LIMINAL LADIES:

RECONSTRUCTING THE PLACE OF WOMEN IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY

ENGLISH BOOK PRODUCTION

A Dissertation

by

MARY CATHERINE COKER

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Chair of Committee,	Margaret J.M. Ezell
Committee Members,	Maura Ives
	Laura Estill
	James Rosenheim
Head of Department,	Maura Ives

December 2019

Major Subject: English

ABSTRACT

Book history as a discipline has had a problem making space for women in its intellectual and pedagogical models. Consequently, women have remained liminal figures in the history of the book. In this dissertation I am responding to bibliographic theories, criticisms, and histories as a woman printer who is focused on recovering the work of women in seventeenth-century English print shops and related book trades. Because book history as a field has marginalized the roles of women in the book trades, women printers and other laborers are seldom if ever acknowledged in reference books or teaching anthologies, despite their consistent presence in the historical record through documentary evidence including legal works, names in imprints, firsthand accounts, and collections of anecdotes. Tradeswomen are thus found at a liminal crossroads in the private and public space of their real, operating businesses, and in the margins of academic scholarship where their roles have frequently been minimized as exceptional cases rather than as norms of trade. To recover their labors, I argue that "critical making" and "empirical bibliography," two methodologies which were designed as forms of pedagogy devoted to exploring technological processes, are useful in re-examining ways that assume technological work and book production has a masculine default, and as ways to literally recover labors through the challenges of recreating material processes.

DEDICATION

for Scott Zrebiec,

with love and without #thanksfortyping

and

for Todd Samuelson,

il miglior tipografo,

with gratitude

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES

Contributors

This work was supervised by a dissertation committee consisting of Professor Margaret J.M. Ezell [advisor] and Professor Maura Ives and Professor Laura Estill of the Department of English and Professor James Rosenheim of the Department of History, as well as Professor Ann Blair of the Department of History at Harvard University.

Unpublished data analyzed as part of Chapter 1 was collected by the student and analyzed in collaboration with Professor Kate Ozment of the Department of English & Modern Languages at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona. Bibliographic citations listed in Appendix A as part of the *Women in Book History Bibliography* were also collected in collaboration with Professor Ozment.

Photos appear in the Introduction, Chapter 1, Chapter 3, and Chapter 4 courtesy of Todd Samuelson at the University of Utah. Photo in the Afterword appears courtesy of Sarah Smith at Dartmouth College.

All other work conducted for the dissertation was completed by the student independently.

Funding Sources

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION:

MAKING SPACE FOR THE WOMEN OF THE PRINTING HOUSE

As a librarian and an archivist, I was trained to not see books. This might seem counterintuitive, but it was accurate to my experience, in which archival training was often passively (if not actively) hostile to rare books. Basic librarianship typically views books only as numbers (books circulating; books waiting to be reshelved; books lost or misplaced; books acquired or deaccessioned, etc.). An anecdote I have told more than once regards my initial meeting with my academic advisor when I began my Masters program in Library Science. "What do you hope to do?" he asked. "Work with rare books," I answered. "Oh no," he said, "you'll never get a job doing that. How do you feel about electronic records management?" "Sick to my stomach," I said, with perhaps more honesty than sense. But this exchange has always highlighted for me the intellectual disjunction between working with books and *working* with books. As a general librarian, books are the objects that we promote, share, fix (occasionally), valorize—but not make or produce. As a special collections librarian, books are rare and often unique objects of intellectual, historical, and monetary value, and again, objects that are promoted, shared, conserved and preserved, valorized, and increasingly *made* with some limitations in the classroom. My experience as a faculty member at the Book History Workshop at Texas A&M gave me new insights into pedagogy and into historical processes of book production, but it also left me with more questions and answers, ones that this project is probably only the first step in answering.

Above all, my concern is not just with the recovery of specific women and their labors in a specific time period, but the necessity of looking more closely at how they have been marginalized and what that means, and how they can be recovered (and what *that* means). Having spent an excess of time as a singular woman working in male space, my work is thus informed experientially as well as theoretically: I am intimately familiar with textual labor practices historically and contemporaneously, as well as how those labors are complicated by gender. Working in print shops, I have had men snap their fingers in my face when giving me instruction or orders, have dodged unwelcome physical interactions, had my words questioned until confirmed by another male in the shop. This real-world marginalization (and, occasionally, erasure) has informed my awareness of how women's labors are treated in practice and in the record.

Further, popular theories of embodiment often dodge the ugly and uncomfortable practices inherent in it. In her book *'Grossly Material Things': Women and Book Production in Early Modern England* (2012), Helen Smith writes that

> Bodies, then, are a product of the books they handle, and both books and bodies are produced by their environment, even as they work upon it. This insight returns us to the world of practice. […] Productive agency is distributed beyond human activity into an environment which both constitutes and is constituted by those who dwell within it. (12)[1]

She goes on to say that attention should be paid to "where the evidence allows, to the bodily habits of writing and reading, and to the places and spaces within which books come into being and through which they move" (12). It is these questions of bodies, places, and spaces that I am preoccupied with here; I want to look more closely at what happens when female bodies create

---

[1] Helen Smith, *'Grossly Material Things': Women and Book Culture in Early Modern England.* Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012.

books, when feminine bodies are working in masculine places and spaces, and what that means in the larger context of book history.

Studies in book history tend to focus on one of two methodologies: either a theoretical framework that can more or less encompass convenient narratives (which oversimplify complex realities for simpler communications, eg. the vastly overused and oversimplified terms "print culture" versus "manuscript culture"), or material literary history (physical books and physical manuscripts, actual rather than ideal readers, etc.). Questions about the place of women in each of these constructs have likewise revolved around their recovery: first locating and documenting them, then their works, and then the context for both.

In contrast, my methodology here combines first-hand practice and experience with more traditional literary research. In the last decade, there has been a resurgence of scholarship following up on Ronald B. McKerrow's 1911 challenge to see a book "from the point of view of those who composed, corrected, printed, folded, and bound it" (220)[2]; such projects have encompassed the constructions of Common Presses by English professors and library deans, the opening of a variety of practical book laboratories in both book arts and book history programs, and a new generation of students who are engaging with literary studies at the material level. To borrow from Andrew Griffin's recent essay "Why Making?," through empirical bibliography and investigating historical practices,

> we have turned instead to our senses, and have put our bodies through the labors that other long-dead bodies have previously performed. We now know, for instance, how the art we engage is limited by the material affordances of the stuff and technology used in its production. (Griffin)[3]

---

[2] Ronald B. McKerrow, "Notes on Bibliographical Evidence for Literary Students and Editors of English Works of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* vol. 12, 1911-13, pp. 211-318.
[3] Andrew Griffin, "Why Making?" *The Making of a Broadside Ballad*. EMC Imprint, February 2016, http://press.emcimprint.english.ucsb.edu/the-making-of-a-broadside-ballad/why-making. Accessed 4 October 2019.

Written as part of the digital humanities project *The Making of an English Broadside Ballad*, Griffin was one of nine men and seven women participants who made paper, carved blocks, composed type, printed a ballad, coded their work online, performed the music selected, and who never once appeared to consider the issues of gendered labor either as it took place in the project or as part of an environment of historical enactment. This makes sense in the context of academic work and pedagogical tools: no one wants a hostile work environment, and everyone wants to believe that we are, of course, much more enlightened regarding sex and gender in the contemporary academy. However, this pedagogical impulse creates a false equivalence that denies the historical erasure of women's labor in exactly the same way it has been overlooked or minimized in scholarly studies for the past hundred years.

In this dissertation I am therefore responding to bibliographic theories, criticisms, and histories as an author, a teacher, a student, *and* as a printer, engraver, and bookbinder. I present this and the following information in the manner of David Greetham's "bio-bibliography", in which the "interplay between a personal narrative and the social conditions that motivate it" explicate both the text and its creation (23).[4] Similarly, Paul Eggert's writings on "textual product" and "textual process" inform the "relationships within and between the author's writings" and so form

> an *authorial* intertextuality, a continuum of authorship, itself part of a larger biographical flux that takes its changing shapes in response to the pressures of the social, cultural, and other environments the author inhabits. The author's ability to organize, shape, and articulate or otherwise respond to those influences is manifested in the activity of authorship which is the part of that continuum we can most readily engage with. (66, italics original)[5]

---

[4] David Greetham, *Textual Transgressions: Essays Toward the Construction of a Biobibliography.* New York, Garland Publishing, Inc., 1998.
[5] Paul Eggert, "Textual Product or Textual Process: Procedures and Assumptions of Critical Editing," in *Devils and Angels: Textual Editing and Literary Theory*, edited by Philip Cohen, Charlottesville, University of Virginia Press, 1991, pp. 57-77.

Eggert's work on bibliography and textual editing helped reframe the renaissance of book history scholarship in the 1990s, even as it recontextualized familiar arguments of authorial intention in documentary analysis. The book as material object may have been touched by many hands during its production, but the author remained central to the text and to literary analysis; reframing the question of "who is an author?" to include people in the book trades allows for a necessary revision in rereading books as objects.

My readings of bibliographic recovery and theories are also complicated both by my experience as a practitioner and as someone whose academic background was originally in Science Fiction Studies and Fan Studies. Although those two disciplines share overlapping interests in genre history and criticism, they functionally split because of the presence of women writers and scholars. This is a vast simplification, of course, but one that is also thoroughly grounded in the Science Fiction field's history, cast in the traditional literary mold of identifying Great (White) Men and creating canons for study and reference. In contrast, Fan Studies pushes back against this narrative; its earliest scholarship in the 1970s and 1980s is inextricably bound up with Science Fiction fandom and how the canonization process consciously removed women writers. As a consequence, it is field whose focus is consistently on underground women's writing and textual dissemination; but at the same time, this focus displaces them from historical considerations and analysis, as if women only had access to publishing and participatory culture with the advent of twentieth century mass culture. It is within this context that I gained an interest in reconsidering the history of women's writing and publishing, recognizing patterns of dissemination and marginalization that remain eerily similar. While this context is largely removed from the present work at hand, this worldview remains intellectually omnipresent: Where are the women and what, exactly, are they doing?

What I hope to do with this project is place women firmly in the center of bibliographic study and recovery. What happens to narratives of book history when gender is the focus rather than an afterthought? This question is inextricably bound up with reconsidering and recovering women's labor. In 1919, Alice Clark wrote an early study on recovering women's historical labors entitled *Working Life of the Women of the Seventeenth Century*; she identified the three stages of work organization that particularly affected women laborers: the "domestic industry" in which all labor took place in the home; the "family industry" in which domestic work and wage work provided income for the family as a unit; and "capitalist industry" in which work took place outside of the household.[6] Histories of English labor in general have largely focused on the industrial age (such as E.P. Thompson's seminal *The Making of the English Working Classes* (1966))[7], with little focus or discussion on gender until Joan Wallach Scott's *Gender and the Politics of History* (1999)[8], which redefines the questions of women's history through the intersections of language, gender, and class. Meanwhile, Donna J. Haraway's influential essay, "A Cyborg Manifesto," forms an intellectual apparatus for analyzing the intersections of body, technology, and gender:

> The actual situation of women is their integration/exploitation into a world system of production/reproduction and communication called the informatics of domination. The home, workplace, market, public arena, the body itself—all can be dispersed and interfaced in nearly infinite, polymorphous ways, with large consequences for women and others… (163)[9]

---

[6] Alice Clark, *Working Life of the Women of the Seventeenth Century.* 1919. Intro. Amy Louise Erickson. London, Routledge, 1992.

[7] E.P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class.* New York, Vintage Books, 1966.

[8] Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1999.

[9] Donna J. Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge, 1991: 149-182. Interesting, this theoretical work which seemed to point early on towards computer science and engineering has been recontextualized through Haraway's more recent work in biology. See *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2016.

The dynamics of power and gender, she argues, construct both our language (and thus our history and politics) and our technology. Book history, with its focus on technological shifts in production, has often overlooked the gendered aspects of its evolution and analysis. The history of recovery implies not just knocking down monolithic cultural narratives of "print culture," "book history," and "women's work," but also dissecting the formation and formulation of those narratives.

Finally, by using empirical bibliography and critical making as a praxis to complicate bibliographic and literary theory, I will inject myself into the narrative I'm creating by *recreating* it on a material level. It is one thing to recover women's work in records and analysis, and another to embody that recovery through work on a press and in manuscript. The gendered metaphors of printing as childbirth (or, per John Donne in his Latin poem to Dr. Andrews, "A Book that with this printing blood is dyed"[10]) gain new relevance when red ink is worked on the inking stone, staining not just it with bloody color but also one's hands and apron. Practical dissemination of the written word varies between hours spent at a desk, quill in hand, and even more hours setting, printing, and cleaning type. In making books as a method of study, I'm recovering labor in a practical way, one that I hope illuminates our study of gender in history.

<div align="center">~</div>

Discussions of gender in book history have largely been confined to recovering the practices and artefacts of women's writing and women's reading. This has created several narratives that have governed scholarly analysis. One of these narratives is that of the persecuted woman writer, who is either openly operating in the public sphere to public stigma and

---

[10] As quoted in Rosemary Huisman's *The Written Poem: Semiotic Conventions from Old to Modern English*. London and New York: Cassell, 1998:129. Huisman cites Edmund Blunden's translation of the phrase from Donne's ca. 1611 original "Epigram." Robin Robbins gives an alternate translation as "colored only with the blood of the press" (118) in *The Complete Poems of John Donne*. London and New York: Routledge, 2014.

condemnation, or is writing in the private sphere and thus expertly navigating alternate forms of publication through manuscript. Another narrative is that of the passive and persecuted woman reader, whose appetite for popular novels continues to be, variously, championed or attacked today in various think-pieces in the popular press. The last narrative is that of the woman as an active member of the trades either as printer, binder, or hawker, but written as an exceptional role viewed as a blip in history writ large rather than as a norm of production. Despite a clear trajectory of greater involvement and activity by and for women in the trade, they nonetheless often remain shadowy figures in academic scholarship, popular criticism, and artistic acknowledgement. What I hope to consider, then, is not just how we might recover the narratives of women in the book trades, but how we have arrived at some of these narratives ourselves.

The current narratives of book tradeswomen also focus on seeming exceptions: Women who ran print-shops as widows, women who created manuscripts as fine art or as text for private circulation, women writers circumnavigating a stigma of print real or perceived. Isobel Grundy has championed book tradeswomen in the long eighteenth century but still called their contributions "minor but significant" or "largely hidden," and noting that "Almost all the women active in the trade were active as wives or daughters if not as widows, and about 10 per cent of London publishing houses were in fact run by women" (149-150).[11] Whereas traditional and male-centric studies of book history and print culture create evolutionary narratives of change and growth, women's history of the book remains marginalized and limited by intersecting points of historiography, received knowledge, and shifting definitions of "book" and "manuscript." The fact that we have no real or theoretical model of women in the book trades to

---

[11] Isobel Grundy, "Women and Print: Readers, Writers, and the Market," in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume 5: 1695–1830*, edited by Michael F. Suarez and Michael L. Turner. New York, Cambridge University Press, 2014, pp. 146-159.

use for teaching or as a point of practice, nor a unified approach to considering how women

worked across numerous periods of history and geography, speaks to how profoundly the book

history tradition has been written in such a way that it eliminates women altogether, and how

much work remains towards recovery—and this despite numerous and highly-detailed studies

such as Maureen Bell's "A Dictionary of Women Writers and Printers" (1983), Paula

McDowell's *The Women of Grub Street* (1998), Helen Smith's *'Grossly Material Things':*

Women and Book Production in Early Modern England (2012), Lisa Maruca's *The Work of*

Print (2007), and Margaret Ezell's *Writing Women's Literary History* (1993).[12]

In perhaps the most famous theoretical model for discussing (and teaching) book history,

Robert Darnton created a "communications circuit" in his 1982 essay "What is the History of

Books?"[13] This model is one that

> runs from the author to the publisher (if the bookseller does not assume that role),
> the printer, the shipper, the bookseller, and the reader. The reader completes the
> circuit because *he* influences the author both before and after the act of
> composition. Authors are readers themselves. [...] So the circuit runs full circle. It
> transmits messages, transforming them en route, as they pass from thought to
> writing to printed characters and back to thought again. (11, italics added)

This model is also one that reflects specifically print culture, emphasizing a masculine public

sphere in which all acts of production and consumption have assumed a masculine default. In

2007 Darnton revisited his work to engage with later criticism, particularly that of Thomas

---

[12] Maureen Bell, "A Dictionary of Women in the London Book Trade 1540- 1730." 1983. M.L.S. thesis. Loughborough University of Technology: Paula McDowell, *The Women of Grub Street: Press, Politics, and Gender in the London Literary Marketplace, 1678-1730*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1998.; Lisa Maruca, *The Work of Print: Authorship and the English Text Trades, 1660-1760*. Seattle and London, University of Washington Press, 2007.; Margaret J.M. Ezell, *Writing Women's Literary History*. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
[13] Robert Darnton, "What is the History of Books?" *Daedalus* vol. 11 no. 3, Summer 1982, pp. 63-85. Reprinted in *The Book History Reader*, edited by David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery, New York, Routledge, 2006, pp. 9-26.

Adams and Nicholas Barker in their 1993 essay "A New Model for the Study of the Book."[14] Their new model called into question the usage of the term *book*, one which they felt should be supplanted by "bibliographic document" instead, but the emphasis remained on public production and consumption. In his reply Darnton stated that their points were valid but that he felt that they "underplay the role of authors" and that he couldn't "work up enthusiasm for any kind of history that would be emptied of human beings" (504).[15] And in neither of these works does the phrase "human beings" include women, which is of course a problem of itself.[16]

       That English women are present in the records of the trades is concrete and undeniable. That their roles grew and changed over time is likewise documented; in seventeenth-century England, for example, women began to enter the Stationers' Company in their own right as formal apprentices rather than informal household labor. In 1983, Felicity Hunt noted that some 108 women were apprenticed between 1660 and 1880, and that early divisions of labor pushed women towards bookbinding rather than to printing because of the comparatively "light" work of folding and sewing—a tradition that continued through the twentieth century.[17] We might

---

[14] Thomas Adams and Nicolas Barker. "A New Model for the Study of the Book," in *A Potencie of Life: Books in Society*, edited by Nicolas Barker. London, British Library, 1993. Reprinted in *The Book History Reader*, edited by David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery, New York, Routledge, 2006, pp. 47-65.

[15] Robert Darnton, "'What is the history of books?' revisited." *Modern Intellectual History* vol. 4, no. 3, 2007, pp. 495-508.

[16] Indeed, Darnton's single venture into feminist literary history is couched in a 1995 book review in *The New York Review of Books*: "For if the vindication of women depends on the discovery of an adequate supply of forgotten writers and power-brokers, what is to be done if the numbers turn out to be disappointing?" he asks, before citing figures that women writers in Enlightenment France accounted for only 2-4% of published writing and thus that "one cannot avoid the conclusion that women contributed relatively little as writers to the Republic of Letters before 1800." See "Cherchez la femme," *The New York Review of Books*, August 10, 1995, pp. 22–24. Carol Pal took this argument head-on in her book *Republic of Women: Rethinking the Republic of Letters in the Seventeenth Century,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pal argues that women were much more active members in pre-Enlightenment and eighteenth century intellectual circles than they have been credit for, stating that "the republic of letters was not a small, heroic cadre of brilliant minds, but rather a much more eclectic, diverse, and conflicted assemblage than we have hitherto believed; and our tidy assumption of an elite, secular, all-male intellectual world is completely undone once we pay attention to the networks of female scholars who were well known and highly respected actors within it" (1).

[17] Felicity Hunt, "The London Trade in the Printing and Binding of Books: An Experience in Exclusion, Dilution, and De-Skilling for Women Workers." *Women's Studies Int. Forum* vol 6, no. 5, 1983, 517-524.

consider why this happened, and then consult Robert Campbell's *London Tradesman*, published

in 1747:

> The trade of a bookbinder has no great ingenuity in it, and requires few talents,
> either natural or acquired, to fit a man to carry it on; a moderate share of strength
> is requisite, which is chiefly employed in beating the books with a heavy hammer.
> …The journeymen make but a mean living; they seldom earn more than ten
> shillings a week when employed, and are out of business for half the year. (135)[18]

Simple work with small wages, unvalued at large, reveals a great deal about how presumably

genderless tasks become gendered in a trade. Pre-industrial familial businesses made extensive

use of women's labor from record-keeping and supply management to daily chores such as

cleaning or banking hearth fires. Bookbinding, with its emphasis on sewing and multiple

stitching forms (necessary to manage the various weights of text-blocks), is an obvious example

of tasks that could be passed on to family members who required no pay and then to laborers

who would cost very little.

Further, descriptive statements such as Hunt's phrasing of "light work" for women have

not been interrogated through empirical means, so I will briefly intervene myself and point out

that, frankly, bookbinding practices in the hand-press era are more physically strenuous and

ergonomically challenging than printing. While there is a growing body of experiential

bibliography and critical making aimed at recreating historical practice and interrogating book

history through first-hand material means, none of this work, thoughtful though it is, has

questioned the roles or place of gender in the trades, either through physical labor or the

sociological implications of working women surrounded by working men during periods when

neither sexual harassment policies nor any other form of other workplace protections were

available. And while we might congratulate ourselves on our presumably enlightened attitudes

---

[18] Robert Campbell, *The London Tradesman*. A.M. Kelley: London, 1747.

towards gender equality here in the twenty-first century, my opening anecdotes show that this assumption of egalitarianism is, unfortunately, rather false.

Further, if we reconsider our historiographical narratives of women in the trades, we continue to see the privileging of the woman as writer, as textual creator, over that of the woman as bookmaker and agent of textual distribution, or even the woman as reader and textual consumer. Michelle Levy has pointed out in "Do Women Have a Book History?" that "Literary studies – both in its pedagogical and research methodologies – has traditionally been oriented around individual writers and close readings of their texts" (304) and that

> rethinking [Darnton's] communication circuit in terms of gender compels us to confront the gender asymmetry that existed within commercial publishing …. [G]ender complicates some of the fundamental assumptions embedded in the communication circuit, which, by assigning discrete roles to various groups, obscures the overlapping roles that many individuals, and it seems, many women, played within the print market place. (312)[19]

Darnton's model—and its revisions by other historians—have always sought only to identify and examine aspects of print culture, with or without the women who could be found in the margins. Returning to McKerrow's pedagogical tradition of empirical bibliography, what has been amply demonstrated in numerous programs is the identification of practical book history as print history, emphasizing *print*, from the American institutions of Rare Book School (RBS) and the California Rare Book School (CalRBS) to the London Rare Book School (LRBS).[20] Aside from the occasional paleography seminar, manuscripts and their circulation remain largely theoretical rather than practical exercises; it is easier to attend a class on hot metal typecasting either with hand molds or with a monotype supercaster than to learn to cut a quill or nib. Indeed, such

---

[19] Michelle Levy, "Do Women Have a Book History?" *Studies in Romanticism* vol. 53, no. 3, 2014, pp. 297-317.
[20] It should perhaps be noted that despite the recurrent name of "Rare Book School," none of these groups are affiliated with one another.

classes that exist emphasize the importance of keeping specific masculine print crafts "alive" at

the expensive of feminine manuscript practices that are indisputably dead.

The disjunction is all the more jarring when we consider another shift in disciplines, and

realize that while the average book history class is either half or predominantly male, the average

book arts class is almost always predominantly female. While this is anecdotal evidence brought

from my experiences at RBS, CalRBS, and the Wells Center for the Book, I bring this up not

only to revisit the adamant distinction made in most book history classes that what is taught is

not "book arts" (which is almost always pronounced with disdain) but so that we can see more

clearly the split between those who shape our historical narratives and those who are its actual

practitioners. This disconnect also goes both ways, with many contemporary book artists only

vaguely familiar with historical practices beyond the most recent century, if at all. That the fields

of book arts and book history are so disconnected speaks to problems of practice, and it is

problems of practice that can be clarified utilizing experiential bibliography. Consider the words

of Anaïs Nin, a letterpress printer in addition to author, writing in her diary in 1942:

> The relationship to handcraft is nourishing, beautiful. Related bodily to a solid block of lead letters, to the weight of the composition tray, to the adroitness of spacing, the tempo and temper of the machine—you acquire some of the weight of the lead, the strength and power of the machine, the bodily conquests and triumphs. You live in the hands, in physical deftness, in the development of your faculties pitted against concrete problems. The victories are complete, concrete, definite and proved. How much greater than abstractions and theories. (100)[21]

Nin's preference for the actual experience of printing rather than the "abstractions and theories"

that speak to the more traditionally academic practice of book history, which tends to rely on the

close examination of material texts in connection with analysis and literary history, illustrates the

---

[21] Paul Herron, ed. *Mirages: The Unexpurgated Diary of Anaïs Nin, 1939-1947*. Athens, Swallow Press/Ohio University Press, 2013.

perspective of many book artists today. Book artists view material texts very differently, analyzing their materiality more like art historians and so connecting the methods of book production with an analysis of techniques and aesthetics. Both viewpoints are informative, and would in an ideal world go together hand in hand rather than as contradictory or even inimical partisan sides.

What I hope I have done thus far is re-present questions of historiography and recovery with regards to women in the book trades. How can we read both their presences and their absences in the record, especially alongside one another? Are we creating new narratives only to silence or privilege others? For example, the story of Milton's daughters, who wrote down *Paradise Lost* while their father dictated, is well known and has been the subject of extensive mythologizing; subsequent generations have used their labor as a means to help formulate varying representations of Milton the man and writer, from the stern Puritan father to Milton the egomaniacal misogynist, rather than saying anything about the women themselves (whose names, by the way, were Anne, Mary, and Deborah). They seem to confirm our worst readings of literate women and the patriarchy, passive recipients of text. In contrast, Mary Simmons, who actually printed the book with her son, has no "story" aside from that of extant records, which paint her as a thriving businesswoman running one of the largest English printing houses. Simmons herself has been the subject of more than one scholarly examination, with articles about her written by both D.F. McKenzie and Ian Gadd. We know where her shop was located, how many apprentices and journeymen she had as well as their names and dates of service; we know some of the titles of other books she printed, and in some cases how she obtained texts and the rights to print them. And yet, she has no "story"; she is not mythologized or presented as a pedagogical anecdote in the same way Milton's daughters are. In a sense, these women were all

working in a domestic sphere that minimized their contributions to a historic text, but the narrative of the passive recipients trumps that of the active businesswoman.

And so I have to ask: Why hasn't the recovery of women in the book trades happened more? I would argue that it is because of the primacy of the author-function and goes back to the invisibility of book as object. It also hits at the larger problem of the erasure of women and their labors in history. When the book exists as a text rather than as an object, the credit goes towards the author rather than towards the team of workers who sew, print, and bind, a team that often, if not always, includes women somewhere in the process. However, this leads to another problem: scholarship on the book trades that focuses on women as *women* becomes a point of Othering from the male default that has been successfully canonized as the norm. As such, in many bibliographies and studies women are relegated to a nebulous anonymity, such as the common phrase "men and women" in studies in which the men go on to be named and examined...and the women do not.[22] Further, those studies that consider the male default are scrupulously divided and delineated into examinations of specific presses or roles. Meanwhile, a growing body of work[23] that seeks to challenge some of these assumptions and define a feminist print culture is only concerned with recovering the history of women in the trades in the twentieth century, and that only in the even narrower margin of political activist culture; neither women in the pre-20th century trades, nor contemporary tradeswomen are considered as part of this tradition, creating a narrative that is as ahistorical and problematic as the patriarchal one it seeks to renegotiate.

---

[22] This problematic formulation occurs no less than fourteen times in James Raven's 2007 monograph *The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade*, on pages 3, 5, 38 (a variation, here: "exclusively men, but a few widows also"), 120 ("the diversity of men (and some women"), 169, 267, 268, 269, 273, 349, 351, 358, 372, 373.
[23] See Maria DiCenzo, Lucy Delap, and Leila Ryan, *Feminist Media History: Suffrage, Periodicals and the Public Sphere*, Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan, 2010; Jaime Harker and Cecilia Farr, eds., *This Book Is an Action: Feminist Print Culture and Activist Aesthetics*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2015; Agatha Beins, *Liberation in Print: Feminist Periodicals and Social Movement Identity*, Athens, University of Georgia Press, 2017.

In revisiting how we might reconceive of a feminist history and practice of the book, we might first turn to Virginia Woolf. If Woolf is famous for erasing the history of women's writing in *A Room of One's Own* (1929), it is telling that she equally erases the history of women's labor:

> Moreover, it is equally useless to ask what might have happened if Mrs. Seton and her mother and her mother before her had amassed great wealth ... because, in the first place, to earn money was impossible for them, and in the second, had it been possible, the law denied them the right to possess what money they earned. It is only for the last forty-eight years that Mrs. Seton has had a penny of her own. For all the centuries before that it would have been her husband's property—a thought which, perhaps, may have had its share in keeping Mrs. Seton and her mother off the Stock Exchange. Every penny I earn, they may have said, will be taken from me and disposed of according to my husband's wisdom—perhaps to found a scholarship or to endow a fellowship in Balliol or Kings, so that to earn money, even if I could earn money, is not a matter that interests me very greatly. I had better leave it to my husband. (23)[24]

Woolf was a keen literary critic but no historian: she would not have appreciated that throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, women (if widows) would indeed have had shares in the English Stock as well as interests in the finances of the guilds. Further, English law had rather specific interests regarding employment altogether, as "masterless" and idle men and women would have been subject to fines and even imprisonment. The idea of women's waged labor is denied, and that of women's *skilled* labor not even considered, despite Woolf's own middle-class experience as bookbinder, typesetter, and printer. Somehow it is utterly telling that she could fictionally connect to thwarted writer Judith Shakespeare, but not to Judith Bookbinder, Judith Engraver, or Judith Printer.

Finally, in her book *Old Books and New Histories: An Orientation to Studies in Book and Print Culture* (2006), Leslie Howsam states that "[l]ike social class (in E.P. Thompson's famous

---

[24] Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own.* London, Hogarth Press, 1929. Reprinted Barnes & Noble, Inc., 2007.

formulation), the book is not so much a category as a process: books happen; they happen to people who read, reproduce, disseminate, and compose them; and they happen to be significant. The book can be a force for change and the history of the book documents that change" (5).[25] This quote telescopes what I see as some of the problems in book history and textual scholarship as a field, acknowledging labors, persons, and processes but distancing them, too, relegating it all to a too safe past tense. Howsam's book presents the models of the book most utilized in the classroom (including Darnton, Barker and Adams, McDonald, and Secord), none of which consider issues of gender; I think this complicates how we conceive of the book as object and as process, let alone of the people "books happen" to and how they in turn react to them.

Howsam also draws attention to the "curiously gendered terminology of bibliography serving as a 'handmaiden' to history" and literary studies (37); though she quotes Barker and Adams, the phrase is not uncommon and is, as she says, "suggestive of a certain anxiety about independence and the relative strengths and weaknesses of disciplines and subdisciplines," as well as a reminder that, too, bibliography "has experienced very little analysis in terms of social class and almost none in terms of gender, race/ethnicity, or national identity" (37-38). This is a weakness of the field generally and of introductory readers in particular; neither Finkelstein and McCreery's *The Book History Reader* (2002, 2006)[26] nor Levy and Mole's *The Broadview Reader in Book History* (2015)[27] place emphasis on these issues of gender or race either. However, this is not for lack of work on those topics: In terms of the intersections of gender and book history, at least, the *Women in Book History Bibliography* I am editing with Kate Ozment

[25] Leslie Howsam, *Old Books and New Histories: An Orientation to Studies in Book and Print Culture.* Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2006.
[26] David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery, eds., *The Book History Reader*. New York, Routledge, 2002. Reprinted 2006.
[27] Michelle Levy and Tom Mole, eds., *The Broadview Reader in Book History.* Ontario, Broadview Press, 2015.

has identified (to date) over fifteen hundred books, articles, and theses on women as both authors and tradeswomen. What we have, then, is not a genuine gap in the scholarship but a gap in how we *perceive* the scholarship, which we then pass on in our own work and pedagogy. In other words, we have yet another unexamined narrative of convenience which needs to be deconstructed and replaced.

As I will soon show, of convenient narratives are effectively displaced by recreating labors and thus making space for women in acts of doing as well as acts of scholarship. In seeking to recreate the work of women in specifically the seventeenth century English printing house, I have combined theoretical discourse with art historiography and empirical bibliography to re-examine our gendered assumptions and revise historical narratives. Along the way I have picked up a number of skills first-hand which have informed my analysis, from filing steel punches to learning how to make a small forge in one's backyard with cinderblocks and a blow-torch. In looking for the history of women printers, I have found not only hundreds of women, but dozens of ways they have been removed or sidelined from narratives. This is, I hope, a first step to restoring them, and their work, to our book histories.

Fig. 1. A Small Forge of Cinderblocks. Photo of the author using a blowtorch with a cinderblock forge to temper steel punches at a temperature of about 1200°F. In July 2016 I took a course with Stan Nelson on "Understanding the Typographical Punch" at the Wells College Summer Book Institute in Aurora, New York, during the course of which we filed punches and created matrices for typecasting. Unpublished photograph printed with the permission of Todd Samuelson.

CHAPTER II

BODIES IN SPACE:

MATERIALITY, EMPIRICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY, AND THE WORK OF PRINT

In her 2004 study *The Body of the Artisan*, Pamela H. Smith argued that sixteenth- and seventeenth-century artists and craftsmen believed that knowledge was "embodied and could only be known through manual practice" (230).[28] This linkage between intellectual knowledge and material matter eventually connected with the developing study of science, particularly in the space of workshops which were used for the creation of both traditional fine arts, such as painting, and for scientific experimentation and empirical study. This intellectual link between the history of art and the history of science and technology provides space to examine the overlaps between the two more closely.

The invention of the printing press in the fifteenth century was simultaneously a leap forward in technology and in art, allowing for the mechanical reproduction and dissemination of texts, images, and knowledge. By the seventeenth century, improvements in machinery design and work processes allowed for standardization in large-scale book production in a field that was not yet industrialized but was nonetheless more of a nationally corporatized entity than small, family-owned businesses. The chartering of the Stationers' Company in 1557 formalized the loose business connections between the printers of London into an extended network of tradesmen with shared resources and responsibilities. Prior to the Charter, the majority of books in England were imports from other countries; by the eighteenth century, the English book trade

---

[28] Pamela H. Smith, *The Body of the Artisan: Art and Experience in the Scientific Revolution*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2004.

was printing numerous books for export. The seventeenth century, then, is a significant period during which the guild, its craftsmen, and its practices evolved in ways that would have an outsized influence on the proliferation of English print culture.

That said, the focus of material study of English books has primarily utilized the methods of traditional analytical bibliography. While such studies do closely "read" the physical characteristics of books to understand the materials and processes that influenced their making, they are too often done at a critical distance, with the bibliographer in question knowledgeable about the historical practices involved in book production, but not necessarily with the actual experience of bookmaking, either through historical or more contemporary means. As Smith goes on to note, "A distinction has often been drawn between the theoretical knowledge of scholars or scientists, which draws knowledge into a system, and practical craft knowledge, which is usually seen to be composed of a collection of recipes or rules that are followed more or less mindlessly" (6).This distinction is typically atomized down to the difference between working with one's mind (academic, scholarly work) versus working with one's hands (artistic or artisanal work), with a not inconsiderable distrust of the other to be found on both sides. "I'm just not crafty enough," a typical historian will demur, or "I've just never felt like reading through all that jargon to get to the point" an artist might say.[29]

Nonetheless, to a certain small subset of book historians, the recreation of material work or the embodiment of art has been seen as an intellectual useful part of bibliographic study and empirical practice—but the default practicing body has always been male. It is therefore worth asking: How does embodying the book shift when the bodies in question are female instead?

---

[29] These are in fact actual quotes I've heard more than once in both classroom and social contexts. Names withheld to protect the innocent and the guilty.

And what if we go a step further, and look at the embodiment of technologies—in this case, printing presses and the body (even the specific sexualization) of the working woman printer? This embodiment links critically to identifying the work of print history as well as its recovery. As bodies doing work, it is the recreation of experience as well as the theory of that experience. The "recovery" of printing as work is something of a misnomer as, functionally, it is not a process that ever went away; letterpress and handpress printing made the transition from job work to art work in the twentieth century. However, the recovery of printing *practices* is something else again, referring to both the work, the norms of production, and, I argue, the associated social aspects of printers. In recovering women printers, therefore, we are looking at both the work and the people. However, this task has several problems inherent in it: 1) the definitions of work, which is to say, *what is printing?* and *who is a printer?*; 2) the difficulty of reconstructing seventeenth-century tools and contexts in the twenty-first century; and 3) the disciplinary issues inherent in attempting to answer these questions. This chapter will provide brief overviews and analyses of these issues to provide a structural context to beginning the work of recovery of women printers.

What is "Printing"?

The predominant work of printing consists of various functions; it is thought that Stationers' Company apprentices would themselves choose a specific task for specialization such as composing/typesetting and redistribution, engraving and woodcutting, or working as pressmen; the work of correcting would be done by a senior member of the shop[30], and minor

---

[30] Charlotte Guillard (148?-1557), a Parisian printer, was particularly noted for her knowledge and expertise in proofing and correcting Latin and Greek texts. See Beech 1983.

tasks such as lifting sheets and boiling lye would be assigned to printers' devils (and "Girles", at least before the males apprentices balked at this female intrusion into their space enough to formally present a petition to the Stationers' Company in 1635, as this was seen as improperly allocating labor to non-Stationers[31]). Acquiring supplies and managing the accounts, particularly with regard to securing copyrights, seems to have been the work of printers' wives[32] and the preparation of ink would have been a shared task. The number of workers needed for these jobs was usually a maximum of ten for a shop with a single printing press, with numbers increasing for each additional press.

A key distinction in managing these tasks also includes defining—and differentiating—terms like *printer* and *publisher* which have a tendency to be used (inaccurately) interchangeably. In his magisterial *The Stationers' Company and the Printers of London, 1501-1557* (2013), Peter Blayney notes that this lack of proper distinction causes a number of misunderstandings regarding who did the actual work, and that the early modern period therefore "teems with books claiming to have been printed 'by' publishers who went from cradle to grave without ever owning or using a press" (30).[33] He notes that in the sixteenth century

> Publishers in the modern sense certainly existed, but the book trade seems to have found it unnecessary to coin a word for them. When considered as people who paid for books to be printed they were usually called *printers* even if they owned no presses; when their role as wholesalers was at issue they were thought of as *booksellers*. Not until late in the seventeenth century did a word other than the equally imprecise *stationer* emerge at at all… (30, emphases original)

---

[31] "That no Master Printer shall hereafter permit or suffer by themselves or their journeymen any Girles, Boys, or others to take off anie sheets from the tinpin [tympan] of the presse, but he that pullet at the presse shall take off every sheete himself." See John Bruce, Ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles I, 1635*, London, Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, & Green, 1865. Volume I: 484.

[32] Paula McDowell notes in *The Women of Grub Street* that copyrights by printers were often maintained in family businesses through intermarriages with the female relations of Stationers' Company members, and that "Marriage into the trade was a standard way for journeymen to acquire privileges, copyrights, equipment, connections, and customers" (38).

[33] Peter W.M. Blayney, *The Stationers' Company and the Printers of London, 1501–1557.* Two volumes. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Recovering the work of printing therefore is more than a series of tasks and experiences; it also involves a not inconsiderable etymological problem of identification—not just of who did what, but what was it called when, and why, and how. This nebulous problem affects not just the identification and function of the workers but also the work that they did.

It is perhaps telling that printing is itself largely undefined in the scholarship except in the context of denoting the various tasks it encompasses. For instance, Philip Gaskell never defines printing in his *A New Introduction to Bibliography* (1972) though he examines all of its tasks—and those of related processes from typefounding to papermaking—in microscopic detail.[34] Therefore the surprising questions that dog discussion of women printers become *what is printing?* and *who is a printer?*, questions that in most bibliographical studies are left unasked or, as in Blayney, used to discern the finer points of historical publishing and bookselling rather than a direct analysis of specific labors. Answering these questions involves an acknowledgement that the contexts of the early modern book trade, especially in England, were often in constant flux as fortunes of guilds waxed and waned and as both churches and secular governments sought various forms of control for political and financial reasons. In short, printing as a trade was subject to change in legal terms on a regular basis, and that without taking into accounts the problems that would affect technological growth or the sociological issues that would affect the labor force. And all of this aside from the basic problems of recreating specific practices from specific periods, to say nothing of locating and recovering the women workers

---

[34] The only other topic he devotes little (no) attention to are the various tasks inherent in *cleaning*, a topic that is likewise omitted by Joseph Moxon in his *Mechanickal Exercises of Printing* (1678-83). This perhaps reflects a division between bibliography as it is practiced and printing as it is practiced, or perhaps even another problem of gender. Indeed, while the materials of cleaning have changed more than the tasks of printing itself (e.g. hot lye in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries being replaced by kerosene and various water-soluble chemicals by the twentieth and twenty-first centuries), there is a significant gap in the scholarship on this topic that remains to be filled.

who were present at the time. Or rather, recovering the women in the *scholarship* of book history, as their presence in the material record is rather more concrete.

Indeed, Felicity Hunt found in her 1983 study[35] that some 108 women were formally apprenticed Stationers from 1666 to 1800, while a cursory examination of Maureen Bell's "A Dictionary of Women in the London Book Trade 1540-1730"[36] finds 195 women operating in the trades during the seventeenth century alone. Women and their work were not notable exceptions but instead an invisible norm whose presence has been noted in conventional bibliographies like Plomer's *Dictionaries* (1907-10)[37] but seldom analyzed in the context of gender. Gendered histories of the book are a casualty of bibliography's framing as a discourse, best articulated by James Raven in his 2018 *What is the History of the Book?*, as a refuge "from high theory" for those "allied [in] their more historical interests" (4).[38] "Theory" in this context is a convenient shorthand for the variety of -isms that permeated scholarship in the 1980s and 1990s, including postcolonialism, critical race, class, and gender studies, and other debates that aimed to deconstruct the traditional white male hierarchies of literary studies. In short, book history's foundations as a form of conservative backlash reflect a core body of work that is Euro-centric and canon-centric in the extreme, and thus reducing the presence of women and their work to the margins and footnotes of many studies.

Consequently, we have numerous histories of a trade in which many of its practitioners are missing from the narrative as a function of the aforementioned definitions. The ability to

---

[35] Hunt, ibid.

[36] Bell, 1983, ibid.

[37] Henry R. Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who Were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667*. London, Blades, East and Blades, 1907, and *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books 1557-1640*. London, Blades, East and Blades, 1910.

[38] James Raven, *What is the History of the Book?* Medford, Polity Press, 2018.

identify what was one specific woman's work, which is inarguably unattributable to another individual, is what makes the case for her as a tradeswoman rather than a nebulous entity who just happens to be present. Tace Sowle was a compositor; her job was to set and redistribute type for print. This is a common task and one of the basics of printing, and therefore she was a printer. Mary Simmons only had her name on certain imprints that came out of the printing house first run by her husband Matthew and then later by her son Samuel; despite the gap of years in which only her name is on imprints, during which Matthew is dead and Samuel is not yet of age, she was working in the shop but the specific tasks that she did are not known, and therefore her identity as a printer is in doubt despite the appearance of her name in business records. The process of recovery for Sowle, Simmons, and other women in the trades is therefore complicated by the concreteness, or lack thereof, of their work as it has been explicitly defined in the scholarship.

Attempts at Reconstruction: A Problem of Discourse?

In his classic 1911 essay "Notes on Bibliographical Evidence for Literary Students and Editors of English Works of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," Ronald B. McKerrow's challenged scholars to see a book "from the point of view of those who composed, corrected, printed, folded, and bound it" (220).[39] Even as it inspired a new generation of bibliographers and encouraged the founding of numerous pedagogical projects in book history programs, the call is read less as an adjuration to actively take up art or craft and more as an encouragement to

---

[39] McKerrow, ibid.

material study of the book. These are two very different things, craft emphasizing the physical as well as intellectual knowledge of making, whereas material study frequently focuses on the finished object; it is process versus product.

Distinctions of "art" and "craft" are also of interest because historically, designating certain processes or objects as "crafts" has been used to deny women status as artists and artisans. In their pioneering 1981 study *Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology*, Griselda Pollock and Rozsika Parker examined these distinctions to note the stratification that emerged in the art studios of the Renaissance and continued through to the contemporary art history classroom, in which a hierarchy of value is created so that

> the arts of painting and sculpture enjoy an elevated status while other arts that adorn people, homes, or utensils are relegated to a lesser cultural sphere under such terms as 'applied,' 'decorative' or 'lesser' arts. This is maintained by attributing to the decorative arts a lesser degree of intellectual effort or appeal and a greater concern with manual skill or utility (50).[40]

In this model, the book as a printed object is an interstitial presence based on its component parts. Printed pages can be seen as hundreds or thousands of duplicates...or not, both through the textual variations of stop-press corrections and copy-specific examples of ownership markings and decorations; bindings can likewise vary from intensely personal, homemade works of art to a variety of purchased materials ranging from rag papers to leather and gilt. Bookmaking, especially with hand-press or letterpress printing, is thus simultaneously a process of mass culture and...not.

Such distinctions matter because, when it comes to the work of recovery and material study, the notions of gender and the existence of women have a tendency to handily disappear. In

---

[40] Griselda Pollock and Rozsika Parker, *Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology.* New York, I.B. Tauris, 1981. Reprinted 2013.

his 2016 essay "Why Making?" for the digital humanities project *The Making of an English Broadside Ballad*, Andrew Griffin argued that, through critical making and investigating historical practices, the acts of printing and woodcutting allowed for a form of historical recovery. He noted specifically that the "art we engage in is limited by the material affordances of the stuff and technology used in its production" (Griffin).[41] That keyword of *art* puts the onus of value on both the finished object and on the object's maker; it applies a kind of status and an inherent worthiness to the acts of creation, appraisal, and analysis. These acts reinforce, however unknowingly and perhaps even unwillingly, familiar critical patterns of hierarchy and even of canonization in terms of declaring what is, or is not, valuable—and why.

Attempting reconstruction of printing shops, whether those of the seventeenth century or other periods, is therefore problematized by the divides I have identified above: the problems of atomizing definitions and tasks, the problems of identifying (and hierarchically placing) art versus craft, and the social problem of interactions between the sexes. All of these are present and inform the scholarship and the pedagogy but they do so silently, as a set of cultural norms that we only become aware of when they prove to be a problem to us specifically—a problem that devil's advocates will term as "political" (see Matt Ratto below) and therefore unique despite, of course, the politics found inherent in any institution. Indeed, the institutionalization of the various discourses discussed here—of art, of book history, of bibliography—both create and confound the disciplinary issues that must be confronted when gender is introduced into the equation.

---

[41] Griffin, ibid.

Attempts at Reconstruction: A Problem of Discipline?

The problem of gender in the reconstruction of print practices is conspicuous in its absence. The methodologies I will outline below, critical making and empirical bibliography, differ in their origins in intellectual history and background but share common ground in assuming an apolitical stance that is firmly rooted in the familiar structures of white Eurocentric patriarchy. Both disciplines emerged in the last twenty years concurrent to a resurgence in interest in print practices in the scholarship and classroom and in broader popular culture. The ascendancy of digital culture has met its analog (as it were) in a revival of letterpress and book arts workshops that can be found in most urban centers today.

Critical Making

Critical making as a discipline emerged from the pedagogy of the history of science and technology; Matt Ratto coined the phrase in 2001 to argue for "open design technologies and processes that allow the distribution and sharing of technical work and its results" which was "less about the aesthetics and politics of design work" and more about material and conceptual exploration (205).[42] As applied to the material study of the book by Griffin, this emphasis on material and experiential analysis bypasses politics, eg. the very notions of gender, race, and power imbalances which have and continue to inform the lives of bookmakers in every period and continent of history. If we focus on the printed book in England alone from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries we witness the consolidation and removal of power through the

---

[42] Matt Ratto, "Critical Making," in *Open Design Now: Why Design Cannot Remain Exclusive*, edited by Bas van Abel and Lucas Evers, Amsterdam, BIS Publishers, 2011, pp. 203-209.

Stationers' Company as well as the rise and fall of the "mechanickal"[43] class of workers who

were its members, and that is without engaging with the legal realities of women who operated

as printers, binders, and booksellers in the pre-Industrial market. (It goes without saying the post-

Industrial market was uglier by far.[44])

Critical making is also firmly founded in the language of the tech sector and computer

science, and was originally meant to refer primarily to hardware and software before being

appropriated by Griffin. Ratto states that:

> The term "critical making" is intended to highlight the interwoven material and
> conceptual work that making involves. As a teaching and research strategy,
> critical making shares on emphasis on "values" with both critical design and other
> critical practices—such as the critical technical practice from which it derives, as
> well as value-sensitive design and values-in-design. I take the exploration of
> values in society and their implementation and concretization within technical
> artefacts as my starting point, choosing to explore these through a series of
> processes that attempt to connect humanistic practices of conceptual and scholarly
> exploration to design methodologies including storyboarding, brainstorming and
> bodystorming, and prototyping. (205)

The language Ratto utilizes here is drawn specifically from the early study and design of AI, or

Artificial Intelligence, systems. "Value-sensitive design" and "values-in-design" refer to the

logic found in computing that individual and social values—or what we and Ratto might think of

as politics— are equally important inputs to the technology design process.

---

[43] "Mechanick" (or "mechanickal") signifies a craftsman and craft work. Richard Atkyns's 1664 *The Original and Growth of Printing* briefly describes the term as applied to the print trades "doth in the Strict Sense comprehend Printers, Founders of Letters, and Book-Binders" (7). The term is perhaps best known through the "rude mechanickals" of Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (III.2: 9). Patricia Parker's analysis of the play in her essay "Rude mechanicals" (1996) looks at the social disruptions of tradesmen in the sixteenth century as a function of changing social values in artisanal work.

[44] For instance, nineteenth-century gynecological manuals anecdotally describe miscarriages and birth defects experienced by women working in printing and typecasting shops of the time. For example, James Craven Wood's *A Text-book of Gynecology* (Philadelphia: Boericke &Tafel, 1894) presents a brief case study of "a woman that worked at cleaning printers' type …. suffer[ed] menorrhagia… [and] also had the symptoms of chronic lead poisoning. I learned from her that, previous to her present employment, she had been delivered of three healthy children at full term, still alive; but that since her employment as a type polisher she has suffered much from ill health. Three months after taking to this employment she became tainted with lead poisoning, and suffered from printers' colic. Four years later she had a second attack of colic and suffered intense pain; shortly after she became pregnant and was delivered of a dead child" (16).

Ratto cites as relevant Philip E. Agre's 1997 essay "Toward a Critical Technical Practice: Lessons Learned in Trying to Reform AI" which analyzes the discursive practices inherent in the day-to-day construction of computer systems generally and AI development in particular.[45] Agre himself particularly notes the breakdown in language itself among programmers, finding that:

> The strategic vagueness of AI vocabulary, and the use of technical schemata to narrate the operation of technical artifacts in intentional terms, is not a matter of conscious deception. It does permit AI's methods to seem broadly applicable, even when particular applications require a designer to make, often without knowing it, some wildly unreasonable assumptions. At the same time, it is also self-defeating. It has the consequence, at least in my own experience, that AI people find it remarkably difficult to conceptualize alternatives to their existing repertoire of technical schemata. (142)

Effectively, Ratto's argument for the "bypassing" of "politics" is undone by his own source, who notes that gaps in language are not a function of deception or lack of importance, but are simply overlooked by programmers who are focused on the practices that work specifically for them as individuals. Rather than being unimportant to critical technical practices like critical making, the politics of our social values are *incredibly important* to the technologies that we build and then use; to bypass them is not only problematic but, theoretically, at least in the context of AI work, even dangerous. The ideological impulse of critical making is therefore muddied within its own intellectual genealogy from Agre to Griffin. While the emphasis on analyzing technical processes has remained, the emphasis on the equal importance of social values has been lost.

Empirical Bibliography

In a different intellectual direction from critical making, instead stemming from the

---

[45] Philip E. Agre, "Toward a Critical Technical Practice: Lessons Learned in Trying to Reform AI," in *Social Science, Technical Systems, and Cooperative Work*: *Beyond the Great Divide*, edited by Geoffrey Bowker, Susan Leigh Star, and Les Gasser, Erlbaum, 1997, pp. 131-158.

familiar discourses of analytical and historical bibliography, is empirical bibliography. Empirical

bibliography is what librarians Todd Samuelson and Christopher Morrow call "an effort to

understand the manner in which a book was constructed through immediate physical experience

(including the systematic and repeatable process of testing and verification based on historical

methodology)" (86).[46] However, bibliography as a discipline has historically ignored questions

of gender and race, with inquiries into power imbalances limited primarily to the history of

censorship—or supposed censorship, as more recent scholarship has reconceived of guild law as

more like union protections rather than purely the machinery of state control.[47] The intellectual

assumptions and limitations of traditional bibliography are therefore echoed in empirical

bibliography's Anglo-European focus on print practices.

Samuelson and Morrow also specifically locate the genealogical and pedagogical origins

of their practice in the work of noted bibliographers Ronald McKerrow and Philip Gaskell[48],

noting that those bibliographers' printing programs and laboratories were both founded on the

idea of a functional "bibliographical press"[49] that could be used with students. Gaskell drew

---

[46] Todd Samuelson and Christopher L. Morrow. "Empirical Bibliography: A Decade of Book History at Texas A&M." *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* vol. 109, no. 1, 2015, pp. 83–109.

[47] See Patrick Wallis, "Labor, Law, and Training in Early Modern London: Apprenticeship and the City's Institutions," *Journal of British Studies* 51: 791–819 (October 2012); Wallis and Ian A. Gadd, "Reaching beyond the city wall: London guilds and national regulation, 1500–1700," in *Guilds, Innovation and the European Economy, 1400-1800*, edited by Stephan R. Epstein and M. Prak, Cambridge University Press, 2008, pp. 288-315.

[48] McKerrow is probably best remembered for his 1927 classic *An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students*, which became a model of bibliographic scholarship for at least a generation and was reprinted by the Oak Knoll Press in 1995. Philip Gaskell's *A New Introduction to Bibliography* (New Castle, Oak Knoll Press, 1972.) was a direct update of McKerrow and has been continuously updated and in print ever since, with the most recent edition published in 2006. Both of these classics, alas, deservedly shoulder the blame for bibliography's reputation as an exceedingly dry discipline.

[49] See Gaskell, "Bibliographical Press Movement," *Journal of the Printing Historical Society* vol. 1, 1965, pp. 1-13. "A simple press" is also delightfully vague for contemporary bibliographers; while the article goes into more depth on the variety of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century iron handpresses that Gaskell and others utilized in their work, contemporary printers will likely find these and other machines heavy to move and expensive to purchase. Modern table-top presses are available but are not inexpensive themselves, as well as involving a variety of different technological challenges in teaching imposition and so forth. In short, while Gaskell jokes about running short of grant money while purchasing equipment in this article, he could scarce imagine the economic challenges of printing programs in the twenty-first century.

directly from McKerrow to build "a workshop or laboratory which is carried on chiefly for the purpose of demonstrating and investigating the printing practices of the past by means of setting type by hand, and of printing from it on a simple press" (1).[50] Gaskell goes on to offer a problematic defense of bibliographical pedagogy, noting that "For most people, a few minutes in which printing equipment is actually seen in use is worth more than hours of reading textbooks about it" (6) while at the same time dismissing teachers who are "actually hostile to bibliography" with a flippant "I do not feel that we need to take them very seriously" (5). Samuelson and Morrow instead opt to link more closely to Terry Belanger's work in establishing the Rare Book School in the early 1980s with an "emphasis on tactile pedagogy while engaging with the history of the book" (93) that champions experiential work without denigrating scholarly criticism or theory in the process.

Empirical bibliography examines historical practices for pedagogical purposes but acknowledges the limitations of true re-enactment. "More than any other factor," Samuelson and Morrow state, "the selection of the equipment determines the degree to which the pedagogical process will emphasize historical verismilitude" (90). While Samuelson and Morrow primarily apply this rationale specifically with regards to presses (and indeed, the locating, purchasing, and moving of printing presses are significant monetary and logistical hurdles), the point still stands with all other equipment needed: metal versus wooden composing sticks, oil-based versus rubber-based inks, woodcut blocks versus linoleum blocks, and so forth. Whether as a function of saving time, money, or sanity, the approach acknowledges that truly accurate historical reproductions and recreations may be sacrificed for the needs of the modern classroom and its

---

[50] This emphasis on specifically print practices as a codification of the pedagogy of book history has its own problems and provisos, which I will cover in more depth in Chapter 4.

students; for instance, linoleum blocks are much cheaper and easier to carve to produce "woodcuts" than are traditional wood blocks, and typecasting demonstrations are easier when making use of an electric crucible, rather than building a period-accurate smithy from scratch.

A Problem of Pedagogy?: Intersections, Denials, and Conclusions

These converging methodologies of experiential learning in the classroom set up what amounts to an ideological conflict between the sharing and analysis of a technology and creating and upholding a set of "values" while doing so. The values of critical making as underscored and transmitted through Ratto and Griffin look to a sensory experience for students, while the values championed by Samuelson and Morrow emphasize the particular value of printing processes specifically for bibliography and literary students. However, neither Agre, Ratto, McKerrow, Gaskell, nor Samuelson and Morrow mention or acknowledge gender, race, or class as values that are themselves reflected—or rather, *not* reflected—in their respective discourses of technology and pedagogy. In short, the values shared by these historians and bibliographers assume a genderless and colorless individual working a machine that is equally genderless and colorless. As such, these methodologies create a space that is, if not inherently hostile, at the very least problematic for people who are not an intellectual default but instead do, indeed, have gender and color.

This disciplinary and pedagogical crux therefore finds women in a liminal space, both present as people and erased as gendered bodies. While much of the emphasis given over to recreating print practices is couched as "preserving skills" and "bodily experience," we should keep in mind how gendered bodies have informed the reception and the value of these processes.

34

Book production is not now, nor has ever been, a genderless act; where there are bodies at work, there are sexes in play. By denying these aspects, we are creating a neutral view of work that is ahistorical, and should be revisited with these thoughts in mind. The rise and fall of print production is inextricably bound up with economics and class issues: printers of the fifteenth through the seventeenth centuries were primarily an artisanal, creative class; from the eighteenth to the twentieth it became an increasingly working class trade subject to brutal conditions and abuses. We would not ignore the strictures or social biases of class in any other context, and we should not ignore the contexts of gender either, however they might be reconstructed or recovered.

Further, in the era of #MeToo it behooves feminist scholars to not only acknowledge erasures but to revisit practical histories with social justice in mind. Bibliography's history as an overwhelmingly white, heteronormative, and masculine space has thus far limited scholarship by discouraging minority scholars, either inadvertently through emphasizing traditional canon work, or purposefully by assuming an off-putting intellectual superiority in which a certain kind of scholar or scholarship need not be taken seriously (per Gaskell[51]). It is, after all, these gendered, classed, and raced bodies that perform the work in making books and reflect the context of their making. Whether it is women bookbinders performing lower-salaried and lower-valued work, or Emily Faithful's all-women Victoria Press in the 1860s as an attempt at fair wage practices, or the brief proliferation of lesbian presses in the 1970s, the history of printing and publishing

---

[51] Following an analysis of what departments and professors teach bibliography and printing, Gaskell writes in his article on "The Bibliographical Press Movement" (ibid.): "A few teachers of English, indeed, are actually hostile to bibliography, as if contact with so arid and niggling a discipline will interfere with the sensitivity and inspiration of their criticism; but perhaps their opposition really springs from a fear that bibliography, with its 'algebra' and its practicality, will be beyond them. In any case, I do not feel that we need to take them very seriously" (5). Presumably the "we" to which Gaskell refers to is print historians generally, but it's a surprisingly partisan statement to find buried in the middle of an academic article!

involves women whose gender is inextricably linked to the production and reception of their texts. The intersections of body, technology, and gender haunt attempts to make sense of the past as well as the present. In looking for ways to recover and revise narratives of bibliography and of women printers, I have come across example after example of women's work in the trades as well as scholarship on the same, only to find that the same problems that minimize their contributions historically have uncanny echoes in the present.

The first problem is a denial of space—in reference works and in scholarly venues. Works such as *The Oxford Companion to the History of the Book* (2010)[52] and its mass-market counterpart *The Book: A Global History* (2013)[53] contain no entries for "Gender," "Sex," "Race," or "Women." At the same time, the single woman indexed most frequently in these volumes (four times) is J.K. Rowling, as multitudinous references to the *Harry Potter* franchise outweighs scholarly investigation into women's roles in the book trade or as authors. At the same time, an analysis of the last decade of presentations at the annual Society for the History of Authorship, Reading and Publishing shows an increase in papers on women and other minority groups accepted, they still make up a minority of presentations: papers specifically on women in any context vary from less than 4% to 10%, with a median of 5.93% across eleven years. (This is a notable contrast from the single paper on LGBT material during the same period.)[54]

The second problem is a denial of revision—in that the scholarship that has been done to revise and revitalize our narratives of book history is not always utilized in pedagogical readers and, therefore, not in classrooms. The first and most commonly used reader, David Finkelstein

---

[52] Michael F. Suarez and Henry R. Woudhuysen, eds., *The Oxford Companion to the Book.* Two volumes. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010.
[53] Michael F. Suarez and Henry R. Woudhuysen, eds., *The Book: A Global History*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013.
[54] These numbers are drawn from a currently unpublished analysis with Kate Ozment on SHARP Program Data, 2008-2018.

and Alistair McCleery's *The Book History Reader*[55], first published in 2002 and updated in 2006, demonstrates both the common trends and fallacies of the field. Of its forty collected essays, all recognized as vital and relevant to the field, only nine are by women scholars and none have a focus on women or gender. To their credit, however, "women" does appear in the book's index, with the following subheadings: "and African American literary clubs"; "and anthologies"; "in colonial New England *see* New England"; "familial control over reading when young"; "literacy"; "as reading teachers"; "religio-political polemicism of and use of print"; "role in creation of canonical texts"; "and Victorian novelists"; "and writing," with this final topic referenced on a single page (560). Women in book history are therefore positioned in the textbook as primarily consumers and disseminators rather than producers of texts in any role. This reflects multiple and particular biases in the field towards women's historical roles that also goes on to inform the assumptions that are made by the next generation of scholars as to what is "known" about book history. In contrast, Michelle Levy and Tom Mole's *The Broadview Reader in Book History* (2015)[56] includes more women scholars in their selections (seven out of thirty-three, and thus only a sliver of improvement) with two essays on, respectively, feminist practice and on women writers. However, this anthology does not have references for "women" or "gender" in the index, so the problem is reinforced in a different way.

These twin denials reiterate the persistent problem of absence and erasure that is found in studies of print culture and book history, and one that therefore haunts the issue of recovery. To recover lost labor, it is useful to try recreating it. However, as this chapter has shown, the very modes of recreating historical processes through experiential learning, whether as critical making

---

[55] Finkelstein and McCleery, ibid.
[56] Levy and Mole, ibid.

or as empirical bibliography, carry their own disciplinary limitations and values that problematize such spaces for women. The next step, then, is in revisiting the historical record to study and recovery the locations of women, their work, and their space in seventeenth-century England.

Fig. 2. The Common Press of the Book History Workshop. The common press of the Book History Workshop at Texas A&M University was built by Steven Pratt. Unpublished photograph printed with the permission of Todd Samuelson.

CHAPTER III

REGULATING SPACE:

CONTEXTUALIZING THE STATIONERS' COMPANY OF LONDON[57]

In *The Writing of History*, Michel de Certeau quotes G. de Rohan-Csermak, referring to spatiality as "the synchronic picture of a system that has no history" (210).[58] While we usually think of historiography as a series of secondary sources and interpretations linking primary sources with scholarship, it also disconnects our intellectual grounding in conceptualizing the past from real people and objects (as Darnton's famous "communications circuit" likewise made writers, printers, booksellers, and readers genderless—and so a masculine default). What I have found is that, in contrast, space itself *does* have a history, and it is a history that is further complicated by gender: the two must not be made separate. Recovering women's work in the book trades is contingent on questions of access and control through trade; in England the regulating body in charge of these aspects was the Stationers' Company.

It is worth keeping in mind that during the period prior to the Company's devolution in the eighteenth century, there was a shifting number of only 22 to 26 printing houses operating in London, and thus at any given time only 22-26 masters, 40-52 journeymen, and 40-80 apprentices—and this out of a population of 15-30,000 freedmen out of a total city population

---

[57] A great deal of information for this chapter, especially in terms of specific document titles, was culled from Ian Gadd's Course Workbook for Rare Book School course H-80, "The Stationers' Company to 1775," which I attended in the summer of 2014.

[58] See *The Writing of History.* Trans. Tom Conley. New York, Columbia University Press, 1988. De Rohan-Csermak's article originally appeared in French as "La premiere apparition du terme 'ethnologie'" in *Ethnologie europa* vol.1, no. 14, 1967, pp. 170-184.

that waxed from 200,000 to 550,000 over the course of the century.[59] In short, the number of printers was very small and they were very intimately connected to one another through business, legal, and familial ties. James Raven's states in *Bookscape: Geographies of Printing and Publishing in London Before 1800* that "the experience and apprehension of space moves beyond the territory of place, but place (here, mostly printing houses and bookshops) also needs secure historical analysis to identify movement, continuity, and the historical context of site" (144).[60] He also states that "place that was essentially sited and locational intersected with space that was social and performative. Identity was closely related to performance; the locus of agency was critical to the object of that activity" (148). However, to be a Stationer, whether in the context of printer, engraver, bookbinder, bookseller, punchcutter, or papermaker, was to have a legally-recognized identity as a tradesman even if one *did not practice* the trade in question; performance of identity was located in one's legally registered status on paper as well. Making sense of this conflicting puzzle of identity and performance is therefore a challenge to distinguishing what, exactly, book tradespeople were actually *doing* in their everyday lives.

This chapter will examine the Stationers' Company (abbreviated to SC) in depth as a legal and intellectual entity. While women were not formal members of the Company for much of its history, they were nonetheless firmly located within it as practitioners and as individuals with viable claims to its resources. As Helen Smith notes, "women's labor is one of the material subtexts of the books we have inherited, and should be read alongside those books as a

---

[59] See Michael Treadwell, "A New List of English Master Printers, c.1686." *The Library*, series 6, vol 4, 1982, pp. 57-61; Ian Gadd, "Were Books Different? The Stationers' Company in Civil War London, 1640-1645," in *Institutional Culture in Early Modern Society*, edited by Anne Goldgar and Robert I. Frost (Leiden & Boston, Brill, 2004, pp. 35-58); Peter W.M. Blayney, *The Stationers' Company and the Printers of London, 1501–1557* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013).

[60] James Raven, *Bookscape: Geographies of Printing and Publishing in London Before 1800*. London, British Library, 2014.

provocation and a challenge to the work of interpretation" (134).[61] While Smith covers multiple case studies of women as Stationers, she does not examine the Company itself closely and thus leaves a gap to be explored, one I hope to analyze more fully below.

The Stationers' Company and Defining the English Guild System

First and foremost, the Stationers' Company was part of the English guild system, and it should be noted that, as such, it operated in a very specific framework different from that of the guilds on the Continent. The term "guild" is itself a highly contentious one; the *Oxford English Dictionary* specifically defines it as "a confraternity, brotherhood, or association formed for the mutual aid and protection of its members, or for the prosecution of some common purpose," with an emphasis on its medieval origins and the adoption and adaptation of that medieval usage by others since.[62] In his essay, "Were Books Different? The Stationers' Company in Civil War London, 1640-1645," Ian Gadd notes with reservation the usage of "guild" in English to denote specifically "religious fraternities" (38)[63], and in their collaborative essay, "Reaching beyond the city wall: London guilds and national regulation, 1500–1700," Patrick Wallis and Gadd state that their usage of the word "guild" (and thus the usage I will adopt here),

> was originally used to mean any association that required subscription payments. However, a few historians have felt the term should only be used to describe the religious fraternities from which many of the London companies developed as opposed to describing the companies themselves. (Company, mystery, and craft were the usual terms employed by contemporaries; guild was used rarely if at all in the period.) In spite of this, many modern English historians have co-opted

---

[61] Smith, 2012, ibid.
[62] See "guild | gild, n." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, June 2019, www.oed.com/view/Entry/82328. Accessed 29 August 2019.
[63] Ian Gadd, 2004, ibid.

guild as a generic term to describe craft and trade organizations, to the extent that it has become ubiquitous. (288)[64]

Ubiquity has a tendency to remove the nuances of meaning and replace it with a different set of connotations, which is why I want to set up this definition up front before examining the SC directly. In particular, the usage of "guild" as being historically identified with religious fraternities may underlie much of the assumed homosociality of guild work. In short, Wallis and Gadd note that the term has been mis-used in the scholarship for so long that its original meaning has been lost and that its current usage has been uninterrogated. Indeed, this is similar to the problem Blayney writes of, regarding the problematic interchangeable usage of "printer" and "publisher."

Scholarly views of the Worshipful Company of Stationers have shifted significantly in recent years. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, first published in 1932 and edited by Sir Paul Harvey[65], has this to say on the subject:

> **Stationers' Company, THE**, was incorporated by royal charter in 1557. No one, not a member of the Company, might print anything for sale in the kingdom unless authorized by special privilege or patent. Moreover, by the rules of the Company, every member was required to enter in the register of the Company the name of any book that he desired to print, so that these registers furnish valuable information regarding printed matter during the latter part of the 16th cent. The Company's control of the printing trade waned during the 17th cent., to be revived, in a modified form, under the Copyright Act of 1709. (744)

This is the entry in total; the entry itself is unsigned. Its brevity is revealing, especially in its emphasis on the supposed control held by the Company; the narrative of the SC as a strongman's organization acting as censoring government body may well have originated here. This entry remained unchanged in subsequent editions through the Sixth Edition, edited by Margaret

---

[64] Patrick Wallis and Ian A. Gadd, "Reaching beyond the city wall: London guilds and national regulation, 1500–1700," in *Guilds, Innovation and the European Economy, 1400-1800*, edited by Stephan R. Epstein and Maarten Prak, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2008, pp. 288-315.
[65] Paul Harvey, ed. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature.* Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1932.

Drabble, in 2000.[66] The entry in the Seventh Edition, published in 2009, is the first to consider

the Company beyond emphasizing its role in government regulation. In it, Henry Woudhuysen

(unsigned; attribution per Ian Gadd[67]) briefly expands on the previous definition to emphasize

that "The Company was not responsible for licensing or censorship" but rather as a mechanism

to create, maintain, and enforce copyrights (948).[68] Tracing this shift in definitions is valuable

because it clearly points to re-examinations of historical givens. Revising our view of the

historical apparatuses necessary to book production helps us reconceive how the book created as

both a physical and intellectual object.

　　While my emphasis throughout this work is gender—a concept that it is itself beset by

the problems of abstract notion and physical reality—I hope to show that revising book histories

to take gender into account is less a radical insertion and more of an additional, needed revision

to how we "read" books materially and intellectually. The rise of book history as a discipline of

its own has provided opportunities for revising attitudes towards the Company, and so away

from the previous view of a censorious entity and towards a picture of a professional

organization focused on matters of trade. Similarly, the rise of women's book history creates, I

hope, opportunities for recovering and expanding upon the roles of women as book tradeswomen

within the Company. Indeed, noting the intersections of histories of women's labor and the

history of the book is necessary for creating a holistic narrative of Stationers and book history.

---

[66] Margaret Drabble, ed. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, sixth edition. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000.

[67] Communicated during lecture as part of his Rare Book School Course on the History of the Stationers in July 2014.

[68] Dinah Birch, ed. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, seventh edition. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009.

While the Stationers' Company archives[69] are remarkably complete and holds nearly half

a millennium of continuous record-keeping, it also creates an illusory narrative of completeness

(much like the false sense one gets from *Early English Books Online (EEBO)*[70] of that database's

universal coverage): surely, therefore, we know all there is to know about the people and events

of the trade. However, there has only been a single complete history of the SC to date: Cyprian

Blagden's *The Stationers' Company, A History, 1403-1959*, published in 1960.[71] Blagden's work

was aimed at a popular audience rather than an academic one; much of his analysis lacks clear

and useful citations. For instance, he claims that there was the "practice, which was fairly

common later in the [seventeenth] century but strictly forbidden at the beginning" stipulating that

girls were only accepted as apprentices if they came from a bookbinder's family (117). Given the

multiplicity of trades the Stationers represented, this is both oddly specific and rather strange, as

one would assume that additional family ties to members of *any* of the book trades, whether

papermakers, printers, or typefounders, would be as eminently useful as bookbinders. The

statement is also backed-up by nothing, with no clear links to documentary evidence of any kind.

In short, Blagden's research is opaque and his results unreproducible, making it a dubious source

to reference even if it is the only one of its kind.

In contrast, Peter Blayney's more recent *The Stationers' Company and the Printers of*

London, 1501–1557 (2013) has every statement backed up by solid, footnoted research.[72]

---

[69] Accessing the Stationers' archive has historically been a challenge: Efforts to transcribe records in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century were never finished, and some volumes were lost during the Blitz in World War II. A microfilm set of extant records was produced for institutional purchase, but even these copies are scarce. More recent efforts have led to the publishing of *Literary Print Culture: The Stationers' Company Archive, London* by Adam Matthew Digital in 2018, a database containing scans of archival records but limited identifying meta-data and negligible transcription.
[70] Text Creation Partnership. *Early English Books Online (EEBO)*. 2003-2019. https://eebo.chadwyck.com/home. Accessed 5 October 2019.
[71] Cyprian Blagden, *The Stationers' Company, A History, 1403-1959*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1960.
[72] Blayney, 2013, ibid.

However, it covers only a single half-century of the institution's history, and while the Company's founding and legitimization is incredibly important in setting its functional norms for the next hundred and fifty years, its usefulness as a guide beyond this period is rather limited. Indeed, the work's greatest service is in its thorough explication and unwinding of a number of terms that scholars have used interchangeably, such as "printer" and "publisher." In unwinding the more convoluted expansion and condensation of the SC's powers and permissions over time, however, it can only effectively set the stage rather than perform the entirety of the play.

Thus there are two additional challenges to understanding the SC: the first is comprehending its actual history in context, and the second is the necessity of likewise examining its *cultural* history, how it has been (and is) perceived popularly and in the academy.[73] As seen above, until very recently academic perception of the SC has been constrained to a singular view on the apparatus of press censorship, with little notice taken of its other functions and operations. Popular perception of the SC, especially via its official website[74] (which contains a rotating series of events, most of which consist of lavish charity dinners and leisure trips to distilleries), is more varied but seemingly limited to a handful of historical texts, with little contemporary attention beyond Blagden and, possibly, the SC itself as a modern conglomerate of business magnates in the communications and publishing industries who meet for charity and social purposes. The popular image of the SC has similarly focused on it as a trade organization. The following discussion will focus on analysis of texts about the SC through histories both academic and popular, which variously define or contextualize the SC as a historical organization either inimical to, or aiding in, printing as a trade.

---

[73] The Worshipful Company of Stationers still exists today, albeit with a greater emphasis on the communications industry writ large rather than the publishing trade.
[74] Found online at https://stationers.org/. Accessed 5 October 2019.

Christopher Barker's 1582 "A note on the state of the Company of Printers, Bookesellers, and Bookebynders, comprehending vnder the name of Stacioners, with a valuation also of all the l[ett]res patentes concerning printing" is the first account of SC history.[75] It exists as a manuscript submitted to William Cecil, with a full transcript contained in the first volume of Arber's *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers 1554-1640*, but otherwise did not appear in print.[76] Barker dates the founding of the SC through the actions of Queen Mary Tudor.[77] Though a key moment, this was not the start of the SC, as it had evolved from the previous body of the Text-Writers and the Limners' guild established in 1403 (and always separate from the Worshipful Company of Scriveners, itself founded in 1373 as a specific body of legal clerks and notaries). What the Charter allowed besides Crown recognition was its legal status of a corporation, which allowed it to own property (and so a guild hall, among other things) and to go or be taken to court[78], and to petition for greater powers beyond those that would have been recognized by the City of London.

---

[75] Christopher Barker, "A note on the state of the Company of Printers, Bookesellers, and Bookebynders, comprehending vnder the name of Stacioners, with a valuation also of all the l[ett]res patentes concerning printing." 1582, British Library, MS Lansdowne 48, art. 82, ff.189-94. Full transcript in *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers 1554-1640 AD,* vol. 1, edited by Edward Arber, London & Birmingham, Private printing, 1874, pp. 116, 144.

[76] Arber, 1875-94, ibid.

[77] "In the tyme of Q[ueen]. Marie the Company procured a Charter for the *establishing of a corporation*; in the which the Queene gyveth aucthoritie to all Stacioners, and none other, to print all laufull bookes, excepting suche as had ben granted, or should be speciall licence be after graunted to any person. Therein lacked his word *Printer-Stacioners*, so that printing is free, to bookesellers, bookebinders, Joyners, Chaundlers, and all other being ffreemen of the said corporation vnder the name of Stacioners whether they be Masters or Journemen[.] This Charter was ratified and confirmed by our soueraigne Lady the Queenes Maiestie that now is, so that the Booksellers being growen the greater and wealthier nomber haue nowe many of the best Copies and keep no printing howse…" (italic emphasis added; Arber 114-116).

[78] Cyndia Susan Clegg's *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997) and *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001) both examine legal cases involving the SC and its movements throughout the changing court systems of the periods examined. However, her emphasis on the SC as a censoring body maintains the prevalent view of the Company as little more than a censoring body rather than as a trade organization.

Another popular work, the 1633 edition of John Stow's *The Survey of London*[79] is the

first to include a supplement on the London Companies, including the Stationers. It emphasizes

the antiquity of the Companies, referencing the pre-history of the SC prior to its incorporation;

there are also chapters on buildings of London with commentary on their relationships to the

Companies. Interestingly, the entry on the Stationers ascribes the Charter as being "granted the

fourth day of May, in the third and fourth yeeres of King *Philip* and Queen *Mary*" (italics

original; 3I2r). A 1645 account in SC Liber A reiterates this account, noting that "the ancient

Brotherhood and Charter the said Corporacion hath byn governed for the Space of 240 yeares

w^{th}out Interuption" (f.153). The key point here is that these two texts, one for a popular audience

and the one for "private" (i.e. the Company's own members) usage emphasize its history as a

trade organization rather than anything else. Finally, Gadd notes that at the very end of the book

is an odd document "concerning the Jurisdiction of the River of Thames, to be inserted p. 26"

which is two letters about censorship.[80] The first letter says p. 26 was supposed to be removed

but was not, and the second letter says they will add this document so people will know p. 26

was supposed to be removed but was not. Since the SC could have actually just removed the

page and said nothing, there is a mystery as to why they simply did not. This document has been

---

[79] John Stow, *The survey of London containing the original, increase, modern estate and government of that city, methodically set down : with a memorial of those famouser acts of charity, which for publick and pious vses have been bestowed by many worshipfull citizens and benefactors : as also all the ancient and modern monuments erected in the churches, not only of those two famous cities, London and Westminster, but (now newly added) four miles compass / begun first by the pains and industry of John Stow, in the year 1598 ; afterwards inlarged by the care and diligence of A.M. in the year 1618 ; and now compleatly finished by the study & labour of A.M., H.D. and others, this present year 1633 ; whereunto, besides many additions (as appears by the contents) are annexed divers alphabetical tables, especially two, the first, an index of things, the second, a concordance of names.* London, Printed for Nicholas Bourn, and are to be sold at his shop at the south entrance of the Royal-Exchange, 1633. *Early English Books Online (EEBO).* http://gateway.proquest.com.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:24448867. Accessed 5 October 2019.
[80] Communicated during lecture in July 2014; see footnote 10.

in all the copies of the book Gadd has looked at; it's an intriguing insight into how functional (or not) the SC actually was as a body.

A later example is the 1643 *To the High Court of Parliament: The Humble Remonstrance of the Company of Stationers, London.*[81] This document is a petition by the SC to the government early on in the English Civil War, a period in which the SC's power dramatically waned as the King's rule, and Parliament, were intermittently suspended, nonexistent, or unenforced:

> For, upon further examination, it must needs cleerly appear, That the late decay of the Stationers (chiefly brought upon them by want of due and Politick regulation) has been an occasion of emboldning Printers to run into enormious disorders, and in the like manner the same disorders have been a further occasion of bringing a decay upon the Company" (lIv).

The "disorders" referenced are the setting up of printers and printing houses without the approval of the SC; this included both political and religious radicals who were printing tracts and news sheets. The Stationers of course considered these efforts as legal infringements on their traditional powers, even if the material printed and those printing it were not necessarily infringing on either the copyrights or labor resources of the Company.

By the second half of the seventeenth century, three more books of note appeared: an anonymous *A Brief Discourse Concerning Printing and Printers* in 1663[82], Richard Atkyns's 1664 *The Original and Growth of Printing*[83], and of course Moxon's 1683 *Mechanick*

---

[81] Printed anonymously but with a handwritten attribution to Henry Parker, see Gadd 2004. The 1663 *Brief Discourse Concerning Printing and Printers* also mentions Parker as the author in the text.

[82] Anonymous, *A Brief Discourse Concerning Printing and Printers.* London, A Society of Printers, 1663.

[83] Richard Atkyns, *The Original and Growth of Printing*. London, John Streater, 1664.

Exercises[84]. These were all histories, aimed at a popular rather than scholarly audience, with no (known) associations with the Company, and indeed, rather critical of it. Like Moxon, Atkyns's book locates the establishment of the press at Oxford as the beginning of print in England, although William Caxton had established his printing house without affiliation two years prior (see Carter 1975 and Gadd 2013). The imprint to *Brief Discourse* says that it was "Printed for A Society of Printers" in contrast to the usual (and requisite for SC materials) notation "Printed for the Company of Stationers." Margaret Ezell identifies this Society as a group that then licensed censer Roger L'Estrange called "the Confederate Stationers" of Thomas Brewster, Livewell Chapman, Simon Dover, Thomas Creake, and Giles and Elizabeth Calvert.[85] The Society's anti-SC stance was founded in their resistance to King Charles's restoration, and even extension, of guild powers of search and seizure. The *Brief Discourse* was therefore part of ongoing debates regarding copyrights (and censorship) that were likewise founded in the tensions between the SC and the Oxford University Press.

Meanwhile, Atkyns's *Original and Growth of Printing* first appeared as a single broadside in 1660, but by 1664 it was expanded and reprinted as a quarto containing lengthy addresses first to the King and then to Parliament; it also takes care to cite Stow's *Survey* as well as Baker's *Chronicle of the Kings of England from the Time of the Romans' Government unto the Death of King James* (1643)[86] and Howell's *Londinopolis: An Historical Discourse or*

---

[84] The *Mechanick Exercises* was first published serially in fourteen issues from 1678-1680, before being republished in 1683 as a single volume. The text quoted and referenced throughout this work will be the 1683 text. See Jagger 1995, p. 199, and Hargrave 2015, p.172.
[85] Margaret Ezell, *The Oxford English Literary History: Volume V: 1645–1714: The Later Seventeenth Century: Companion Volume*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2017, pp. 130-131.
[86] Sir Richard Baker, *Chronicle of the Kings of England from the Time of the Romans' Government unto the Death of King James*. London, George Sawbridge and Thomas Williams, 1643.

Perlustration of London and Westminster (1657)[87] to place itself firmly as a historical work first

and foremost— and as a historical work, harshly judgmental of the practices of the SC:

> And whereas before they Printed nothing but by the Kings especiall Leave and
> Command, they now (being free) set up for themselves to print what they could
> get most Money by... Thus was this excellent and desireable ART, within less
> than one hundred years, so totally vitiated, that whereas they were before the
> King's Printers and Servants, they now grew so poor, so numerous, and
> contemptible, by being Concorporated, that they turn'd this famous ART into a
> Mechanick Trade for a Livelyhood. (6-7)[88]

In short, Atkyns accuses the Stationers of being more interested in making money through

popular print than in serving their King and country (though why this should be a surprise given

that they were a mercantile guild is a bit of a mystery), and makes the direct argument that

previous generations of printers had been an artisan class who are now falling in stature to a

lower class of trade worker. This is interesting because Atkyns's narrative parallels that of the

Stationers above and their "late decay" as recounted in the *Humble Remonstrance*, but locates

the problem as stemming from the guild's own practices.

Finally, Moxon's *Mechanick Exercises* (1677-1683) is conspicuous in the absence of any

mention of the SC. In his Preface he cites the work of Dr. (John) Wallis, a Professor of Geometry

at Oxford who became Keeper of the University Archives in 1658 and whose manuscripts on the

history of the setting up of the press there are still held at Oxford; in their annotated edition of

Moxon, Herbert Davis and Harry Carter note that "Wallis was concerned with finding grounds

for the defense of the University's right to print 'all manner of books' against attacks by the

---

[87] James Howell, *Londinopolis, an historicall discourse or perlustration of the city of London, the imperial chamber, and chief emporium of Great Britain whereunto is added another of the city of Westminster, with the courts of justice, antiquities, and new buildings thereunto belonging….* London, J. Streater, 1657. *Early English Books Online (EEBO).* http://gateway.proquest.com.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:12539624. Accessed 5 October 2019.
[88] Atkyns, 1664 ibid.

Stationers' Company" (5).[89] Moxon mentions the invention of "Typographie" in China, then fifteenth-century German printers, Caxton, and the founding of the Oxford University Press, but neither acknowledges nor describes the SC. Between this significant lacuna and the citation of Wallis, it seems possible there was a subtextual critique of the Company in Moxon's writing, despite the fact that his brother was a member. This growing enmity against the SC, founded through its rivalry with Oxford, would culminate in the removal of many of its powers through deregulation, starting with the Printing Act of 1696 which stripped the limitations on licensing and title registry, among others.

In 1720, John Strype's *A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster*[90] expanded upon the corporate supplement found in Stowe, with the SC getting five pages, versus the Scriveners who have a few paragraphs. Strype couldn't access the SC records as he was not a member of the SC, so he built the account from other records and documents; he notes that "Of this Corporation are *Printers*, *Booksellers*, and such as sell Paper and Parchment, and Blank Books bound up for the Use of Tradesmen and Merchants: and these last are now peculiarly called *Stationers*" (221a, italics original). And so, from power to peculiarity: eighteenth- and nineteenth-century accounts increasingly portray the SC as an anachronism of the bad old days before ultimately emphasizing the narrative of the controlling and censoring body mentioned above, a narrative that, as has been demonstrated, is still being rewritten.

Despite ongoing scholarly attempts, like those of Blayney and Gadd, to revise the history of the SC, the bulk of historical references to the Company remain "peculiar," particularly in volumes of typographical curiosities. Such anecdotal studies as Joseph Ames's *Typographical*

---

[89] Moxon, 1978 reprint, ibid.
[90] John Strype, *A survey of the cities of London and Westminster and the Borough of Southwark written at first in the year 1698 (i.e. 1598). Corrected, improved, and very much enlarged in the year 1720 by John Strype.* London, W. Innys, J. Richardson, and C. Bathhurst, 1754-55. Two volumes.

Antiquities (1749), John Nichols's *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century* (1812), and

C.H. Timperley's *Encyclopedia of Literary and Typographical Anecdote* (1842), are collections

of trivia, instruction, poetry, and commentary, rather than traditionally scholarly volumes.[91] For

instance, while Timperley does note historical information regarding the chartering of the SC,

noting membership in the biographies of printers, and so on, he also goes on at length in

describing the "Printers' May Festival" including the parade of its officers, its costs ("half-a-

crown a-piece of every guest"), and an extensive description of their "Whifflers" or pipers (523-

524). Nichols, meanwhile, is incredibly useful for being the source of the only extant quotes

from Elinor James's *Mrs. James's Advice to All Printers in General* in which she recounts her

history as a printer; while the original broadside itself has been lost.[92]

Edward Arber's *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of the Stationers of

London, 1554-1640 AD*[93], published in five volumes between 1877 and 1894, is the first account

to provide a combative narrative, writing that the SC records "may help us to understand the

genesis of the books of that time by assisting us to an all surrounding knowledge of them; from

the paper and print which formed their bodily substance, through all the purgatory of labour and

money matters, to the fifth-essence of mind contained in them: and so lead us to some sure

canons of criticism respecting their text" (II.27). Unfortunately, this promise of canons of

criticism has yet to be fulfilled; instead, we have new but anachronistic narratives of control and

exceptionalism that must themselves be broken down, re-examined, and re-written.

---

[91] Joseph Ames, *Typographical Antiquities: Being an Historical Account of Printing in England.* London, W. Faden, 1749; John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century.* Five volumes. London, Nichols, Son, and Bentley, 1812; C.H. Timperley, *Encyclopaedia of Literary and Typographical Anecdote.* London, Henry G. Bohn, 1842.
[92] Nichols, ibid. Vol. I, p. 306.
[93] Arber, 1875-94, ibid.

Conclusion: Revising Narratives, or, The Story of Judith Moxon

Traditional readings of space have focused on the home as a domestic, feminine sphere and the locus of both women and their labors, often overlooking the concrete realities of English guild law. Historians' emphases on guild control, and especially of the Stationers' Company as an example of a body that strictly and easily imposes government censorship[94], have created a convenient narrative in which a massive, faceless group was able to successfully steer models of production and consumption in the book trades for almost three centuries. Other studies have shown this narrative to be only partially accurate, and what I would like to interrogate here is how the Stationers' Company operated with and around women beyond the standard stories of widows running their husbands' businesses until they remarried or their sons came of age. While obviously examples such as these are plentiful, they reinforce the notion of women's labor as being exceptional and outside the norm. Why do we never ask what the wives were doing *before* their husbands died or *after* their sons took over? Presumably they would still have been in the shop, yet invisible to the written record that was primarily concerned with men as the only legal entities.

Indeed, the sudden appearance of women in some of the male-dominated guilds in the seventeenth century is borne through the record, but as yet no specific cause, if any, has been identified to explain the occurrence. We might, however, consider that other English guilds, such as those of the Clothworkers and Drapers, allowed women to be free and act as Masters in the

---

[94] While the Company did indeed regulate the book trade and maintain a form of copyright licensing, trade monopoly, and quality control, they did not, as Andrew Murphy notes in "The History of the Book in Britain, c. 1475-1800" (2013), administer pre-publication licensing, or censorship—various shifting government offices, including the Archbishop of Canterbury and later a formal office of Licenser, were responsible for these duties. The Company was, however, empowered to search the premises of all stationers for seditious material and seize whatever they found.

sixteenth century if not before. A cursory examination of the *Records of London's Livery Companies Online (ROLLCO)* which has digitized records from the rolls of the Bowyers, Clothworkers, Drapers, Founders, Girdlers, Goldsmiths, Mercers, Musicians, Salters, and Tallow Chandlers provides 105 women members of those companies.[95]

As the goal of this dissertation is to provide a critical revision of the place of women in the English printing house, reconsidering their relationship to the SC is key. Further, revising conceptions of women's labors is a vital part in revising the history of book production. As Helen Smith notes, "women's labour is one of the material subtexts of the books we have inherited, and should be read alongside those books as a provocation and a challenge to the work of interpretation" (134).[96] Smith's study is expansive in its close rereadings of women's labors as both writers and as tradeswomen, but it remains a single study that encompasses multiple trades in brief. Further, while it can be seen as part of a growing trend of studies that acknowledge women's contributions to the production and history of the book, it remains noticeably counter-narrative, which is to say, we are nowhere near conceptualizing book history as a field with gender parity either in or outside the scholarship.

Most importantly, revising our narratives of women as members of the book trades involves looking at their actual *work* rather than for their monetary employment. As Pamela Sharpe states,

> Women's access to economic resources did not always readily translate into wages. Indeed, controlling resources can be concerned with budgeting, looking after children or the sick, or managing a piece of land. None of these is readily measurable in terms of economic indicators. Instead we need a much broader definition of "employment" for women than for men. The problem with using

---

[95] *Records of London's Livery Companies Online (ROLLCO)*. Web URL: https://www.londonroll.org/. Date accessed: 25 August 2019.
[96] Smith, 2012, ibid.

either "continuity" or "change" to explain the history of women's employment is the nebulous character of the benchmarks for comparison. (356)[97]

The simple fact of the matter is that as members of their households, women were generally not paid employees, despite their presence in the shops and in the records. For instance, Elinor James, writing in a now-lost broadside thought to be dated ca. 1715 and entitled *Mrs. James's Advice to All Printers in General*, writes that "I have been in the element of Printing above forty years, and I have a great love for it, and am a well-wisher to all that lawfully move therein, and especially to you that are masters; therefore I would have you wise and just, and not willingly break the laws of God nor man, but that you would do by all men as you would desire they should do by you" (n.p.).[98] When Maureen Bell asks whether it is "likely that women… could have developed, as it were, overnight and for very brief periods, a competence in running a printing house or bookshop, only to relinquish all interest at the moment of remarriage?" what we have to confront is that the knowledge and the women were physically present in the printing houses, but that they were conspicuously and purposefully removed in the scholarship, and what this means in terms of revisiting both historical practices and accounts (17-18).[99]

The removal of women from narratives and their return via thought experiments— "Judith Shakespeare" by Virginia Woolf[100], "Judith Donne" by Margaret Ezell[101]—have proven incredibly productive for the field in terms of historical revision. To that end, here's a story of my own—the story of Judith Moxon. Like her brother Joseph, Judith would have spent her youth

---

[97] Pamela Sharpe, "Continuity and Change: Women's History and Economic History in Britain." *The Economic History Review*, New Series, vol. 48, no. 2, May 1995, pp. 353-369.

[98] Elinor James, "Mrs. James's Advice to All Printers in General." *Elinor James, Printed Writings 1641–1700*: Series II, Part Three, Volume 11. Edited by Paula McDowell, New York, Routledge, 2005, pp. 256-259.

[99] Maureen Bell, "Women in the English Book Trade 1557-1700." *Leipziger Jahrbuch zur Buchgeschichte* vol. 6, 1996, pp. 13-45.

[100] Woolf, *A Room of One's Own*, ibid.

[101] Margaret Ezell, "A Possible Story of Judith Donne: A Life of Their Own?" *The John Donne Journal* vol. 18, 1998/99, pp. 1-20.

in print shops in Delft and Amsterdam where their father oversaw the printing of English Bibles. While the boys sorted and distributed type and went out for beer with the men, she would have taken on the more ignominious jobs of pulling sheets from the tympan and sewing gatherings; throwing out the buckets of used chamber-lye, or fair water if she was lucky, from the ink-ball pelts would have been an unpleasant but necessary task. She would eventually have married a man from another comfortable merchant-family in the trade, perhaps returning to London after the English Civil War like her brothers. While Joseph became the King's hydrographer and her older brother James would open his own print shop on the Strand, Judith would float between her husband and her brother's shops depending on where her skills were most needed: She would have been well-versed in the tasks of maintaining the account and record books, seeing that the paper- and ink-sellers' bills were paid and that the rights for copy-texts were sorted. Sometimes she might have been like James's wife (whose name is lost, for the moment at least, in the historical record) in the front of her husband's shop, selling books.

Judith would be of middle years when the first women were formally apprenticed as Stationers, earning wages for the work she had seen done all her life. If she married a printer herself she would have likely assisted in many more of the daily tasks of the shop, helping to compose or redistribute type in the wee hours to finish jobs; it is notable that while the Stationers' Company had firm rules against training men who were not in the guild's trade, no such rules applied, or even were expected to apply, to wives and daughters. When her husband died, Judith would keep the shop going until her son was of age to take over his father's imprint; until he was made journeyman, she saw to all business matters herself, including directing the printing.

Judith would have been in her seventies when Joseph's *Mechanick Exercises* appeared. What would she have thought of the women missing from its pages, women who only appeared as Journeymen's wives or visitors? What would she have thought of Joseph, who was less of a printer than herself at this point, yet publicly disclosing all the Mysteries of the trade?

Recovering women's labors is frequently written around objects, such as the records that contain their writing and the books that are made from their work, but are seemingly impersonal. A receipt of supplies delivered is full of objects, but it is only the record itself that hints at the work for which they were used, from how they were gotten. David Greetham has written that "the book has emerged as an extremely productive site for showing how the means of production and consumption affect and inform our concepts of literature, of genre, of meaning, and of authoriality itself" (30).[102] While scholarship is increasingly willing to tackle the materiality aspect of bibliography and print and how they can inform these concepts, the question of gender is one that remains. Those useful studies by Bell, McDowell, Ezell, Smith and others have started the recovery process, but their work is confined to literary history and criticism. By adding empirical bibliography to our toolbox, feminist scholars can revise our narratives in a different way in a different location.

As a final anecdote, John W. Moore provides the following cautionary fable regarding women in the print shop in his 1886 collection *Historical Notes on Printers and Printing*:

> It is related that in Germany, while an edition of the Bible was printing, the wife of the printer went into the office and deliberately altered the sentence of subjection to her husband—Gen. iii, 16—from 'and he shall rule over thee' to 'and he shall be thy Fool'. Her life paid for the alteration, which was discovered soon after, though some copies of the book with this intentional error were sold. (73)[103]

---

[102] David Greetham, "What is Textual Scholarship?" in *A Companion to the History of the Book*, edited by Simon Eliot and Jonathan Rose, Malden and Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009, pp. 21-32.
[103] John W. Moore, *Historical Notes on Printers and Printing 1420 to 1886.* Reprinted New York, Burt Franklin, 1968.

This story reveals not just anxiety about women in the print shop but about women changing text to empower themselves. I would argue that by literally making use of the materials as books, we as women scholars can change the text of the scholarship, and so write new narratives in the history of the book.

CHAPTER IV

THE LANGUAGE OF SPACE:

REREADING MOXON'S MARGINALIZED WOMEN[104]

The English printing house was initially conceived, legally, as a printing house, with an emphasis on *house*: a private home in which public work took place. The private space of the home emphasized the traditional hierarchies of political and legal order: for men and for King and for God. Women's work that took place within the printing house thus fell into the traditional—and so, unremarkable—role of household labors, a form of erasure I would like to consider as transitioning from textiles to texts. This erasure of labor is one that foregrounds the erasure of women's writing from history; women who worked in essence as publishers, as printers and booksellers, are very clearly present in the historical records but invisible in our narratives of book history. How did this erasure happen, and why is their presence, and work, overlooked? I think the first part of the answer has to do with the physical and intellectual spaces that they inhabited.

If we consider the language of space as theorized in Jurgen Habermas's public and private spheres, Henri Lefebvre's dissections of social space, production, and consumption, and Michel de Certeau's analysis of space and language, we see the ways in which the ideas of space itself can be implicitly gendered, both in seventeenth-century reality and twenty-first-century theory. This chapter will investigate the politics of this argument and the politics of the gendered

---

[104] This is an original manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *The Seventeenth Century* on 14 August 2017, available online: https://doi.org/10.1080/0268117X.2017.1340850.

spheres, considering the printing house as a location of public masculine labor and of private feminine domesticity.

What are Printing Houses?

The very nomenclature of English and colonial American "printing houses" ties into a patriarchal government and guild system that legally required printers to work in their own homes for tax and census purposes, effectively combining the private and public spheres into one. In England printers were required by an Ordinance of 1653 to exercise their trade "in their respective Dwelling Houses and not elsewhere" (Firth and Rait, 696).[105] (What did printers do prior to 1653? While not formally codified in law, it is probable that similar strictures were in place. This particular Ordinance originated as an Act of Parliament in 1649 which then lapsed in 1651, was revived and revised in 1653, and then lapsed again in 1659. A product of the Civil War and Commonwealth, it was largely aimed at minimizing seditious activity.) To publish from one's home was thus the only legal and respectable avenue, homes in which women's labor was often invisible except in cases where the men were conspicuously absent, i.e. jailed or dead. Adrian Johns notes that the "bifurcated representation of the workplace as a home and as a business was consequently made central to the production and reception of printed books" (125, italics original).[106] In other words, the known site of production legitimized a text in a way that the printer as an individual person, artisan, intellectual, or worker did not.

This conception of private space for public work seems at odds in what is otherwise a

---

[105] C.H. Firth and R.S. Rait. *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum,* Vol. II. London, His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1911.
[106] Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1998.

conventional narrative of professionalization in a growing industry. The advent of print had

shifted the business of the book trades in multiple respects, altering models of production,

consumption, and capital. It changed the workers too; in England, the prefacing guild body to the

Stationers' Company was that of the Fellowship of the Text-Writers and Limners, described in a

1403 Ordinance as consisting "of the Writers of Text- Letter, Limners, and others, who bind and

sell books," and differentiating these workers from the guild of the Scriveners, for scribes who

would produce only legal documents, including public notaries, as Hazlitt notes in his 1892 *The

Livery Companies of the City of London* (625).[107] This division between the production of

documents for public consumption (legal documents) and private consumption (all other books)

gestures at formational practices in bookmaking that would be echoed through the history of the

trade to the present day. The 1557 incorporation of the Stationers' Company revised these

narratives once again, subsuming a guild created for producing the literal written word into one

primarily focused on *recreating* the written word through print.

Print reconceived the book as an object; it required the development of a new apparatus

of reading, including paratexts such as title pages and various spatial and intellectual divisions

(such as chapter headings, section markers, etc.). Andrew Pettegree described book buyers in the

Renaissance as having "to be retrained to accept" the book in its new, print form (53).[108] David

McKitterick goes on to describe the printing trade of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as

being characterized by anxiety: a period taking place between the initial "wonder" at the

---

[107] William Carew Hazlitt, *The Livery Companies of the City of London: Their Origin, Character, Development, and Social and Political Importance*. New York, Macmillan & Co., 1892. This book remains possibly the most extensive "modern" guide to the Livery Companies. He places the Stationers under "The Minor Companies" which run the gamut from "Apothecaries" to "Woolmen."
[108] Andrew Pettegree, *The Book in the Renaissance.* New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2010.

invention of printing but before the eighteenth-century's relegation of print books to items of "antiquarian interest," in which the printed book is neither omnipresent nor unusual (8-9).[109]

When Joseph Moxon published his 1683 manual *Mechanick Exercises on the Whole Art of Printing*, he included a brief history of the print trade as part of the preface, placing the English printing trade as being firmly in the line of progressive, intellectual progress. McKitterick chooses to read Moxon as a point of resistance, however, declaring that "since such manuals (by their very publication) appear to reveal to the world some of the secrets of a trade, an impression is conveyed of orderliness and of responsibility… at odds with what we see if we look at early printed books" (147). Indeed, in 1683 the English printing trade was changing, and some might even argue, its traditional cornerstones were declining. The Stationers' Company was at odds with the University printers at Oxford and Cambridge over printing rights, and women suddenly appeared (with no explanation) to be going through the formal guild apprenticing system in which they had traditionally worked on the peripheries.

In their introductory essay to a modern (1978) reprint of the *Mechanick Exercises*, Herbert Davis and Harry Carter note that at the time of the book's composition and printing, the Stationers' Company was embroiled in an ongoing lawsuit with the University of Oxford Press (which was not affiliated with the Company).[110] They note that while Moxon's work did not seem overtly political, he does note that the first printers in England—William Caxton and Wynken de Worde—were located at and affiliated with the University rather than with the guild of the Stationers that was founded in 1441 and the body of which prefaced that of the Stationers' Company, which was chartered in 1553. Davis and Carter intimate that Moxon was making a

---

[109] David McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript, and the Search for Order 1450-1830*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005.
[110] Joseph Moxon, *Mechanick Exercises on the Whole Art of Printing*. Herbert Davis and Harry Carter, eds. New York, Dover Publications, Inc. 1978.

specific choice to quietly back Oxford's case against the Stationers, perhaps in order to weaken

the guild system that he was not a part of and, apparently, did not want to join. By removing

women in his narrative, Moxon may have been making a similar statement, advocating for the

diminishment of women's presence in the male economic sphere.

The diminishment of women's labor is nothing new—far from it, in fact—but given the

presence of Moxon's text as a significant primary source in teaching book history, we should

reconsider the narrative that he has formed, especially with regards to gender and how he

recreates the "space" of printing in his manual. In the *Mechanick Exercises*, Moxon chose to

atomize the printing house from its physical space to the language of its associated objects by

declaring the aim of the Master printer:

> His Office is therefore to provide a House, or Room or Rooms in which he is to set his *Printing-House*. This expression may seem strange, but it is *Printers* Language: For a *Printing-House* may admit of a twofold meaning; one the Vulgar acceptance, and is relative to the House or Place wherein *Printing* is used; the other a more peculiar Phrase *Printers* use among themselves, *viz.* only the *Printing* Tools, which they frequently call a *Printing-House*: Thus they say, Such a One has set up a *Printing-House*, when as thereby they mean he has furnish'd a House with *Printing* Tools. Or such a one has remov'd his *Printing-House*, when thereby they only mean he has remov'd the Tools us'd in his former House. (16, italics original)

Interestingly, Moxon was a printer by training (through his father's business printing English

Bibles in Holland) but not a member of the Stationers' Company of England; his manual was not

endorsed by them in any way and, unfortunately, its reception by them was not recorded.

However, we may assume that Moxon's emphasis on the language of the printing trade,

illustrated in this excerpt, is accurate through its specificity. He describes at length and in great

detail the tools and work of the trade, as well as noting certain customs pertaining to gender that

I will analyse further later on. But in this excerpt here, it is worth noting how he, as a printer in

his own time, considers the use of the term "printing house" as both physical—as a set of rooms

or a house—and as theoretical and linguistic, noting how the term is used colloquially by practicing printers to refer to tools rather than just a working space.

In contrast, and in an interesting shift of spatial description, scholar Alexis Weedon has chosen to use the phrase "printing offices" to describe printing houses, characterizing them as "small-scale family businesses" (155).[111] However, this seems to misapply American usage to the British term[112] as well as minimizing the scale of production and of workforce: The smallest presses would have required at least four workers (two pressmen, a compositor, and a Master/corrector) while the largest concerns would have consisted of sixteen to twenty workers (two pressmen per press, plus additional compositors).[113] Further, neither of these calculations include the non-guild-affiliated workers who would still have been present, such as the devils and flies (small boys, not apprenticed, responsible for running errands and cleaning) or the women of the shop—the Master's wife and daughters, who would also be expected to run errands for the business, clean, and probably provide food and drink. It is also often assumed that the women would be responsible for the initial sewing of gatherings prior to their binding, and images of the period often show women in the "shop" part of the printing house selling books. We know that all of these people, and especially the women, were indeed present through

---

[111] Alexis Weedon, "The Economics of Print" in *The Book: A Global History*, edited by Michael F. Suarez and H.R. Woudhuysen, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013, pp. 154-168.

[112] Theodore Low De Vinne, the American scholar and printer who is perhaps best known as one of the founders of the Grolier Club, reprinted Moxon in an 1896 edition of two volumes. In his concluding Notes, he states that "Although 'printing-house' is still used in England as a proper designation for the workshop of the master-printer, the term 'printing-office,' which is more common in the United States, has equally good authority. Many of the early printers called their workshops by the Latin name of 'Officina.' A book before me by Jodocus Badius, dated 1513, has the imprint 'In Officina Afcenfiana.'" (402). Weedon herself does not gloss her terminology and uses "office" interchangeably with "printing house," with the implication that the one is a smaller affair than the other. This is not the case, but an interesting bit of linguistic slippage.

[113] In *A New Introduction to Bibliography* (1972)*,* Philip Gaskell identifies and describes the five "grades" of personnel during the hand-press period: the master-printer; the master's deputy who acted as an overseer of the journeymen, as well as corrector in smaller shops; the corrector; and the journeymen and apprentices who would have made up the bulk of the workforce (171-173).

surviving woodcut images, Company and Hearth Tax records[114], and the occasional offhand

references to them in other works, including the *Mechanick Exercises*. Further, Weedon's phrase

"family businesses" implies relationships among workers that probably were not present. While

some apprentices and journeymen would have had blood-ties to the master of the shop (sons,

nephews, cousins), most would not. Indeed, economic historian Patrick Wallis describes the

London apprentice system and adds an unexpected parallel:

> Apprentices were often from gentry or wealthy families and represented
> substantial investments. They were the sons of their masters' peers, sometimes of
> their social superiors. Although formally subject to their master's patriarchal
> authority, they and their families possessed voice and agency. If we sought a
> modern parallel for early modern metropolitan apprenticeship, it would be in mass
> higher education, not blue-collar apprenticeship. (794)[115]

This picture of laborers in the book trades reiterates their origins as an artisan class, which is

something altogether different from our image of printers as the "rude mechanicals" of usual

book history parlance. That term manages to encompass two different implications of class

distinctions, "rude" for "unlearned" and "mechanical" for "artisan."[116] As such, we see the

linguistic deterioration of a profession, of the artist class descending in respect in an increasingly

literate society that takes books for granted.

Thus, when we are considering a printing house as an actual place of work, we should

take note of what that actual *space* implies. Space goes beyond mere location; it is inhabited. We

might therefore ask: Where were the printing houses? Who were the printers and the stationers?

---

[114] Most of the Stationers' Company records are still extant; Robin Myers has a catalog and guide to them in *The Stationers' Company Archive, 1554-1984: An Account of the Records* (1990), in addition to the five volumes of transcripts created by Edward Arber. Hearth Tax records for metropolitan London and the surrounding regions have also been digitized at the online database *Hearth Tax Online*.

[115] Patrick Wallis, "Labor, Law, and Training in Early Modern London: Apprenticeship and the City's Institutions." *Journal of British Studies* vol. 51, October 2012, pp. 791–819.

[116] Patricia Parker's essay on "Rude mechanicals" (1996) further explores the trade and class distinctions of the term in an interesting reading of Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* by focusing on another trade, that of joinery.

Because my study is also focused on the recovery of women's history, we must also consider questions of erasure, and not just those labors and laborers that have been erased from our narratives, but the language of that erasure and the *space* of that erasure.

"The Customs of the Printing House"

The *Mechanick Exercises* concludes with a section entitled "Ancient Customs used in a Printing-house" that includes details about how the male workers should treat women. One rule reads "if a Workman or a Stranger[117] salute a Woman in the *Chappel*[118], after the making of the *Solace*, it is a *Solace* of such a Value as is agreed on" (Moxon, 325, italics original). Moxon defined a solace as a ritual beating in which the other printers hold the offender over the Correcting stone of the shop and beat him across the buttocks (he also notes a precautionary tale in which an offender was "*Solaced* with so much violence, that he presently Pissed Blood, and shortly after dyed of it," 324); the "Value agreed upon" intimates that the severity of the phrase "to salute a woman" often concludes "with a kiss," but it is difficult to interpret what else this rule might indicate. Given the presence of women workers in the shop, might it offer a form of protection—to the printer's family if not his maidservants—like a primitive sexual harassment policy? This might also indicate why this was one of the offences worthy of a possibly severe beating.

---

[117] "Stranger" in seventeenth-century usage would have meant a foreigner or non-Englishman. The *OED* also cites Hobbes' definition in *Leviathan* (II.xii.101): "Strangers (that is, men not used to live under the same government, nor speaking the same language)."

[118] The "chappel" (or chapel) referred to here is the print house itself. As Moxon explains earlier on in "The Customs" the term likely derived from the earliest use of the printing house as printing what he calls "Books of Divinity." This presents a rather inaccurate picture, as Caxton was better known for his printing of secular works such as *The Canterbury Tales* (1477), romances such as *Le Morte d'Arthur* (1485), and other material such as the Roman histories.

Outside of situations that call for social (domestic?) violence, Moxon indicates other familial customs that further blend the lines of social interactions in the printing house. These customs state that

> If a Journey-man marry, he pays half a Crown to the *Chappel*.
>
> When his Wife comes to the *Chappel*, she pays six Pence: and then all the Journey-men joyn their two Pence apiece to Welcome her.
>
> If a Journey-man have a Son born, he pays one Shilling.
>
> If a Daughter born, six Pence. (328, italics original)

This section on marriage is noteworthy because marriage was intimately tied to the English guild labor system. For instance, apprentices were forbidden to marry and the requisite age of gaining one's freedom was twenty-four; improper relations between the sexes would involve the offending apprentice's removal from the guild system altogether and so eliminate the possibility of acquiring middle-class employment and even certain local government positions, so this was a not insignificant offence. The playful fines which are negated in the interchange above parody the real fines printers would pay for minor offences in the printing house, including swearing, leaving tools out, etc. Finally, the monetary present for a girl being literally half of that given for a son reinforces the economic realities of a system that consistently rewarded one gender while minimizing and denying the other. While this gestures at a legal system that denied women sovereign identities as well as property, it also denies the agency that they seem to possess in the historical records.

How, then, can we make sense of the identities of printers generally, let alone in terms of gender? The calling of the printing house "a chapel" refers not just to historical custom but to a living language; as a note in a Geneva Bible helpfully reminds us, "Masters in their houses ought to be as preachers to their families that from the highest to the lowest they may obey the will of

God."[119] Women in the houses were their husbands' helpmeets; in the trades, they would have been expected to work alongside of them. Elinor James was sufficiently confident in her own abilities as a printer that she printed a broadside entitled *Mrs. James's Advice to All Printers in General*, in which she declared that she had "been in the element of Printing above forty years, and I have a great love for it, and am a well-wisher to all that lawfully move therein." Unfortunately this broadside, thought to have been published circa 1715, is no longer extant; portions of it only survive in long quotations cited in the first volume of John Nicol's *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, itself published from 1812-1815.[120] We might also consider additional numbers: Henry R. Plomer's monumental *Dictionary of the printers and booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667* records forty-six different women in the book trades during those years, twenty-one of whom he identified as printers; the following volume which documents the years *1668-1725* records eighty-five more women altogether, including seventeen printers. Where possible he identifies further information about the women's work or shops, as in the entry for Ellen Cotes, a London printer who is noted in the survey of presses in 1668 for employing nine pressmen and two apprentices at a three press shop on Aldersgate Street, or that of Anne Griffin, who was reprimanded by Archbishop Laud, then censor, in 1637 for reprinting Thomas Becon's *Displaying of the Popish Masse*. In her article on "Women in the English Book Trade 1557-1700," Maureen Bell compiles Plomer, Arber, and other sources to detail some 324 women working in the trades in London (15),

---

[119] Quoted in: Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England*, chap 13, title and epigraph.
[120] While *Mrs. James's Advice to All Printers in General* does not survive in toto, many of her other broadsides do. See Paula McDowell, Ed. *Elinor James: Printed Writings 1641–1700*, which contains ninety texts by James, including *Mrs. James's Reasons that Printing may not be a Free-Trade* (n.d. 1695-1702?).

arguing that it is their sporadic appearance in the "visible" record that has led us to diminish their "routine (and therefore 'hidden') work of day to day" (16).[121]

In Moxon's account, the women are completely liminal, but I have to wonder if it's more than just taking their labor for granted. In the period in which the *Mechanick Exercises* was written and printed, more women were entering the book trades formally, working their way through the guild's apprenticeship system. Paula McDowell notes in *The Women of Grub Street* (1998) that some 108 women were apprenticed between 1666 and 1800; though this represents less than 2% of the total apprentices of England during the period, it nonetheless documents women's labor within male space and accounting.[122] Parents or relations of these women would have paid fees for these women's entry and training, and if they successfully went through the system, as some did, they would have had to pay redemption fees, and then as journeymen would have a set of rights to work and to wages that they would not have as non-guild laborers. In short, in the *Mechanick Exercises* Moxon is making a deliberate choice in removing women from his accounts of the trade, and we should consider what this means. Given Moxon's significant place in how the field of book history is taught, we should question his construction of the players in the printing house.

In her landmark study, *Grossly Material Things: Women and Book Production in Early Modern England*, Helen Smith revisits these passages with an eye towards re-conceptualizing the place of gender in Moxon's account, arguing that his "elevation of the 'chapel' to a location for the construction of trade brotherhood through disciplinary ritual, drinking customs, and the symbolic control of women's presence … may be read as an attempt to impose and sharpen

---

[121] Bell, 1996, ibid.
[122] McDowell, 1998, ibid.

boundaries" between domesticity and public space which are otherwise permeable (124).[123]
These boundaries that were both physical and intellectual remain in our narratives and must be
interrogated more closely.

What is Space?

As we reconsider the printing house as an entity of production, we should also consider
the space that our own concepts of space inhabit. Theories of space as both an abstraction and as
concrete reality create numerous questions. In *The Production of Space* (1991), philosopher
Henri Lefebvre interrogates the possibilities of social space through several viewpoints,
including historical, linguistic, and Marxist analyses, trying to reconcile the mental with the
physical. He declares that social space "has a part to play among the forces of production" and
goes on at length to define it further as something that can be consumed, can be politically
instrumental, that it "underpins the reproduction of production relations and property relations
(i.e. ownership of land, of space; hierarchical ordering of locations; organization of networks as a
function of capitalism; class structures, practical requirements)" and "is equivalent, practically
speaking, to a set of institutional and ideological superstructures that are not presented for what
they are (and in this capacity social space comes complete with symbolisms and systems of
meaning — sometimes an overload of meaning)" (394).[124] When it comes to models of book
history, production and consumption of print and manuscript have been primarily organized by
discussions of the physical materiality of books, however they are produced, and only
secondarily on the readers that bought or read them. However, this emphasis on production tends

---

[123] Smith, 2012, ibid.
[124] Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*. Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, 1991.

to consider the business and trade practices of printers and scribes as being writ large, often generalizing narratives unless interrogating a specific text under analysis. Further, this model makes the individual workers passive constructs under trade organizations rather than considering them as specific individuals with their own agency to operate within a practical, rather than just theoretical, system. That said, the application of theory nonetheless allows us a method of entry in reconsidering how the systems of the everyday act and function, as well as evolve (or devolve) over time.

In *The Practice of Everyday Life* (1984), Michel de Certeau declares that "space occurs as the effect produced by the operations that orient it, situate it, temporalize it, and make it function" (93).[125] We might "read" space as we read a page (be it handwritten or printed): constructions of people and equipment as analogs to words and images that present not just the text but also the paratexts, gesturing at the story of material creation and reading. As Lisa Maruca states in *The Work of Print* (2007), "production values" are

> the social standards or community agreements as to what is worthy of notice and is best to uphold, and likewise what must be repressed in order to maintain these standards--that are promulgated both through the act of textual production and about textual production. (7, italics in the original)

Maruca's words also hint at the possibilities of what we might call negative space, that territory through which we often have to read between the lines to understand both literary and historical evidence.

In seventeenth-century England, the space of the printing house was primarily oriented through the Stationers' Company as a force for business regulation and through the Master Printer as an individual straddling the spheres. He was the master of the individual shop in public

---

[125] Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Trans. Steven Rendall. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1984.

space as well as the master of the house in private space. At the same time, government and

social mechanisms operated in the background through the legal censors whose presence and

political clout shifted enormously depending on the moment; and through the details and dealing

that characterized each individual printing house (and the Guildhall as the court for that

regulation). Jürgen Habermas's theories of public and private space create a narrative of

convenient history to emphasize how

> [p]ublic authority consolidated into a concrete opposition for those who were merely subject to it and who at first found only a negative definition of themselves within it. These were the "private individuals" who were excluded from public authority because they held no office. "Public" no longer referred to the "representative" court of a prince endowed with authority, but rather to an institution regulated according to competence, to an apparatus endowed with a monopoly on the legal exertion of authority. Private individuals subsumed in the state at whom public authority was directed now made up the public body. (51-52)[126]

While influential and useful, this delineation is one that takes place outside of actual social

history. When we consider something like the Stationers' Company, a trade entity with extensive

records as to its workings, we see how quickly the differences between "public" and "private"

disappear when it comes to the printing house.

Reconsidering historical space thus emphasizes the narratives that go into their creation;

rereading marginalized spaces opens up the possibilities for recovery, especially of women. For

instance, Caroline Bowden's work on women's education compares the formal spaces of

religious institutions as a location for the study of reading and writing with the informal spaces

of the home, in closets and private chambers. Nancy Fraser has also broken down Habermas's

arguments in terms of how they erase women across periods past and present; women have

---

[126] Jürgen Habermas, "The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article (1964)." Trans. Sara Lennox and Frank Lennox. *New German Critique,* vol. 3, Autumn 1974, pp. 49-55.

become "split subjects," she says, and "as a result, the roles themselves, previously shielded in their separate spheres, have suddenly been re-opened to contestation" (43).[127] Nonetheless, many historians seem to have opted for a theoretical narrative that, rather than considering questions of gender as a point of disruption, instead sew them up firmly into a narrative of convenience. Academic feminist discussion on the separation of the spheres and the creation of a feminine "domesticity" has relied on a predominantly middle-class, nineteenth-century model as the comparative norm, as Amanda Vickery has explicated at length,[128] while in *The Disorder of Women: Democracy, Feminism, and Feminist Theory*, Carole Pateman contextualizes public and private spheres within the dichotomy of culture/men and nature/women[129]. Both Vickery and Pateman contextualize their arguments within the development and growth of the feminist movement from the nineteenth century onwards; their Marxist architectures effectively eliminates women and women's work altogether prior to 1800.

More recent studies have tried to map public and private space—and their permeability—onto the time period with more accurate historical context, again noting that "what really happened" is often very different from the narratives that have taken hold in the scholarship. In "Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England," Peter Lake and Steve Pincus argue that these negotiations are more accurately read through the massive intellectual and social changes that took place after the Reformation and would ultimately come to a head through the

---

[127] Nancy Fraser, "What's Critical About Critical Theory?" in *Feminists Read Habermas: Gendering the Subject of Discourse*, edited by M. Johanna Meehan, New York, Routledge, 1995, pp. 21-55.

[128] Vickery's historiographical study revolves around interrogating the "unquestioned belief that the transition to industrial modernity robbed women of freedom, status and authentic function [that] underlies most modern women's history" (401). She critiques Alice Clark's "slight" evidence (406) in *Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century* (1919) before concluding that "The economic chronologies upon which the accounts of women's exclusion from work and their incarceration in domesticity depend are deeply flawed" (413).

[129] Carole Pateman, *The Disorder of Women: Democracy, Feminism, and Political Theory*. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1989.

English Civil War in the mid-seventeenth century.[130] Erica Longfellow attempts to add gender

into this debate in her article "Public, Private, and the Household in Early Seventeenth-Century

England," in which she examines women's letters to uncover what was considered truly

"private" in the period.[131] She concludes that while it is true that women were often excluded

from official public functions in the church or state, their daily household work nonetheless

required their presence in the wider community: "a woman's economic activity, such as doing

the marketing, managing the household accounts, or selling products she had made, was often

vital for the survival of the household and conferred on her a degree of autonomy and agency"

(327). As I will argue more fully later, recovering the history of women's labor is a feminist act

that should be considered in both theory and in practice. The framework of a domestic,

altogether feminine sphere at a remove from a public, altogether masculine sphere is not only

ahistorical, but serves to other women and their work in a way that is ahistorical, inaccurate, and

problematic.

<div align="center">

Recovering Women's Labors

</div>

I hope that this close reading of Moxon and considerations of spatial theory has started to

upset how we think of situating women's labor in the English printing house. While the recovery

of women's writing and reading has been an active part of the scholarship for the last two

decades, the recovery of women's work in the book trades has been comparatively neglected. I

think this is for two reasons: 1) the privileging of the author as the text-creator over the text-

---

[130] Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, "Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England." *Journal of British Studies* vol. 45, April 2006, pp. 270–292.
[131] Erica Longfellow, "Public, Private, and the Household in Early Seventeenth-Century England." *Journal of British Studies* vol. 45, April 2006, pp. 313–334.

producer (the scribe or printer), and 2) the primacy of Robert Darnton's famous "Communications Circuit" (and those of his imitators) that overlooks gender completely. It's one thing to consider a faceless printer at work, and another to consider a faceless *woman printer*, as we are all too accustomed to the removal of women from history. I would thus like to resituate our given book history narratives around these women and reconsider how these narratives change when we add gender to the equation.

Histories of women's labor not only tackle the problems of erasure, but the problems of patriarchal power inherent in the public sphere and in contemporary industry and economics. Cynthia Cockburn's 1985 study *The Machinery of Dominance: Women, Men, and Technical Know-How* explicitly reconsidered the sexual division of labor within the context of access to and training in technology—problems that persist, rather glaringly, even today.[132] In a 2009 essay that revisited this work, Cockburn writes of Marxist feminist theorists reading *Capital* and that

> [w]e understood the importance of that special category of worker that had historically garnered the creative, transferable skills of engineering, the one who uniquely was able to design and control the instruments of labor, owned by the capitalist, that shaped and disciplined the labor processes of the ordinary worker. We saw his contradictory class position. He was the only one whose job and earnings weren't threatened as one new machine after another revolutionized the factories. The difference was, we feminist readers of *Capital* noticed the "he" in the story of the technologist. (269)[133]

Unfortunately, even Cockburn sidelines the history of women as guild-workers prior to the Industrial Revolution, declaring that only "an exceptional woman might have broken the convention" of paid labor and returning to the familiar narrative of widows managing businesses

---

[132] Cynthia Cockburn, *The Machinery of Dominance: Women, Men, and Technical Know-How*. Pluto Press, 1985. Reprinted Northeastern University Press, 1988.
[133] Cynthia Cockburn, "On *The Machinery of Dominance: Women, Men, and Technical Know-How*." *WSQ: Women's Studies Quarterly*, vol. 37, no. 1 /2, Spring/Summer 2009, pp. 269-273.

in the absence of their husbands (23).[134] But what we should consider here is the idea of the woman printer as a form of engineer: familiar with the numerous working parts of the press, its construction, its assembly and disassembly. Practicing printers will note the necessity of engineering, major and minor, with each print job; the requirements of make-ready to create an even print for every job, the necessity of periodically rearranging the actual bed of the press (the stone as well as whatever material cushioned it) or replacing it; the various other problems that can arise and must be fixed. Women in the trade would likely have been familiar with each of these issues and able to take part in their solutions, especially in the smaller shops. To argue otherwise is to imply that someone who works with specialized equipment every single day would have no idea how it works, a scenario unlikely in the pre-Industrial era.

What we should then reconsider then is the role of women in printing houses as parties informed of basic engineering, work space, and business acumen, and as public and private laborers. Rereading Moxon's *The Mechanick Exercises* reveals the presence of women in the print shop, but consigns them to the margins of book history. As any reader of early modern texts well knows, the margins are where we can often find illuminating commentary as well as evidence of how a book was used. To date, most readers of Moxon have not considered the implications of revisiting his manual through a feminist reading, but doing so sheds new light on the expected and perceived roles of women in the printing house and in the history of labor.

---

[134] Cockburn, 1988, ibid.

Fig. 3. "Knocking Up" the Inkballs. Photo of the author "knocking up" the inkballs per Moxon's instructions in *The Mechanick Exercises*. Unpublished photograph printed with the permission of Todd Samuelson.

CHAPTER V

MATERIALITY AND EMPIRICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY:

PEDAGOGY AND THE WORK OF MANUSCRIPT

As I have shown, problems regarding materiality and gender are grounded in the premises that have structured empirical bibliography, and in this chapter I will go a step further by looking at how these issues carry into pedagogical work. Empirical bibliography's emergence from the earlier bibliographical press movement has predisposed it towards the recovery of print practices, which, at least in the west, spans only five centuries in the history of the book. As previously discussed, print production has also assumed a masculine default, in which its practitioners are assumed to be men. This final chapter, therefore, will apply the methodology of empirical bibliography to manuscript practices.

It is particularly interesting to me how empirical bibliography can be applied to manuscript production, as well as why, seemingly, it has not been . Because of the lower material costs of procuring quills, ink, and slanted writing surfaces (especially given the increasingly inflationary rates of buying presses and printing equipment), the teaching of manuscript practices (versus manuscript *culture*) would, one would think, have been widely adopted for classroom use. Despite consistent evidence of overlap between print production and manuscript production in the early modern period, the bulk of book histories have focused on the printed book rather than on the manuscript book; thus there has been the bibliographic press movement, but not, until recently at least, a text-writing and manuscript movement.[135] Hilary Havens has traced the

---

[135] Over the course of the composition of this chapter, workshops at the Folger and elsewhere have appeared where students can work with and create early modern writing materials including quills and ink, as well as experiment with writing the letterforms of various early modern hands.

emergence of manuscript studies since the 1950s in her 2019 article "Manuscript Culture and the Eighteenth Century," noting the ways that the field has significant implications and ramifications for reconsidering literary genres, readership, and authorship as well as providing useful future avenues of research at the intersections of women's studies and other fields.[136] Similarly, manuscript study has much to offer empirical bibliography, and vice versa.

Indeed, the recovery process of manuscript skills can assist in pushing beyond the familiar conceptions of the "book" to consider alternate narratives of book history, and how the materiality of both the object and its study is a key element of how it is gendered, thus allowing feminist scholars to revise our narratives in a different way in a different location. Studies by Havens, Ezell, and others have started the undertaking of recovery by examining the intersections of textual reception and production with gender and authorship, but their work has primarily consisted of literary history and criticism rather than of material practice and recovery.

"Gendering" and Archival Research

The study of manuscript culture has traditionally been foregrounded as a function of archival research, requiring either individual and unique items viewed in a library, or, at a remove, through online databases of photographs and digital facsimiles which preserve the text though not necessarily the materiality of the given object.[137] The unique nature of many

---

[136] Hilary Havens, "Manuscript Culture and the Eighteenth Century." *Literature Compass* vol. 16, no. 7, 2019, 212537. *Wiley Library Online*, https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/lic3.12537. Accessed 5 October 2019.

[137] As a simple example: how often is the placement of watermarks on papers preserved as part of a digital rendering? This is a small but vital piece of information that is often and easily "lost" in scans or microfilms. Other examples include the visual loss of rubrication or points when digital images have had their brightness and contrast altered to increase legibility—at the expense of losing evidence of the manuscript's material nature. In contrast, a notable example of a facsimile that makes a point of preserving evidence of material culture is the 1982 facsimile of

individual manuscripts, either through their contents, their provenance, and/or their material scarcity, has reinforced an intellectual evaluation of manuscript work as being more alike that of fine art even when most manuscripts were created through market labors (eg. a commissioned work by a paid scribe) or private labors (the commonplace book of an individual) for what we would most often think of as a private audience (with varying levels of "private," especially for coterie manuscript publication and dissemination) rather than a public one. Ultimately, we do not think of manuscripts per se as reproducible—even though we acknowledge that the intellectual and economic circumstances of their creation did indeed often depend on reproducibility. The collection of manuscripts in libraries and archives, and therefore, their intellectual access (through cataloging) and physical access (through institutional safety procedures ranging from dark storage to special curatorial appointments) emphasize the limitations of the singular object, and so its individuality. Studying manuscripts through reproducing historical processes, however, can both offer a new appreciation for their production and their dissemination that restores the original contexts of material use and creation and inform the bibliographic scholar's interpretations of material history.

In the library classrooms in which I have taught, students consistently demonstrate a sense of anxiety (and even, sometimes, awe) when being taught how to handle rare manuscript materials versus when they are taught how to handle rare printed works. Particularly with younger and more enthusiastic patrons, certain cautions have to be reiterated consistently in the page handling of printed works, whereas there is more reluctance to even *touch* a manuscript.[138]

Ashmole 1511 in *Vollständige Faksimile-Ausgabe Im Originalformat Der Handschrift Ms. Ashmole 1511— Bestiarium: Aus Dem Besitz Der Bodleian Library, Oxford*. This facsimile edition uses high-resolution photographs to preserve the rubrication and points, vellum discolorations, varied and unmatched page sizes, and torn leaves of the physical manuscript to reproduce as closely as possible the experience of its reading and handling.

[138] Interestingly, this holds true both for notable editions from the western canon, including the First and Second Folios of Shakespeare, and for period books of much more modest origins as well, such as unknown authors or

Said reluctance also increases dramatically if the manuscript includes illuminations rather than

solely text. Illuminations or other handmade images (whether as professional or amateur

drawings, doodles, or other traces) reinforce the reading of the document as a piece of individual

and singular "art" rather than as "book."

Further, there is often a specific problem of accessing manuscripts in archives. Unlike

printed books, the manuscript is a singular object versus a copy among copies. Most archivists

and catalogers, however, either through a lack of time or funds or both, do not take this as an

opportunity for descriptive cataloging. Instead, manuscripts will frequently be given a unique

numerical identifier, often starting at "001" and then continuing until the collection is completed.

Likewise, there are problematic practices of classification and cataloging which can limit

specific women writers (note too, "writers" rather than "authors") to the obscurity of "Family

Papers" or "Domestic Papers," and so on.

As Melissa Adler notes in her study, *Cruising the Library: Perversities in the*

Organization of Knowledge (2017),

> The disciplinary apparatus affects both the text and the reader. The classificatory
> mechanism inscribes a book's subject in the catalog in a language that may be
> foreign to both the text and the person seeking the text, resulting in a range of
> effects and affects. (29)[139]

Adler situates her study on the problematic organization of information—and texts—in the

Library of Congress classification system through the lens of queer theory and the classification

of LGBT materials. Historically such texts were, and still are, located under the Library of

Congress Subject Headings for "Sexual perversion in literature … See: Paraphilias in literature"

---

anonymous exercise books. It appears to be the aura of age and materiality that affects them, rather than just the
ascribed value of major works. Walter Benjamin would have had a field day with this material.

[139] Melissa Adler, *Cruising the Library: Perversities in the Organization of Knowledge*. New York, Fordham
University Press, 2017.

with narrower terms that include "Sadism," "Masochism" and other "Psychosexual disorders" (31). These problematic classifications are a holdover from early- and mid-twentieth-century subject cataloging practices that locate queerness in a sociological and medical context rather than a literary one. Without useful updates to this practice, the topic of queerness is therefore, variously, erased, misrepresented, and othered in the cataloging classification system. In short, the intellectual arrangement of knowledge for access is influenced by the institutionalization of classification systems that mirror their contemporary social politics and thus are far from neutral or objective presentations of information.

What Adler notes with regard to queerness, I note with gender: Subject Headings and Finding Aids that do not reflect women as either specifically named creators or as anonymous yet gendered creators can effectively hide or distort materials in library holdings. For instance, a manuscript at the Rare Books and Manuscript Library at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign is cataloged as "Advice to a husband, late 1600s?" and has the shelfmark POST-1650 MS 0047 to allocate it to the Post-1650 Manuscript holdings that have been issued numerical identifiers in the common practice identified above. Its author is "Anonymous" and because of its primarily religious content its subject is identified as "Christianity - Early works to 1800." Despite being a trained librarian, I would never have located this volume were I not allowed to familiarize myself with holdings by going directly into the rare book vaults and walking along the shelves. As retrospective cataloging efforts at this institution, like many others, are ongoing but with a large backlog and a lower priority, this manuscript's subject headings are unlikely to be updated any time soon. Therefore the way it is currently most discoverable in the online catalog is through the subject heading (Christianity - Early works to 1800), keyword search ("advice," "husband"), or scrolling through the Post-1650 Manuscripts

finding aid to number "0047." None of these are great options, and all reinforce the notion that gender is missing from historical materials rather than ignored, misrepresented, or erased.

In the classroom these values are perpetuated through the problems identified above: both manuscripts and women creators are effectively othered through systems of knowledge and access than normalize and prioritize print materials. As Margaret Ezell noted in *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* (1999), the private/public sphere dichotomy of print and manuscript culture has directly affected the reception history of women's writing, where

> having a "voice" is equated with being in print, with the obvious implication that "work" is equated with print texts and anything else, manuscript copy in particular, is only "silence." The sole criterion of the success of these generations of women writers is the amount they *published*, with no mention of the amount they actually *wrote*. Intentionally or not, we thus train our students to classify literary activity with print as the superior mode and to employ false gender dichotomies when interpreting early modern texts. (43-44, italics original)[140]

Mass print culture has defined the parameters of "bookness" for generations, but the problem has become amplified for contemporary students. When I was a student in the late 1990s and early 2000s, the emphasis of authority was given to print because of the inherent untrustworthiness that was ascribed to the early Internet. As digital culture has expanded and normalized, the trustworthiness (or lack thereof) is founded upon identified authorities that inscribe power relations into the reception of online material.[141] Library and archival catalogs, therefore, have a legitimacy in recognizing and accessing information, despite the problems that have been

---

[140] Margaret J.M. Ezell, *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print.* Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

[141] In the late 2000s, I had to caution students that accessing government websites for accurate information could be problematic depending on the political agenda of the government in question. At the time, the George W. Bush administration's pro-abstinence agenda presented a great deal of inaccurate material on young adult sexuality on the webpages of the Department of Health and Human Services (see Connolly 2001). More recently, justified anxieties regarding the Trump administration's scrubbing of climate data from the websites of the Environmental Protection Agency has reinforced the notion that publicly accessible data is only as accessible as institutions allow (see Dennis 2016 and Bernstein 2017).

analyzed above. The disconnect between print and digital cultures isn't as transparently gendered as literary historical criticism, yet it is nonetheless present in the reception of popular texts and elsewhere.[142]

Materiality, Sociology, and Textual Embodiment

In his 1991 article on "Textual Criticism and Literary Sociology," G. Thomas Tanselle argued that the trend towards what he called "textual theory" and editorial studies grew alongside that of more traditional literary theory, especially deconstructionism and the New Historicism.[143] All of these discourses displace the hierarchical placement of the author as central to a text's creation in favor of a collaborative model of the specific mechanisms for production, dissemination and reception necessary to their publication. Surveying two decades of criticism, Tanselle analyzes the work of W.W. Greg, D.F. McKenzie, Jerome McGann, and others to reconsider the book as an object accompanied by an extensive academic apparatus made up of editors and collations that can ultimately provide numerous variant "texts" and readings of those texts, many of which hinge on identifying the supposed intention of this or that actor (whether as author, printer, editor or other) in the ongoing process. "There is no escape from the eternal dilemma posed by works in the medium of language (or in any other intangible medium): do we accept the texts of artifacts," he asks, "which are primary evidence of the forms of works that were disseminated at particular times, or do we create new texts from that evidence, hoping

---

[142] See my forthcoming essay "The Other Digital Divide: Gendering Science Fiction Fan Reading in Print and Online" in *The Edinburgh History Reading: A World Survey from Antiquity to the Present, Volume I, Book 2: Modern Readers*, edited by Jonathan Rose and Mary Hammond. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, forthcoming 2019.

[143] G. Thomas Tanselle, "Textual Criticism and Literary Sociology." *Studies in Bibliography* vol. 44, 1991, pp. 83-143.

through the trained historical imagination to come closer to what the authors (or other producers) of the works intended?" (143). If traditional literary study emphasizes the individual author and textual study the collaborative author, material study dissects the *object* as it is rather than what it might have been or is intended to be.

The critical question therefore transforms from "what is the text and how did it come to be?" to "what is the object and how was it made?" As discussed earlier, both critical making and empirical bibliography can be used as tools for answering this question. However, these practices need to be more fully integrated into the work that has been done on textual materiality and the embodiment of text; what has been presented largely through individual case studies needs to be more broadly examined as a methodology with practical and pedagogical applications rather than singular examples, and all should be further interrogated with gender in mind. For instance, imagine a scenario in which male students typeset and print ten copies of a poem, and the female students must make ten copies of the same poem by hand.[144] How then do the students perceive these documents? Will they even be "read," or will they make their way to the recycling bin, thus recreating many of the problems inherent in ephemeral culture. Will any of the documents be seen as more professional or more amateurish than the others, and if so, why or why not? Which process is more technologically challenging or fatiguing, the typesetting or the handwriting? And so on.

Textual materiality integrates the physical make-up of the book into how it is read critically. As Jonathan Walker puts it in his 2013 article "Reading Materiality: The Literary Critical Treatment of Physical Texts," reading the materiality of the book is to take as "meaningful not only the words on the page but also the disposition of the text on the paper, the

---

[144] Any issues in legibility would only assist in reproducing historical problems!

condition of the paper itself, decorative elements, [and] the ways that the writer or printer has utilized space" (202).[145] Walker applies this critical apparatus to dramatic texts in both print and manuscript, arguing that this reading practice provides useful analysis beyond textual collations as a way to recode textual, or bibliographical meaning. This practice is interdisciplinary by default, going beyond purely literary study to encompass other methodologies as needed, but which, Walker argues, also rely on at least an element of intentionality, however constructive or fictive, in the production of a textual object. He states that "any heuristic that stresses the importance of the material conditions of early texts is perhaps made the more honest through a kind of promiscuous practice of reading, which would cross back and forth from literary and bibliographical fields and lexicons, and from semantic and non-semantic features of the page, with a bit more enthusiastic abandon" (232). Empirical bibliography as a methodology allows for such "promiscuity" of practices through the range of skills and elements of production necessary to any given text, which is particularly valuable in enabling us to see "hidden" elements of women's participations in the trade: the making of paper, the sewing of sheets, the writing or printing, the very letters in script or type—and all the attendant accidents that are not intended but certainly happen along the way. These too can range from the well-known (turning a sort for *A* upside down for use as a *V* when printing, or joining a pair of *V*s into a single *W* or *M*) to the literally invisible (editing a text prior to printing such that it can fit into the size of paper on hand for printing, or to fit the lengths of spacing material available).

Material study therefore reads both what is in plain sight and what is made invisible. Indeed, when printing, the blank spaces on the page are in face made up of the tangible (and

[145] Jonathan Walker, "Reading Materiality: The Literary Critical Treatment of Physical Texts." *Renaissance Drama* vol. 41, no. 1 /2, 2013, pp. 199-232.

heavy) spacing materials necessary to keep a text locked in place. In scribal materials, the blank

spaces are left open (or not) as a consequence of either the material cost of paper or the social

practices of its use[146]: Those who can *afford* additional sheets can write large letters with clean

spacing and significant margins, while those who cannot...can't. The visual differences between

pages of cleanly spaced text versus cramped and tiny writing demonstrate the gulfs between

those who have easy access to additional materials and those who do not, as well as the gulf

between the professional and the amateur keeper of text, both of which are implicitly, if not

explicitly, gendered through production practices. If labor is all too often a blank space in the

literature of textual materials, and gender even more so, then these blank spaces should inform

our readings. The rest of this chapter will examine more closely the problems of manuscript

practices as well as their recovery in the context of critical making and empirical bibliography.

How do manuscript practices complicate our readings of labor and publication? Why is the

recreation of manuscript work limited in contrast to the bibliographic press movement? How

does the issue of gender affect and effect both?

The Blank Space of Manuscript Labor

Until recently, a text's status as "published" or "unpublished" was determined by whether

it had been printed, rather than circulated via manuscript. Its critical reception in the scholarship

was likewise shaped by the weighted expectations of print culture. Accordingly, print culture has

likewise been privileged in the modern classroom, with empirical and critical exercises in

---

[146] See Heather Wolfe, "Was early modern writing paper expensive?" *The Collation: Research and Exploration at the Folger*. February 13, 2018, https://collation.folger.edu/2018/02/writing-paper-expensive/. Accessed 4 October 2019.

typesetting and printing becoming increasingly commonplace since the 1950s. In contrast, exercises and experiments with manuscript publication by way of working with quills, writing ink, and recreating (or rather, attempting to recreate) simple scribal hands in the classroom have been noticeably rare until very recently.

I would argue that this reluctance to recreate manuscript forms in the classroom is primarily a problem of labor, and of how the labor is valued and, functionally, "seen." To create a metaphor from the objects of printing: labor, and women's labor in particular, are the pieces of spacing material used to form a page—the quads, leads, slugs, and furniture—but which generally leave no physical trace behind, unless, of course, it is a mistake that is rendered present visually, as with the occasional black marks left behind by displaced or flipped type. Centuries of reading print have taught us the visual cues and norms of print-reading, while manuscript-reading has largely been relegated to the esoteric specialty of early modern scholars and librarians. The work of manuscript—from the making and usage of parchment, to the making and using of writing inks, to the reading and writing of various hands—has not been widely explored[147] in either bibliographic classes or in bibliographic workshops—a striking omission given the larger contexts of scribal studies, which relates further to the invisibility of labors generally and of women particularly.

In the introduction to their foundational collection *Language Machines, Technologies of Literary and Cultural Production* (1997), Jeffrey Masten, Peter Stallybrass, and Nancy J. Vickers declare that "material forms regulate and structure culture and those who are the agents or subjects of culture" and "new technologies redefine and regurgitate, rather than replace, old

---

[147] When I say "widely explored" I specifically mean extended time, rather than a single session of only an hour or two, spent in making and using manuscript materials. Extended time may cover workshops or classes of one or two days, or longer periods, but at any rate is greater than a single fifty or ninety-minute session, as seems to be the more common practice right now.

technologies" (1)[148]; these "agents" include the scribes, printers, compositors, and so on who who operate those technologies, whether pen or press, while the technologies include both printing and manuscript production (including, but not limited to, various writing hands, calligraphy, illuminating, etc.). Masten, Stallybrass, and Vickers question the progressive narrative of technological change ushered in by Elizabeth L. Eisenstein and her imitors, arguing that the manuscript-print continuum resituates rather than replaces material production. The printing press did not supersede manuscript production, and the two were concurrent for centuries, but it did change how texts were perceived, valued, and shared in ways that trickle down to the present.

In particular, the printed page is given an authoritative heft that is often denied the manuscript page, both because of Maruca's production values[149] and because of the literal machinery of labor. Labor that has been erased on the page, however, can be reconstructed and re-envisioned by physically replicating the page. It is therefore telling that the bulk of such efforts are focused on replicating the printed page, further elevating print culture's ascendance in authority and the definition of a "book" as a printed work rather than a manuscript or digital work. The emphasis on print culture and production in empirical and experiential analysis therefore presents a skewed (and possibly gendered) perception of books as objects that exist in a specifically male public market, per Darnton and his "communications circuit." The history of women's coterie, and thus often private, manuscript-publishing problematizes this theoretical model of public business as well as the critical model of physical recreation.

---

[148] Jeffrey Masten, Peter Stallybrass, and Nancy J. Vickers, eds. *Language Machines, Technologies of Literary and Cultural Production*. New York, Routledge, 1997.
[149] As defined in *The Work of Print*, 2007, ibid., p. 7: "the social standards or community agreements as to what is worthy of notice and is best to uphold, and likewise what must be repressed in order to maintain these standards-- that are promulgated both through the act of textual production and about textual production" (italics original).

The varieties of texts that remain unseen despite the widespread use of databases and digital aids that are the companions to contemporary scholars:

> They are the "messy" manuscript books, books that combine accounts of rents collected with copies of verses, alphabet exercises with prayers and diary entries. They are books that look like "real" books, that is to say, like printed books, on the outside, but behave entirely differently for the reader and writer once the cover is opened, and which, at present, are largely invisible in studies of book history. (55)[150]

Further observing that in most accounts, that "'print' and 'book' seem to exist as interchangeable nouns" (56), Ezell concludes that domestic, written texts tend to be dismissed by literary historians, and so are classified and analyzed in a very different way from the printed books that are more familiar to readers and scholars.[151] In academic work, familiarity does not breed contempt so much as canonicity; printed books, through their familiarity and perhaps even their "normalcy" are recognized as intrinsically book-like in a way that manuscripts have not quite been, and likewise their material reconstruction in the literature classroom and bibliographic workshop.

What I want to query here is the attitude of preserving material print skill sets as valuable to bibliographers, in contrast to the seeming "forgetting" of writing and manuscript production. Further, there is an emphasis on recreating printed materials that is often couched as "preserving skills" and even sometimes as "preserving a culture" in a way that hand-lettering arts, including calligraphy[152] (which comes from the Greek for "beautiful writing"), simply are not. Such

---

[150] Margaret Ezell, "Invisible Books" in *Producing the Eighteenth-Century Book: Writers and Publishers in England, 1650-1800*, edited by Laura L. Runge and Pat Rogers. Newark, University of Delaware Press, 2009, pp. 53-69.

[151] In another essay, Ezell notes that "the combination of women's studies and manuscript studies usefully complicates our received notions of how 'literature' is defined, classified, and packaged in anthologies and teaching texts for study and use in the classroom" (65). See: Ezell, "Do Manuscript Studies Have a Future in Early Modern Women's Studies?" *Shakespeare Studies* vol. 32, 2004, pp. 63-65.

[152] For the purposes of this study, calligraphy and hand-lettering are limited to Anglo-European art forms, in contrast to the calligraphic forms as historically and currently practiced in Asian and Islamic cultures.

phrases recur regularly in the book arts courses that I have taken, albeit in the context of preserving twentieth-century book culture (eg. through the use of Vandercook or other cylinder presses, monotype supercasters, etc.) rather than seventeenth-century bookmaking. In contrast, contemporary book arts courses on calligraphy and font development teach the skills as exercises in artistic and aesthetic appreciation, with emphasis generally given over to "classical" style letterforms rather than more contemporary forms.[153]

Functionally, the actual writing of letterforms is primarily left to the students of fine arts rather than those of literature or history. This is thus an issue of discipline and value with consequences to bibliographers both empirical and general, returning us to the questions posed in Chapter 1 regarding the hierarchical (and frequently gendered) domains of art and craft. These categories problematized handpress print production through its inherent mechanical reproducibility and so diminished its status as a "traditional" art form. In contrast, hand-lettering is recognized, although not always celebrated, as an art form which produces copies that can be both unique, singular works of art, and copies that are heavily reproduced by hand (as per vast quantities of wedding invitations and school diplomas, for example).

---

[153] For example, in 2017 noted calligrapher Jerry Kelly curated an exhibit at The Grolier Club entitled *The Calligraphy Revival, 1906-2016* that examined a century of contemporary hand-letter artists. In an introduction to the printed catalog, noted graphic design and visual artist Christopher Calderhead writes:

> How this desire to speak to one's contemporaries plays out for individual calligraphers differs from scribe to scribe. Practitioners of pointed-pen scripts such as Copperplate and Spencerian can point to an unbroken transmission from the eighteenth century and even earlier. Their work is less a revival than a continuity. Just as an orchestra can perform Beethoven without any sense of anachronism, these calligraphers can continue to use styles and layouts that are clearly connected to the work of earlier centuries. Edged-pen calligraphers, on the other hand, have had to relearn the use of tools that, while not entirely eclipsed, had largely fallen by the wayside in the opening years of the twentieth century. Writing the Roman alphabet with a brush using rough, expressive strokes is essentially a new technique without much precedent in the Western tradition. (12)

The artistic recognition of hand letter-forms therefore begs the question: Why has the recovery of manuscript and scribal labors in theory or practice been neglected, especially in contrast to the practice and theory of print? Is it only the scholarly anxiety regarding the creation of "art" that has been previously discussed? Is it that bibliographic press studios have become normalized in a way that bibliographic handwriting "scriptoria" have not been? (Indeed, I do not know of a single such studio or other effort, more's the pity.) Or is the problem linked to the other, and equally familiar, problems of gender?

Already distanced from the production of mass objects that are taken from granted, a session or course of handpress or letterpress printing reconceptualizes the familiar for many students: the many hands and many stages of print production are seen for the first time through bibliographic presses. However, the lack of such systematized studios or exercises for bibliographic manuscript study are currently nonexistent. The final section below will function as a brief tutorial for use in instituting empirical bibliography for manuscript study in the classroom.

Teaching Manuscript Culture: An Empirical Bibliographic Guide

This disconnect can be mediated through the use of empirical bibliography in teaching manuscript production and culture alongside of, or indeed instead of, printing and print culture. Manuscript production itself presents numerous challenges for the classroom, but arguably less than obtaining or building a functioning printing press and the related equipment necessary to experience print production first-hand. Indeed, arguably all that is needed to produce a "manuscript" is pen, ink, and paper, though of course this is greatly simplified in terms of

materials and tools. For instance, period-accurate inks can be reconstructed through recipes in primary or secondary sources, or skipped altogether in favor of contemporary bottled inks that are used with fountain or calligraphy pens. Pens such as quills or styluses can be purchased pre-made and often in bulk. A variety of papers, handmade or imitation-handmade (with deckled edges), can be easily obtained in craft stores. The reproduction of specific "hands" or letterforms for writing can be managed with copies of period teaching alphabets or modern calligraphic teaching sheets.

The problem, such as it is, therefore becomes the acceptance of manuscripts and manuscript culture as a non-normative aspect of book history study (and one fraught with gendered assumptions in production and reception), especially for the undergraduate student. How then to integrate such exercises until they do become normalized—a pattern of practice that I have seen steadily emerge over the last several years. Colleagues at several institutions—the majority of them women specializing in early modern and eighteenth-century literature[154]—have taken up this challenge with the goal in mind to expose students to alternative types of documentary evidence. Exercises have included quill preparations and cutting; writing with quills or with calligraphic pens (usually metal nibs rather than slanted felt-tips); and writing exercises. Others have reframed the traditional reader-response journal into an assignment for creating and keeping commonplace books and florilegia: private anthologies of other people's writings rather than traditional individual reader responses, thus giving the assignment a historical element.

---

[154] A notable exception to this "rule" has been the Conservation lab at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, where conservators have taught brief (two hour) workshops in quill preparation, cutting, and writing to librarians and library school graduate students.

How then to introduce manuscript culture in classroom pedagogy? The first step is to identify useful exercises and then tools for those exercises. Many teachers have made use of a pair of low-cost, low-effort practices: building commonplace books that will be periodically shared and/or graded in class, and reading by candle-light at home.[155]

In-class exercises with quills and ink can be utilized with a bit more effort, especially since most of the necessary items can be purchased online and in bulk. In his work on identifying material tools for writing, James Daybell itemizes the list of tools for writing from a 1556 household inventory for Sir William More of Loseley in Surrey, which includes "'a standyshe of pewter,' 'a perpetuall Kalendar in a frame' for dating, 'a deske to wryte on', 'a dust boxe of bone' for pounce, 'a payre of sesers', 'too whetstones' for sharpening knives, 'a haere of bone to make a sele', 'a penne of bone to wryte wt', 'a Sele of many Seles', 'a penknyf' for cutting quills, 'a foote rule', 'a penne of yron', 'Sr Thomas Eliots Dictionary' (that is, a Latin-English dictionary) and 'a boke of papere'" and from the household accounts of Margaret Spencer (d.1613) which records a purchase of "three quires of paper (12d.), 'inke & quilles' (l0d.), '2 rolles of harde wax' (12d.), 'a payer of tabell bouckes' (12d.) and an inkhorn (12d.)" (30-31).[156] These are useful lists for sharing with students, but actual exercises can often be done with much less: again, the trifecta of requisites is ink, pen, and paper.

Pre-cut quills can be purchased usually for around $2-4 a piece; a medium-sized bottle of writing ink usually costs something like $4-9. If pure authenticity is not of overwhelming

---

[155] My own undergraduate experience included this latter method, made slightly more difficult due to the school dorms having banned candles and matches as fire hazards and therefore absolutely verboten. A classmate and I in the same dorm banded together to clandestinely obtain the necessary tools—which is to say we took a bus off-campus to a craft store—and utilize them in the nearby quad to read the first few pages of *Frankenstein*, hindered somewhat by suitably atmospheric flickering and inadvertently making use of social reading as well, though it would be much, much later before I would recognize this aspect.

[156] James Daybell, *The Material Letter in Early Modern England: Manuscript Letters and the Culture and Practices of Letter-Writing, 1512-1635*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

concern, packs of styluses with nibs and small ink bottles can often be found in craft stores for $8-12. Advantages to this latter method are that the materials can be easily disseminated and collected at the end of class, rather than measuring out small amounts of ink in disposable cups and then pouring the remnants back into the bottle. Pieces of tape can be placed on bottle caps with numbers to better keep track of materials and prevent runaways.

One of the most useful exercises I've come across was in Heather Wolfe's RBS course on Tudor paleography. While most of the week was given over to examining various letterforms and writing hands while transcribing copies of texts, an afternoon session was given over to actually writing with a quill and walnut gall ink. This water-based ink is incredibly runny; a slanted writing surface is absolutely necessary so that puddles don't form on the page, and the pages themselves need to be thick—sketchbook quality at least (computer paper is right out). A quill nib is difficult to maneuver, and required working through a sample alphabet of basic letterforms before attempting a complete text (a period ink recipe). RBS has the additional volunteer help to arrange set-up and removal of materials during breaks; this exercise would be difficult to recreate without a space prepared in advance and at least twenty minutes each for preparation and clean-up.

These exercises cover only some of the possibilities of recreating manuscript culture in the classroom. Others can certainly be made, especially with regards to coterie work and social writing and reading. But to return to the question of gendering materials themselves: What can be learned about textual production using these methods in contrast to print methods? What does it mean to "privately" produce and disseminate writing versus "publicly"? And in using empirical bibliography to do so, how are we disrupting the narrative givens of book history?

Conclusions? The Empirical Study of Manuscript Production

Recreating the materiality of texts is a useful way to recover the labors necessary in their making and in their reception, and uncovers assumptions made regarding the creation and value of a specific piece of work. However, the lack of attention paid to reconstructing manuscript production reveals an ongoing problem in a field that continues to privilege print culture at the expense of manuscript culture and thus reinforce imposed norms of value and publication. Using critical making and empirical bibliography as a tool has the potential to disrupt these norms by providing an alternate, experiential method to understand the physicality of manuscript practices and place them in conversation with the bibliographic press movement of the early twentieth century. A century on, practical examinations of book production demonstrate the intellectual leaps that have been made in the scholarship even as they emphasize the gaps that yet remain in material access and recreation.

Fig. 4. Sorting Leads and Slugs. Photo of the author sorting leads and slugs before teaching at the

Book History Workshop. Unpublished photograph printed with the permission of Todd

Samuelson.

CHAPTER VI

AFTERWORD AND CONCLUSIONS:

THE LIMINAL SPACES OF LABOR

In the process of writing this dissertation, I built a print shop in my garage. This happens,

so I understand, when you catch the printing bug: you pick up this or that on impulse, or as

opportunity presents itself, and then you need to get the materials to care for your equipment, and

then obviously you need more type, more cuts, more ink… Upon obtaining the machine that

would become the foundation of the Hogarth Press, Virginia Woolf wrote to Vanessa Bell on

April 26, 1917 that:

> Our press arrived on Tuesday. We unpacked it with enormous excitement…
> Anyhow the arrangement of the type is such a business that we shant be ready to
> start printing directly. One has great blocks of type, which have to be divided into
> their separate letters, and founts, and then put into the right partitions. The work
> of ages, especially when you mix the h's with the ns, as I did yesterday. We got so
> absorbed we can't stop; I see that real printing will devour one's entire life.
> (150)[157]

Woolf articulated well the bodily delight—and despair—inherent in working with type day in

and day out. And for my part, as I started what became an ongoing restoration of a cast iron

press, was the realization of how such items take up space in the home—which became the

germination of this project.

Presses must be stored somewhere, and the notion of "going to work" at a specific

location outside of the home involves a lot of social and capitalist apparatus located largely in the

industrial period rather than otherwise. This is how I came to find that printing houses… were

---

[157] Nigel Nicolson, ed. *The Letters of Virginia Woolf, Volume 2: 1912-1922*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1978.

houses. Where people lived. And went about their lives by navigating the workers, some of whom (such as the apprentices, who often had room and board at the print shop as part of their contracts) lived there for periods of time themselves, while others were only there for set periods of the day. We think of working at home as being domestic, private labor, but as I have examined, the early modern house was equally a "public" location of business. To work in an English printing house was, frequently, to actually *live* in it. And for the women working in these printing houses, their status as laborers was muddied by their gender and their legal relationships (or lack of them) in navigating ownership and publishing. Women printers frequently lived in a liminal crossroads, simultaneously inhabiting private and public space and operating businesses that they did not necessarily own, and so acting as a living "holding space" for years in between the death of their master printer husbands and the businesses being legally taken over by sons or new husbands.

This problem of liminality, of space, is one that continues today, albeit in different ways. While contemporary women printers at least own their equipment, they do nonetheless find themselves in the same private/public divide in managing their printing space: even if the term "printing house" is no longer in use, it remains a functional reality. Modern letterpress printers *have* to store their presses in and work in their homes. There are some exceptions to this, as in the case of collectives of women who have found it monetarily easier to share the purchase and storage of their presses in another location. (Some notable examples of such collectives include the following: The Woman's Building of Los Angeles, which operated from 1973-1991; the Chicago Women's Graphics Collective which operated from 1970-1983; and the Women's Studio Workshop, founded in 1974 in New York and continuing today.) Usually these businesses double as educational and art centers, with printing classes for the public during the day and,

often in the evening hours, job printing for profit. Modern job printing is most often made up of items such as wedding invitations, notecards, and other stationery ranging from business cards to custom letterheads. In contrast, other printers work as book artists from their homes, printing posters and books in limited editions for a selective clientele. To the contemporary printer, literally finding and making space for one's work is the first of many challenges to managing a press either as a business or as a hobby.

The problematic intersection of space and gender recurs over and over; while it is most famously articulated by Woolf in her *A Room of One's Own* with regards to literary activity, it manifests in the founding of art collectives and centers—like those named above—for women printers and book artists. Further, the history of women's labor in the book trades is marked repeatedly by efforts by women to build feminized working spaces throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: Agnes B. Peterson founded the Women's Co-operative Printing Union (WCPU) in San Francisco in 1868 and the Women's International Auxiliary of the International Typographical Union was founded in 1902 (though women were admitted as members of the ITU itself starting in 1869).[158] Most recently, the Ladies of Letterpress was founded in 2010 as a community and network of women printers to share resources, educational and business opportunities; they have held a conference each year since 2011, and their motto is that they are "dedicated to the proposition that a woman's place is in the print shop."

Specific presses have also been founded as both a safe space for women workers and as a method to strengthen women's working rights. Emily Faithfull's Victoria Press operated from 1860 to 1866, employing women as typesetters and correctors (men were employed as pressmen) and providing equal wages and humane working conditions to its employees that included breaks

---

[158] See Levenson 1994.

for meals.[159] The entirety of the feminist print movement from the 1960s onward utilized women printers and feminist presses as a form of activism by publishing women writers and disseminating information about women's rights.[160] In short, by the twentieth century, women's voices were not only to be found in their published writings, but in their publishing businesses. This itself circled back around to contemporary desktop publishing in the home, with women publishers of feminist zines and periodicals holding "collation parties" at their houses to print and staple works to be sold and circulated.

However, even as scholarly work increasingly recognizes the necessity of recovery of women's labor, the spaces for its acknowledgement remain marginalized. Making space for women and their work in book history as a discipline, therefore, involves effectively decolonizing our information structures: rewriting narratives alongside creating more access points for information location and reference. My background as a librarian has repeatedly informed how I search for information, which has only reinforced my frustrations with the limitations on how information on women in the book trades has been made accessible—or rather, not. Searching Subject and Names Authority Headings in the Library of Congress Classification System (which is currently itself undergoing a process of revisions to bring it up to date with current cataloging standards) can provide snapshots of canonization in action as names and subjects are codified and increasingly used in classifying new works. On the other hand, the system also remains in many respects painfully out of date with our contemporary viewpoints, as with the case of historically classifying LGBTQ+ material under headings for "sexual deviancy"

---

[159] See William E. Fredeman, "Emily Faithfull and the Victoria Press: An Experiment in Sociological Bibliography," *The Library* 29: 139-164 (1974), and Eric Ratcliffe's *The Caxton of Her Age: The Career and Family Background of Emily Faithfull (1835-95)*, Upton, Images Publishing, 1993.

[160] Although frustratingly, the movement and its historians have identified it as being specifically about twentieth-century feminism, with little to no effort made to recover the history of women in the book trades prior to the mid-to-late nineteenth century. See Murray 2004, Harker and Farr 2015, and Beins 2017.

(Adler 2017) or the years-long fight to replace the subject heading "Illegal aliens" with "Noncitizens" (Ros 2019). Despite best intentions, information organization is inherently biased, and even such "neutral" spaces as libraries and bibliographies are inherently political as they are shaped by their creators.

The personal, too, is political, which is why I started this project wanting to recover women printers and am concluding it by pointing out that women printers have *been* recovered, and now the goal is to keep them that way. It is not that women don't have a book history, it is that the history of women and the book has been so isolated in indexes and subject headings, the scholarship uncited[161], that its marginalization is a function of the discipline rather than its byproduct. As I said in the introduction, I was trained not to see books; in learning to see them and the labors they involve, I have also come to see so much else that has also been made invisible. Not necessarily erased, but invisible as so much other women's work has been made invisible culturally and well beyond the fields of book history and bibliography. Likewise, making their labor visible once again requires an activist model alongside a theoretical one. The first step to remediating injustice is to call attention to it. The second step is to maintain momentum. Rather than concluding, it is clear that the work is just getting started.

---

[161] Maureen Bell's 1983 "A Dictionary of Women Printers"*,* her Masters' thesis, is simultaneously one of the most useful and most broadly under-utilized reference sources in existence.

Fig. 5. At the Bixler Foundry. In July 2015 I spent a week at the Bixler Foundry in Skaneateles, New York, casting hot metal type. The Bixlers live above their typefoundry and letterpress studio; the family dogs run around everywhere but the confines of the typefoundry itself. During the week's work I cast some seventy pounds of type, including three typefaces and several sets of ornaments. I also learned firsthand some of the accidents that can happen, as when my casting partner failed to lock the matrices into the caster. The matrices were eventually dislodged by the pressure of the molten typemetal, shot out of their lock, followed by further sprays of typemetal until it cooled and jammed the machinery. During this incident, I was lucky to only get drops of cooled metal caught in my hair. This incident demonstrates some of the challenges of the invisible work of making; the imprints of the type are left behind, but the type itself can be lost or discarded (even recycled in the unshown crucible to the left), while the workers themselves are seldom seen. Unpublished photograph printed with the permission of Sarah Smith.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Thomas and Nicolas Barker. "A New Model for the Study of the Book." *A Potencie of Life: Books in Society*, edited by Nicolas Barker. London, British Library, 1993. Reprinted in *The Book History Reader*, edited by David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery, New York, Routledge, 2006, pp. 47-65.

Adler, Melissa. *Cruising the Library: Perversities in the Organization of Knowledge*. New York, Fordham University Press, 2017.

Agre, Philip E. "Toward a Critical Technical Practice: Lessons Learned in Trying to Reform AI." *Social Science, Technical Systems, and Cooperative Work*: *Beyond the Great Divide*, edited by Geoffrey Bowker, Susan Leigh Star, and Les Gasser, Erlbaum, 1997, pp. 131-158.

Ames, Joseph. *Typographical Antiquities: Being an Historical Account of Printing in England.* London, W. Faden, 1749.

Anon. *A Brief Discourse Concerning Printing and Printers.* London, A Society of Printers, 1663.

Anon. "Advice to a husband." Circa late 1600s, Rare Book and Manuscript Library at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, POST-1650 MS 0047.

Arber, Edward, Ed. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers 1554-1640 AD.* London & Birmingham, Private printing, 1875-94. Five volumes.

Asherson, Suzanne Baruch. "The Benefits of Cursive Go Beyond Writing." *The New York Times*, April 30, 2013, https://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2013/04/30/should-schools-require-children-to-learn-cursive/the-benefits-of-cursive-go-beyond-writing.

Atkyns, Richard. *The Original and Growth of Printing*. London, John Streater, 1664.

Bachelard, Gaston. *The Poetics of Space,* translated by Maria Jolens, Boston, Beacon press, 1994.

Baker, Sir Richard. *Chronicle of the Kings of England from the Time of the Romans' Government unto the Death of King James*. London, George Sawbridge and Thomas Williams, 1643.

Barker, Christopher. "A note on the state of the Company of Printers, Bookesellers, and Bookebynders, comprehending vnder the name of Stacioners, with a valuation also of all the l[ett]res patentes concerning printing." 1582, British Library, MS Lansdowne 48, art. 82, ff.189-94. Full transcript in *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers 1554-1640 AD, Volume 1*, edited by Edward Arber, London & Birmingham, Private printing, 1874, pp. 116, 144.

Beech, Beatrice. "Charlotte Guillard: A Sixteenth-Century Business Woman." *Renaissance Quarterly* vol. 36, no. 3, Autumn 1983, pp. 345-367.

Beins, Agatha. *Liberation in Print: Feminist Periodicals and Social Movement Identity*. Athens, University of Georgia Press, 2017.

Bell, Maureen. "A Dictionary of Women in the London Book Trade 1540- 1730." 1983. M.L.S. thesis. Loughborough University of Technology.

---. "Women in the English Book Trade 1557-1700." *Leipziger Jahrbuch zur Buchgeschichte* vol. 6, 1996, pp. 13-45.

Bernstein, Lenny. "NIH unit deletes references to climate 'change'." *The Washington Post*, August 23, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/to-your-health/wp/2017/08/23/nih-unit-deletes-references-to-climate-change.

Birch, Dinah, Ed. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, seventh edition. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009.

Blagden, Cyprian. *The Stationers' Company, A History, 1403-1959*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1960.

Blake, N.F. *William Caxton and English Literary Culture.* London, The Hambledon Press, 1991.

Blayney, Peter. W.M. *The Stationers' Company and the Printers of London, 1501–1557.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2013. Two volumes.

Bowden, Caroline. "Women in educational spaces." *The Cambridge Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing* edited by Laura Lunger Knoppers, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp. 85-96.

Bruce, John, Ed. *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles I, 1635* Volume I. London, Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, & Green, 1865.

Campbell, Robert. *The London Tradesman*., London, A.M. Kelley, 1747.

Carter, Harry. *A History of the Oxford University Press.* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1975. Two volumes.

Clark, Alice. *Working Life of the Women of the Seventeenth Century.* 1919. Intro. Amy Louise Erickson. London, Routledge, 1992.

Clegg, Cyndia Susan. *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

---. *Press Censorship in Jacobean England*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Cockburn, Cynthia. *The Machinery of Dominance: Women, Men, and Technical Know-How*. Pluto Press, 1985. Reprinted Northeastern University Press, 1988.

---. "On *The Machinery of Dominance: Women, Men, and Technical Know-How*." *WSQ: Women's Studies Quarterly*, vol. 37, no. 1 /2, Spring/Summer 2009, pp. 269-273.

Coker, Cait. "Gendered Spheres: Theorizing Space in the English Printing House." *The Seventeenth Century*, vol. 33, no. 3, 2018, pp. 323-336.

---. "The Other Digital Divide: Gendering Science Fiction Fan Reading in Print and Online." *The Edinburgh History Reading: A World Survey from Antiquity to the Present, Volume I, Book 2: Modern Readers,* edited by Jonathan Rose and Mary Hammond, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, forthcoming 2019.

Connolly, Ceci. "Administration Promoting Abstinence." *The Washington Post*, July 30, 2001. https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/2001/07/30/administration-promoting-abstinence.

Darnton, Robert. "Cherchez la femme." *The New York Review of Books*. August 10, 1995. pp. 22–24.

---. "What is the History of Books?" *Daedalus* vol. 11 no. 3, Summer 1982, pp. 63-85. Reprinted in *The Book History Reader*, edited by David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery, New York, Routledge, 2006, pp. 9-26.

---. "'What is the history of books?' revisited." *Modern Intellectual History* vol. 4, no. 3, 2007, pp. 495-508.

Daybell, James. *The Material Letter in Early Modern England: Manuscript Letters and the Culture and Practices of Letter-Writing, 1512-1635*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life.* Trans. Steven Rendall. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1984.

---. *The Writing of History.* Trans. Tom Conley. New York, Columbia University Press, 1988.

de Rohan-Csermak, G. "La premiere apparition du terme 'ethnologie.'" *Ethnologie europa* vol. 1, no. 14, 1967, pp. 170-184. Cited in: Michel de Certeau, *The Writing of History.* Trans. Tom Conley. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1988: 209-43.

de Vicq de Cumptich, Roberto. *How to Make Love to Your Type.* Type Directors Club brochure, 2011.

Dennis, Brady. "Scientists are frantically copying U.S. climate data, fearing it might vanish under Trump." *The Washington Post*, December 13, 2016,

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2016/12/13/scientists-are-frantically-copying-u-s-climate-data-fearing-it-might-vanish-under-trump.

DiCenzo, Maria, Lucy Delap, and Leila Ryan. *Feminist Media History: Suffrage, Periodicals and the Public Sphere*. Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan, 2010.

Drabble, Margaret, Ed. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, sixth edition. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000.

Eggert, Paul. "Textual Product or Textual Process: Procedures and Assumptions of Critical Editing." *Devils and Angels: Textual Editing and Literary Theory*, edited by Philip Cohen, Charlottesville, University of Virginia Press, 1991, pp. 57-77.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth. *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change.* New York, Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Ezell, Margaret J.M. *Writing Women's Literary History*. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

---. "A Possible Story of Judith Donne: A Life of Their Own?" *The John Donne Journal* vol. 18, 1998/99, pp. 1-20.

---. *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print.* Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

---. "Do Manuscript Studies Have a Future in Early Modern Women's Studies?" *Shakespeare Studies* vol. 32, 2004, pp. 63-65.

---. "Invisible Books." *Producing the Eighteenth-Century Book: Writers and Publishers in England, 1650-1800*, edited by Laura L. Runge and Pat Rogers. Newark, University of Delaware Press, 2009, pp. 53-69.

---. *The Oxford English Literary History: Volume V: 1645–1714: The Later Seventeenth Century: Companion Volume*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2017.

Finkelstein, David and Alistair McCleery, Eds. *The Book History Reader*. New York, Routledge, 2002. Reprinted 2006.

Firth, C.H. and R.S. Rait. *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum,* Vol. II. London, His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1911.

Fraser, Nancy. "What's Critical About Critical Theory?" *Feminists Read Habermas: Gendering the Subject of Discourse*, edited by M. Johanna Meehan, New York, Routledge, 1995, pp. 21-55.

Fredeman, William E. "Emily Faithfull and the Victoria Press: An Experiment in Sociological Bibliography." *The Library* vol. 29, 1974, pp. 139-164.

Gadd, Ian. "Were Books Different? The Stationers' Company in Civil War London, 1640-1645." *Institutional Culture in Early Modern Society*, edited by In: Anne Goldgar and Robert I. Frost. Leiden & Boston, Brill, 2004: pp. 35-58.

---. *The History of Oxford University Press.* Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013. Three volumes.

---. Communications during his Rare Book School Course on the History of the Stationers in Charlottesville, VA. July 7-11, 2014.

Gaskell, Philip. *A New Introduction to Bibliography.* New Castle: Oak Knoll Press, 1972, reprinted 2006.

---. "Bibliographical Press Movement." *Journal of the Printing Historical Society* vol. 1, 1965, pp. 1-13.

Graham, Arthur. *Women Printers: Quotation, Doggerel and Woodcut*. Lexington, Polyglot Press, 2006.

Greetham, David. *Textual Transgressions: Essays Toward the Construction of a Biobibliography.* New York, Garland Publishing, Inc., 1998.

---. "What is Textual Scholarship?" *A Companion to the History of the Book*, edited by Simon Eliot and Jonathan Rose, Malden and Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009, pp. 21-32.

Griffin, Andrew. "Why Making?" *The Making of a Broadside Ballad*. EMC Imprint, February 2016, http://press.emcimprint.english.ucsb.edu/the-making-of-a-broadside-ballad/why-making.

Grundy, Isobel. "Women and Print: Readers, Writers, and the Market." *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume 5: 1695–1830*, edited by Michael F. Suarez, SJ and Michael L. Turner. New York, Cambridge University Press, 2014, pp. 146-159.

"guild | gild, n." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, June 2019, www.oed.com/view/Entry/82328. Accessed 29 August 2019.

Habermas, Jürgen. "The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article (1964)." Trans. Sara Lennox and Frank Lennox. *New German Critique,* vol. 3, Autumn 1974, pp. 49-55.

---. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere.* Tr. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence. MIT Press, 1991.

Haraway, Donna J. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York, Routledge, 1991.

---. *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham and London, Duke University Press, 2016.

Hargrave, Jocelyn. "Joseph Moxon: A Re-Fashioned Appraisal." *Script & Print* vol. 39, no. 3, 2015, pp. 163–181.

Harker, Jaime and Cecilia Konchar Farr, eds. *This Book Is an Action: Feminist Print Culture and Activist Aesthetics*. Urbana and Springfield, University of Illinois Press, 2015.

Harvey, Paul, Ed. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature.* Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1932.

Havens, Hilary. "Manuscript Culture and the Eighteenth Century." *Literature Compass* vol. 16, no. 7, 2019, 212537. *Wiley Library Online*, https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/lic3.12537.

Hazlitt, William Carew. *The Livery Companies of the City of London: Their Origin, Character, Development, and Social and Political Importance*. New York, Macmillan & Co., 1892.

Hearth Tax Online. https://hearthtax.wordpress.com/

Herron, Paul, Ed. *Mirages: The Unexpurgated Diary of Anaïs Nin, 1939-1947*. Athens, Swallow Press/Ohio University Press, 2013.

Hill, Christopher. *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England*. Great Britain, Martin Secker & Warburg, Limited, 1958. Reprinted New York, MacMillan & Co., 1997.

Howell, James. *Londinopolis, an historicall discourse or perlustration of the city of London, the imperial chamber, and chief emporium of Great Britain whereunto is added another of the city of Westminster, with the courts of justice, antiquities, and new buildings thereunto belonging….* London, J. Streater, 1657. *Early English Books Online (EEBO).* http://gateway.proquest.com.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:12539624.

Howsam, Leslie. *Old Books and New Histories: An Orientation to Studies in Book and Print Culture.* Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2006.

Huisman, Rosemary. *The Written Poem: Semiotic Conventions from Old to Modern English*. London and New York, Cassell, 1998.

Hunt, Felicity. "The London Trade in the Printing and Binding of Books: An Experience in Exclusion, Dilution, and De-Skilling for Women Workers." *Women's Studies Int. Forum* vol 6, no. 5, 1983, 517-524.

Jagger, Graham. "Joseph Moxon, FRS, and the Royal Society." *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, vol. 49, 1995, pp. 193, 200.

James, Elinor. "Mrs. James's Advice to All Printers in General." *Elinor James, Printed Writings 1641–1700*: Series II, Part Three, Volume 11. Edited by Paula McDowell, New York, Routledge, 2005.

Johns, Adrian. *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Kelly, Jerry. *The Calligraphy Revival, 1906-2016.* New York, The Grolier Club, 2017.

Ladies of Letterpress. https://ladiesofletterpress.com/.

Lake, Peter and Steven Pincus. "Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England." *Journal of British Studies* vol. 45, April 2006, pp. 270–292.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, 1991.

Levenson, Roger. *Women in Printing: Northern California, 1857-1890*. Santa Barbara, Capra Press, 1994.

Levy, Michelle. "Do Women Have a Book History?" *Studies in Romanticism* vol. 53, no. 3, 2014, pp. 297-317.

Levy, Michelle and Tom Mole, Eds. *The Broadview Reader in Book History.* Ontario, Broadview Press, 2015.

---. *The Broadview Introduction to Book History*. Ontario, Broadview Press, 2017.

Literary Print Culture: The Stationers' Company Archive, London. Adam Matthew Digital, 2018. https://www.amdigital.co.uk/primary-sources/literary-print-culture.

Longfellow, Erica. "Public, Private, and the Household in Early Seventeenth-Century England." *Journal of British Studies* vol. 45, April 2006, pp. 313–334.

Maruca, Lisa. *The Work of Print: Authorship and the English Text Trades, 1660-1760*. Seattle and London, University of Washington Press, 2007.

Masten, Jeffrey, Peter Stallybrass, and Nancy J. Vickers, eds. *Language Machines, Technologies of Literary and Cultural Production*. New York, Routledge, 1997.

McDonald, Peter. *British Literary Culture and Publication Practice, 1880-1914*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

McDowell, Paula. *The Women of Grub Street: Press, Politics, and Gender in the London Literary Marketplace, 1678-1730*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1998.

McKerrow, Ronald B. "Notes on Bibliographical Evidence for Literary Students and Editors of English Works of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* vol. 12, 1911-13, pp. 211-318.

---. *An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1927. Reprinted, ed. David McKitterick, New Castle, Oak Knoll Press, 1995.

McKitterick, David. *Print, Manuscript, and the Search for Order 1450-1830*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Moore, John W. *Historical Notes on Printers and Printing 1420 to 1886.* Reprinted New York, Burt Franklin, 1968.

Moxon, Joseph. *Mechanick Exercises on the Whole Art of Printing*. Ed. Herbert Davis and Harry Carter. New York, Dover Publications, Inc. 1978.

---. Ed. Theodore L. De Vinne. New York, Typothetæ of the City of New York, 1896.

Murphy, Andrew. "The History of the Book in Britain, c. 1475-1800." *The Book, A Global History,* edited by Michael F. Suarez, S.J. and H.R. Woudhuysen. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013.

Murray, Simone. *Mixed Media: Feminist Presses and Publishing Politics.* London and Sterling, Pluto Press, 2004.

Myers, Robin. *The Stationers' Company Archive, 1554-1984: An Account of the Records*. Winchester, St. Paul's Bibliographies, 1990.

Nichols, John. *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*. London, Nichols, Son, and Bentley, 1812-16. Six volumes.

Nicolson, Nigel, Ed. *The Letters of Virginia Woolf, Volume 2: 1912-1922*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1978.

Pal, Carol. *Republic of Women: Rethinking the Republic of Letters in the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Parker, Patricia. "Rude mechanicals." *Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture*, edited by Margreta de Grazia, Maureen Quilligan, and Peter Stallybrass, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996, pp. 43-82.

Pateman, Carole. *The Disorder of Women: Democracy, Feminism, and Political Theory*. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1989.

Pettegree, Andrew. *The Book in the Renaissance.* New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2010.

Phelps, C. Deirdre. "Where's the Book? The Text in the Development of Literary Sociology." *Text* vol. 9, 1996, pp. 63-92.

Plomer, Henry R. *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who Were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667*. London, Blades, East and Blades, 1907.

---. *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books 1557-1640*. London, Blades, East and Blades, 1910.

Pollock, Griselda and Rozsika Parker. *Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology.* New York, I.B. Tauris, 1981. Reprinted 2013.

Ratcliffe, Eric. *The Caxton of Her Age: The Career and Family Background of Emily Faithfull (1835-95)*. Upton, Images Publishing, 1993.

Ratto, Matt. "Critical Making." *Open Design Now: Why Design Cannot Remain Exclusive*, edited by Bas van Abel and Lucas Evers, Amsterdam, BIS Publishers, 2011, pp. 203-209.

Raven, James. *The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade.* New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2007.

---. *Bookscape: Geographies of Printing and Publishing in London Before 1800*. London, British Library, 2014.

---. *What is the History of the Book?* Medford, Polity Press, 2018.

Records of London's Livery Companies Online (ROLLCO). https://www.londonroll.org/.

Robbins, Robin, Ed. *The Complete Poems of John Donne*. London and New York, Routledge, 2014.

Ros, Amanda. "The Bias Hiding in Your Library." *Salon Magazine.* March 23, 2019. https://www.salon.com/2019/03/23/the-bias-hiding-in-your-library_partner/.

Samuelson, Todd. Unpublished photos. 2012-2016.

Samuelson, Todd and Christopher L. Morrow. "Empirical Bibliography: A Decade of Book History at Texas A&M." *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* vol. 109, no. 1, 2015, pp. 83-109.

Scott, Joan Wallach. *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1999.

Secord, James A. *Victorian Sensation: The Extraordinary Publication Reception, and Secret Authorship of 'Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation'*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Sharpe, Pamela. "Continuity and Change: Women's History and Economic History in Britain." *The Economic History Review*, New Series, vol. 48, no. 2, May 1995, pp. 353-369.

Smith, Helen. *'Grossly Material Things': Women and Book Culture in Early Modern England.* Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012.

Smith, Pamela H. *The Body of the Artisan: Art and Experience in the Scientific Revolution.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Smith, Sarah. Unpublished photo. 2016.

The Stationers' Company. https://stationers.org/.

Stow, John. *The survey of London containing the original, increase, modern estate and government of that city, methodically set down : with a memorial of those famouser acts of charity, which for publick and pious vses have been bestowed by many worshipfull citizens and benefactors : as also all the ancient and modern monuments erected in the churches, not only of those two famous cities, London and Westminster, but (now newly added) four miles compass / begun first by the pains and industry of John Stow, in the year 1598 ; afterwards inlarged by the care and diligence of A.M. in the year 1618 ; and now compleatly finished by the study & labour of A.M., H.D. and others, this present year 1633 ; whereunto, besides many additions (as appears by the contents) are annexed divers alphabetical tables, especially two, the first, an index of things, the second, a concordance of names.* London, Printed for Nicholas Bourn, and are to be sold at his shop at the south entrance of the Royal-Exchange, 1633. *Early English Books Online (EEBO).* http://gateway.proquest.com.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:24448867.

Strype, John. *A survey of the cities of London and Westminster and the Borough of Southwark written at first in the year 1698 (i.e. 1598). Corrected, improved, and very much enlarged in the year 1720 by John Strype.* London, W. Innys, J. Richardson, and C. Bathhurst, 1754-55. Two volumes.

Suarez, Michael F., S.J. and Henry R. Woudhuysen, (eds). *The Oxford Companion to the Book.* Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010. Two volumes.

---. *The Book: A Global History*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013.

Tanselle, G. Thomas. "Textual Criticism and Literary Sociology." *Studies in Bibliography* vol. 44, 1991, pp. 83-143.

Text Creation Partnership. *Early English Books Online (EEBO).* 2003-2019. https://eebo.chadwyck.com/home.

Thompson, E.P. *The Making of the English Working Class.* New York, Vintage Books, 1966.

Timperley, C.H. *Encyclopaedia of Literary and Typographical Anecdote.* London, Henry G. Bohn, 1842.

Treadwell, Michael. "A New List of English Master Printers, c.1686." *The Library*, series 6, vol. 4, 1982, pp. 57-61.

"Beatrice Warde (1900 - 1969)." University of Brighton Design Archives. http://arts.brighton.ac.uk/collections/design-archives/resources/Women-Designing-1994/European-Feminist-Research-Conference/beatrice-warde-1900-1969.

Vickery, Amanda. "Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women's History." *The Historical Journal* vol. 36, no. 2, 1993, pp. 383-414.

Vollständige Faksimile-Ausgabe Im Originalformat Der Handschrift Ms. Ashmole 1511— Bestiarium: Aus Dem Besitz Der Bodleian Library, Oxford. Graz , Akademische Druck-University of Verlagsanstalt, 1982.

Wallis, Patrick. "Labor, Law, and Training in Early Modern London: Apprenticeship and the City's Institutions." *Journal of British Studies* vol. 51, October 2012, pp. 791–819.

--- and Gadd, Ian A. "Reaching beyond the city wall: London guilds and national regulation, 1500–1700." *Guilds, Innovation and the European Economy, 1400-1800*, edited by Stephan R. Epstein and Maarten Prak, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2008, pp. 288-315.

Walker, Jonathan. "Reading Materiality: The Literary Critical Treatment of Physical Texts." *Renaissance Drama* vol. 41, no. 1 /2, 2013, pp. 199-232.

Warde, Beatrice. *The Crystal Goblet.* New York, The World Publishing Company, 1956.

Weedon, Alexis. "The Economics of Print." *The Book: A Global History*, edited by Michael F. Suarez, S.J. and H.R. Woudhuysen, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013, pp. 154-168.

Wolfe, Heather. "Was early modern writing paper expensive?" *The Collation: Research and Exploration at the Folger*. February 13, 2018, https://collation.folger.edu/2018/02/writing-paper-expensive/. Accessed 4 October 2019.

Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own.* London, Hogarth Press, 1929. Reprinted Barnes & Noble, Inc., 2007.

APPENDIX A

THE *WOMEN IN BOOK HISTORY BIBLIOGRAPHY*

AND A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SCHOLARSHIP ON WOMEN IN THE

EARLY MODERN BOOK TRADES

There is a story behind the story of this dissertation. In 2016, Kate Ozment and I, both graduate students whose projects emphasized in different ways the history of women and the book trades, decided to share some of our most-used scholarly resources in a shared Google document. (There's only so many times one can ask via instant message, "What was that article again?" and "You mentioned that book, what's its title?" before shared files seems like an Incredibly Good Idea.) In May of that year the first iteration of the *Women in Book History Bibliography* (*WBHB*) was born by way of enumerative lists on a simple site; there were 209 citations, and we were incredibly proud. Over three years later, the *WBHB* is a searchable database hosted through the Initiative for Digital Humanities, Media, and Culture (IDHMC) at Texas A&M University, with over 1,550 citations (and growing), with a blog, webstore, associated social media, and an MLA Award to its name. Scholars often talk about serendipity in research; the impact of the *WBHB* is indicative of the serendipitous intersection of gaps in research we were able to help fill and a discipline itself in the throes of transformative change.

Fig. 6. The *WBHB*'s first interface, May 2016.

Fig. 7. The *WBHB*'s current interface, August 2019.

Serendipity was also one of the major factors in locating scholarship on women printers, at least at first. My earliest searches in major databases revealed a paucity of hits, leading to the impression that what work had been done was scattered in both age (articles by Maureen Bell and Felicity Hunt which dated to the 1980s) and content (biographies of individual women, specific book publication histories, etc.). It soon became clear that the problem was not an absence of scholarship, but an absence of easy access to that scholarship.

A July 2019 search in the *MLA International Bibliography* currently displays eighteen results on the topic, with only fifteen actually linked to "women printers" as an index term. The Library of Congress Authority Files lists five bibliographic records[162] under the Subject heading "women printers" with an additional 22 sub-headings that expand to include additional topics ("Bibliography," "Biographies," "Fiction") and geographies ("Great Britain," "Italy," "United States") and thirty-four bibliographic titles. The LOC Authorities also include "Women printmakers" as an *unauthorized* heading with zero results, before expanding to twelve authorized subheadings (and twelve titles) that range from "Women printmakers — Australia — biography" to "Women printmakers — United States — exhibitions." A search for "printers" in the *WBHB* returns 36 individual citations where the term appears in a title, while the field "Book Trades" provides 441 entries that can be sorted further by time period and geographic location. The filtered search for "Book Trades," "Sixteenth Century (1500-1600 C.E.)" and "Seventeenth Century (1600-1700 C.E.)" produces 50 results. In short, the taxonomies used in indexing are

---

[162] A bibliographic record is separate from an individual title or work. The idiosyncrasies of local and national cataloging practices allows for expansive possibilities in detailing title records at individual institutions, stemming from the variety of systems and practices that made sense locally in the pre-digital, pre-internet era. This does, of course, provide a great deal of confusion in digital catalogs for contemporary researchers, to say nothing of the numbers of retroactive cataloging projects taking place in libraries all across the world as librarians strive for accurate records of their holdings. Thus there is a great deal of difference in individual records for titles at various libraries, usually because a specific librarian at a specific institution made a decision in 1925 that surely made sense at the time, and the intervening century of bibliographic practice is doing its best to properly classify it.

reflective of information organization practices that can become stagnant and out of date ("Negro authors" being replaced by "African American authors"), politically problematic (the term "Illegal aliens" was replaced by "Noncitizens and Unauthorized immigration" in 2016), or otherwise non-illustrative of contemporary topics and usage.

In developing the *WBHB*, Kate Ozment and I had numerous conversations regarding categorizations and, later, controlled vocabularies. As the project evolved, we began to see additional issues inherent in scholarly work: disciplinary preferences for authorship over trade work, the isolation of women writers (in LOC, most frequently categorized with "Children's Literature" rather than "Literature" or "Literary Studies"), the marginalization of genre studies outside of specifically genre scholarship, and so on. Collecting and indexing scholarship to revise these categorizations reveals new intersections of the work that has been done to date. For example, a sample search on "Publishing" will return 58 records, including work on the 1970s feminist press movement, editing the writing of women of color, and case studies of 19th c. texts. While some researchers focused on a topic might find these results filled with a lot of "noise," I think it reinforces the idea that women's publishing history is as long and variegated as the broader field itself.

A Selected Bibliography of Scholarship on Women Printers

This selected bibliography has been mined from the *WBHB*, using filters for "Book Trades" and for "Sixteenth Century (1500-1600 C.E.)" and "Seventeenth Century (1600-1700 C.E.)." This is not a complete listing of material found with those filters, but it is indicative of the scholarship located during my research.

Antique Modern & Swash: A Brief History of Women in Printing. [New York]: Club of Printing Women of New York, 1955.

Arbour, Roméo. *Dictionnaire des Femmes Libraires en France, 1470-1870*. Genève: Droz, 2003.

Barlow, Marjorie Dana. *Notes on Women Printers in Colonial America and the United States, 1639-1975*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1976.

Beech, Beatrice. "Charlotte Guillard: A Sixteenth-Century Business Woman." *Renaissance Quarterly* 36 (3): 345-367 (1983).

---. . "Women Printers in Paris in the Sixteenth Century." *Medieval Prosopography* 10 (1): 75-93 (1989).

Bell, Maureen. "A Dictionary of Women in the London Book Trade 1540- 1730." M.L.S. thesis, Loughborough U. of Technology, 1983.

---. "Mary Westwood: Quaker Publisher." *Publishing History* 23: 5-66 (1988).

---. "Hannah Allen and the Development of a Puritan Publishing Business, 1646-51." *Publishing History* 26: 5-66 (1989).

---. "Elizabeth Calvert and the 'Confederates.'" *Publishing History* 32: 5-49 (1992).

---. "Women in the English Book Trade 1557-1700." *Leipziger Jahrbuch zur Buchgeschichte* 6: 13-45 (1996).

Conway, Melissa. *The Diario of the Printing Press of San Jacopo di Ripoli 1476-1484: Commentary and Transcriptions*. Milan: Leo S. Olschki, 1999.

Davidson, Rebecca W. *Unseen Hands: Women Printers, Binders, and Book Designers*. Princeton: Princeton University Library, 2005.

de Courcelles, Dominique and Carmen Val Julián. *Des Femmes et des livres: France et Espagne, XIVe-XVIIe siècles*. Actes de la journée d'étude organisée par l'Ecole nationale des Chartes et l'Ecole normale supérieure de Fontenay Saint-Cloud, Paris, 30 avril 1998. École des Chartes, 1999.

Demeter, Richard L. *Primer, Presses, and Composing Sticks: Women Printers of the Colonial Period*. New York: Exposition Press, 1979.

Draper, Helen. "Mary Beale and Art's Lost Laborers: Women Painter Stainers." *Early Modern Women: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 10 (1): 141-151 (2015).

Ezell, Margaret J. M. "Invisibility Optics: Aphra Behn, Esther Inglis, and the Fortunes of Women's Works." In: *A History of Early Modern Women's Writing*, ed. Patricia Phillippy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018: 27-45.

Fors, Lynne M. *Chez la Veuve: Women Printers in Great Britain 1475-1700.* An exhibition at the University of Illinois Rare Book and Special Collections Library, August - November 1998. Web.

Furtado, Christina Anne. "Bloody, Strange, and Unnatural Women: Advertising on Early Modern English Title Pages, 1565-1640." PhD. Thesis, Fordham University, 2013.

Goldsmith, Elizabeth C. *Going Public: Women and Publishing in Early Modern France*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Gravier, Marina Garone. "Herederas de la letra: mujeres y tipografía en la Nueva España." *Casa de la Primera Imprenta de América.* Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana y Gobierno de la Ciudad de México, 2004: [n.p.].

---. "Impresoras hispanoamericanas: un estado de la cuestión." *Butlletí de la Reial Academia de Bones Lletres de Barcelona:* 451-472 (2007).

---. *Muses de la imprenta. La dona i la imprenta en el món del llibre antic.* Museo Diocesano de Barcelona y Asociación de Bibliófilos de Barcelona, 2009.

---. "Huellas invisibles sobre el papel: las impresoras antiguas en España y México (siglos XVI al XIX)." *Locus, Revista de História, Departamento de História e ao Programa de Pós-Graduação em História da Universida de Federal de Juiz de Fora, Brasil* 17 (2): 103-123 (2011).

Hamill, Frances. "Some Unconventional Women before 1800: Printers, Booksellers, and Collectors." *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 49: 300-314 (1955).

Han, Seo Kyung. "Reclaiming the Ideals of the Yŏllyŏ: Women in and with Books in Early Chosŏn Korea." PhD. Dissertation, State University of New York at Binghamton, 2016.

Hanaford, Phebe A. "Women Printers." In: *Daughters of America : or, Women of the Century* by Phebe A. Hanaford. Augusta: True and Co., 1883: 687-696.

Hudak, Leona M. *Early American Women Printers and Publishers, 1639-1820*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1978.

Kastan, David Scott. "In Plain Sight: Visible Women and Early Modern Plays." In: *Women Making Shakespeare: Text, Reception and Performance*, ed. Gordon McMullan, Lena Cowen Orlin, and Virginia Mason Vaughan. London: Bloomsbury, 2014: 47-56.

Kreps, Barbara. "Elizabeth Pickering: The First Woman to Print Law Books in England and Relations within the Community of Tudor London's Printers and Lawyers." *Renaissance Quarterly* 56: 1053-1088 (2003).

Lenky, Susan V. "Printers' Wives in the Age of Humanism." *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch* 60: 331-337 (1975).

Lirberg, Mikaela and Anna-Karin Skoglund. "Ett vittert fruntimmer. En studie av boktryckaränkor och speciellt fru Fougt." M.L.S. thesis, University of Borås, 2002.

Mann, Alastair. "Embroidery to Enterprise: the Role of Women in the Book Trade of Early Modern Scotland." In: *Women in Scotland c. 1100–c. 1750*, ed. Elizabeth Ewan and Maureen M. Meikle. Glasgow: Tuckwell Press, 1999: 136-151.

Markey, Lia. "The Female Printmaker and the Culture of the Reproductive Print Workshop." In: *Paper Museums: The Reproductive Print in Europe, 1500-1800*, ed. Rebecca Zorach and Elizabeth Rodini. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005: 51-73.

McDowell, Paula. "'On Behalf of the Printers': A Late Stuart Printer-Author and Her Causes." In: *Agents of Change: Print Culture after Elizabeth L. Eisenstein*, eds. Sabrina Alcorn Baron, Eric N. Lindquist, and Eleanor F. Shevlin. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007: 125-139.

Meiner, Annamarie. "Die Frau im Druckgewerbe." *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch*: 333-343 (1933).

Parker, Deborah. "Women in the Book Trade in Italy, 1475-1620." *Renaissance Quarterly* 49 (3): 509-541 (1996).

Petto, Christine. "Playing the Feminine Card: Women of the Early Modern Map Trade." *Cartographica: The International Journal for Geographic Information and Geovisualization* 44: 67-81 (2009).

Robin, Diana. "Courtesans, Celebrity, and Print Culture in Renaissance Venice: Tullia d'Aragona, Gaspara Stampa, and Veronica Franco." In: *Italian Women and the City: Essays*, ed. Janet Levarie Smarr and Daria Valentini. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2003: 35-59.

Smith, Helen. *'Grossly Material Things': Women and Book Culture in Early Modern England.* Oxford University Press, 2012.

---. "'Print[ing] your royal father off': Early Modern Female Stationers and the Gendering of the British Book Trades." *Text: An Interdisciplinary Annual of Textual Studies* 15: 163-186 (2003).

---. "Old Authors, Women Writers, and the New Print Technology." In: *A Companion to Tudor Literature*, ed. Kent Cartwright. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010: 178-191.

Straznicky, Marta. *Privacy, Playreading, and Women's Closet Drama 1550-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

---, Ed. *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers, and Readers in Early Modern England*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006.

van Goinga, Hannie. "Schaduwbeelden: Vrouwen in het boekenvak in de vroegmoderne tijd: Een nieuw terrein van onderzoek." *Jaarboek voor Nederlandse Boekgeschiedenis* 12: 13-28.

Viljoen, Madeleine. *Printing Women: Three Centuries of Female Printmakers, 1570-1900*. New York: New York Public Library, 2015.

Wigginton, Caroline. *In the Neighborhood: Women's Publication in Early America*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2016.

Ziegler, Edda*. Buchfrauen. Frauen in der Geschichte des deutschen Buchhandels*. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2014.