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Manchester, John Rylands Library, MS Latin 165 is a compilation of largely Marian devotional texts dating from the turn of the sixteenth century. In contrast to the printed books of hours being mass-produced at the same time, this manuscript retains the conventions of the individualised, elaborate display manuscripts more characteristic of the pious practices of the laity in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. However, from its original gold-tooled binding to the additions of its various owners in later decades and centuries, it is an object rich with evidence that it was simultaneously alive to the changing contemporary contexts in which it was made, used and passed on.[[1]](#endnote-1)

Rylands MS Latin 165, measuring 115 x 80mm and made up of ninety-six folia of vellum, appears to be a single ‘production unit’.[[2]](#endnote-2) The manuscript’s striking and rare original binding consists of dark brown leather over wooden boards, and has the remains of two metal clasps. Both covers are decorated with gold tooling which consists of a frame of roll-ornament, elaborated *fleur-de-lys* angle ornaments and a central panel with the arms of England and France quarterly. The expanded collation provided in M. R. James’ 1921 catalogue entry - ‘*a*2 (1 lining the cover) *b*8: 18 (+1\*) 28 -98 104 (wants 4): *c*8 *d*2 (2 lining the cover)’ - acknowledges that all of the quires were contemporary to the time of binding whilst drawing a distinction between the ‘main text’ and the quires either side of it that were ruled but not written on at the time of the codex’s binding (but later annotated by subsequent users).[[3]](#endnote-3)

The ‘main text’, rendered in Textualis Formata (Textus Quadrata), is regularly punctuated by illuminated initials in alternating red and blue as well as larger decorated initials at the beginning of texts. The scribe has also included rubrication (in red ink) to indicate psalms, orationes and versicles.[[4]](#endnote-4) It contains (in Latin): prayers to the Trinity followed by Psalms 21 to 30 (with antiphons and collects); an account of the Passion according to John; pseudo-Bede’s meditations on the final seven words of Christ; the ‘Fifteen Oes’ of St Bridget; prayers of thanksgiving for Christ’s redemption; Psalm 43 (with versicle and oratione); and devotions to the Virgin including ‘O intemerata’, the ‘Obsecro te’, the ‘Stabat mater’ and the Five Joys of the Virgin. These are followed by a prayer for strength against enemies; the headings of Psalms 53, 43, 66, 130 and 142; and finally, prayers of intercession and devotions to the holy sacrament.

Excluding the fly-leaves and a full-page image of the crucifixion on additional folio 1v inserted immediately before the ‘main’ text, both the verso and recto of every folio has a designated written area of 70 x 50mm, ruled with thirteen long lines in red-brown ink. The fact that every page has been ruled is most clearly evident in the annotated ‘additional’ quires (which James labels ‘*b*’ and ‘*c*’ respectively) that precede and follow the ‘main text’ - some of which are otherwise blank. However, the rulings are also visible on the ten illustrated folia and the four written folia that include quarter-page historiated initials.[[5]](#endnote-5)

Three different hands in quires ‘*b’* and ‘*c’* correspond to three names written beneath the ‘Stella maris’ on f.1r of quire ‘*b*’. James generalises that all three are ‘cent. xvi or xvii early’ and suggests that ‘Katheren Poole’ is the oldest, followed by ‘Katharin Fortescue’ and finally ‘Elizabeath Warneford’.[[6]](#endnote-6) In hands and ink corresponding to the signatures, the later users have added to the quire preceding the main text the ‘Stella maria maris’ (Poole); prayers to Christ against plague and famine (Fortescue) and prayers of intercession to Saints Roche and Apolonia (Warneford). Although the remainder of this quire is blank, in the quire following the main text, Elizabeath Warneford has added prayers to St Anne and St Winifred in the pages immediately before earlier additions by Poole, which include Latin prayers to the Virgin and again to St Winifred. Warneford has picked up the theme in the following pages with a Litany of St Winifred and a hymn to the same, both in English.

The academic attention that MS Latin 165 has received is limited to James’s catalogue of 1921 and to tantalisingly fleeting glimpses, nearly a century later, in Martin Heale’s study of the influential men presiding over the monasteries of medieval England.[[7]](#endnote-7) This is particularly remarkable considering recent scholarship’s focus on lay piety and the emphasis that studies in the history of the book have placed on what Seth Lerer calls ‘the personal and the marginal’.[[8]](#endnote-8) This Tudor prayer book appears to have actively catered for, and indeed encouraged, just such additions from its very conception. In an attempt to emulate the work of Raluca Radulescu and Margaret Connolly, my ‘Janus-like’ codicological analysis of the book’s physical features and the contents of the manuscript’s marginal spaces will help to fill in gaps in its ownership history, to chart its changing use and significance over time, and to trace these patterns back to its genesis at the very heart of the Tudor establishment.[[9]](#endnote-9)

**The Particular Purpose of Rylands MS Latin 165 and the Case for a Courtly Context**

As is apparent from the description above, Rylands MS Latin 165 bears more than a passing resemblance to fifteenth-century manuscript books of hours.[[10]](#endnote-10) However, the absence of various fundamental features suggests that the book is an example of what Roger Wieck designates as an ‘accessory text’, used to supplement the liturgical texts found in books of hours.[[11]](#endnote-11) Just as the contents of the ‘original’ manuscript demonstrate efforts to enhance and enrich the practice of the liturgical offices, the additions of the book’s later owners in the spaces before and after the main text show the opportunity the manuscript provided to supplement and personalise devotional piety.

The term ‘accessory text’ proves doubly useful if we consider MS Latin 165’s diminutive size, its decorative binding and the remains of two metal clasps on its covers, all of which suggest it was to be carried in-hand, in a pocket, or possibly at the waist in a conspicuous display of ownership.[[12]](#endnote-12) Just such an ostentatious use of prayer books is in contrast to what Virginia Reinberg called a ‘habit’ amongst modern academics ‘of imagining the reader of a book of hours as a pious woman sitting or kneeling alone in her private chamber or prayer closet’.[[13]](#endnote-13) By avoiding the temptation to generalise based on this assumption, a more complex conception of devotional aids like MS Latin 165 emerges. Like Helen Newsome’s study of devotional texts owned by Henry VII and his family, this approach acknowledges the value of these objects as windows into the ‘familial and political relationships’ of their owners and more broadly into the ‘gift-giving practices employed by medieval and early modern’ men and women.[[14]](#endnote-14)

M. R. James attributed the original manuscript to the early sixteenth-century abbot of Westminster John Islip, based on the repeated use of Islip’s rebus (a human eye and tree branch, or ‘slip’) in marginal decoration and on multiple portraits - one of which includes the rebus on a scroll which his avatar unfurls before the Madonna and Child on f.52r.[[15]](#endnote-15) The use of the rebus mirrors the same iconography used in the decoration of Islip’s personal chapel at Westminster Abbey, and in addition to the mitres and abbot’s crook that figure behind the portraits on f. 52r and f. 58v, these features serve both to clearly identify the individual who commissioned the work and to assert his specific social position.[[16]](#endnote-16) They therefore give a strong indication that the book was produced whilst Islip was abbot, between 1500 and 1532. However, for a professed monk to identify himself this conspicuously in a fashionable, French-style book of devotions suggests that it was intended as a gift rather than a personal commission. Instead of viewing the depictions of Islip as the kind of ‘owner portraits’ observed by Eamon Duffy and Virginia Reinburg, therefore, they are more appropriately seen as examples of the ‘donor portrait’ as discussed by Kathryn Smith with reference to the Neville of Hornby Hours (London, British Library MS Egerton 2781).[[17]](#endnote-17) In what context, then, might Islip have made such a gift?

The ambition of Islip, who became a Benedictine monk in 1480, was not satiated by his appointment as Abbot in 1500: he went on to become the warden of Henry VII’s manors, a member of the Royal Council and royal chaplain under Henry VIII.[[18]](#endnote-18) Prominent and influential at both kings’ courts, Islip guaranteed his favour by collaborating with Henry VII on the Lady Chapel at Westminster Abbey, one of the king’s most prominent prestige projects. In a ceremony held on 24th January 1503, Islip laid the foundation stone for an architectural project in which, although still unfinished when Henry VII died in 1509, the crown invested nearly £20,000. In addition to being a chantry for Henry VII and his family, the chapel was intended to house the remains of the last Lancastrian king, Henry VI. The Westminster project represented the intensification of Henry VII’s promotion of the cult of his ancestor following the initiation of canonisation proceedings in 1495 - a campaign in which Islip’s contribution was instrumental.[[19]](#endnote-19)

The large-scale construction project, however, was not the only form that the promotion of the association between Henry VII and Henry VI took. It was part of a much broader scheme in which visual artefacts were witness to the intersection of piety and propaganda. Indeed, the historian John N. King suggested that Henry VII was using the royal saint as a motif in a scheme that sought to assert the legitimacy of his own rule.[[20]](#endnote-20) A Marian prayer book known as the Bute Book of Hours (Washington D. C., Museum of the Bible, Signatry MS 000893), produced between 1500 and 1520 and held to have belonged to the young Henry VIII, features a depiction of Henry VI that includes attributes of sainthood, including a halo and a figure praying for intercession.[[21]](#endnote-21) This manuscript suggests that prayer books were produced during this period to help foster the association of the royal family with the cult of their ancestor Henry VI. Islip’s central role in the construction of the Lady Chapel at Westminster as a mausoleum to house the remains of Henry VI makes it possible that Rylands MS Latin 165 was produced to promote the cult in a similar manner, and therefore to contribute to Henry VII’s broader propagandist project of self-legitimisation.

Stamped onto both the front and back boards are the arms of France moderne and England displayed quarterly (first and fourth, three fleurs de lis and second and third, three lions passant guardant). James’s description tentatively suggests that these are employed as the coat-of-arms of Henry VII. However, this arrangement of the French fleurs-de-lis and the English lions was not exclusive to Henry VII. Indeed, both elements were incorporated into the arms of all reigning English monarchs from 1399 until the accession of James I. Therefore, ambiguity in the symbolism employed might explain James’s reluctance to attribute the iconography more certainly to the contemporary king.

Heraldic elements accompanying the royal coat-of-arms were used to distinguish between individual monarchs. In the case of Henry VII, a dragon and a greyhound supported the crest as references to his Welsh (Tudor) and Beaufort ancestry. This heraldic iconography, alongside the Beaufort portcullis, is prominent in the stonework of the Lady Chapel at Westminster Abbey, where, in addition to supporting the crest, each symbol appears in its own right. In an article on late medieval and early modern understandings of heraldry, Kathryn Will explains how heraldic animals, when separated from coats of arms in this way, could function as ‘badges’, which ‘were stylistically similar to charges, crests, and supporters on coats of arms, and shared their representative functions’.[[22]](#endnote-22) Closer inspection of the stamped border on the binding of MS Latin 165 reveals that the Beaufort greyhound and Welsh dragon are conspicuously absent. However, the roll-ornament tooled border surrounding the central crest features stylised lions’ faces and, near the centre of each side on both covers, pairs of beasts that bear a closer resemblance to the spotted panther or heraldic antelope associated with Henry VI. In the top and bottom borders, there are pairs of addorsed (back-to-back) spotted creatures whilst the left and right borders feature pairs of respectant (facing) griffin-like creatures with sun-like rays emanating from them.[[23]](#endnote-23)

Both sets of creatures incorporate identifiable characteristics of the varying heraldic manifestations of the beasts associated with Henry VI. A heraldic antelope with flame-like tufts and the multi-coloured hide otherwise associated with the panther appears on the coat of arms of King’s College, Cambridge, on f. 8r of a Yorkshire prayer roll from around 1500 (New York, Morgan Library, MS G.93), and in the marginal decoration of f.5r of London, British Library, Royal MS 15 E VI, a book gifted by the first Earl of Shrewsbury to Margaret of Anjou on her betrothal to Henry VI. In addition, Arthur Charles Fox-Davies, an Edwardian expert on heraldry, explained how ‘English Armory knows an animal [...] which has gold rays issuing from its body in all directions’ and which is ‘merely one form of the heraldic panther’.[[24]](#endnote-24) He went on to assert that ‘the male griffin of English heraldry is nothing more than a British development and form of the Continental panther’.[[25]](#endnote-25) The pairs of animals in the border decorations could therefore be seen to combine, or at least reference, elements of both heraldic and naturalistic forms of the panther, or of the heraldic forms of both the panther and antelope.

The absence of any of the iconography employed elsewhere by Henry VII, and an awareness that contemporary viewers were likely to have been alert to the subtleties and connotations of animal heraldry, act as a suggestion that the book was produced to help foster the association between the two Lancastrian monarchs, particularly when we consider the contemporary collaboration between the king and the abbot on the chapel at Westminster. The translation of Henry VI’s relics to their new home within the architectural centrepiece of Henry VII’s project entailed their reclamation from within an impressive Yorkist church in Windsor. Having already been moved once from Chertsey Abbey to Windsor at the command of Richard III, the relics formed the basis of a scheme that was not merely meant to promote Henry’s association with his Lancastrian ancestor, therefore, but to overwrite previous competing campaigns conducted by earlier kings from the House of York.[[26]](#endnote-26) The relationship between various further visual characteristics of MS Latin 165 points towards the identity of its original owner and how, in her hands, the book represented a pragmatic negotiation of the conflicting Yorkist and Lancastrian allegiances in the royal court following Henry’s marriage to Elizabeth of York in 1486.

The three sixteenth-century signatures on the recto of the first folioof quire ‘b’ locate MS Latin 165 more securely in a courtly context. Synthesis of the genealogical information in *Who Where the Nuns?,* an online database of the women who entered the English convents in exile between 1598 and 1800, situates all three names within the aristocratic Fortescue family.[[27]](#endnote-27) The three women (or their husbands) ultimately descended from Sir John Fortescue and Elizabeth Boleyn, the aunt of Henry VIII’s second wife. The prominent positions held by these women’s male relatives suggest the family’s proximity to the royal court: Sir John’s son Adrian, for example, was a member of the King’s Privy Chamber at the same time as John Islip and was knighted alongside the future King Henry, accompanying him at the Field of the Cloth of Gold, while Sir John’s son-in-law Anthony Fettiplace was Esquire to the Body to Henry VIII.[[28]](#endnote-28) If we make allowances for common contemporary variations in spelling (which we even see between the ‘Katherine’s in the signatures), the earliest signature could then belong to Adrian’s daughter-in-law, Catherine Pole (b. 1540). The next then corresponds with her granddaughter Katherine Fortescue (b. 1585) and the last with Elizabeth Warneford (b. 1584), the great-great-granddaughter of Sir John’s second child Mary and her husband, the aforementioned Anthony Fettiplace.[[29]](#endnote-29)

Following the maternal line of the book’s first named owner reveals an even more direct connection to the royal court and its mixed Yorkist and Lancastrian heritage. Catherine Pole was the granddaughter of Lady Margaret Pole (1473-1541), born Margaret Plantagenet. Daughter of Isabel Neville and George of York, Duke of Clarence, Margaret was the cousin of Elizabeth of York, Henry VII’s queen. Temporarily a member of the new royal household, Margaret was married to Sir Richard Pole in 1487. Like the marriage of the King and Queen, this union of a prominent daughter of the House of York and Prince Arthur’s Gentleman of the Bedchamber was a strategic display of the York-Lancaster alliance. In order to interconnect the two houses further, Margaret was appointed lady-in-waiting to Prince Arthur’s young bride Catherine of Aragon in 1501, but this post was as short-lived as the royal marriage. After a period of poverty and obscurity in Syon Abbey following the death of her husband in 1505, she was restored to her position as lady-in-waiting upon Catherine’s second marriage to Henry VIII, created Countess of Salisbury in 1512 and later made governess to Princess Mary. Indeed, her family’s affiliation to Catherine of Aragon and her daughter was so close that it proved her eventual downfall. After siding with the Spanish queen over the King’s marriage to Anne Boleyn, she was alienated from court, but restored after Anne’s execution. Her subsequent resistance to Henrician religious reform, however, resulted in her own execution in 1541, for which she was later beatified by the Catholic Church in 1886.[[30]](#endnote-30)

Alongside Islip’s rebus, the most prominent marginal decorations in MS Latin 165 are roses and pomegranates. The pomegranate was used as the badge of Catherine of Aragon, adopted with reference to her parents’ conquest of Granada in 1492 (an association based on the false etymology of the word ‘pomegranate’ that mistranslated *granatum*, in fact meaning ‘seeded’). In addition, it was used in Christian art as a symbol of the fullness of Christ’s suffering and resurrection, as well as the virtues the Virgin. As a classical emblem of fertility, the pomegranate also embodied the hope that Catherine represented for the continuation of the Tudor line.[[31]](#endnote-31) Whilst its partnership with the rose might be reminiscent of the famous woodcut of Henry VIII’s first marriage in Stephen Hawes’ *A Joyfull Medytacyon to All Englande* (printed by Wynkyn de Worde in 1509), it is important to note that the roses are emphatically not Tudor roses - that is to say, they do not combine red and white petals within the same flower.[[32]](#endnote-32) First, this suggests that the decoration employs iconography more consistent with that employed by Henry VII than Henry VIII, and therefore indicates an earlier provenance. The association with Catherine of Aragon is likely to be either in relation to her first marriage to Prince Arthur, or at least in advance of her marriage to Henry VIII in 1509. Second, it suggests that the white Yorkist and red Lancastrian roses retained their separate associations with the historically warring houses. The prominent combination of red and white roses and pomegranates in conjunction with the manuscript’s date and the Fortescue and Pole family associations of the owner inscriptions makes a strong case for Islip having gifted the book to a member of Catherine’s household - perhaps in commemoration of her wedding to Prince Arthur - and for Margaret Pole as one of its earliest owners, if not its original recipient.

**Meaning in the Margins**

Viewing Rylands MS Latin 165 as a courtly gift made at the heart of the fledgling Tudor dynasty informs our reading of its striking marginal decoration. On sixteen folia, the substantial borders are filled with marginal decoration. Alongside Islip’s rebus and the pomegranate, this decoration gives particular prominence to red and white roses.

In an article that refuted centuries of popular historiography, C. S. L. Davies dismissed the idea of ‘a powerful “Tudor propaganda machine”’ as an ‘historical cliché’.[[33]](#endnote-33) He identified examples of a strategy combining ‘discretion’ and multiplicity rather than ‘the more commonly touted “propaganda”’ in order to propose that Henry VII was in fact reluctant to promote any single, cohesive narrative to legitimise his accession to the throne.[[34]](#endnote-34) Davies’s argument complicates the analysis of Tudor visual ‘iconography’ by scholars such as John N. King, who suggested the evolution of a continuous project of self-representation initiated under Henry VII.[[35]](#endnote-35) Davies pointed to floral symbolism in the stained glass window in Henry VII’s chapel at King’s College, Cambridge to illustrate how ‘symbolic images could create an impression of numerous royal ancestries without arguing a specific case’.[[36]](#endnote-36) By identifying examples of both red roses and roses combining red and white petals, he suggested that whilst acknowledging the significance of his marriage to Elizabeth of York, the self-legitimising project of Henry VII’s early reign tended towards an emphasis on his Lancastrian heritage.[[37]](#endnote-37)

The rose proved to be a versatile symbol employed under subsequent Tudor monarchs in print works such as the aforementioned*Joyfull Medytacyon* and the title page to Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales* in the 1598 edition of his complete works.[[38]](#endnote-38) It is clear to see how such sustained use of what appears to be single symbol contributed to the idea of a cohesive and unified project of Tudor propaganda. However, as Davies demonstrated, the rose took various forms and was employed in various combinations and with varying emphases. Its use in Rylands MS Latin 165 therefore warrants closer interrogation.

As if to appease those with different allegiances, either red (Lancastrian) or white (Yorkist) roses feature in the marginal decoration on every illustrated folio of MS Latin 165. Although no ‘Tudor roses’ combining the red and white petals appear, the symbolic representation of the union of the two royal houses is not avoided entirely: On folios 47v, 57r, 58v and 61v, the two roses are intertwined. However, in acknowledgement of the separate factions as well as their union through Henry’s marriage, elsewhere the roses also appear entirely separately. By displaying symbols of both the Lancastrian and Yorkist dynasties, the marginal decoration demonstrates the royal strategy of multiplicity identified by Davies.

In the illustrations that feature either only the Lancastrian *or* Yorkist rose, there is an intriguing correspondence between the marginal decoration and the scenes they surround.Significantly, these images all accompany the same text. Each miniature depicts a scene from the life of the Virgin, illustrating the corresponding verse from Josquin des Prez’s fifteenth-century motet ‘Ave Maria... Virgo Serena’. On f. 66r beneath an image of Joachim and Anne embracing at the golden gate in Jerusalem (a scene of celebration between the Virgin Mary’s parents from the apocryphal yet tolerated narrative describing her conception, which appears in the Protoevangelium of James amongst other texts), the red rose appears in isolation. The image of Anne and Joachim formed part of an extensive Christian narrative that was in turn part of the late medieval tradition of the cult of the Holy Family. An additional element of the lore surrounding the cult established a genealogy that linked the Virgin Mary to a royal lineage reaching as far back as King David.[[39]](#endnote-39)

If we follow the interpretation of the iconography on the manuscript’s binding as an allusion to Henry VII’s drive for the canonisation of Henry VI, the association of the red rose of Lancaster with the tradition of extolling the Virgin’s royal lineage acts as another strand of the project of self-legitimisation. An association with the royal ancestry of Christ’s mother would have elevated Henry’s own familial claim to the throne, which was itself maternal - resting, as it did, on his grandmother Catherine of Valois and her first marriage to Henry V, as well as her own French royal ancestry. The final four images in the manuscript appear in pairs across the verso and recto of consecutive folia. The penultimate pair of images depicts the birth of the Virgin opposite the Annunciation (Figures 2 and 3) and the final pair depicts Christ’s Presentation at the Temple and the Assumption (Figures 4 and 5). Both the white and red roses appear across each pair of images, but because the roses are split between the verso of the previous folio and the recto of the next, this now means that each margin only figures one of the roses. This enables a more direct association between the image on each page and the rose in the corresponding margin.

Following the association of the image of Joachim and Anne, Mary’s legitimate yet earthly ancestors, the rose beneath the Birth of the Virgin is red. Depicting Mary and Anne in the same scene alongside the red rose means the genealogical resonance of the iconography becomes even more pronounced. It implies that the relationship between Mary and her parents is analogous with that between Henry VII and his Lancastrian ancestors – an associative leap not unimaginable in a culture saturated with typology. Indeed, the royal family actively fostered associations not only with the divine more generally, but also specifically with the lineage of Mary. One historical precedent was Henry VI’s 1432 entry to London: the procession included a Jesse Tree to parallel the depiction of his own ancestry with that of Christ.[[40]](#endnote-40) The particular devotion of the later Lancastrian king to the Holy Family is illustrated by the prominent central depiction of Henry VII, Queen Elizabeth and their children venerating the meeting of Joachim and Anne at the Golden Gate in the manuscript of *The Ordinances of the Confraternity of the Immaculate Conception, London* (c. 1503-1517).[[41]](#endnote-41) Correspondingly, the appearance of Angel Gabriel in the opposite depiction of the Annunciation aligns the white rose with the heavenly. If the book was a gift intended for a courtier with ties to the house of York, this association would indeed be flattering.

In the final pair of images, the positions of the roses are swapped. Here, the heavenly association of the white rose is now assimilated into Mary’s family by the arrival of the infant Jesus. Although one might point to the potentially thorny implication of the superiority of the white rose here, the final effect is ultimately the association of the newly formed biblical and royal families with the heavenly. This dynamic is mirrored in the opposite and final image of Mary’s Assumption accompanied by a red Lancastrian rose. Along with Mary, the red rose of Lancaster (not in fact usurped by the Yorkist white) ascends and rests finally with the angels amongst the clouds. Thus, the roses become interchangeably divine – neither rose’s associations are superior.

These marginal designs, deemed ‘rude’ by M. R. James, are apparently rather more sophisticated than previously acknowledged and therefore the natural siblings of Islip’s Textus Quadrata bookhand. Furthermore, by interpreting these symbols as a representational system able to flatter the Yorkist heritage of the queen whilst appeasing the now dominant Lancastrian order (and in so doing, ratifying joint claims of the union), this reading further endorses the suggestion that it was a gift made within the fraught context of the first Tudor court. The illuminations and marginal illustrations invest the spaces around the text with an expressive potential that is at once independent of and conversant with the texts they surround. The marginal decorations set a precedent for the use of the book’s marginal spaces and by including blank pages before and after the ‘main text’, the codex invited the subsequent owners to fill these remaining spaces with meaning.

**Continuity and Change in Later Use**

Certain prayers and devotions in the ‘additional’ quires suggest that the book’s female users not only imitated the scribe’s use of marginal spaces, but also the acts of self-definition these spaces facilitated and the strategies of pragmatic ambiguity they made necessary.

Various scholars have presented devotional reading in a late medieval context as explicitly gendered, and acknowledge the complexity of the dynamic it implies between control and subversion.[[42]](#endnote-42) C. Annette Grisé builds upon Felicity Riddy’s warning that ‘we should not assume that women were merely passive recipients of books’ to suggest that female readers conceived particularly of hagiographical texts simultaneously as tools of control and sources of empowerment.[[43]](#endnote-43) This paradox suggests that it is not necessarily anachronistic to identify empowered female positions in texts that otherwise conform to ideas of female subordination, particularly if they are seen as the product of a co-operative and yet complicated venture of guidance and exchange between male confessor and female penitent. Within such a framework, women’s religious ‘self-fashioning’ was positively encouraged, and women were capable of considerable agency in their own right.[[44]](#endnote-44) The additional marginal pages in this private book of devotions provide a unique ‘site of negotiation’ of the ‘multiple subject positions’ inhabited by women readers (and writers) in the pious tradition.[[45]](#endnote-45) We are invited to look beyond the apparent simplicity of the devotions and question what greater complexity this might belie.

Taking a book of private devotions belonging to Elizabeth I as his example, William Haugaard acknowledged the tension at the very heart of approaching even the kind of personal inscriptions found in this type of book as a form of straightforward self-expression. Haugaard underscored the ‘unique character’ of Elizabeth’s prayer book for informing our ‘understanding of her inner life’ whilst recognising that ‘this is not to say that the devout do not pose before their gods and before themselves’.[[46]](#endnote-46) Awareness of the posturing or performance inherent in this type of text allow such additions to provide an insight into the shared intellectual world of sixteenth-century laywomen retrospectively identified by historians as well as the contemporary ‘imagined community’ they constructed themselves.[[47]](#endnote-47) Accordingly, we need not only trace personal biographical resonances in the texts for self-fashioning to be a useful lens through which to view them. By imprinting a form of constructed identity onto the pages of the prayer book, the female owners of Rylands MS Latin 165 were engaging in the sixteenth century with an affective tradition that negotiated a female identity stretching back into the Middle Ages.

The texts addressing or dedicated to St Winifred in quire ‘*c*’ represent particularly pertinent instances of the ways in which the additions of female readers both illustrate and define how the manuscript was used to negotiate the construction of identity in the face of conflicting pressures. No less than seven devotions by the earliest and latest named female readers are united in dedication to this single saint. However, they span languages, generations and the irreparable rift of the English Reformation.

Table 1 *Details of the texts devoted to St Winifred in quire ‘c’*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scribe** | **Text** | **Language** | **Location (within quire ‘c’)** |
| *Katheren Poole* | Devotion to St Winifred: |  |  |
|  | *Aue gemma claritatis ad instar carbunculi* | Latin | 1v |
|  | *Ora pro nobis sancta Wenefreda, etc.* | Latin | 1v |
|  | *Deus qui b. Wenefredam* | Latin | 1v |
|  | *Oremus. Omnipotens sempiterne deus qui b. Wenefredam* | Latin | 2r |
| Elizabeath Warneford | Litany of St Winifred | English | 2v – 4v |
|  | The himme.  *For Winefrede vir(g)ine pure* | English | 5r – 6r |
|  | Devotion to St Winifred | English | 6v |

The latest of these texts, a rhymed prayer added by Elizabeath Warneford which advertises itself as a ‘himme’, is recorded in the *Digital Index of Middle English Verse* as the only extant version (item 2977) - although that is not necessarily to say that it is an original composition. As a potentially sung verse, it is more than possible that it was transmitted orally. Indeed, analysis of the tradition of literature about St Winifred suggests that its absence from the written record may have been intentional and indeed sensible.

All of the devotions in the additional quires are lent simple coherence by the suggestion that they are all prayers of intercession directed towards saints associated with crises of what Warneford, in the prayer immediately preceding the ‘himme’, terms ‘corporall health’.[[48]](#endnote-48) However, this kind of superficial rationale is challenged by the concentration of texts devoted to St Winifred. Femke Molekamp’s suggestion that ‘women drew on paradigms of affective reading to discover a religious subjectivity that the onlooker could not codify’ invites the reader to question the expressive potential of the emphasis placed on this particular figure.[[49]](#endnote-49) At the same time as performing a particular commitment to conventional forms of female piety, the numerous devotions to St Winifred might simultaneously be seen to draw from an established and enduring tradition in which the saint was a well-worn emblem used for various projects of controversial self-definition.

The legend of St Winifred holds that the seventh-century daughter of a Welsh landowner was called to the religious life from a young age and received her education from the itinerant St Beuno. In retaliation for having rebuffed the unwanted advances of the son of a local chieftain, Winifred was beheaded by the young man, named Caradog. After meting out his supernatural punishment on Winifred’s would-be executioner, St Beuno restored Winifred’s head and a miraculous well sprang from where it had fallen. The healing spring attracted pilgrims and became the still-famous shrine of Holywell. Winifred herself went on to found a religious house in Gwytherin and died at an advanced age. Centuries after her death, her relics were translated to Shrewsbury, where another shrine to the saint was established. The legend of St Winifred bears many of the hallmarks of the virgin saint’s life (exceptional virtue in the face of threatened chastity, extreme physical violence and, ultimately, martyrdom) and by illustrating just how easily even ostensibly defiant women could be mobilised as symbols of orthodoxy, it exemplifies the paradox at the heart of female sanctity.

The literary critic J. S. Ryan showed how earlier Latin and English versions of St Winifred’s Life were popularised by the Welsh bards Iolo Goch in the fourteenth century and Ieuan Bryddydd and Tudur Aled in the fifteenth.[[50]](#endnote-50) The heavily-wrought nature of these ‘cwydds’ set St Winifred in a bardic tradition that was explicitly and self-consciously literary as well as part of a nationalistic and genealogical project of self-definition. The historian M. J. C. Lowry argued, furthermore, that these Welsh renderings were part of a cynical political manoeuvre towards the end of the Middle Ages when ‘a section of the governing class realized that if it was to rule England or conquer France it would need to draw some of its most valuable man-power from Wales’.[[51]](#endnote-51) This charges references to St Winifred with associations with self-promotion and propagandist claims for legitimacy that should not be ignored in favour of readings which foreground simple and naive piety. Lowry focused particularly on the ‘propaganda-value which Henry VII extracted from his Welsh origins’, and cast the version of St Winifred’s life that Lady Margaret Beaufort commissioned William Caxton to print towards the end of the fifteenth century as ‘the last and most overtly political phase of the process’.[[52]](#endnote-52)

Notably, however, in the sixteenth century, a statue of St Winifred was used to further underscore Henry’s Welsh heritage in the decoration of the Lady Chapel at Westminster Abbey.[[53]](#endnote-53) Indeed, the figure of St Winifred continued to be subject to what Alison Shell termed ‘overdetermination’ well into the Reformation and beyond.[[54]](#endnote-54) St Winifred and the miraculous well that was a pilgrimage site for her devotees became associated with recusant Catholics and, according to a contemporary account by John Gee, ‘especially those of the feminine and softer sex’.[[55]](#endnote-55) Shell has traced the literary legacy of St Winifred through to Francis Chetwinde’s 1642 poem ‘New Hellicon’, using it to demonstrate how the St Winifred story ‘lends itself exceptionally well to imaginative allegorisation’.[[56]](#endnote-56) In literary culture as in culture more broadly, Shell concludes, ‘there is no denying the extent to which the Well acted as a conduit for Catholic self-definition’.[[57]](#endnote-57) Much like Catholic orthodoxy itself, the cult of St Winifred went from being closely allied with the Tudor regime to representing a distinct oppositional identity. The texts the ‘himme’ accompanies and the association of St Winifred with the Tudor programme of self-fashioning allows Warneford’s text to retain a semblance of benign orthodoxy. However, the very versatility of St Winifred that allowed Henry VII to mobilise her as a figurehead ironically allowed her simultaneously to stand as an emblem of defiance and opposition, particularly in the seventeenth-century context in which Protestantism was established as the official religion.

I do not mean to propose that the later seventeenth-century devotions to St Winifred sought only to subvert earlier versions of the tale, and even less that Katheren and Elizabeath’s texts represent an attempt to supplant male textual authority. However, in a text in which the women’s additions constitute annotations of a sort and therefore marks of *reading*, they do serve to elevate the women’s acts of devotion and capture the ‘accessory text’ at work. After all, without them, the central text flanked by blank pages would ultimately remain an inanimate object. By adding to its pages, the book’s later owners mobilised various discourses to define not only their own pious identities but the mutable signification of the book itself. The inscriptions leave a record of the female owners’ pragmatic negotiation of the nuances of religious and political conformity, throughout a period in which neither was fixed.

**A Fitting Fate**

Indications that this text was passed amongst women within a Catholic family known for recusancy and self-imposed exile adds weight to the claim that the inscriptions can be read in light of theories regarding the nature of late medieval female readership. Scholars such as Susan Groag Bell argue for the importance of studying books of devotion in the context of their transmission, which she believes to have been at least sometimes matrilineal.[[58]](#endnote-58) The owner inscriptions in MS Latin 165 suggest that this kind of transmission was certainly possible. The book did not pass simply from mother to daughter, however, and the family tree suggests that the reason for this was a defiant female piety that characterised the family in more ways than one. The fact that all of these women appear in the *Who Were the Nuns?* database indicates that a significant number of the female descendants of this family entered convents on the Continent following the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII and the anti-Catholic legislation implemented by him and his successors. If we examine each generation of the family tree, we see that the passage of the book from mother to daughter is interrupted by offspring who prevent the possible transmission of the book to future generations by taking holy vows. If the book was passed between female relatives as a present to commemorate a life event such as an engagement or marriage, it would account for it skipping a generation after Catherine Pole (whose only child was male) and passing from one branch of the family to another when all eleven of Katherine Fortescue’s daughters became nuns.

Katherine and Elizabeth were about the same age, and their marriages were not far apart. The book is unlikely to have been in Katherine’s possession for very long but she need not have waited until each of her daughters came of age to establish that their fate was to enter the English convents in exile and therefore to pass up the opportunity to inherit the family prayer book. In the chronicles of St Monica’s Convent in Louvain, Victoria Van Hyning has discovered how Katherine Fortescue herself had wished to renege on her engagement to a Catholic nobleman by the name of Bedingfield in order to become a nun. Her soon-to-be father-in-law was unprepared for her to reverse her betrothal to his son and therefore ‘she consented, and after sought by her children to make up that which she did not perform herself’.[[59]](#endnote-59) This biographical detail not only situates Rylands MS Latin 165 within a famous recusant family, but demonstrates how acts of self-assertion amongst female recusants were not limited to voluntary exile in Europe.

How, then, did such a book end up for a substantial period in the ownership of men? The records of its purchase and sale offer an explanation of how the failure of its matrilineal transmission finally saw it also pass beyond the family into the hands of antiquarians. John Rylands MS Latin 165 was purchased on 5th April 1909 for £248 12*s* 6*d* from the bookdealer Bernard Quaritch. Quaritch had previously acquired it in 1908 from Lord Amherst of Hackney, who had in turn bought it from Edwin H. Lawrence, F. S. A. (whose name is written in pencil on the fly-leaf) in 1892.[[60]](#endnote-60) At this point, it appears that the manuscript, a rare survival of England’s medieval Catholic past, changed hands as an artefact, curiosity or even novelty valued for its age, connection to Westminster Abbey and state of preservation. However, only one step back in its ownership history reveals that the breakdown of its matrilineal transmission was the occasion for loss of its more complex significance.

The ownership history provided by the catalogue entry appears to terminate with Lawrence in 1892. However, James elsewhere lists its ‘Old Provenance’ as ‘Abbot Islip, Sir T. Gage 1867’ and the catalogue of this sale confirms the identity of the historic owner as Sir Thomas Gage, first Viscount Gage.[[61]](#endnote-61) This means that Edwin Lawrence would have been sold Rylands MS Latin 165 by Thomas Gage’s descendent, Henry Hall Gage, 4th Viscount Gage.

This is significant because Sir Thomas Gage’s first wife, whose estate he inherited upon her early death, was born Benedicta Hall and was the daughter of Henry Benedict Hall and Frances Fortescue. This means that the Gages were descendants of the same Catholic family as the book’s previous owners, and therefore that the 1892 sale was the point at which the manuscript left the family. As both of Elizabeath Warneforde’s children were sons, and the majority of more closely related female members of the next generation became nuns, Frances or her daughter Benedicta would have been two of the only remaining eligible female inheritors of the book. It may have been that having died young with two sons, Benedicta was unable to see that the book was passed on to a female descendant awaiting marriage. Thus, a book passed between women for centuries fell back into the hands of men.

Sir Thomas’s inheritance of the manuscript from his first wife’s estate did not only see an end to its matrilineal transmission, however; despite its connections to illustrious histories of recusancy and even martyrdom, the manuscript also eventually lost its place within the English Catholic community, even whilst the manuscript remained within the family. The book of devotions went from being a tool for, to being a victim of, pragmatic self-construction when Sir Thomas Gage converted to the Church of England in 1715, perhaps in order become a member of Parliament.[[62]](#endnote-62) Inherited by sons raised as Anglicans, the book’s coded meanings may have finally been lost to its owners. Without the abilities necessary to access its capacity for pragmatic and potentially subversive self-definition, the owners of MS Latin 165 would have been left with an heirloom that spoke to historic allegiances no longer politically expedient to their position within the establishment.

Nevertheless, perhaps these newfound insights into its history allow us to see it as a totem of the kind of canny pragmatism that characterised all its owners. It was a gift made at the heart of the Tudor court, an ‘accessory text’ passed between potentially subversive female readers, an heirloom inherited by their conformist Protestant descendants and sold on as an artefact traded amongst antiquarians and rare book dealers. It is strangely fitting, then, that Rylands MS Latin 165’s final transformation was into one of the treasures of the John Rylands Library, cathedral that it is to both collective civic identity and religious non-conformity.
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