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This workshop takes as its starting point the publication of Re-Reading Mary Wroth, forthcoming from Palgrave in February 2015. This innovative volume, co-edited by Katherine Larson and Naomi Miller, with Andrew Strycharski, commemorates the twenty-fifth anniversary of Reading Mary Wroth, a groundbreaking collection that helped to propel interest in Wroth before modern editions of most of her texts were available. It also, however, establishes new directions across the broadening field of early modern women’s writing. This workshop uses Re-Reading Mary Wroth as an entry point for thinking through the current moment in early modern women’s studies, expanding the focus beyond Wroth to encompass the range of early modern women authors represented by participants’ scholarship and teaching. We will invite participants to consider how approaches to and methodologies prompted by early modern women’s writing across disciplines help to open up broader questions about pedagogy and practice within and beyond the academy. This workshop would fit equally well under the conference themes of “Pedagogies” or “Taxonomies of Time.”
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Workshop Description
2016 will mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of Reading Mary Wroth, a groundbreaking collection that helped to propel interest in Wroth before modern editions of most of her texts were available. A surge of critical interest in Wroth is now transforming our experiences of reading her. Re-Reading Mary Wroth, an innovative collection co-edited by Katherine Larson and Naomi Miller, with Andrew Strycharski, and due to be published by Palgrave Macmillan in the winter of 2015, charts opportunities for scholars and students to re-read Mary Wroth now that the necessity of reading her has been recognized. It also, however, establishes new directions for the broadening field of early modern women’s writing.
In extending the work of the 1991 volume, *Re-Reading Mary Wroth* takes seriously the many different practices that emerge around the term “reading,” including editing, performance, curating, pedagogy, scholarly and creative writing, and digital reproduction. The essays featured in the collection thus extend the boundaries of the “canon” of approaches to literature and to early modern women’s writing in much the same way that Wroth’s “rediscovery” has helped to expand and destabilize the very notion of canonicity. In *Re-Reading Mary Wroth*, Wroth becomes a fruitful point of departure as much as a subject of analysis in her own right.

We envision this workshop as an opportunity to expand and further probe the implications of the kinds of methodological approaches represented in the content and structure of this volume across a range of early modern women authors. Our own contributions to *Re-Reading Mary Wroth* center on two particular test cases: crowdsourcing for Sheila Cavanagh, who demonstrates the value of a “Wrothipedia” that pools student expertise in a collaborative online environment to help bring the rich layers of *Urania* to life in the classroom; and creative writing for Naomi Miller, who has written a historical novel based on Wroth’s life. Both of these projects open up new methodologies for teaching and researching Wroth. Both projects, moreover, emerge out of, are informed by, and in turn offer new insight into the substance and structure of Wroth’s own writings.

In the first twenty minutes of the workshop, we plan briefly to introduce participants to the *Re-Reading Wroth* project and our own work within it as examples of the kinds of methods the collection foregrounds. Our primary aim at the conference, however, will be to generate discussion about other practical and creative methods that are derived from and/or helping to illuminate early modern women’s texts both within and beyond the academy, as well as the significance of such practices for facilitating new avenues into research, teaching, and public outreach. While the volume focuses on Wroth, the workshop will encourage participants to consider new ways of reading and responding to a range of early modern women writers.

Participants will be asked to read the Introduction to *Re-Reading Mary Wroth* in advance of the workshop, but in many ways the most important preparatory work will be their selection of a sample teaching tool to share with the group (whether an assignment, discussion model, excursion, creative initiative, or similar) or a creative or practice-based approach connected to their current work on a range of early modern women’s texts. After our introductory comments, we plan to break the workshop into smaller groups for approximately twenty minutes to facilitate the sharing of those examples. If participants are amenable, we might also consider the development of an online portfolio after the conclusion of the workshop that would enable the sharing of these tools and approaches for future use.
In the time remaining, we propose to reconvene as a full group to explore the broader implications of the kinds of methods and tools presented, organizing this conversation around guiding questions that emerge out of the kind of work represented in the Wroth volume: How can early modern women’s writing instigate and encourage approaches that open up these texts in new ways to our students and/or broader audiences? How do such approaches in turn offer new insight into women’s texts? What do we learn from such approaches? What is the broader value of such approaches at this particular moment in early modern women’s studies, in higher education, and in contemporary culture?

It is a rare opportunity at academic conference to participate in conversations uniting theory and practice. This workshop aims to create a collaborative environment that will enable participants to share methodologies drawn from their own pedagogy and practice, while also exploring how those strategies might further deepen our encounters with early modern women’s texts, invite us to reassess future directions for the field of early modern women’s studies, and even push beyond the boundaries of the academy in facilitating broader pedagogical, creative, and political dialogues.

**List of Readings**

Participants will be asked to read the introduction from *Re-Reading Mary Wroth* (23 pages, double-spaced) and to bring either a sample teaching tool (assignment or similar) or a creative or practice-based approach connected to their current work to share with the group.
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INTRODUCTION

Re-Reading Mary Wroth: Networks of Knowing

KATHERINE R. LARSON, NAOMI J. MILLER, AND ANDREW STRYCHARSKI

In Part One, Book Two, of Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania* (pub. 1621), the titular heroine excuses the shift of her attentions from Parselius to Sterianus by insisting that, because Sterianus had "wonne [her] first," her refocused devotion to her original love is not a change, "but as a booke layd by, new lookt on, is more, and with greater judgement understood." The capstone of an episode of confessing and excusing second love, Wroth's metaphor of re-reading emphasizes the importance of looking anew to enhance understanding and improve judgment. In another of the romance's many episodes of re-reading, Pamphilia, suffering from love insomnia, opens her cabinet. Looking over some of the "many papers" therein, she is prompted by dissatisfaction to write new verses—with which she is, again and predictably, dissatisfied (62–3). Re-reading here prompts a different reaction than in the first episode, generating the activity of writing a new poem as a response to the original text. Kathryn DeZur has recently argued that in its examples of reading and writing *Urania* trains its readers in how to read. If *Urania* teaches us to read, however, it also guides its own re-readings. These two episodes suggest opposite perspectives on the activity of re-reading. In the first, we re-read for greater understanding—something akin to the conventional scholarly and critical work of understanding a text within its context. In the second, re-reading prompts activity—praxis and poesis, contemporary acts of making.

Wroth's seemingly textual romance suggests that the act of re-reading creates vibrant, and fundamentally imaginative, sites of exchange rather than reinforcing marmoreal canons. This volume takes a similar approach to the notion of re-reading Wroth, one of the first "canonized" women writers of the English Renaissance. The essays featured in this collection invite us to re-read Mary Wroth as a strategy not simply for enhancing appreciation of her writings, but as one that prompts critical reevaluation
of our own practices as scholars and teachers, writers and readers of her work. The year 2016 will mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of Reading Mary Wroth (1991), coedited by Naomi Miller and Gary Waller, a groundbreaking collection that helped to propel interest in Wroth before modern editions of most of her texts were available. Much early scholarship on Wroth, aptly represented in that influential volume, tackled crucial questions about gender, biography, and canonicity: how to read Wroth as a woman writer within the context of Jacobean court politics; how to account for female literary ambitions in an era in many ways adverse to them; and how to negotiate the tricky path between incorporating and yet resisting a male-centered literary tradition. While that volume’s introduction, “Reading as Re-Vision,” signaled the importance of revising the canon by reading Wroth in multiple contexts, the present volume’s focus on re-reading recognizes that “as a book layd by, new lookt on, is more, and with greater judgment understood,” so we can now consider Wroth anew with greater critical judgment regarding our own reading practices.

As we move further into the second decade of the twenty-first century, a surge of critical interest in Wroth is transforming our experiences of reading her—exemplified by Margaret Hannay’s recent biography; Mary Ellen Lamb’s abridged teaching edition of the Urania; Clare Kinney’s collection on Wroth for the Ashgate Critical Essays on Women Writers in England, 1500–1700 series; a special issue of the Sidney Journal devoted to Wroth; Paul Salzman’s ever-expanding Internet edition of her poetry; a new print edition of her poems from Ilona Bell and Steven May; and Naomi Miller’s historical novel, The Tale-Teller, based on Wroth’s life. Enthusiasm for new work on Wroth is evidenced by the well-attended 2012 Modern Language Association roundtable, “Re-Reading Mary Wroth,” that provided the initial spark for this volume, as well as the International Sidney Society’s organization of three sessions on “Wrothian Networks” for the 2014 Renaissance Society of America conference. The increasing scholarly attention to Wroth that has emerged in recent years speaks also to a growing interest in an expanded Sidney circle, first propelled by Mary Ellen Lamb’s Gender and Authorship in the Sidney Circle (1990) and by Gary Waller’s The Sidney Family Romance: Mary Wroth, William Herbert, and the Early Modern Construction of Gender (1993). The continued prominence of the Sidney circle and our increasing awareness of its scope and impact are perhaps best illustrated by the forthcoming two-volume Ashgate Research Companion to the Sidneys (1500–1700), coedited by Margaret Hannay, Michael Brennan, and Mary Ellen Lamb, which spans four generations of the Sidney family.

Wrothian Networks

If the current volume charts opportunities for scholars and students to re-read Wroth now that the necessity of reading her has been established,
it aims also to establish new directions for the broadening field of early modern women’s writing. The feminist approaches to reading developed in concert with scholarship in women’s literature have prompted recognition of a paradigm shift from static canon to nonlinear networks. In the early development of the field this allowed scholars to reframe some of the traditional practices and assumptions underpinning early modern studies. But awareness of the importance of networks in assessing early modern women’s writing itself—and of Wroth’s place within it—is growing. Seminal pedagogical works such as *The Cambridge Companion to Early Modern Women’s Writing*, edited by Laura Lunger Knoppers (2009), as well as a series of influential monographs, such as Patricia Demers’s *Women’s Writing in English: Early Modern England* (2005) and Paul Szirmai’s *Reading Early Modern Women’s Writing* (2007), have built on pioneering work by Elaine Beilin and Barbara Lewalski by exploring connections among genres and authorial practices. While such interventions attest to the ongoing need to facilitate focused opportunities for the study and teaching of women’s writing, our understanding of women’s literary networks—and indeed of early modern literary culture more broadly—has also been enriched by tracing associations and resonances among writers like Mary Sidney and George Herbert, Mary Wroth and William Shakespeare, Margaret Cavendish and Ben Jonson, and Lucy Hutchinson and John Milton. Undergraduate and graduate syllabi have been transformed as a result of such intertextual conversations.

The renewed attention to early modern form and genre has generated further evidence of women’s widespread engagement in literary and cultural networks. New light continues to be shed on women’s formal innovations in poetry, drama, and romance, all areas where Wroth contributedstartlingly original work. The study of women’s genres, meanwhile, has expanded to include noncanonical forms such as works of household economics and lay devotion. This work has likewise enlivened thematic studies of traditional literary writing by early modern women. Herbals and medical and culinary “receipts,” for example, have helped to spur interest in the question of how gender shaped food and medical practice, as well as the interplay between domestic and political spheres in the period. Re-reading early modern women authors has enabled us in turn to recognize previously undervalued compositional and inscriptive practices that range from translation, transcription, and calligraphy to textiles, needlework, and gardening. Evaluating such practices draws us to considerations not only of visual rhetoric but also of document design. Book history and manuscript culture have become important dimensions of the field in this regard, exemplified by *Early Modern Women’s Manuscript Writing* (2004), edited by Victoria Burke, and *Women Editing/Editing Women: Early Modern Women and the New Textualism* (2009), edited by Ann Hollinshead and Chanita Goodblatt. Growing attention to women’s musical contributions, meanwhile, exemplified by *Musical Voices of Early Modern Women: Many-Headed Melodies* (2005), edited by Thomasin
K. LaMay, have galvanized broader studies of gender and embodiment in relation to the arts. While it is clear that the interest in authorship and biography that characterized the first wave of recovery work in early modern women's writing in the late 1980s and early 1990s continues to flourish, these recent interventions are increasingly underscoring the need to consider women's writing as actively contributing to and constitutive of innovative and influential networks in early modern culture. A sense that the study of early modern women is entering such a moment of reassessment and reorientation is attested to by the recent theme of "Remapping" at the 2012 Attending to Early Modern Women meeting and the February 2013 "Early Modern Women: New Perspectives" conference that celebrated the relaunch of Early Modern Women: An Interdisciplinary Journal. Moving away from T. S. Eliot's famous description of a solitary (usually male) poet confronting a homeostatic "tradition" into which he struggles to force an entry with his "individual talent," the practice of mapping Wrothian networks enables us to recognize the intellectual as well as cultural connections informing works that scholars might previously have labeled "exceptions," to be relegated to the margins of the canon.

Re-reading Mary Wroth across disciplines as a participant in a dynamic literary and cultural network of writers, readers, and thinkers in early modern England makes visible not simply her historical position relative to the development of a literary "tradition," but her importance as a generative source for current critical and creative practices. Featuring contributions by leading scholars who helped to lay the groundwork for Wroth studies, as well as those of newer arrivals in the field, this volume provides prospective views on major areas of concern that have animated much scholarship on early modern women's writing, and increasingly early modern studies generally. But the essays featured within it, which we gather under the rubrics of "re-examining," "re-measuring," "re-mediating," and "re-mixing," also exemplify how re-reading a pivotal early modern woman writer can stimulate and transform the increasingly dynamic reading experiences of humanities scholars and students within and beyond the academy.

The twin processes of re-reading for understanding and re-reading for poesis and praxis so integral to Wroth's own writings blend, overlap, and animate the network of essays collected here. In extending the work of the 1991 volume, Re-Reading Mary Wroth takes seriously the many different practices that emerge around the term "reading": editing, performance, curating, pedagogy, scholarly and creative writing, as well as manual, mechanical, and digital reproduction. Our volume thus offers opportunities not simply to reflect but actively to engage, practicing re-reading for comprehension, communication, and even creation. As it maps Wrothian networks, Re-Reading Mary Wroth extends the boundaries of the "canon" of approaches to literature in much the same way that Wroth's "rediscovery" has helped to expand and indeed to destabilize the very notion of
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canonicity. In this regard, Wroth emerges in this collection as a fruitful point of departure as much as a subject of analysis in her own right.

Re-Examining Wroth: Authorship, Life, and Society

The essays in the opening section of the volume revisit biographical assumptions about Wroth and her writings that coalesced during the earlier phase of her “rediscovery,” charting new directions for scholarship on women’s authorial practices. In “Sleuthing in the Archives: The Life of Lady Mary Wroth,” Margaret P. Hannay confronts the methodological challenges inherent in the work of crafting a literary biography and shares major findings from her award-winning biography, Mary Sidney, Lady Wroth (2010). Drawing on the meticulous archival work that she undertook for that study—the first book-length biography of Wroth—Hannay reflects on the rich array of extant sources that document Wroth’s life. In particular, she probes the inevitable gaps and silences that surround the traces of early modern lives as well as the delicate tension between fact and fiction revealed by critical assessment of surviving texts. This tension is especially challenging in the case of Wroth, whose fictional writings are tantalizingly autobiographical and have tended to be read as such. Even as Hannay draws attention to the elusiveness of biographical “truth” and the pitfalls associated with the construction of biographical narrative, her archival research provides vital new insight into Wroth’s personal relationships and literary trajectory. In this chapter, Hannay persuasively overturns several key misconceptions—about Wroth’s marriage to Robert Wroth, the birth of her illegitimate children, the response to the publication of Urania, and her supposed isolation from court—that have long informed interpretation of Wroth’s life and work.

Chapters 2 and 3 consider how Wroth’s literary output was shaped in response to and in dialogue with two prominent members of the Sidney circle: her uncle Sir Philip Sidney and her cousin and lover William Herbert. In “Authorship and Author-Characters in Sidney and Wroth,” Barbara K. Lewalski considers how the author-characters created by Philip Sidney and Mary Wroth in Arcadia, Urania, and Pamphilus to Amphitritus reflect their very different conceptualizations of authorship. While Wroth’s romance lays overt claim to the “Sidney mantle” through its structural and thematic allusions to Arcadia, she departs from her uncle’s model by foregrounding issues of gender as well as women’s literary creativity. In Part One, her female characters regularly resort to story and lyric to voice their experiences. Wroth emphasizes not only the importance of these oral and written texts for establishing women’s histories, but also the artfulness required to control and successfully communicate emotion, exemplified by the sonnet sequence appended to the published text of Wroth’s romance. While Wroth places less emphasis on women’s creative production in Part Two, she continues to validate the lives of
female scholars and writers, underscoring the wisdom of characters like Urania and Melissa as well as Pamphilia's continued intellectual pursuits. To read Urania alongside Anadia, therefore, is to push beyond questions of imitation and influence. By placing women's creative self-expression at the heart of her romance, Wroth validates her own innovative contribution to her family's literary legacy.

Mary Ellen Lamb's essay, "Can you suspect a change in me?: Poems by Mary Wroth and William Herbert, Third Earl of Pembroke," takes as its focus the poetic exchanges between Wroth and her cousin. While their love affair has long fascinated scholars, little attention has been paid to the question of how their intimacy informed their poetic production. Contending that Wroth's proximity to Pembroke throughout her early years and her sexual relationship with him constituted "perhaps the most formative context" for her writing, Lamb demonstrates how their creative exchange manifests in the content and structure of four lyrics: Wroth's "Love like a juggler, comes to play his prise," which Lamb situates as a response to a poetic dialogue between Pembroke and Benjamin Rudyerd; Pembroke's "Had I loved but at that rate," sung by Pamphilia in Part Two of Wroth's Urania; Pembroke's "Muse get thee to a Cell; and wont to sing," which shares sun imagery with Wroth's aubade, "The birds do sing, day doth speece;" and Pembroke's "Can you suspect a change in me?" Placing the relationship between Wroth and Pembroke at the heart of the familial, literary, and social contexts framing their poems, Lamb makes a compelling case for renewed attention to Pembroke's lyrics even as she persuasively accentuates the need to read Wroth's and Pembroke's poems in dialogue with each other.

In chapter 4, "Performing 'fitter means': Marriage and Authorship in Love's Victory," Beverly M. Van Note also focuses our attention on a re-reading of the social and familial networks shaping Wroth's literary production. Building on Hannay's biographical work, which posits that Love's Victory was written for the wedding of Wroth's younger sister Barbara, Van Note re-examines Wroth's pastoral tragicomedy through the lens of period correspondence relating to that marriage as well as Wroth's own. She argues that the play reflects Wroth's active role in the marriage negotiations for Barbara and dramatizes women's claim to more equitable roles in courtships and marital unions. Ultimately, Van Note suggests, the play offers a powerful critique of marriage as a patriarchal institution. Dovetailing with Lewalski's discussion of Wroth's authorial characters, she situates marital choice as an important form of self-authorship for Wroth's vibrant female protagonists. This chapter also challenges readings of Love's Victory that have identified Musella as Wroth's autobiographical avatar. Instead, Van Note links Wroth with Silvesta, whose singleness validates Wroth's own status as a widow even as her relationship with the Forester offers commentary on Wroth's affair with William Herbert.
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Re-Measuring Wroth: Form and Ritual

The second section of the volume shifts from Wroth's literary and social contexts to examine her generic innovations and the material, and often embodied, dimensions underpinning the form and structure of her writings. While early modern studies is benefiting from a renewed attention to formal analysis, early modern women writers have rarely been approached from this perspective given that scholarly attention to the field only emerged after the mid-twentieth century. In chapter 5, "Turn and Counterturn: Reappraising Mary Wroth's Poetic Labyrinths," Clare Kinney exemplifies how formal analysis can enrich our readings of Wroth's poetry, illuminating the ambiguity that pervades the sonnets of Pamphilia to Amphilanthus. Positioning Wroth as a "poet of quiet derelictions," Kinney situates re-reading as a practice embedded within Wroth's poetic structures. The voltas in Wroth's sonnets, she argues, continually "turn" her audience from expected or fixed outcomes. This essay also offers insight into other formal "turnings" enacted through the poems: the relationship between rhyme scheme and unsettled doubts; tensions within and between a Wrothian sestet and the quatrains it contains that turn sonnet structure back on itself; and local ambiguities that lead cut toward broader contexts—in the sequence, in Wroth's other writings, and her life. To read Wroth, Kinney argues, is to be confronted with a poetic practice that is "at once labyrinthine and open-ended." Her breathtaking interpretation of Pamphilia to Amphilanthus's corona as an inward-turning "super-sonnet" juxtaposed against Lindamira's mini-sequence within the Urania, read here as an outward-turning anticlimax, clinches the sense that Wroth's poetry displays formal and generic variety that scholars have only begun fully to appreciate.

Chapter 6, "Measuring Authorship: Framing Forms, Genres, and Authors in Urania," provides further insight into Wroth's generic experimentation. Focusing on the lyrics and songs embedded throughout Wroth's romance, Stapleton argues that Wroth uses these inset texts and the discussion-based critiques that often frame them to draw narrative attention to processes of poetic composition and reception. Crucial to her analysis is the notion of "measure," which for Wroth surpasses the strictly formal meaning of meter to include the idea of generic decorum "suitable to its audience, its function, and the skill level of its creator." By focusing attention on the several authorial characters in Urania—their misfires as well as successes—Stapleton's essay shows how Urania instructs its readers in this idea of measure through example, even as Wroth plays with these parameters, thereby distinguishing herself from even the most successful of her authorial avatars. Urania emerges in Stapleton's reading as a compelling example of literary criticism that places questions of literary form and genre, authorial skill, and audience response at the forefront of the narrative encounters that have long fascinated Wroth critics.
Chapters 7 and 8 take up the notion of “measure” in Wroth’s writings in relation to her proclivities for music and dance. In “Voicing Lyric: The Songs of Mary Wroth,” Katherine Larson attends to the inset songs that pervade Wroth’s writings as songs, that is, “as metrical compositions written with a tune in mind, adapted for musical setting and performance, or simply meant to be imagined as sung.” She begins by examining the material structure of the Folger manuscript of Wroth’s poems in relation to songbooks produced by women in the period. Arguing that the miscellany contains traces of musical performance, she provides a new reading of the *fermesse* that has prompted much debate among Sidney scholars and challenges common views of Wroth’s poetry as “eerily disembodied.” Larson also explores Wroth’s fascination with the rhetorical potency of the gendered singing body, focusing especially on Pamphilia’s performance of one of William Herbert’s lyrics in Part Two of *Unania*. Attention to the rich musical dimensions of Wroth’s texts, she concludes, pushes readers to think much more flexibly about their generic boundaries and contexts of circulation as well as to recognize the significance of Wroth’s engagement with musical culture in her treatment of lyric voices.

Wroth was an avid dancer as well as a musician. Karen Nelson’s “‘Change Partners and Dance’: Pastoral Virtuosity in Wroth’s *Love’s Victory*” alerts us to how Wroth’s familiarity with dance practice may have informed the structural choreography of *Love’s Victory*. Juxtaposing contemporaneous dance manuals, notably Thoinot Arbeau’s *Orchesographie* (1589) and Fabrioto Caroso’s *Nobilitas di Danze* (1600), with examples from visual art, Nelson traces how three elements of early modern dance performance—improvisation that takes place within set structures, relationality and responsiveness among pairs and small groups of dancers, and referentiality to Petrarchan conventions as well as to the symmetrical structures of visual iconography—manifest themselves in the formal structure and stylistics of Wroth’s pastoral tragi-comedy. Despite new evidence that *Love’s Victory* was part of the entertainments prepared for the wedding of Wroth’s sister Barbara, the play’s performance potential has only recently begun to be explored, as evidenced by its staging at Penshurst Place in the summer of 2014 for the Globe Theatre’s “Read Not Dead” series. Nelson’s argument helps to animate the embodied experiences that undergird this play, while also shedding light on the significance of dance and music within the pastoral tradition.

Chapter 9, “Gifts of Fruit and Marriage Feasts in Mary Wroth’s *Unania*,” takes Nelson’s focus on the movements buttressing Wroth’s writings in a very different direction. In this essay, Madeline Bassnett charts the movement of Wroth’s romance protagonists across local and rational boundaries as well as the cross-border relationships they negotiate. Placing *Unania’s* “tropes of mobility” in dialogue with seventeenth-century conceptualizations of national identity and James’s foreign policies, Bassnett convincingly elucidates the significance of ritual practices of gift exchange and feasting as markers of larger political tensions and alliances. She underscores also
the vital role played by women in these negotiations. Expanding on political analyses of Urania as well as on the growing interest in “politicized domesticity” in the period, Bassnett establishes food’s crucial mediating function in Wroth’s works while also calling for further attention to food and food-based rituals in early modern women’s writing.

Re-Mediating Wroth: Editing and the Digital Humanities

If Bassnett’s essay draws attention to the mediating function of bodies and ritual objects in Wroth’s texts, the third section of the volume invites readers to consider how new reading and editorial practices are transforming and re-mediating encounters with Wroth, particularly in light of recent attention by scholars of early modern women’s writing to book history and manuscript studies as well as the emergent interest in digitization and digital cultures. One of the most important developments in Wroth studies in this regard has been the increasing attention being devoted to the manuscript version of Wroth’s Pamphilia to Amphilanthus, MS V.a.104 in the Folger Library.

In chapter 10, “The Autograph Manuscript of Mary Wroth’s Pamphilia to Amphilanthus,” Ilona Bell traces the radical re-readings of Wroth that are emerging from her work on the print and online edition of the Folger manuscript she is coediting with Steven May. Following the publication of Josephine Roberts’s seminal edition of Wroth’s poems, which foregrounded the 1621 printed sequence appended to Urania, scholars have tended to read Pamphilia to Amophilanthus as a “static, abstract, and conventional” sequence. The Folger manuscript tells a very different story, revealing a much more intimate relationship between Pamphilia and Amophilanthus that situates Pamphilia as an active wooer and depicts the consummation of their love affair. This content, Bell posits, was toned down in revision to prepare the poems for a public audience. Many of Wroth’s revisions constitute “calculated evasions” that “cloud the diction, twist the syntax, and alter the context in order to obscure and change the meaning.” Attention to the Folger manuscript, therefore, reveals Wroth consciously preparing her work for different contexts of circulation. Bell’s analysis and forthcoming edition situate the poems contained within the Folger manuscript as a distinct Wrothian text that demands scholarly consideration in its own right. This essay also, however, illustrates the need to consider Wroth within broader poetic networks, notably continental models such as Louise Labé and Veronica Franco, both of whom produced amorous poetry, and members of the Sidney coterie like Samuel Daniel, who undertook a similarly strategic revision of his sonnet sequence Delia.

Paul Salzman’s online edition of Pamphilia to Amphilanthus has also been tremendously influential in bringing the Folger manuscript to the attention of scholars and students. In “Me and My Shadow: Editing Wroth
for the Digital Age,” he advocates digital editing as a model for counteracting the editorial tendency to hierarchize and conflate extant versions of early modern texts, which, in its attempt to create an “ideal” text, ends up instead producing a version “stabilized” by an editor. Salzman’s digital edition of *Pamphilia to Amphilia*thys aims to make available all of the primary material needed by scholars while also creating an interface accessible for readers new to Wroth. It includes facsimiles of the different versions of the sequence, the infamous “hermaphrodite” exchange between Wroth and Lord Edward Denny, and the poems from the manuscript version of *Urania* and *Love’s Victory*. It also provides transcriptions and modernized, annotated versions of all of the texts. The result is a resource that enables readers to move easily between and to compare the different versions of Wroth’s poems while also foregrounding how much is lost to Wroth scholars when those versions are conflated. Salzman is currently undertaking a similar editorial project focused on the Penshurst and Huntington manuscript versions of *Love’s Victory*.

Chapter 12 builds directly on these analyses, probing the close interplay between editorial and reading practices. In “*Pamphilia* Unbound: Digital Re-Visions of Mary Wroth’s Folger Manuscript, V.a.104,” Rebecca Fall argues that gendered editorial tendencies that privilege textual “fixity” have conditioned scholars and students to read sonnet sequences in similar ways. As a result, even lyric sequences—like Wroth’s—that explode and resist linear narrative structures have tended to be read in very rigidly sequential terms. Drawing on features of Wroth’s Folger manuscript, like the fermes, that help to illustrate the poems’ ambiguity and varied connections, Fall calls for a digital edition that structurally foregrounds the “innovations and instability” integral to *Pamphilia to Amphilia*. She proposes a digital app that would enable readers to play with the order of the poems, develop their own annotations, read collaboratively via social media, and develop performative interpretations. Such an edition, which reflects Ramona Wray’s recent call for a more playful, feminist approach to the editing of early modern women’s texts,15 would help to challenge assumptions about the structural fixity of poetic units and tangibly connect modern readers to the flexible and fluid reading practices of early modern audiences.

The pedagogical implications of such digital initiatives are many, as Sheila Cavanagh’s “Crowdsourcing the *Urania*: Lady Mary Wroth and Twenty-First-Century Technology” ably demonstrates. Her argument stems from the challenge that university instructors often face in exposing students to the incredible scope of Wroth’s *Urania* without overwhelming them. While teaching texts like Mary Ellen Lamb’s abridged version of the romance have made the *Urania* more accessible to students, it is a text that is rarely taught in full and which does not always fit easily within conventional syllabus and assignment design. Drawing on her experience teaching “International Shakespeare in a New Media World” at Emory University and directing the World Shakespeare Project, Cavanagh argues
that digital pedagogies, notably crowdsourcing, can help to address this problem. She imagines the creation of a multimedia "Wrothipedia," whereby students tackle facets of the text that spark their individual interests, contributing to the development of an online archive that holds particularly exciting potential for illuminating the material and audiovisual facets of the romance. Such creative, collaborative digital endeavors, Cavanagh maintains, will not only help to bring Urania into undergraduate classrooms, but also offer students valuable opportunities for independent research.

Re-Mixing Wroth: Beyond the Academy

In making digital pedagogy the focus of her argument, Cavanagh foregrounds an important goal of this collection: to "reconceptualize what counts as scholarship." Re-Reading Mary Wroth aims to disrupt and extend the traditional "canon" of approaches to Wroth's writings in much the same way that Wroth's own work—and early modern women's writing more broadly—has helped to expand and unsettle notions of canonicity in literary studies. For all of the challenges that the study of early modern women's writing has posed to the traditional canon, however, very little scholarship has managed to expand the form of the academic essay. Some of the most interesting work in this direction appeared in the "Pedagogy" section of Betty S. Travisky and Adele F. Seiff's edited collection of essays, Attending to Women in Early Modern England, a volume that emerged from the first of the Attending to Women conferences. While all of the essays included in this volume chart new opportunities and new approaches for reading Wroth, the contributors in the final section of the volume build on the digital and pedagogical work represented in "Re-Mediating Wroth" by opening up less traditional avenues into Wroth's writing that prompt consideration of the questions such approaches might generate about the broader impact of Wroth studies. "Re-Mixing Wroth" extends Wroth scholarship beyond the confines of the classroom and of the academy to forms of public engagement that include curating an exhibition, advocacy for the humanities, and the creation of poetry and fiction that re-reads Wroth through writing.

In chapter 14, "Curating Mary Wroth," Georgiana Ziegler examines the process of organizing the "Shakespeare's Sisters: Voices of English and European Women Writers, 1500–1700" exhibition at the Folger Shakespeare Library in 2012. Challenged to create a framework for 65 English, French, and Italian women writers that would stimulate researchers, students of all ages, and curious members of the public, many of whom were encountering women's writing from the period for the first time, Ziegler opted to group the selected materials so as to highlight often unexpected generic, national, chronological, and familial connections. Her positioning of Wroth within this framework powerfully highlights
the kinds of networks that shaped and now help to illuminate her works: her friendship with Lady Anne Clifford, the example of Italian women romance writers, and matrilineal relationships, among others. The exhibit is now available online and, like Rebecca Fall’s proposed app as well as many video game platforms, enables visitors to expand the boundaries of the original display cases, engaging with visual and contextual materials in different combinations and orders, thereby creating their own experience of spectatorship. Ziegler’s essay underscores the value of physical and virtual exhibitions in educating readers about Wrothian networks and also draws compelling parallels between the role of the curator and the writer of romance.

Although the success of initiatives like “Shakespeare’s Sisters” testifies to the vitality and pedagogical impact of early modern women’s writing in public and academic spheres, the question of the relative importance of the humanities continues to dominate discussions both inside and beyond the academy. In “Strange Labyrinths: Wroth, Higher Education, and the Humanities,” Nona Fienberg reflects on her experience of re-reading Wroth after nine years of decanal service. She argues that the study of women’s writing offers teachers, scholars, students, and administrators valuable tools for confronting the so-called crisis in the humanities. Foregrounding the “nimbleness” of the feminist reading practices that have helped to define the field, Fienberg underscores the need for a model of advocacy that acknowledges the dynamic, collaborative, and contingent nature of humanities work, rather than seeking to define it as “a collection of timeless truths” or as the purview of elite institutions and privileged students. She reads the vitriolic exchange between Wroth and Edward Denny in analogous terms, situating Wroth as a staunch defender of humanist practice as her poetic response deploys playful rhetorical strategies that effectively explode Denny’s rigid interpretation of her romance.

The volume concludes with contributions by Gary Waller and Naomi Miller, the coeditors of the original Reading Mary Wroth collection. Since that volume appeared, both Waller and Miller have become increasingly engaged in the imaginative process of re-reading Wroth’s life and works as creative writers. In chapters 16 and 17, both reflect on their individual trajectories in Wroth studies, first as students and then as groundbreaking scholars, and on the creative work that is transforming their encounters with her writings. In “To bleeve this but a fiction and dunn to please and pass the time: Re-imagining Mary Wroth and William Herbert in Feigning Poetry,” Waller builds on his work on sexuality and gender roles within the Sidney family, alternating between critical reflection and verse in his exploration of the love affair between Wroth and William Herbert—whom Waller imagines here as “M” and “W”—through intimate poetic exchange. This chapter, and the poems included within it, brings to vivid life the sexualized and erotic intensity of the cousins’ relationship that Ilona Bell locates in the Folger manuscript.
Margaret Hannay's essay in this volume begins with the questions, "How do we know what Lady Mary Wroth was really like? How can we know?" Recalling the circular structures of Wroth's own narratives, the final chapter, "Re-Imagining the Subject: Traveling from Scholarship to Fiction with Mary Wroth," returns us to Hannay's reflections on the differences between the work of the literary biographer and that of the biographical novelist, this time from the perspective of the latter. As a pioneering Wroth scholar, Naomi Miller is ideally positioned to undertake the work of bringing Wroth's story to a public audience. Yet, as her essay demonstrates, the process of developing, writing, and then pitching her novel, The Tale-Teller, has prompted her to see her subject in entirely new ways. Miller's essay, which incorporates a tantalizing excerpt from her novel, illustrates the value of fictional representations of early modern women to "suggest striking and perhaps unexpected commonalities and contrasts in the challenges and opportunities faced by women across periods." Fittingly, it also testifies to the significance of the broader Wrothian networks of scholars, collaborators, and teachers whose own contributions have helped to shape her depiction of Wroth and her world. Like this volume as a whole, then, Miller's novel invites us to read Wroth anew, not only for deeper attention to her innovative writings, but also as a means toward a critical evaluation, and creative generation, of transformative literary practices.

Notes


3. Josephine A. Roberts's seminal edition of Wroth's poetry, The Poems of Lady Mary Wroth (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1983), was published a decade earlier. As noted in the introduction to Reading Mary Wroth: Representing Alternatives in Early Modern England, ed. Naomi J. Miller and Gary Waller (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1991), however, "not one of the five major collections of critical essays concerned with early modern women which appeared in the second half of the 1980s included an essay on Mary Wroth...and the Norton Anthology of Literature by Women: The Tradition in English, edited by Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, does not even mention Wroth, in spite of the notable variety and length of the works to her name" (3). Alluding to the critical novelty of treating Wroth as a subject in her own right, as well as considering the striking range of subjects represented by Wroth across genres, Naomi Miller's first monograph on Wroth was titled Changing the Subject: Mary Wroth and Figurations of Gender in Early Modern England (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996).

4. See Margaret P. Hannay, Mary Sidney, Lady Wroth (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010); Mary Ellen Lamb, ed., Mary Wroth: The Countess of Montgomery's Urania (Abridged) (Tempe,


