller, *Katherine Parr* 508).

In *Precationes*, Elizabeth also employs thematic headings like Grymeston’s that reflect traditional female piety, which I have translated from Latin to English as “Preparations for prayers” and “Prayers for the Kingdom,” highlighting the general categorization and usages of “prayer” as an appropriate educational matter for women. In *The Instruction of a Christian Woman*, Vives’s overarching sentiment was that women’s education would allow them “more opportunity to be devout and to occupy themselves and inform themselves of all that is good” (27). A focus on this moral and religious goodness is especially prevalent in the writing of both Elizabeth and Grymeston, as they have specific categorizations for the subject of sin. Despite a difference in their religious leanings, Elizabeth uses the heading “Preparation for the forgiveness of sin” and Grymeston “a Sinners Glasse,” displaying the connection between Christian morality and women’s literacy. Alternatively, the headings in Elizabeth’s *Sententiae*, “On rule,” “On justice,” and “On counsel,” shift to more masculine matters of political authority. Similarly, Grymeston pays particular attention to the matters of justice in “The union of Mercie and Justice” and “Of the office of Judge,” the latter of which features a further subdivision within the chapter titled in Latin “Philosophus Justicia” (F2). While the titles of Grymeston’s *Miscelanea* shows a connection between feminine and masculine topics, characteristic of an ambiguously gendered education similar to that of Parr and Elizabeth I, her frequent use of Latin, amongst other languages, situates her within the traditional commonplace book culture.

In “Commonplace-Books in Print,” Moss explains that, while commonplace books entirely in vernacular English were widely used, they lacked the “verbal sophistication” and “stylistic distinction” of Latin, an essential aspect of humanist education and, therefore, the commonplace book genre (207–208). Even though Vives advocated for women’s study of Greek and Latin, the learning of languages was most often dependent on the husband’s education of his spouse (2). This caused languages to be a more common acquisition of male grammar students across more variable class lines, establishing the connection between women’s exclusion from formal education and the writing of commonplace books (Moss 208). Despite these barriers, many women did acquire the ability to write in Latin, Greek, and other languages. Consequently, translation became a “major form of literary production engaged in by women writers in the Renaissance,” as exemplified by Margaret Roper, Ann Askew, Katherine Parr, and Elizabeth I (Clarke 13). In *The Politics of Early Modern Women’s Writing*, Clarke states:

> The practice of translation [was] thought of as “safe” for women if its functions [were] reduced to a slavish relationship of [translator] to the text, where [she] merely passively subordinates [herself] to the original author and his messages. While it may be the case that male writers devalue women’s reading by directing them towards an “inferior” form of writing, it is equally the case that the “permission” for women to read [and write] translations [opened] up several areas of agency. (13)

Through her ability to read and write with active alteration of her sources in various languages, Grymeston enacts this agency in her writing as a participant in the translation tradition of the early modern women writers, allowing her to adopt the same commonplace-book practices as the formally educated men of her time.

Nevertheless, Grymeston sparingly quotes from foreign sources, with a single line copied from Pindar in Greek in Chapter IV and a brief verse in Italian in Chapter III, laden with errors, from the first stanza of Canto VI of Aristo's *Orlando Furioso* (Hughey and Hereford 89). She does, however, slightly alter the Italian from "L'aria e la terra stessa in ch'e sepulto" to "L'aria la terra e 'l luggo in ch'è sepolto" and follows it with the English translation by Elizabeth I's godson, John Harrington, suggesting that she intended to improve her acquisition of the language (Hughey and Hereford 89; Mueller and Scodel 16). Nonetheless, her writing is filled with Latin headings and phrases, either in composite English and Latin quotations or side-by-side translations, suggesting that perhaps she had been using her manuscript to actively polish her translation abilities. In Chapter III, Grymeston writes:

> Judge your selues, that you bee not indged: *Vt sementem feceris, ita metes*; what you sow that you reape; either a crown of glory, *quam nemo scit nisi accepit*, or a chaos of confusion, *in qua sempiturnus horror habitat*, whose worth cannot be expressed, but of him that enioyes it, or a masse of confusion in which eternal horror doth inhabit. (B4v)

Quoting from the books of Galatians, Revelation, and Job, Grymeston seems to be providing the Latin first, followed by the English translation. Yet, Hughey and Hereford have identified her "incorrigible habit" of using the Latin *sementemfeceris* ("you will carry the seed") instead of the more precise *seminaveris* ("you will sow"), suggesting that her understanding of Latin was still being developed (87–88). Grymeston's practice of alternating from the vernacular to Latin is similar to the education of Elizabeth I as facilitated by her tutor, Roger Ascham, who prescribed a "double translation" method, where she would translate "from Latin to English, and back to Latin" in multiple notebooks (Crane 90). Despite some of her more amateur Latin phrases, Grymeston must have at least had a functional understanding of the language as she quotes

almost invariably from the Latin Vulgate Bible, the prevalent biblical source in both Parr's and Elizabeth I's commonplace books (Hughey and Hereford 89; Mueller and Scodel 346; Mueller, *Katherine Parr* 209). Additionally, in Chapter XV, Grymeston includes a composite quote in Latin and English without repeated translation, exhibiting a different form of her linguistic practice, in which she partially quotes from Jerome's commentary on sin in the Book of Ezekiel, one of many Church Fathers quoted by Grymeston: "It is true, that *anima qua peccauerit, ipsa morietur*; but it is as true, that *panitentia addit quod peccatum detraxit. lmpietas impij non nocebit impio in illa die in qua conversus fuerit ab impietate sua*" (E5v). Her adaptation of Jerome here is indicative of the reading materials that would have been prescribed to her, since Vives encouraged women to read "the authority of the holy fathers" (*The Education of a Christian Woman* 106).

Like Grymeston, Parr also heavily relied on the Church Fathers in her writing, indicated by the section in her personal prayer book titled "Saint Jerome's devotion out of David's Psalter," which begins with a translation of Psalm 5:2–3 from the Vulgate (Mueller, *Katherine Parr* 588). Although Grymeston does not actively translate her quoted psalms, both her and Parr's inclusion of the psalms in their writing reflects not only the presence of multiple genres within their commonplacing but their shared participation in the early modern psalm tradition (Smyth 98). Similarly, Grymeston transcribed and reordered from Richard Verstegan's *Odes in Imitation of The Seaven Penitential Psalmes*, the seven psalms of Chapter XIX (XIII in the first edition) in *Miscelanea*. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, psalms were believed to be "a microcosm of faith, despair, and all spiritual states in between," used for private meditation or public worship and strongly identified with the Protestant faith (Clarke 128). Due to their ambiguous narrative voice, psalms were particularly attractive to women as they could be

appropriated by any specific individual regardless of gender, class, age, or ability, "enabling women to encounter and rework [a psalm]...because poetic paraphrase could easily be seen as only partially their own work" (Clarke 129). As one of the most prominent female figures of the psalm tradition, Mary Sidney took on the project of translating and paraphrasing the Psalms alongside her brother, producing the work known as the "Sidney Psalter," and dedicating it to Elizabeth I as a major contribution to women's literary and religious pursuits (Beilin, *Redeeming Eve* 121–123). As a central aspect of devotional life for both men and women, psalms were often copied, translated, and adapted for the purpose of personal religious practice and improvement, often appearing in commonplace books. Even though Grymeston's alteration of Verstegan's penitential psalms is minimal, her repurposing of them for her personal use is similar to the commonplacing practices in which both Parr and Elizabeth I were involved.

Since her Chapter XIX relies on Verstegan's translation, Grymeston strictly quotes the penitential psalms 6, 32, 38, 51, 102, 130, and 143, which focus on themes of repentance, confession, and forgiveness (Lingas, *The Oxford Companion to Music*). In Elizabeth's *Precationes*, excerpts from the Psalms precede her written prayers, which Marcus, Mueller, and Rose attribute to the influence of Parr's *Prayers or Meditations* on Elizabeth's writing (135). Parr translates a variety of psalms in her *Prayers or Meditations* and she alludes to some of the seven penitential psalms, including Psalm 32, which she references in the line "Lord, I will knowledge unto Thee all mine unrighteousness, and I will confess to Thee all the unstableness of my heart" (Mueller, *Katherine Parr* 400). Grymeston seems to include a variation of the same verse from Verstegan's translation of Psalm 32:

> Be therefore joyfull in our Lord,
>
> All that to righteousnesse accord;

Let ech with gladnesse beare his part,

That hath a pure and perfect hart. (G4)

Both translations emphasize a concern with righteousness and natures of the heart, yet Parr's privileges the negative through the terms "unrighteousness" and "unstableness," while Grymeston's, citing Verstegan, privileges the positive by using "righteousnesse" and "gladnesse," reflecting the ability to adapt the same source differently in order to serve one's personal preferences. Parr has also adapted the psalm using first-person pronouns, establishing herself as the writer, whereas Grymeston has transcribed rather than translated it, thus turning herself into the reader to whom the psalm is addressed. The differences between Grymeston's and Parr's adaptation and authorship show their individual perspectives and usages, reflecting the practice of compiling relevant materials into one's commonplace book.

Following Grymeston's transcription of penitential psalms is her final chapter, "Memoratives," containing a series of unattributed proverbial maxims in English, which range from piety to lawful obedience. Grymeston's "Memoratives" displays "an approach to language that privileges the…little block of text" and "the production of new texts out of old parts," established as attributes of commonplace-book culture in Smyth's study. The use of brief moral sentences, most often categorized as adages, *sententiae*, collects, or maxims, were especially recommended for use in the commonplace books of male grammar students by Vives. Erasmus compared their small size and high value to precious jewels, writing "what man of sane mind would not prefer gems, however small, to immense rocks" (Crane, *Framing* 62). Many of Grymeston's maxims reflect similar pious sentiments and meditations on death from her previous chapters, including "He dies most willingly that liued most honestly," an almost exact replica of her fourth chapter title (G6v). Like Grymeston, Parr also made use of the "little block of text" in

her personal prayer book, using her collect titled "For strength of mind to bear the cross" to conjure a similar sentiment about her willingness to die: "I abide patiently, and give mind attendance upon Thee, continually waiting for relief at Thy hand" (Mueller, *Katherine Parr* 618). Grymeston also includes multiple adapted secular and philosophical sentences transcribed or adapted from the ancients (Lyly 36; Beale 145). For example, she includes the saying "A peruerse man is like a sea crab that alwaies swimmes against the streame," which closely resembles the quote "as the Sea-Crabbe swimmeth alwayes agaynst the streame, so wit alwayes striveth agaynst wisedom," commonly attributed to Pythagoras but likely taken from the English writer John Lyly's *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit* (1578) (36). In a similar vein, Elizabeth I's *Sententiae* is constructed as a series of brief collects of moral and political value sourced and adapted from "the Bible, classical authors, church fathers, medieval ecclesiastical writers and Desiderius Erasmus" (Mueller and Scodel 331). According to Mueller and Scodel, Elizabeth I's *Sententiae* "declared to the educated elite…that Elizabeth, still relatively new to her throne, was [learned]...[and] receptive to wise counsel" (332). This practice of collecting sentences in one's commonplace book is a display of learnedness that can aptly be applied to Grymeston's work as well. Despite writing in a fundamentally different context and educational background, several of Elizabeth I's brief sentences share topics and phrasings with Grymeston's "Memoratives." Each author is concerned with financial charity; Elizabeth writes, "to enrich others is more regal than to grow rich," echoing a similar sentiment in Grymeston's line: "Charity and humility purchase immortality," with both lines reflecting that generosity as an important trait in potential rulers and political authorities (Mueller and Scodel 349; G6v). Additionally, Grymeston's line "The death of an euill man is the safetie of a good man" strikingly resembles Elizabeth's "by removing bad men, he makes other men live more safely," from a longer maxim about the importance of

the law (G8v; Mueller and Scodel 356). Taken up with the more political matters of law and justice, Grymeston also addresses her obedience to state authority, "The vertue of a prince is the chiefest authoritie of his magistrate," an overarching theme that appears throughout Elizabeth I's sentences in her section "On Rule" (G8v). While Elizabeth I's focus on lessons of monarchy is expected from her commonplace *Sententiae*, Grymeston's "Memoratives" displays a comparatively impressive account of personal political values for a non-aristocratic woman, establishing her commonplace book as a site of composite education on secular subjects as well as religious ones.

Aside from their general structure and subject matter, Grymeston's *Miscelanea* can also be compared to Elizabeth I's *Sententiae* for its use of anthology as a primary secular source in their commonplace book. For the majority of her secular writing in the *Miscelanea*, Grymeston relies on *Englands Parnassus*, often categorized as Allott's anthology or commonplace book of modern English poetry. For example, in Chapter II, Grymeston begins a verse with the phrase "Since harvest never failes," borrowed and adapted from Lodges's "*Sinnes* harvest never failes," originally written in "A Fig for Momus," yet appearing as a standalone line in Allott's *Englands Parnassus*, which Grymeston borrowed without citation (A8v; Allott 329). Similarly, Elizabeth I sourced her quotations of classic authors such as Plutrach and Stobaeus from Domenico Nani Mirabello's *Polyanthea* (1503) and Thomas of Ireland's *Manipulus florum* or *Flores omnium pene doctorum* (1483), widely used medieval collections of patristic, ecclesiastical, and pagan authorities. However, Elizabeth's citations consistently reference original sources rather than the commonplace books from which she actually borrowed (Mueller and Scodel 338–339). Her twelfth *sententia*, "A king should treat his subjects as a shepherd does his sheep," is quoted as originating from Book VIII of Aristotle's "Ethics." Yet the slight variation reveals it to be

sourced from *Polyanthea*, from which Elizabeth reproduces the original citation (Mueller and Scodel 347). Both women make use of what Mueller and Scodel describe as "a common, but also a condemned, Renaissance practice in the creation of commonplace books: the copying of others' collected commonplaces" (339). Additionally, Grymeston freely borrows excerpts from Lodges's work, amongst others included in *Englands Parnassus*, as she saw fit, a practice similar to the creation of the source text itself, in which Allott arranges what he believed to be the most valuable sections from the various works of contemporary poets into his commonplace anthology. Like Grymeston, Elizabeth seemed to have based much of her format on her source text as well, since both Mirabello and Elizabeth began with scripture, followed with ecclesiastical quotations, and ended with excerpts from classical writers (Mueller and Scodel 339). Mueller and Scodel note that the practice of sourcing from anthologies was frowned upon during the early modern period:

> When quoting from the *Polyanthea* and the *Flores*, she always cites the original author without ever acknowledging reliance on either collection, which she clearly regarded as convenient shortcuts to the appearance of erudition in the classics…Paolo Cherchi has described the *Polyanthea* as one of the major "secret" manuals of the sixteenth century, pillaged by many but cited by none. Montaigne mocks men who "quote Plato and Homer without ever having set eyes on them" and thus "eke out their studies on the cheap…" (339)

While Elizabeth I would have likely had the means to acquire original classical texts, her use of popular anthologies reveals a stigmatized practice during the early modern period and point to class and gender exclusions within the commonplace genre. Conversely, Grymeston's access to an abundance of secular literature was likely limited by both her class and gender, meaning that

her use of one anthology to source multiple works and thus "eke out [her] studies on the cheap" allowed her to exhibit a significant education of contemporary poetry in her commonplace book (339).

Smyth proposes that the fluid ownership of compiled materials is essential to the genre, challenging the idea that the commonplace books of Grymeston and Elizabeth I should be dismissed for their use of anthologized sources (94). He asserts that within greater commonplace-book culture the compiler of a public commonplace book must recognize that their materials "can always be passed on [and] can always be taken up by later readers" (95). Smyth's reasoning for contradicting traditional prescriptions of the method lies within his effort to stray from the early modern cultural unease of female authorship. While Elizabeth I's reason for relying on anthologies rather than original sources in her *Sententiae* remains unknown, her choice to disguise her usage of them by citing the original works reveals an understanding of the practice as unsavoury, thus implicating her alongside Grymeston in the resistance of traditional commonplace-book culture that largely excluded female authors. By blurring the lines of "scribe and author," Smyth suggests a study of early modern women as authors who rely less on *where* they procured their source material and more on their use and understanding of it (95). Elizabeth I's *Sententiae* and Grymeston's *Miscelanea* therefore aid in the understanding of women's reading and adapting of anthologies, exemplifying a broadened idea of commonplace culture and female authorship.

Although *Englands Parnassus* served as a major source in Grymeston's *Miscelanea*, it does not account for her devotional material, as taken from her other significant sources, Southwell and Verstegan. Unlike her use of *Englands Parnassus*, which is dispersed throughout the *Miscelanea*, Grymeston's use of these devotional sources appears contained in their specific

chapters, with Southwell's *Saint Peter's Complaint* confined to Chapter XI "Morning Meditation" and Verstegan's *Odes* in Chapter XIX (XIII in the first edition) "Evening Meditation." Whereas her transcription of Versetgan's *Odes* appears with little alteration, her rendition of *Saint Peter's Complaint* is altered, rearranged, and mixed with sections of her own written prose, reconfiguring the text for her own "mentall prayer" (C4v). In comparison, Parr's *Prayer or Meditations* features a similar method through her "60 page abridgement" of the 177-page third book of Thomas à Kempis's *De Imitatione Christi* as it appeared in the English translation of Richard Whitford's *The Following of Christ* (1531) (Mueller, *Katherine Parr* 372). Parr takes on an active reworking of Whitford's text which occasionally gives way to self-referential vocabulary for personal relevance, replacing third-person masculine references with first-person pronouns throughout, and altering gendered phrasing such as "wretched man" to "wretched creature" (Mueller, "Devotion as Difference" 187). Grymeston employs the same strategy for creating personal relevance in her manipulation of Southwell, changing his lines "Give vent unto the vapours of thy brest" to "Give vent unto the vapours of *my* brest" and "let not thy teares be few: / Baptise thy spotted soule in weeping dewe" to "let not *my* teares be few: / Baptise *my* soule in weeping dewe" (Southwell A4; Grymeston C5v). Additionally, Grymeston's dedication to "polite suffering, pointed obedience, and exemplary personal conduct," characteristic of Catholic womanhood, is revealed through the chapter's prose component (Matchinske, "Gendering Catholic Conformity" 354). In a stanza borrowed from Southwell, she writes, "I am ashamed to be seene of thee, because I am not assured to be receiued by thee, hauing neither deserued pardon for my faults, nor participation of thy glorie" (C5). This personal tone of feminine piety and submission is similarly evoked in Parr's *Prayers or Meditations* in the line "But what am I (Lorde) that I dare speake to thee? I am thy poore creature," challenging the

traditionally masculine authoritative voice of the commonplace genre (187). Through the alteration of pronouns and the addition of written verse, both writers adapt male-authored religious works in their commonplace books, using them as vehicles to express their personal devotion.

As identified by Mueller in "Devotion as Difference: Intertextuality in Queen Katherine Parr's 'Prayers or Meditations,'" Parr's writing was also heavily influenced by the Protestant archbishop Thomas Cranmer's vernacular religious work *Litany* (1544). Comparing the two, Mueller states:

> Cranmer's is the work for souls in *public*, Parr's the work for the soul in *private*. Both attained the status of royally sanctioned productions of an English church that was making its first moves from Catholic to Protestant formulations in handbooks for worship offered at large to its literate membership. (177)

Mueller's characterization of Parr's writing as private aligns with Smyth's reconfigured image of commonplace-book culture, as one of his sixteen traits recognizes the importance of creating "a private (or semi-public) text through the appropriation of public texts," a strategy similarly used throughout Grymeston's work, as seen in her personal reworking of Southwell's popular *Saint Peter's Complaint*. Grymeston's manipulation of public work for private devotional use in Chapter XIX, Chapter XIII exemplifies her capacity for writing equivocally on the public politics of the Reformation. On the nature of the crucifixion, she writes:

> The passion of Christ [is] compounded of so many forcible contraries, as of glory; misery; gladnes; fadnes; life; death; God; man; the union of these contrarieties in one subject is so effectuall, as it mooueth compassion…for one subject contentedly to containe two predominant contraries, is a thing of that admiration, as that mans

> understanding cannot comprehend, how the union of such disunion should bee in communion. (D2v–D3)

As suggested by Matchinske, Grymeston's use of oppositional language speaks to her simultaneous Catholic sincerity and state loyalty, promoting ambiguous understandings of allegiance in times of religious trial and national suspicion, and thus using the method of commonplacing to flesh out ideas on public opinion ("Gendering Catholic Conformity" 336). Similarly, Elizabeth I's *Precationes* combines prayers for private use, such as her aforementioned "Preparation for prayers" and "Preparations for the forgiveness of sins" with those more applicable for public use, such as "Prayers for the Kingdom," "Thanksgiving for recovering her health," and "Prayer for wisdom in the administration of the kingdom." In her public prayer, "Thanksgiving for the benefits conferred," she writes, "I may rightly and perpetually use upright governance towards Thy people, and sound administration of the kingdom and Thy commonwealth," thus exemplifying her more traditionally masculine positioning as a public authority (Marcus et al. 142). Although their circumstances and leanings were different, the commonplace books of Parr, Elizabeth I, and Grymeston are concerned with the collecting, reworking, and writing their texts in a way that concerns the same overarching themes of politics and religion, effectively combining conventional aspects of masculine public and feminine private life.

Finally, while Grymeston's *Miscelanea* is textually similar to Parr's work through their shared devotional reworking, they also exhibit similarities within a broader context of commonplace-book culture, which certainly warrants further discussion. Smyth suggests the connection between commonplacing and generational legacy is an integral component of the collaborative spirit of the genre (106). Grymeston's *Miscelanea* first illustrates this intersection

of legacy and commonplace through the inclusion of her family arms in the 1606 printed edition, added to her text posthumously by a member of her family, alluding to "the presence…of many hands" (Smyth 106). Additionally, Grymeston's Chapter XII, "A Madrigall," is a song written by her dedicatee and son, Bernye Grymeston, "to conceit of his mothers play to the former ditties," representative not only of familial collaboration and shared authorship but successive legacy. In comparison, Parr's personal prayer book enacts a similar legacy through collaboration with Lady Jane Grey, who owned, added to, and passed on the personal work of devotional material, as Parr died in childbirth. At the bottom of fol. 78r to fol. 80r of Parr's prayer book, Grey's final goodbye to her father states: "thincke not I most humblye beseache youre grace / that you have loste [your child] but truste that we by leasinge thys mortall life have wunne an imortal Life and for I / my parte as I have honoured youre grace in thys life wyll praye for you in another life" (Mueller, *Katherine Parr* 534). Similarly, Bernye's madrigal serves as a form of correspondence, since he would presumably sing to his mother the lines:

> How many pipes, as many sounds
> Do still impart to your sonnes hart
> As many deadly wounds.
> How many strokes, as many stounds,
> Ech stroke a dart, ech stound a smart,
> Poore Captiue me confounds.
> And yet how oft the strokes of sounding keyes hath slaine,
> As oft the looks of your kind eies restores my life againe. (D2)

Both Grey's and Grymeston's work shares in the theme of death and restored or immortal life, as well as serving the purpose of familial correspondence, demonstrating not only the

"collaborative spirit" that Smyth considers essential to commonplace book culture but also the genre's function of legacy. The implication of legacy in Grymeston's *Miscelanea* cannot be overlooked even in its active recontextualization outside of the mother's legacy genre. As a work written at the time leading up to its author's death, the *Miscelanea* functions simultaneously as a legacy of Grymeston's religious resistance, national allegiance, literary skill, and maternal influence, even when she is considered outside of the role of mother. For Grymeston, like Parr, who lived as a devout, learned woman and died a sickly mother, the commonplace book provides a means of legacy not only for her son, but for her own authorial self.

Conclusion

In *The Mother's Legacy in Early Modern England*, Heller proposes that the mother's legacy genre takes shape in many forms:

> Manuscripts range from five pages in a commonplace book to a collection of 1,000 holograph pages, and printed volumes of varying lengths appear in anything from sextodecimo to quarto size. The variety within the genre suggests that generic conventions are metastable, for they have specific features that are nonetheless malleable. (2)

By definition, the term *metastable* refers to "a situation or condition which is apparently stable but is capable of reaction if disturbed" (*OED*). Making use of this metastability, my study argues for the disturbance of Elizabeth Grymeston's positioning as a mother's legacy text and the consideration of *Miscelanea, Meditations, Memoratives* as a commonplace book in order to assess the literary, devotional, and political value of her writing. Early modern marriage and subsequent motherhood worked to establish a woman's relationship to a particular man, who would then define her womanhood legally and politically, creating a fixed association of her identity with private, domestic life and minuscule personal autonomy (Aughterson 102–103). Conversely, as a tool for educational upkeep, the commonplace book is connected with learnedness and personal improvement, presenting a vastly different context in which to consider Grymeston's work (Moss 188–189). By surveying the publication history and paratextual representation of the *Miscelanea*, it is revealed that Grymeston's position within the mother's legacy genre should not be entirely dismissed but rather understood as an expression of her authorial agency and emergence as an early modern female writer. As a mother's legacy text, Grymeston's *Miscelanea* would have likely served as an early influence upon the subsequent

mother's legacy writers to which she is most often compared, such as Dorothy Leigh and Elizabeth Joceline, who emerged during the genre's peak in the seventeenth century. Yet the comparative analysis of Grymeston's *Miscelanea* and the collections of early modern women writers who came before her, such as Lady Frances Abergavenny, Katherine Parr, and Elizabeth I, reveals the limitations of maternal identity, which has largely defined the current scholarship on Grymeston's work, and provides a broader framework within which this early example of the mother's legacy genre can be reevaluated.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Allott, Robert. *Englands Parnassus: Or, the choysest flowers of our moderne poets, with their poeticall comparisons descriptions of bewties, personages, castles, pallaces, mountaines, groues, seas, springs, riuers, &c. whereunto are annexed other various discourses, both pleasaunt and profitable*. London: N. Ling, C. Burby and T. Hayes, 1600.

Bentley, Thomas, et al. *The Monument of Matrones.* Printed by H. Denham, 1582.

Elizabeth I. *Elizabeth I: Collected Works.* Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. University of Chicago Press, 2000.

—. *Elizabeth I: Translations 1544–1589.* Edited by Janel Mueller and Joshua Scodel. University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Grymeston, Elizabeth. *Miscelanea, Meditations, Memoratives.* London: Melchisidec Bradwood, 1604.

—. *Miscelanea, Meditations, Memoratives.* London: George Elde, 1606.

—. *Miscellanea, Prayers, Meditations, Memoratives.* London: Melchisidec Bradwood, 1608.

—. *Miscellanea, Prayers, Meditations, Memoratives*. London: Edward Griffin, 1618.

Joceline, Elizabeth. *The Mothers Legacie to Her Unborn Child.* London: John Hauiland, 1624.

Leigh, Dorothy. *The Mothers Blessing.* London: John Budge, 1616.

Lyly, John. *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit / by John Lyly (1578) to Which Is Added the First Chapter of Sir Philip Sidney's Arcadia, Edited with Introduction and Notes by Friedrich Landmann*, edited by Gebr. Henninger, 1887.

McKerrow, R. B. *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books 1557–1640*. Bibliographical Society, 1968.

Parr, Katherine. “Prayers or Meditations.” *Katherine Parr: Complete Works & Correspondence*, edited by Janel Mueller, University of Chicago Press, 2014, pp. 369–424.

Southwell, Robert. *Saint Peter's Complaint with Other Poems.* London: James Roberts, 1595.

Smith, Peter. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554–1640 A. D.* Vol. 2, 1950.

Verstegan, Richard. *Odes in Imitation of the Seuen Penitential Psalmes, With Sundry Other Poemes and Ditties Tending to Deuotion and Pietie.* 2nd ed., Antwerp, 1601.

Vives, Juan Louis. *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth-Century Manual.* Translated by Charles Fantazzi. University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Secondary Sources:

Allan, David. “A Very Short History of Commonplacing.” *Commonplace Books and Reading in Georgian England*, edited by Joad Raymond, Cambridge UP, 2010, pp. 35–45.

Anselment, Raymond A. “Katherine Paston and Brilliana Harley: Maternal Letters and the Genre of Mother’s Advice.” *Studies in Philology*, vol. 101, no. 4, 2004, pp. 431–453.

Arblaster, Paul. “Verstagan [formerly Rowlands], Richard (1548–1640).” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Oxford UP, 2004.

Atkinson, Colin, and Jo B. Atkinson. “Subordinating Women: Thomas Bentley’s Use of Biblical Women in ‘The Monument of Matrones’ (1582).” *Church History*, vol. 60, no. 3, 1991, pp. 289–300.

Atkinson, Colin B. “The Identity and Life of Thomas Bentley, Compiler of The Monument of Matrones (1582).” *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol. 31, no. 2, 2000, pp. 323–348.

Atkinson, Colin B., and William P. Stoneman. "'These Griping Greefes and Pinching Pangs': Attitudes to Childbirth in Thomas Bentley's The Monument of Matrones (1582)." *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol. 21, no. 2, 1990, pp. 193–203.

Aughterson, Kate. *Renaissance Women: A Sourcebook: Constructions of Femininity in England*. Routledge, 1995, pp. 102–226.

Beale, Peter. "Notions in Garrison: The Seventeenth-Century Commonplace Book." *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts: Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society*, edited by W. Speedhill, Renaissance English Text Society, 1993, pp. 131–148.

Beilin, Elaine V. *Redeeming Eve: Women Writers of the English Renaissance.* Princeton UP, 1987.

—. "Neville [née Manners], Frances, Lady Abergavenny (d. 1576), writer." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Oxford UP, 2004.

Burke, Victoria E. "Ann Bowyer's Commonplace Book (Bodleian Library Ashmole MS 51): Reading and Writing among the 'Middling Sort.'" *Early Modern Literary Studies*, vol. 6, no. 3, 2001, pp. 28–40.

—. "'Memorial Books': Commonplaces, Gender, and Manuscript Compilation in Seventeenth-Century England." *Ars Reminiscendi: Mind and Memory in Renaissance Culture*, edited by Donald Beecher and Grant Williams, Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2009, pp. 121–146.

Charlton, Kenneth. *Women, Religion and Education in Early Modern England*. Taylor and Francis, 2002.

Chenovick, Clarissa. "Saint Peters Complaynte." *The Literary Encyclopedia.* 2013.

Clarke, Danielle. *The Politics of Early Modern Women's Writing.* Routledge, 2013.

Collinson, Patrick. “Elizabeth I (1533–1603).” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford UP, 2004.

Corthell, Ronald. “Irony, Recusancy, and Repentance in Robert Southwell’s Saint Peter’s Complaint.” *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 65, no. 1, 2023, pp. 58–87.

Cousins, A. D. “Humanism, Female Education, and Myth: Erasmus, Vives, and More’s ‘To Candidus.’” *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 65, no. 2, 2004, pp. 213–230.

Crane, Mary Thomas. *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England*. 1st ed., vol. 247, Princeton UP, 2014.

—. “‘Video et Taceo’: Elizabeth I and the Rhetoric of Counsel.” *Studies in English Literature 1500–1800*, vol. 28. no. 1, 1988, pp. 1–15.

Cranfield, Nicholas W. S. “Sutcliffe, Matthew (1549/50–1629), dean of Exeter.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Oxford UP, 2008.

Duncan, Moira. “Educating a Princess: Elizabeth I’s Commonplace Book.” Thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 2019.

Florescu, Catalina Florina. *Disjointed Perspectives on Motherhood*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2013.

Genette, Gerard, et al. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation.* Cambridge UP, 2009.

Gibson, Joan. “Educating for Silence: Renaissance Women and the Language Arts.” *Hypatia*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1989, pp. 9–27.

Havens, Earle. *Commonplace Books: A History of Manuscripts and Printed Books from Antiquity to the Twentieth Century.* Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, 2001.

Heller, Jennifer. “The Legacy and Rhetorics of Maternal Zeal.” *ELH*, vol. 75, no. 3, 2008, pp. 603–623.

—. *The Mother’s Legacy in Early Modern England*. 1st ed., Routledge, 2011.

Horton, Louise. "'Restore Me That Am Lost': Recovering the Forgotten History of Lady Abergavenny's Prayers." *Women's Writing: The Elizabethan to Victorian Period*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2019, pp. 3–14.

Hughey, R., and P. Hereford. "Elizabeth Grymeston and Her Miscellanea." *Library*, vol. 15, no. 1, 1934, pp. 61–89.

Hull, Suzanne W. *Chaste, Silent, and Obedient: English Books for Women, 1475–1640.* Huntington Library, 1982.

King, John N. "The Godly Woman in Elizabethan Iconography." *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 1, 1985, pp. 41–84.

—. "Thomas Bentley's Monument of Matrons: The Earliest Anthology of English Women's Texts." *Strong Voices, Weak History: Early Women Writers and Canons in England, France, and Italy*, edited by Joseph Benson and Victoria Kirkham, University of Michigan Press, 2005, pp. 216–235.

—. "Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen." *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol. 43, no. 1, 1990, pp. 30–74.

Klein, H. M. "Florilegium Florilegii: An Example of the Influence of 'England's Parnassus.'" *Notes and Queries*, vol. 20, no. 20, 1973, pp. 378–379.

Lingas, Alex. "Psalm." *The Oxford Companion to Music*. Oxford UP, 2011.

Ljungqvist, Fredrik Charpentier. "Female Shame, Male Honor: The Chastity Code in Juan Luis Vives' *De Institutione Feminae Christianae*." *Journal of Family History*, vol. 37, no. 2, 2012, pp. 139–154.

Marcus, Leah S., et al. *Elizabeth I: Collected Works.* University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Matchinske, Megan. “Gendering Catholic Conformity: The Politics of Equivocation in Elizabeth Grymeston’s ‘Miscelanea.’” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, vol. 101, no. 3, 2002, pp. 329–357.

—. *Writing, Gender, and State in Early Modern England: Identity Formation and the Female Subject.* Cambridge UP, 1998.

Mazzola, Elizabeth. “Something Old, Something New, Something Borrowed, Something Ermine: Elizabeth I’s Coronation Robes and Mothers’ Legacies in Early Modern England.” *Early Modern Women: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, vol. 1, 2006, pp. 115–136.

McGee, J. Sears. “Adams, Thomas (1583–1652), Church of England Clergyman.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Oxford UP, 2012.

Mendelson, Sara, and Patricia Crawford. *Women in Early Modern England, 1550–1720.* Clarendon Press, 1998.

Moss, Ann. *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought.* Clarendon Press, 1996.

Mueller, Janel. *Katherine Parr: Complete Works & Correspondence.* University of Chicago Press, 2014.

—. “Devotion as Difference: Intertextuality in Queen Katherine Parr’s ‘Prayers or Meditations’ (1545).” *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 53, no. 3, 1990, pp. 171–197.

Mueller, Janel, and Joshua Scodel. *Elizabeth I: Translations, 1544–1589.* University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Narveson, Kate. “Traces of Reading Practice in Thomas Bentley’s Monument of Matrones.” *ANQ*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2008, pp. 11–18.

O'Reilly, Andrea. *Maternal Theory: Essential Readings.* 1st ed., Demeter Press, 2007.

Pearson, Jacqueline. "Women Reading, Reading Women." *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500–1700*, edited by Helen Wilcox, Cambridge UP, 1996, pp. 80–99.

Pender, Patricia. *Early Modern Women's Writing and the Rhetoric of Modesty.* Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Polkowski, Marcin. "Richard Verstegan as a Publicist of the Counter-Reformation: Religion, Identity and Clandestine Literature." *Publishing Subversive Texts in Elizabethan England and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth*, edited by Daniel Woolf and Mark Kishlansky, Brill, 2016, pp. 263–287.

Rose, Mary Beth. "Where Are the Mothers in Shakespeare? Options for Gender Representation in the English Renaissance." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 42, no. 3, 1991, pp. 291–314.

Salmon, V. "Women and the Study of Language in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England." *Histoire, Épistémologie, Langage: HEL*, vol. 16, no. 2, 1994, pp. 95–119.

Schurink, Fred. "Manuscript Commonplace Books, Literature, and Reading in Early Modern England." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 73, no. 3, 2010, pp. 453–469.

Sizemore, Christine W. "Early Seventeenth-Century Advice Books: The Female Viewpoint." *South Atlantic Bulletin*, vol. 41, 1976, pp. 41–48.

Snook, Edith. *Women, Reading, and the Cultural Politics of Early Modern England*. 1st ed., Ashgate, 2005.

Smith, Helen, and Louise Wilson. *Renaissance Paratexts*. Cambridge UP, 2011.

Smith, Hilda L. "Humanist Education and the Renaissance Concept of Woman." *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500–1700*, edited by Helen Wilcox, Cambridge UP, 1996, pp. 9–29.

Smyth, Adam. "Commonplace Book Culture: A List of Sixteen Traits." *Women and Writing c. 1340–c. 1650: The Domestication of Print Culture*, edited by Anne Lawrence-Mathers and Phillipa Hardman, University of York Medieval Press, 2010, pp. 90–110.

Travitsky, Betty S. "Elizabeth Grymeston (before 1563–before 1604)." *Sixteenth-Century British Nondramatic Writers: Second Series*, edited by David A. Richardson, vol. 136, Gale, 1994, pp. 164–167.

—. "Grymeston [Grimston; Née Bernye], Elizabeth (in or before 1563)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Oxford UP, 2004.

—. *Mother's Advice Books: Printed Writings 1500–1640*. Routledge, vol. 8, 2001.

Travers, James. "Aspley, William (b. in or before 1573, d. 1640), bookseller." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford UP, 2008.

Wall, Wendy. *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance.* Cornell UP, 1993.

White, Micheline. *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production, 1500–1625*. Routledge, 2016.

Wright, Gillian. *Producing Women's Poetry, 1600–1730: Text and Paratext, Manuscript and Print.* Cambridge UP, 2013.