Channelling Catholicism through Translation:
Women and French Recusant Literature around the Court of Queen Henrietta Maria (1625-42)

Abstract
At the English court of Queen consort Henrietta Maria (1625-42), women played important roles in the translation and circulation of French Catholic materials. Translations of recusant literature dedicated to the queen included the works of women, such as Elizabeth Cary’s *The Reply* and Susan Du Verger’s *Admirable events*. Whether as patrons, dedicatees, intended readers, translators or printers, women contributed to the dissemination of recusant writings and the advancement of Catholic culture under King Charles I’s Anglican rule. This article explores the agentic strategies employed by women as demonstrated in a corpus of recusant literature which was translated from French to English and meant to circulate at the queen’s court and among the English Catholic elite. I investigate textual and paratextual strategies deployed in translated works as markers of a complex transnational/networked Catholic identity in Caroline England.

1. Introduction

At the English court of Queen consort Henrietta Maria (1625-1642), women played important roles in the translation and circulation of French Catholic materials. In this article, I look at the translated Catholic recusant literature which was meant to circulate at the court of Henrietta Maria and among the Catholic elite. This was a complicated time for English Catholics as the king was the head of the Anglican Church. On the one hand, the Protestant majority was limiting the rights of Catholics, and on the other, the Catholic queen
and her Jesuit entourage maintained close ties with the dévot party at the court of French king Louis XIII. The royal couple’s relationship presented a strangely common model where the husband was Protestant for political reasons and the wife was Catholic or a Catholic convert. In this context, women therefore played an important role in secret Catholic networks.

The contribution of early modern women to literary and cultural production has been highlighted in interdisciplinary studies on topics ranging from the history of literature to gender politics in religious convents. What interests me specifically is the consistent inclusion of women in translated Catholic works, be it as dedicatees, translators, patrons or printers. The case studies I will present show how women participated, both actively and passively, in the dissemination of recusant writings in England and in the advancement of Catholic culture under King Charles I’s Anglican rule. Using case studies of translated recusant literature, I will show in what ways printed translation operated as a space for political and public agency for early modern women. The examples compiled present an opportunity to revisit the societal roles of women and shed new light on how women used print to establish and exploit ideological networks. Through a series of examples, we will look at forms of agency used by early modern women, specifically patronage, translation, and printing.

2. Methodology and Theoretical Framework

I built the corpus of printed translations that were destined to circulate at and around Henrietta Maria’s English court by analyzing paratextual data documented in the catalogues Renaissance Cultural Crossroads (RCC) and Cultural Crosscurrents in Stuart and Commonwealth Britain (CCC).¹ My research continued

¹ The Renaissance Cultural Crossroads catalogue created under the direction of Brenda M. Hosington documents bibliographical information on printed translations between 1473 and 1640 and is available in open access at https://www.dhi.ac.uk/rcc/. As for the Cultural Crosscurrents Catalogue of Translations in Stuart and Commonwealth Britain (1641-60), it is under
with keyword searches on *Early English Books Online* (EEBO), then, as I acquired biographical data on courtiers and people connected to Henrietta Maria, I expanded my corpus to include works dedicated to these people. Biographical data was pulled from the online edition of the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (ODNB) and the *Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who Were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667* (Plomer 1907, online), as well as printed publications such as the *Biographical Encyclopedia of Early Modern Englishwomen: Exemplary Lives and Memorable Acts, 1500-1650* (Levin, Bertollet, and Carney 2017). There are currently seventy-three works in my corpus, and as I continue to explore the networked relations of translating agents, I expand the corpus of printed translations that were dedicated to Henrietta Maria, Charles I, members of the queen’s court and her entourage. I analyze printed translations and originals, exploring paratextual features and the human and political networks they trace back to. I also compare original and translated texts to investigate how the original wording is manipulated to fit the needs of a new audience.

In my research I apply a critical and comparative lens for the analysis of printed translations to unearth connections between marginal political or ideological influencers such as translators, patrons and printers. By centring my theoretical framework on agency (innate empowerment) or agentic practices (deliberate acts of empowerment), I attempt to blur the lines between the public and private spheres, considering the “uses” or functions of print within the production under the supervision of Marie-Alice Belle (Université de Montréal) and Brenda M. Hosington (Université de Montréal/Warwick).

2 Though accessible only through subscription, the *Early English Books Online* platform is a vital tool for research on early modern literature as it brings together over seventeen million images of books printed between 1473 and 1700 from over 220 libraries worldwide. It has recently been merged onto the ProQuest platform.

3 This dictionary does not document booksellers through the entire period that I analyze in my research, but several entries which are valid for 1641 provide hints for the years preceding those indicated. This resource is available in open access, see bibliography for website address.
broader context of early modern print culture. Furthermore, as the practice of naming people in early modern printed works carried symbolic capital, I use printed paratexts as preliminary network data to explore connections between those who have power and those seeking it. I borrow Hélène Buzelin’s (2005) concept of “translating agent”, which corresponds to any person or institution with the power to impact the process and result of the creation, production and distribution of translations. Assuming agency in early modern print culture is a necessary step for analysis of the real or desired cultural and ideological value of printed works, and as I have argued elsewhere (Guénette 2016), this agency extends to any role in the creation of printed translations. Indeed, translating agents can be patrons, printers, translators, booksellers... any one of which can be the central actor in the lifecycle of a printed translation.

In *Langage et pouvoir symbolique*, Bourdieu writes about language and representation having the ability to symbolically construct reality. He claims that agents in the literary field have an acute knowledge of this system of transfer of meaning, and by extension, power: “by structuring the perception that social agents have of the social world, naming/nominating contributes to establishing the structure of this world and all the more so because it is recognized and authorized” (Bourdieu 2001 [1982]: 155). Early modern translating agents were knowledgeable in the art of *naming* as a strategy for acquiring symbolic capital and establishing relationships of patronage. Naming as a multifaceted strategy for the acquisition of symbolic capital is documented in printed translations, for instance, with the translator naming the author and establishing his or her relationship to the original work; the location of print and name of

---

4 For more on the functions of print and the notion of “print culture”, see Chartier 1987.
5 The notion of “translation agent” is defined in Buzelin 2005, 193-218. For expanded applications to early modern English translation and print culture, see Guénette 2016, 155-76.
6 For more information on the various roles that agents could take on within early modern English print culture, see Boutcher 2015, 22-40.
7 My translation of “en structurant la perception que les agents sociaux ont du monde social, la nomination contribue à faire la structure de ce monde et d’autant plus profondément qu’elle est plus largement reconnue, c’est-à-dire autorisée”. 
printer ascribing cultural or ideological capital to the work; the translator’s work being publicly valued by his or her peers through the printing of laudatory poems in English of Latin; and with the translator often dedicating his or her work to a strategic, powerful and wealthy person who may or may not have acted as a patron for the work. With early modern women’s social status often being secondary to that of men, the naming of a woman in print culture carries strong meaning of that woman’s influential status at court or in other public spheres.

In the past, scholars have not specifically studied the court of Henrietta Maria as a place for the production and circulation of ideology. The rehabilitation of Henrietta Maria as a capable leader and active agent of cultural production began with Erica Veevers’s 1989 book *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments*. Since then, the Queen’s cultural contribution to early modern England has been largely restored, with scholars speaking more about her patronage of the arts, her role in the production of court masques, and her decided representation of overt Catholic faith for Recusants across Britain. The scholarly works of Susan Wiseman (1998) and Karen Britland (2006; 2016 [2008]) on Henrietta Maria’s patronage of drama have opened the discussion on the politics of such theatrical performances, but there is still a need to explore the ideological and cultural functions of printed translations at the Queen’s court. In Erin Griffey’s (2016 [2008]) edited volume titled *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage*, contributors draw an elaborate portrait of how ideology, politics and culture were interwoven as the Queen aired her interests at court. Diana Barnes’s (2008) chapter on *The Secretary of Ladies*, a guidebook for correspondence which was translated from French, reveals how printed translations intersected with female court culture. Malcolm Smuts’ (2008) piece provides a much-needed overview of the Queen’s entourage and shows how religion and politics were constant within her inner circle. Smuts’ work hints at the inescapable impact of Catholicism on

---

8 Henrietta Maria’s status as an agent of cultural production is highlighted in the following works: Britland 2006; Butler, 2008; Clarke, 2001; Griffey, 2016 [2008]; Stedman 2013.
the Queen’s artistic choices and cultural preferences. Indeed, in the introduction, Griffey (2016, 6) notes that the book insists on “Henrietta Maria’s importance as a political figure who attempted to shape court politics through her cultural patronage of and representation in art, drama and music, [and] this is based on the understanding that her piety was, ironically, her principal political tool”. As a matter of fact, the Queen’s Catholic upbringing and close ties to French dévot culture have been established by historians and literary scholars through analysis of historical documents and literary works.9

Typically, in the early modern period, women, the practice of translation and devotion are all considered “private” matters: women, like children, should mostly be seen and not heard; translations are poor reflections of their original counterpart, and devotion is best expressed through silent prayer. However, my research on printed translations dedicated to the queen and members of her court has highlighted that the genre of French Catholic literature was often Englished while Henrietta Maria was queen consort (1625-42), and that women took on active roles in the production of such texts. The relevance of recusant literature in translation in early modern Europe has been affirmed by Jaime Goodrich (2013) in her book Faithful Translators where she demonstrates the agentic strategies used by women to ensure their works were read. And despite the “private” nature ascribed to women, translation and devotion, it is clear that the translating agents involved in these publications made use of the overtly public printed form as well as the public request for patronage from royalty or courtiers. As Micheline White states in her introduction to English Women, Religion, and Textual Production, 1500-1625, “new interpretive paradigms emerged as scholars began acknowledging the central (rather than marginal) place of religious writing in Renaissance England” (2011, 2). White has also published extensively on early modern women’s religious writings and use of print as means to communicate their opinions, assert them-

9 Historian Carolyn Harris attributes Henrietta Maria’s lifelong commitment to the defense and promotion of Catholicism to her upbringing. For more information, see Harris 2016, 15-47.
selves as patrons, and establish networks with like-minded individuals. Women’s strategic uses of translation and print have also been brought to light by translation history scholars, with an increasing number of case studies revealing the intentional exploitation of female agency through print culture (see Belle 2012; Coldiron 2016; Uman 2012; Wilson-Lee 2015). In this article, I will attempt to show the variety of agentic practices that women took on within the scope of translated recusant literature, addressing recurrent strategies such as patronage, translation and print.

3. Forms of translation and print agency demonstrated in recusant literature at the English court of Queen Henrietta Maria

3.1 Patronage

Patronage has a curious way of establishing connections between the rich and powerful and the most humble early modern translator. I consider patronage expressed through printed dedications an active agentic role even if some of the connections between writers and patrons are virtual or impossible to confirm. As Marie-Alice Belle and I (2019) have stated in our publication on translation and print networks in seventeenth-century England, “we still consider these [connections] to be significant, because social and cultural capital, even imagined, represent major components of early modern print culture. Translators and printers were clearly alert to the social potential of their medium, and it is crucial here to acknowledge the performative, symbolic aspects of the early modern network as a means of social identification, cultural self-fashioning, or ideological positioning”. It is also important to remember that for a woman to have a work dedicated to her in such a public manner, she must have some form of power or prominence in society.

---

10 See White, 2005, 187-214. For a broader perspective of recent research, see Knight, White and Sauer, eds., 2018.
i. Translated recusant works dedicated to Queen Henrietta Maria

Seeing as Henrietta Maria is the central element to this corpus and arguably the most powerful historical figure in this context, with the possible exception of her husband, it is only normal that she should appear as a dedicatee in numerous translations. Thus far, I have identified eleven printed recusant translations which contain a dedication to Henrietta Maria.\(^{11}\) I published a case study on Thomas Hawkins’s 1626 translation of Nicolas Caussin’s *La Cour Sainte* (Guénette 2016), and will therefore not go into detail here, but it is significant that it is the first printed translation of recusant literature that was dedicated to Henrietta Maria. Curiously, the book was translated from French to English and dedicated to the queen who, at the time, did not speak or read English. Hawkins’s dedication to Henrietta Maria also appears in the second volume of *The Holy Court* in 1631, and subsequent third volume in 1634.

Other repeat dedicators to the queen include Edward Walpole with his 1629 and 1630 editions of *The Pilgrime of Loreto* (original by Louis Richeome). Both the original and translation were written by Jesuit priests – Edward’s parents had tried to prevent his conversion to Catholicism, but he joined the Jesuits in 1594, and studied in Louvain, Brussels and Antwerp before accepting high-ranking positions among the Jesuits in England (see Walpole 1629). An obvious Jesuit logo at the top of the title page is the first indication of connections to Catholic circles, followed by the author’s name “Fa. Lewis Richeome of the Society of Jesus” (Walpole 1629, title page). The title page also shows a false imprint of Paris, though the RCC documents that the translation was printed at the English Jesuit College of Saint-Omer in France. In the notes on the translation section of the RCC, it is also recorded that the ESTC suggests that Edward Worsley and Edward Weston may be possible translators, though the attribution to Edward Walpole is confirmed by the ODNB.

\(^{11}\) The examples presented in this section are but a few of these translations. The others are discussed throughout the article as they are cross-listed in several sections with some by female translators and others printed by women.
In his dedicatory epistle, Walpole draws on the image of the humble pilgrim to create a rich semantic field which ties in perfectly with the false modesty of the translator’s preface. The dedicatory epistle begins as follows: “This Pilgrimage [...] was driven backe by a double feare: the one, of offending with his over-boldnes, in presenting himselfe (poore Pilgrime) to so great a Princesse: the other, least the very name of Pilgrime might debar him of all accesse, and Audience” (Walpole 1629, 1r-1v). After sufficient apology, the translator reminds the queen of her connections to the French court, writing: “Accept then, MADAME, in England, what your renowned Father imbraced in France. He desireth only to be graced, and honoured with your Maiestyes Name, and to shroud himself under the wings of your Princely protection, and to be admitted your Maiestitie poore beadesman” (Walpole 1629, 1v). Here, the translator makes a case for the Queen’s patronage by reminding her that her father had supported such work in France. He spells out the terms of the agreement he is seeking, as he wishes to be affiliated with her name, to benefit from her protection, and to be recognized as her servant in writing or in prayer. With these strategic connections, it becomes apparent that the translator was not as humble as he claimed to be.

Walpole’s dedication also hints at the proven value of the prayers included in Richeome’s book when he writes:

This Pilgrime was presented to your Maiestitie Father in France, of purpose to offer his prayers for the then Dauphine, now King (the benefit and fruit whereof he hath found and felt in good success of his affairs) [...] he commeth now wholly, and particulery to do the like for both your Maiestities, that God (by the intercession of his Blessed Mother) would blesse your Royall persons [...] And namely, that having united you in the sacred bandes of holy Matrimony, and lincked your hearts with so fast Loue and Affection, [...] that he would also blesse you with the happy fruit thereof, and make his Maiesty a joyfull Father, and You a Mother of many goodly, and Godly Princes, who may longe sway the Scepter of great Britaine after you [...] (Walpole 1629, 2r-2v)
In May 1629, Henrietta Maria gave birth to her first child, who unfortunately lived only two hours. The following year, the future King Charles II was born on 29 May 1630 (Wolfson 2017, 271). I cannot be certain if the exact timing meant that Walpole’s translation provided the queen with prayers following the loss of her child, but he certainly speaks of the royal couple’s future children. By the time the work was reprinted in 1630, Walpole is able to claim that the prayers were answered, as the young Charles lives. The dedicatory epistle remains the same in this second printing — there do not appear to be any references (or gloating) in the second edition.

**ii. Translated recusant works dedicated to the Lord Chamberlain**

It also appears that translators wishing to reach the Catholic elite at Henrietta Maria’s court thought it appropriate to dedicate works to Lord Chamberlain Edward Sackville. The Chamberlain’s proximity to the queen increased the likeliness that the given text would reach her. It should be noted that these are only the dedications of recusant literature and that several secular works were dedicated to the Lord Chamberlain. Two printed translations of recusant literature were dedicated Edward Sackville:

- **1631. La Cour sainte – Holy Court, 2nd tome.** Original by Nicolas Caussin, translation by Thomas Hawkins. (STC 4873).
- **1638. Réveille-matin des dames – An alarum for Ladyes.** Original by Jean-Puget de la Serre, translation by Francis Hawkins. (STC 20487.5).

Familial connections are evident here, with Thomas Hawkins translating *The Holy Court* and his nephew Francis Hawkins, who was educated in an English Jesuit College on the Continent, translating the *Alarum for Ladyes*.

Thomas Hawkins’s dedication in this second volume of the Holy Court presents a hierarchy whereby the Lord Chamberlain is above the queen. As a first strategy to praise the dedicatee, Hawkins uses a lengthy and detailed heading for the dedication, addressing his translation “to the right honovrable Edward D’Sackvile, Earle of Dorset, Baron of Buckhurst, Lord Chamberlaine to
the Queenes Maiesty, Knight of the Noble Order of the Garter, and one of his Maiesties most Honourable Priuy Councell” (Thomas Hawkins 1631, dedicatory epistle). Within the dedication itself, Hawkins explains that he dedicated the first tome of The Holy Court to the queen, and that the experience of that dedication now “emboldens” him to present the second tome to the Lord Chamberlain:

The eminent, and well deserverd place your Honour holds in the Court of her Majesty (to vvhose Gracious Favour the first part of this my Worke vvas heretofore humbly consecrated) emboldsens me in the adventure of this present addresse to your Honour; nor shall there (I hope) any notable disproportiion appeare to the eyes of the judicious, that I thus purposely select your Honour, to vwaye on her Highnesse in a printed Dedication, vwho at Court in so neere a degree, daily attend on her Sacred Person. (Thomas Hawkins 1631: 1r-1v)

What is perhaps most interesting here is the fact that though Hawkins states the Lord Chamberlain as the dedicatee of this work, he identifies the proximity to the queen as the raison d’être for his dedication. He both compliments his dedicatee by claiming his superior hierarchical position in the adventure of the printed dedication and reminds him of his inferior status at court in relation to the queen.

Hawkins is skilled in the art of the dedication, and concludes with a paragraph where he writes: “It is your Honours Patronage, that thus brings them [the subsequent volumes] with the rest into the fruitio of English Ayre, and me by this opportunity into the gratefull acknowledgment of many favours receyued from your Honour; vvhich since I cannot make knovvne by more reall Demonstrations, I offer this poore endeavouer to supply the plentifull desires of him, vwho resolues to persist” (Thomas Hawkins 1631, 1r). If we hold the translator to his word, we are to understand that this is not the first time Sackville has acted as Thomas Hawkins’s patron.

In Francis Hawkins’s translation of Jean Puget de la Serre’s Réveille-Matin des Dames, the translator is not so bold as to claim he deserves the patronage of
the Lord Chamberlain, nor does he reference his connections at court, or Sackville’s proximity to the royal couple beyond the name of the dedicatee. The word order here may not have been chosen by the translator himself, but the decision made by one of the translating agents involved in the production of this work does impact the status of the dedicatee. The Lord Chamberlain’s titles are inverted in this dedication “to the right honovrable Edvvward Sak-vile, Earle of Dorset, One of his Majestye’s most Honourable Priuy Councell, Knight of the Noble Order of the Garter, and Lord Chamberlaine to the Queene’s Majesty, &c.” (Francis Hawkins 1638, dedicatory epistle). The dedication thus references the dedicatee’s connection to the King (priy council), then another all-male society, the Order of Garter, and finally the connection to the Queen. By flaunting the dedicatee’s numerous titles, the translator is highlighting Sackville’s level of importance at court, and similarly to Thomas Hawkins’s dedication, showing that the translator acknowledges the boldness of the act of dedication. In the dedication, the translator reminds Sackville that he is barely ten years old and apologizes for his soaring ambition “as to call your Excellence the Patron of this my Treatise” (Francis Hawkins 1638, dedicatory epistle). The skillful wording and mastery of the art of the printed dedication indicate that it was probably written by someone other than Francis Hawkins, which shows how familial ties, recusant connections and structures of translating agents were leveraged to increase the viability of printed recusant literature in translation.

The royal connections here, though not stipulated in the dedicatory epistle, run deep, as de la Serre was historiographer of France and a favourite of Henrietta Maria’s mother, the Queen Mother Marie de Médicis. It is to be noted that another translation from de la Serre, the Catholic devotional treatise The Mirrour which flatters not, is dedicated to both Henrietta Maria and Charles I, and its patron Marie de Médicis herself is named in both the original and the translation (see Thomas Cary 1639). By translating one of the Sieur de la Serre’s texts, the young and well informed (or rather, well connected) Francis Haw-
kins is therefore revealing his knowledge of Henrietta Maria’s familial patronage and ties to the Catholic community.

**iii. Translated recusant works dedicated to other women**

Henrietta Maria was known to have a close female entourage, and these women, along with other prominent recusant figures, were also dedicatees of translated recusant literature. Here are the translations of Catholic works dedicated to women other than Henrietta Maria and connected to the Queen’s English court that I have identified thus far.

**Lady Elizabeth Dormer**, wife of Edward Somerset, 2nd Marquess of Worcester

**Elizabeth Darcy Savage**, Countess Rivers and Vicountess Savage

**Lady Anne Arundell** (1616-49)

**Frances Weston**, Countess of Portland
- 1634. *The Holy Court in 3 tomes*. Original by Nicolas Caussin, translation by Thomas Hawkins. *Also includes dedications to Queen Henrietta Maria and Edward Sackville, Earl of Dorset. (STC 4874).*

**Katherine Manners Villiers MacDonnel I**, Duchess of Buckingham

**Lady Margaret O’Brien**, second wife of Edward Somerset, 2nd Marquess of Worcester

---

12 See White 2006; Clarke 2001; Levin, Bertolet and Eldridge Carney, eds., 2017, 540-554.

In the dedicatory epistles, each of these women is identified with a title that shows her prominence in society, and according to the biographical information I have found on each of them, these women were known Catholics. Elizabeth Dormer (d. 31 May 1635) was the sister of Robert Dormer (1610-43) first earl of Carnarvon and the first wife of Edward Somerset, 2nd Marquess of Worcester. Her family’s Catholicism is documented, with influential ties to Mary Tudor’s court. As for Elizabeth Darcy Savage, she was sworn in as a Lady of the Bedchamber to Henrietta Maria after the dismissal of the queen’s French officers (Wolfson 2017, 550). According to Wolfson (2017, 550), she was also “one of the few English Catholic court women granted permission by the king to accompany Henrietta Maria to Mass in her small oratory”.

Lady Anne Arundell is likely Anne Arundell (1616-49) the daughter of Thomas Arundell, first Baron Arundell of Wardour. A known Catholic, she married Cecil Calvert who journeyed to Rome to convert to Catholicism prior to their wedding (see Bremer 2008). There is a likely connection to English Catholicism and colonial exploration with her marriage to Cecil Calvert, second Baron Baltimore, as Calvert played a role in the establishment of the American state of Maryland. Maryland, so named for Queen Henrietta Maria, was explicitly meant to be a Catholic colony.

Frances, Countess of Portland, was born “into one of the leading Essex Catholic families”, according to her husband’s ODNB profile (Quintrell 2008). She married Richard Weston, first earl of Portland (bap. 1577, d. 1635), kept “her own priests and [was....] busy during the 1630s among the proselytizing

---

13 I take this opportunity to thank Susannah Brietz Monta and Elizabeth Patton for helping me identify Lady Anne Arundell as Anne Arundell (1616-49). Their extensive research on Anne Dacre Howard, countess of Arundel (1557-1630) at Arundel castle made it possible to eliminate Anne Howard as a possible dedicatee for *A draught of eternitie*. 
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women around the queen” (Quintrell 2008). The translator was aware of her religious beliefs, as he wrote in the first sentence of his dedicatory epistle “THE excellent endowments of your soule, acknowledged even by enuy, and admired by truth, together with your known propension to the reading of pious Bookes, intuites me to this dedication…” (Thomas Hawkins 1634, A1r, following Title page “The Holy Court Second Tome”).

The fourth volume of The Holy Court printed in 1638 is dedicated “To the Excellent Princess The Duchesse of Buckingham” (Thomas Hawkins 1638, A2r), which I believe to be Katherine Manners Villers, Duchess of Buckingham and wife of Georges Villiers, Duke of Buckingham. The dedication is ambiguous as there is no specific name, which leaves doubt as to the possibility of the dedication being in fact to Mary Villiers, Katherine and George’s daughter, born in 1622. The translator does, however, provide additional information on the Duchesse’s family: “The pretious memory (Excellent Princesse) of your thrice-noble Father, whose liuing Image, and second-selfe you representatiuely are, together with your knovnve loue of pious Bookes, and daily practise in your life of the holesome precepts couched in This…” (Thomas Hawkins 1638 A2v). The translator further hints at the existing relationship of patronage he has with his dedicatee’s family: “I wish (Excellent Lady) there were any thing wherein I might better expresse the deuoted service I ove to your eminent selfe, and illustrious Family…” (Thomas Hawkins 1638, A2v).

Katherine Manners Villiers was one of Henrietta Maria’s closest confidantes; she was converted to Catholicism through the efforts of her recusant stepmother Cecily Tufton and may have practised her religion at the queen’s chapel (Kennedy 2017, 547). As for Lady Herbert, Brenda M. Hosington (2016, 101) identifies her as Lady Margaret O’Brien, second wife of Edward Somerset, 2nd Marquess of Worcester. Lady Herbert’s husband was renamed

---

14 See the ODNB entry for Katherine Manners Villiers’s father, where the family’s conversion is attributed to Cecily Tufton: A. J. Loomie, “Manners, Francis, sixth earl of Rutland (1578-1632),” Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (29 May 2014), https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/17953.
Lord Herbert of Raglan from 1628-44 and was known to be a royalist courtier and friend to Henrietta Maria (Hibbard 2008).

3.2 Translation

Women also took on an active role as translators of recusant literature. And despite the numerous translations which were printed as anonymous, some did sign their works. By sifting through the corpus of Catholic recusant translations at the English court of Queen Henrietta Maria, I was able to identify three female translators: Elizabeth Cary, Elizabeth Evelinge and Susan Du Verger.  

Elizabeth Cary:  

Elizabeth Evelinge:  

Susan Du Verger:  
• 1639. *Admirable events*. Original by Jean-Pierre Camus. (STC 4549 & STC 4550).

Elizabeth Cary, Viscountess Falkland (1585-1639), was a writer and translator whose most controversial work was the *Reply of the most Illustrious Cardinal of Perron* (1630). As noted in her ODNB profile, the book was “an overt piece of Catholic propaganda, [which...] was dedicated—publicly via the printed text, and privately via presentation volumes inscribed with an autograph verse—to Queen Henrietta Maria, identifying her as an ambassador for the Catholic faith in England” (Hodgson-Wright 2014). In her dedicatory epistle to the Maiestie
of Henrietta Maria of Bovrbon Queene of Great Brittaine, Elizabeth Cary uses several literary tropes to connect the queen to France, England and this work:

You are a daughter of France, and therefore fittest to owne his worke who was in his time, an Ornament of your countrie. You are the Queene of England, and therefore fittest to patronize the making him an English man, that, was before so famous a French-man. You are Kinge James his Sonns wife, and therefore, since the misfortune of our times, hath made it a presumption, to giue the Inheritance of this worke (that was sent to the Father in Frêch) to the Sonne in English, whose proper right it is, you are fittest to receiue it for him, who are such a parte of him, as none can make you two, other then one. (Elizabeth Cary 1630, A2, my emphasis)

After using Henrietta Maria’s nationality, title and marriage to position her as the proper dedicatee, Cary goes on to comment on the queen’s gender and religious affiliation:

And for the honor of my Sexe, let me saie it, you are a woeman, though farr aboue other wemen, therefore fittest to protect a womans worke, if a plaine translation wherein there is nothing aimed at, but rightlie to expresse the Authors intention may be called a worke. And last (to crowne your other additions) you are a Catholicke, and a zealous one, and therefore fittest to receiue the dedication of a Catholicke-worke. (Elizabeth Cary 1630, A2, my emphasis)

The repetitive format throughout the dedicatory epistle, which Cary uses as a means to underscore Henrietta Maria’s station in society, shows one woman claiming to deserve the protection of another. The queen’s and the translator’s gender may have them at a disadvantage in early modern society, but Cary is clearly calling for a united front while seeking protection and patronage.

According to Jaime Goodrich (2013, 151), “Catherine Magdalen (Elizabeth) Evelinge, a Poor Clare, created a unique form of authorship that is comparable to synecdochic anonymity by ascribing two printed translations to Magdalen of St Austin (Catherine) Bentley, another nun at her house”. This false attribution allowed her to distance herself from her writing while partici-
pating in literary and doctrinal debates. Religious women also played on anonymity to increase the visibility of their congregations as opposed to that of individual writers, notes Goodrich (2013, 151): “these translators renounced their individual identities to shape perceptions of their religious circles or communities, using the collectivity implied by synecdoche to enter the public sphere and claim a mediated form or authority”. Diana Barnes (2008, 44) also writes about the importance of anonymity for women’s writing in her article titled, “The Secretary of Ladies and Feminine Friendship at the Court of Henrietta Maria”: “Anonymity not only permits women’s participation in rhetorical reasoning, it is crucial to the form’s capacity to imagine political community”.

Incidentally, each of these translations was dedicated to a woman: the first three were dedicated to Henrietta Maria, and Du Verger’s Diotrephe was dedicated to Lady Herbert. Brenda M. Hosington has written extensively on Susan Du Verger (see Hosington 2016, 2017), notably contextualizing the translator’s choice of texts. Though Jean-Pierre Camus’s texts are secular courtly romances, they are paratextually framed as moralistic Catholic French writings, which is why I consider them recusant literature for the purposes of this analysis (Hosington 2017, 104-105). Jane Collins (2008) writes about Du Verger’s dedication of Diotrephé in the ODNB: “The dedicatory letter, to Elizabeth, Lady Herbert – a zealous and active Catholic gentlewoman – is signed simply S. DuVerger, but it refers pointedly to her earlier “labours in this kind”, suggesting that this DuVerger was also the translator of Admirable Events”. Collins (2008) also flags the obvious religious conflict between Du Verger’s birth into a French Huguenot family and the translator’s decision to “publish works that seem to support Catholic culture and doctrine”. Though the mystery has yet to be solved, the translator’s dedications to overt Catholics Henrietta Maria and Lady Herbert were probably intentional, perhaps an attempt to acquire patronage, visibility, and to ensure her works were read in the highest circles.
3.3 Print

In the corpus of translated recusant literature, I identified three translations printed by women. The first is Miles Car’s translation of Jean-Pierre Camus’s *Crayon de l’éternité* which was printed in Douai in 1632 by the Widowe of Marke Wyon (Car alias Carre 1632). This translation is also dedicated to a woman, Lady Anne Arundell (thought to be Anne Arundell Calvert). The second is the aforementioned *The Mirrour which flatters not*, which was written by Jean Puget de la Serre, translated by Thomas Cary, and printed by Elizabeth Purslowe. The imprint only includes the printer’s initials, but her identity was recovered by the ESTC: “London: printed by E[liabeth] P[urslowe] for R. Thrale, and are to be sold at his shop at the signe of the Crosse-Keyes, at Pauls Gate, 1639” (Cary 1639, title page). As indicated previously, *The Mirrour which flatters not* was dedicated to Charles I and Henrietta Maria, and the original was commissioned by Marie de Médicis, Henrietta Maria’s Mother, which highlights the decidedly powerful (and Catholic) female connections in this printed translation. Finally, the corpus includes a 1633 translation of the New Testament printed by Augustine Matthewes at the request of Hester Ogden (Martin and Parker 1633). The imprint shows both female names spelled out, not just with initials: “London: printed by Augustine Mathewes on of [sic] the assignes of Hester Ogden. Cum priuilegio Regis, 1633” (Martin and Parker 1633, title page). I could not find biographical information on Augustine Matthewes, nor can I confirm Hester Ogden’s identity. I do not think this is a Catholic Bible, as paratextual materials include a dedicatory epistle to King Charles I by the same Hester Ogden, and a reprinted dedicatory epistle to Queen Elizabeth I by theologian William Fulke (1536/7-89).
3.4 Depictions in literature

In analyzing the presence of women in the corpus, I also noted a few translated books which were about women and meant to circulate at the court of King Charles and Henrietta Maria. The printed translations about women are:

- 1634. *The historie of the life and reigne of that famous princesse Elizabeth* […]. Original by William Camden, translation by Thomas Browne (from Latin to English). Dedicated to King Charles I by translator. (STC 4499).


While the presence of women’s agency in this selection of texts is debatable, there is certainly something to be said about female representation in print culture. The books listed above are all of the same genre—they are biographies of powerful women (Queen Elizabeth I and Queen Mary Stuart), and a hagiography of a woman whose life story made her a religious leader (Saint Clare of Assisi). The connection to recusant literature is tenuous for the biography of Queen Elizabeth, but Queen Mary’s ties to Catholicism are indisputable, as are those of Saint Clare.

4. Conclusion

In this article, I have tried to highlight the omnipresence of women across the genre of printed Catholic literature in translation. By investigating paratexual
strategies deployed in translated works as markers of a complex transnation-
al/networked Catholic identity in Caroline England, I have shown how wom-
en actively participated in the production and dissemination of recusant writ-
ings in England and thus contributed to the advancement of Catholic culture.
In my research, I try to show that the agency of women is not limited to the
cases in which they occupied a leading role. The majority of the women from
the data I presented here were elite courtiers who held a prominent status in
erly modern English society, and despite their social prestige, they often only
appear as the wives and daughters of well-known and/or powerful men.

Many aspects of women’s contribution to early modern society still need
to be investigated, and I have demonstrated here how roles traditionally con-
sidered marginal, such as that of the translator, can be a starting point for such
research. The analyses presented may serve as examples of how rallying
around ideological constructs and seeking patronage for translations put wom-
en squarely at the intersections of transnational cultural exchanges. The main
takeaway here is that printed translation operated as a space for political and
public agency for women. Whether as dedicatees, translators, patrons or print-
ers, women were active and visible participants in the creation of early modern
religious culture.
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