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Recent work on early modern women’s marginalia has already revealed much about the ways in which early modern women read and wrote, using the materials of manuscript and print as markers of relationships and as tools for self-positioning.\(^1\) However, as Heidi Brayman Hackel has argued, such traces are thought to be relatively rare, and, to date, studies of substantial archives of marginalia have centred on books annotated by two authors: Margaret Hoby and Anne Clifford.\(^2\)

In this essay, I would like to begin to examine a third significant archive: Mary Queen of Scots’ diverse collection of marginalia in her Book of Hours.\(^3\) This illuminated 15\(^{th}\) century manuscript was given to Mary during her time in the French court and was added to over her lifetime and beyond.\(^4\) It contains three different types of marginalia: the queen’s independent marks of ownership, ten other signatures, and fourteen quatrains, or fragments of quatrains, some signed and all written in French in Mary Stuart’s very clear italic hand. This article examines all three of these types of marginalia in order to reconstruct what Jason Scott-Warren describes as ‘the anthropology of the book’: as evidence not only for reading but also for understanding the place of this Book of Hours in the individual, social and material fabric of the lives of its owners and readers over half a century.\(^5\)

Although this is a relatively large collection of marginalia within a single text, Mary Stuarts’ Book of Hours has received little critical attention, despite the last decade’s increased critical focus on the material traces of book use.\(^6\) Its absence within English literary histories derives at least in part because its poems are in French, but written by a sovereign who moved between the French, Scottish and English courts, and as such they occupy an uncertain status in nationally focused genealogies of women’s writing. The marginalia also occurs in a devotional text, one of the hundreds of surviving private prayer books owned and routinely annotated by women, which themselves form a rich and intriguing archive only now beginning to be considered as part of early modern women’s use of the spaces of the book.\(^7\) Mary Stuart’s Book of Hours is particularly interesting, however, because it is at once ordinary and extraordinary. Her practice of
annotation is entirely usual for women who owned private prayer books, but the kinds of
marginalia it contains and how that marginalia was circulated were shaped by her status as an
extraordinary political figure in the period. The book’s marks of ownership, signatures and poems
participate in the economies of exchange, self-positioning and intrigue that are inseparable from
Mary Stuart’s charged political presence in France, Scotland and England. As such, the text
supports recent readings of early modern women’s marginalia as active, political and goal-
oriented, rather than private verses of little significance. Ordinary and extraordinary, individual
and communal, personal and political, the marginalia in Mary Stuart’s Book of Hours is a new and
significant example of a larger archive through which the material cultures of early modern
women’s writing might be explored.

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

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

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

    Brother et es another sayenge

    That owt of syt owt of mynd

    But I troste in you

    I shall not fynd it true

    Maud Perre 15

In the same volume, her niece Katherine Parr, the future queen, writes at the foot of a suffrage and a picture of her name-saint St Katherine of Alexandria:

    Oncle when you do on thys loke

    Pray you remember wo wrote this in your boke

    Your loyynge nys Katherine parr16

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

One reason, perhaps, that this resource has been overlooked in recent explorations of histories and traces of women’s reading is because the diverse practices that made up the devotional recitation and reading of prayers do not map readily upon the male-authored models of reading that have been seminal in critical work on marginalia. In ‘Studied for Action: How Gabriel Harvey read his Livy’, Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton argue that scholarly male reading ‘was always goal-oriented – an active, rather than passive pursuit’, intended ‘to give rise to something else’, a ‘public performance, rather than a private meditation, in its aims and character’.17 This essay has influenced histories of reading in early modern women’s writing chiefly through the work of Julie Crawford, who persuasively argues that Margaret Hoby’s dialogic and communal reading practices were also ‘goal directed’ in the sense that they sought real-world effects, ones that extended past the familial and sociable practices of godly culture to her region and beyond.18 Crawford uses Hoby’s example to argue against an earlier critical tendency to see women’s spiritual reading as private, domesticated, and implicitly in keeping with their subordination. She argues that this is a critical fiction rather than a reflection of historical practice, and joins William Sherman in arguing that both women and men read within the base of operations that was the household in ways that could be domestic and communal, as well as contestatory and goal-oriented.19 But Crawford also argues, along with Hackel and Sherman, that material traces of such complex reading practices by women are rare – sufficiently rare for Hoby’s reading of de Mornay to be seen as a key site for the study of early modern women’s reading practices.20 Critics working with early modern women’s marginalia routinely cite an anecdote where Ann Boleyn scolded her maid for writing verse in the margins of a Book of Hours, implying that such marginalia was transgressive rather than orthodox, forbidden rather than common.21 In fact, the multiple examples of marginalia contained within Books of Hours suggest that the reverse was closer to women’s
historical practice. They indicate that women routinely used scribal annotation as part of their devotions and as a form of intimate exchange within and across households. If recent work on marginalia has sought to uncover how women, like men, read in scholarly and goal-oriented ways, then Mary Queen of Scots’ archive might provide a new context through which this very specific type of early modern women’s book use might be understood within overlapping domestic, communal and public contexts.

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

In the case of Mary Stuart’s Book of Hours, however, its status as the material artefact of the devotional practice a Catholic queen, regnant or in exile within hostile Protestant states, its circulation among her peers as a tool of alliance or remembrance and its use as the means of disseminating her secular poetry, means that it could never be an apolitical, private and domestic text. Yet neither is it a widely disseminated print text: it occupies an intriguing liminal status in its mixed content of devotional text and images, signatures of possession and exchange, and texts of pious meditation and secular lyric. It exemplifies the particular kind of archive that such books became: serving a number of functions - pious, domestic, sociable and political – which might shift according to place, time and circumstance over a lifetime and as we shall see, beyond. It is to the three different types of marginalia contained within this lavish, illuminated 15th century French manuscript that I now turn to illustrate this complexity.

The first kind of marginalia in the archive contained within the Mary Stuart Book of Hours is the simplest: her marks of ownership. Folio 1r is inscribed ‘A moi, Marie R’; across the lower margin of folios 12v and 13r is ‘Ce livre est a moi, Marie Reyne. 1554’; folio 110r has ‘Marie, R. 1579’ and folio 145v ‘Marie R’. These inscriptions indicate something of the length of time the Book of Hours was in Mary Stuart’s possession – in 1554, she was 12 years old and living in the French court; in 1579, five years before her execution, she was 37 and imprisoned at Sheffield Castle. In marking the Book of Hours twice as ‘mine’ and four times with her signature, Mary Stuart circulates her text under her name for others to read, a name with very different meanings in the contexts of the French and Scottish courts and her imprisonment at Sheffield. In 1554, her emphatic marks of ownership – ‘Ce livre est a moi Marie R. 1554’ - are aligned with the first of
the sequences from the Gospels, that of Luke, beneath a miniature depicting Luke at study accompanied by his emblem of the sacrificial bull and Latin text beginning the story of the Annunciation to Mary with the appearance of the angel Gabriel. While intentionality in these instances must be speculative, Luke is the patron saint of artists and students, and his gospel is the only account that contains the Magnificat – the canticle of Mary, which made evident her sacrifice, strength and devotion to God. One of her later undated signatures in the Book of Hours, ‘Marie R’ on f145r, is written beneath a miniature of the Virgin Mary and child, with a kneeling female figure at their feet. Her signature here denotes both her material possession of the book and, again, affiliation with her namesake the Virgin Mary – a figure who became an increasingly transgressive site of divine authority in Elizabethan England.

The Book of Hours is also filled not only with evidence for its circulation under Mary’s name, but with 10 other signatures. As Jason Scott-Warren argues, such marking up of the early modern book by multiple hands was common, indicating sociability as well as possession. At 39r are the signatures ‘E Shrewsbury’ (Elizabeth Talbot, Countess of Shrewsbury), ‘T. Sussex’ (Thomas Radcliffe, Earl of Sussex), ‘Nottingham’ (Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham), and ‘W. Essex’ (Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex). It is an intriguing cluster of names. As Charles Howard only became the Earl of Nottingham in 1596, his signature must have been added to the text after Mary Stuart’s execution in 1587 – as Lord Admiral he was the commissioner at her 1584 trial and, according to secretary and diplomat William Daveson in his testimony from the tower, urged her execution as the best solution to the problem of her presence in England. The signature of Walter Devereux, on the other hand, must have been inscribed between 1572, when he became the Earl of Essex, and his death in 1576. His signature is mystifying – engaged with colonising Ireland from 1573-5, he must have visited Sheffield in either 1572 or 1576 to even have had access to the Book of Hours. The signature of Elizabeth Talbot, in whose households Mary was imprisoned from 1569, is less unexpected, as is that of Thomas Radcliffe, Earl of Sussex; a commissioner with
Norfolk and Sir Ralph Sadler in Elizabeth’s first enquiries into Mary’s forced abdication, he sent Mary to Tutbury under the Shrewsburys’ care so that she would be a ‘nearer guest’. Sir Nicholas Bacon and Edward Fiennes de Clinton, first Earl of Lincoln, also sign the volume at folios 229v and 197v respectively. Both were commissioners in Elizabeth’s second enquiry at Westminster in November 1568, with Radcliffe, Norfolk and Sadler, as well as Leicester and Cecil Saye.32 As Edward Clinton became the Earl of Lincoln in 1572, he must have signed the volume between 1572 and 1585; he was both Lord Admiral and a member of the Privy Council, and spent time in 1572 in Paris as part of his role in ratifying the treaty of Blois.33

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

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

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

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

un Coeur que loutrage martire       A heart tormented by insults,
par un mepris ou dun refus          contempt or by a slight
a le pouvoir de faire dire          has the power to say:
Ie ne suis plus ce que ie fus Marie    I am no longer what I was    Marie

The Latin text that this poem appends is the second nocturne of the Office of the Dead, Matins, with a reading from Job 14: 13-16:

Lectio sexta (Iob 14): The sixth lesson (Job 14):
Quis mihi hoc tribuat, ut in inferno protegas Who will grant me this, that in hell thou
me, et abscondas me, donec pertranseat furor protect me, and hide me, till thy fury pass,
tuus, et constitutas mihi tempus, in quo and appoint me a time, wherein thou wilt
In these verses, Job’s meditation upon his despair becomes an imprecation to God to be remembered, invoked, and reached out for. It reminds the subject that even in the darkest of times, hope of God’s redemption still exists: ‘thou shalt call me, and I shall answer thee.’

The verse accompanying this biblical example of the hope of redemption says something quite different, however. Rather than an expression of piety and of the possibility of divine grace, its focus is secular. The speaker’s injury derives from a loss of face, the specifically social exclusions of insults, contempt or slights. The third line however outlines a new source of power, the power to ‘faire dire’, to speak, which sets up the quatrains’ final line where what the speaker has to say is a statement of both loss and renewal: ‘I am no longer what I was.’ There is no call and response, yet the dynamic of this bleak and simple quatrains is also the dynamic of Job’s experience of loss, despair and renewal. Because of the poem’s secular range of reference, such an inference can only be drawn from the poem’s material place on the space of the page, from the juxtaposition of margin to text.

Yet at the same time that it evokes a common devotional experience, that of the despairing sinner turning to God, this poem also has broader political dimensions. When the speaker refers to his or her experience of public disgrace, particularly in the verbal form of insults, and claims to be

recorderis mei? Putas ne mortuus homo remember me? Shall man that is dead, rursum vivet? Cunctis diebus, quibus nunc thinkest thou live again? All the days, in milito, expecto donec veniat immutatio mea. which I am now in warfare, I expect until my Vocabis me, et ego respondebo tibi. Operi change do come. Thou shalt call me, and I manuum tuarum porriges dexteram. Tu shall answer thee. To the work of thy hands, quidem gressus meos dinumerasti, sed thou shalt reach thy right hand. Thou indeed (130v) parce peccatis meis. hast numbered my steps, but (130v) spare thou my sins.
‘no longer what I was’, shadowed behind this experience is the personal history of Mary Queen of Scots. She was, in Elizabeth I’s poetic terms, the ‘daughter of debate’, textually vilified through ballads, pamphlets and books as a murderer and adulterer, stripped of her sovereignty and kept in England as prisoner. The trope of self-alienation with which the quatrain concludes recalls the first stanza of Elizabeth’s 1582 poem ‘On Monsieur’s Departure’, particularly the concluding couplet:

I grieve and dare not show my discontent;

I love, and yet am forced to seem to hate;

I do, yet dare not say I ever meant;

I seem stark mute, but inwardly do prate.

I am, and not; I freeze and yet am burned,

Since from myself another self I turned.

Both queens use the convention of self-alienation to demonstrate their textual power: Elizabeth through a display of Petrarchan rhetorical virtuosity that underlines her active role in the Duc d’Anjou marriage negotiations; and Mary Stuart through the sonnet’s paired and answering genre, the complaint.

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

The dynamic of public shame and rejection by others, then redeemed by personal piety and a future, after death, among God’s chosen in heaven, recurs across the quatrains as their unifying topos. Folio 81v contains eight poems and fragments in different hands and inks which return to the speaker’s concern with her loss of renown and her compensating strategies, converting public dishonour to evidence of private piety in a move recognisable from other women’s use of complaint.43 These quatrains and fragments are crowded onto a rare blank leaf in the volume, opposing an illumination of King David with open prayer book and harp, praying to God whose image crowns the miniature, rays of light issuing from his open mouth. A small amount of text of Psalm 6: 2-11 is under the illumination, ‘Domine ne in furore tuo arguas me neas in ira tua corripias me’ (Lord rebuke me not in thy fury nor chastise me in thy wrath). This psalm presents the speaker in weakness, torment and trouble, turning to God and asking for deliverance. His weakness is exacerbated because he is surrounded by enemies, but his case is answered when the Lord hears his appeal and accepts his prayers, with the result of a sudden reversal of fortunes in which the speaker’s enemies are put to shame, ruined and rejected.
This penitential psalm offers striking resonances with Mary Stuart’s condition in prison; a 
fall from favour, surrounded by enemies, but still with the hope that God’s intervention will 
reinstate her, either on earth or in heaven. The material location of this collection of eight quatrains 
and fragments opposite a related penitential psalm suggests a parallel between the writing of Mary 
and the psalmist King David, suggestively amplifying the queen’s claims to sovereign authority, 
lyric and spiritual. The first two of these quatrains introduces the theme of the speaker’s sorrow at 
her lack of support from others:

Qui iamias dauantage eust contraire le sort Who ever had a more contrary lot!
si la vie mest moins utile que la mort Since life is less meaningful to me 
than death,
et plus tost que chager de mes maus laduenture and rather than transforming my 
misfortunes
chacun change pour moi dhumeur et de nature each one changes my mood and my 
very being

Come autres fois la reno[m]mee Now, as in the past, fame
ne vole plus par l univers doesn't fly across the universe.
isy borne son cours divers Its unpredictable course is confined 
here
la chose delle plus aimee its most loved object.

Marie R

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

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

I observe the hours and the day

par lordre exacte de ma carriere  

according to the precise requirements of my duty

quittant mon triste seiour  

leaving my sad abode,

pour isy croistre ma lumiere  

here to increase my light

le xxx mai

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

Celle qui dhonneur sait combler  

She, who from honour knows how to gratify

chacun du bruit de sa louange  

each one according to the noise of his praise,

ne peut moins qua soi ressembler  

cannot be less like herself

en effet nestant que un bel ange  

indeed being only a beautiful angel

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French Phrase</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>si nos pensers sont esleves</td>
<td>If our thoughts are on higher things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne lestimes pas chose estrange</td>
<td>don't judge them as strange;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ils meritentestre aprouves</td>
<td>they deserve to be acknowledged,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayant pour obiet un bel ange</td>
<td>having as their focus a beautiful angel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This poem appends the concluding prayer of the third nocturne, ‘Libera me domine de morte eternal’, said on the day of the dead, and when the three nocturnes are said together. The Latin text addresses the day of judgement, a day of anger, fear and calamity, when God comes to ‘iudicare saeculum per ignem versus’- to judge the world by fire. This response is immediately followed on the same folio by the text of Psalm 35, ‘Judica domine nocentes me expugna impugnantes me’: ‘Plead thou my cause Lord with them that strive with me’. In a text where the figure of ‘un bel ange’ has been explicitly associated with the speaker, and that speaker identified with the queen, this quatrain positions that angel as the focus of meditation after death – a site of illumination for the devout at prayer. This figure has been elevated by God on the day of her judgement, a sure sign that God has validated her cause against those hostile to her in the world.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pour recompense ou pour sala[i]re</td>
<td>As compensation or reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de mon amour et de ma foie</td>
<td>for my love and my faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rendes men ange titulaire</td>
<td>return to me guardian angel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autant comme ie vous en doye</td>
<td>as much as I owe you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{en feinte mes amis change leur bienveillance} & \quad \text{My friends feign their concern,} \\
\text{tout le bien quils me font est desirer ma mort} & \quad \text{wishing instead to see me dead} \\
\text{et comme si mourant jestois en deffailance} & \quad \text{and as if dying I was merely in a faint;} \\
\text{dessus mes vestements ils ont jette le sort} & \quad \text{they have cast lots for my clothes.} \\
\text{ils ne appartient porter ces armes} & \quad \text{Only those with an indomitable spirit,}
\end{align*}
\]
qua ceus qui dun coeur indomte who have no fear of danger
com[m]e nous nont peur des allarmes should carry the fight
du temps puissant mais sans bonte in these hard-hearted times (158v)

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

La Vieillene est un mal qui ne se peut guerire Old age is a sickness without cure
Et jeunesse un bien qui pas un ne menage and youth is a blessing without care
Qui fait qu aussitot ne lHomme est pres du mourire Immediately man is born he is near death
Et qui lon croist heurheux travaille advantage Successful is the contented life (172v)

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

Collectively, these poems present a fragmented poetic sequence, one that not only supplements the biblical text that it appends but also forms a new text within it. Read together with the strategically placed marks of ownership in this text and its collection of autographs, the
thematic coherence and political ambition of this sequence indicates that this is an archive intended to be seen, whose disparate parts were used by the queen to shore up her primary political agenda of sovereign legitimacy: spiritual, political and poetic. It also contains signatures from her enemies, reminding us that this text is no more coherent than the other, multiply constructed archives that constitute Books of Hours: it was available to a variety of interpretations and uses that worked for and against the queen in her lifetime and beyond. This Book of Hours provides another place where early modern women’s uses of marginalia can be seen to face out to the world, to be public, political and geared towards action. Yet this marginalia occurs in a text also used for daily devotional practice, indicating that it might also have other uses, across a spectrum of public and private functions that complicates our understanding of the role of marginalia in the lives of its authors and readers. In the case of Mary Stuart’s poetry, the political uses to which such poems might be put are more retrievable than their uses in more intimate acts of meditation and prayer, and to emphasise the public aspects of these poems and marks is not to forget their other types of use in devotional practice. To this end, the broader archive of marginalia within other Books of Hours remains to be examined to understand how, why and to what purposes, different kinds of women readers and owners of these devotional texts might have read and written in the margins of their books.
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