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Reprenant les travaux de Gérard Genette, cet article vise à souligner la pertinence de lire les traductions comme des “hypertextes” — c’est-à-dire des œuvres qui se viennent se greffer sur d’autres qui leur précédaient (ou “hypotextes”) — à partir de l’exemple singulier de The Admirable Life of the Holy Virgin S. Catharine of Bologna (1621), traduction composée par Catherine Magdalen Evelyn, Clarisse au couvent des Gravelines. La traduction est peu connue aujourd’hui malgré son importance historique (Evelyn est la traductrice la plus prolifique du début du règne des Stuart), et la voix de la traductrice y est comme sublimée : les paratextes sont laconiques et l’œuvre est de fait attribuée à une autre moniale. En dépit de cette opacité auctoriale savamment orchestrée, la traduction prend toute sa signification si on la replace dans le système hypertextuel que représente la littérature franciscaine publiée en anglais, français, italien et portugais au long des seizième et dix-septième siècles. En analysant la série de greffes hypertextuelles à laquelle procède le texte, au niveau bibliographique, intertextuel et traductionnel, on tâche de reconstruire de manière détaillée la voie de la lecture, de la traduction, et de la publication de The Admirable Life par Evelyn. Ce texte aux apparentes modestes révèle à l’examen un système d’écriture hypertextuelle complexe, renvoyant lui-même à un projet d’historiographie de l’ordre franciscain à l’échelle européenne. L’article offre enfin quelques pistes pour l’intégration d’une méthode de lecture “hypertextuelle” aux études de la première modernité, en Grande-Bretagne et au-delà.
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Drawing on the ideas of Gérard Genette, this article argues for the value of reading translations as “hypertexts,” or as works grafted onto earlier texts (“hypotexts”), on the basis of the intriguing case study of The Admirable Life of the Holy Virgin S. Catharine of Bologna (1621), translated by Catherine Magdalen Evelyn of the Gravelines Poor Clares. Little-known today despite Evelyn’s importance as the most prolific female translator of the early Stuart period, this publication sublimates the voice of the translator through its laconic paratextual materials and its misattribution of Evelyn’s work to another nun. In spite of this carefully engineered authorial opacity, the stakes of Evelyn’s translation become clearer when it is read as part of a hypertextual system of Franciscan writings published in English, French, Italian, and Portuguese over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. An analysis of how her text is grafted onto this series of hypotexts through bibliography, intertextuality, and translation results in a detailed, albeit speculative, account of Evelyn’s motivations for reading, translating, and publishing The Admirable Life. This seemingly modest publication is thus revealed as a rich hypertext that participated in a wider European project to chronicle the history of the Franciscan order. A concluding discussion of hypertextuality in early modern England briefly gestures more broadly toward the relevance of this method for studies of Renaissance literature.

Reprenant les travaux de Gérard Genette, cet article vise à souligner la pertinence de lire les traductions comme des “hypertextes” — c’est-à-dire des œuvres qui se viennent se greffer sur d’autres qui leur préexistent (ou “hypotextes”) — à partir de l’exemple singulier de The Admirable Life of the Holy Virgin S. Catharine of Bologna (1621), traduction composée par Catherine Magdalen Evelyn, Clarisse au couvent des Gravelines. La traduction est peu connue aujourd’hui malgré son importance historique (Evelyn est la traductrice la plus prolifique du début du règne des Stuart), et la voix de la traductrice y est comme sublimée : les paratextes sont laconiques et l’œuvre est de fait attribuée à une autre moniale. En dépit de cette opacité auctoriale savamment orchestrée, la traduction prend toute sa signification si on la replace dans le système hypertextuel que représente la littérature franciscaine publiée en anglais, français, italien et portugais au long des seizième et dix-septième siècles. En analysant la série de greffes hypertextuelles à laquelle procède le texte, au niveau bibliographique, intertextuel et traductionnel, on tâche de reconstruire de manière détaillée (bien que spéculative) les enjeux de la lecture, de la traduction, et de la publication de The Admirable Life par Evelyn. Ce texte aux apparences modestes révèle à l’examen un système d’écriture hypertextuelle complexe, renvoyant lui-même à un projet d’historiographie de l’ordre franciscain à l’échelle européenne.
L'article offre enfin quelques pistes pour l'intégration d'une méthode de lecture "hypertextuelle" aux études de la première modernité, en Grande-Bretagne et au-delà.

In Areopagitica (1644), John Milton offers a biting satire of the Catholic practice of approbations mandated by the Council of Trent: "no Book, pamphlet, or paper should be Printed [...] unlesse it were approv’d and licenc’t under the hands of 2 or 3 glutton Friers."1 Elaborating on this point with savage humour, Milton continues, “Sometimes 5 Imprimaturs are seen together dialogue-wise in the Piatza of one Title page, complementing and ducking each to other with their shav’n reverences, whether the Author, who stands by in perplexity at the foot of his Epistle, shall to the Presse or to the spunge.”2 This whimsical metaphor of the title page as a Roman “Piatza” populated by “glutton Friars” nicely illustrates the cultural specificity of print as a medium: an imprimatur marks a book as Catholic and thus alien. While these foreign friars serve as the butt of Milton’s joke, during the first half of the seventeenth century English Franciscans had zealously created a vibrant print culture of their own in order to increase awareness of their order in England as they undertook the restoration of the English Franciscan Province. Indeed, approbations constituted one of the defining features of the English friars’ publications, as A. F. Allison noted in his bibliography of English Franciscan books from 1559 to 1640.3 Although Allison established this corpus in 1955, subsequent scholars of print history have paid little attention to the Franciscans. Translation played a key role in the Franciscans’ project, and this critical neglect reflects the doubly marginalized position of both Catholic authors and translation within early modern literary scholarship. As R. Po-chia Hsia has already shown, Jesuit translators printed their work for missionary purposes during this period.4 English Franciscans likewise exploited translation’s potential to facilitate cultural exchange by publishing translations that could allow English Catholics to encounter foundational Franciscan texts from the past and to stay abreast of

current developments on the Continent. To extend Milton’s metaphor of the title page as “Piazzza,” such works were effective tools of Catholic conversion and recruitment precisely because the printed translation was a public space that allowed writers of different eras and nationalities to enter into dialogue.

This article aims to shed fresh light on this little-known pocket of English Catholic print culture by analyzing Catherine Magdalen Evelyn’s 1621 translation of works by and about Catherine of Bologna: *The Admirable Life of the Holy Virgin S. Catharine of Bologna*. This translation offered English readers the novel sight of two cloistered Poor Clares conversing in the public square constituted by the printed text. In 1426, St. Catherine of Bologna, known today as an artist and author of the mystic treatise *The Seven Spiritual Weapons*, joined a community of devout laywomen in Ferrara, which became a Poor Clare convent after much internal turmoil. Catherine supported this change, and afterwards she served as abbess of a filiation established in Bologna. On the title page of *The Admirable Life*, Catherine is juxtaposed with the ostensible translator of the text, “Sister Magdalen of S. Augustine, of the Order of Poore Clares in Gravelinge.” Scholars have demonstrated, however, that the actual translator was not Magdalen of St. Augustine (Catherine) Bentley, but rather her fellow nun Catherine Magdalen (Elizabeth) Evelyn (or Evelinge), who professed at the Gravelines convent in 1620 at the age of 23. After the


Gravelines house experienced conflicts over differing views of Franciscanism, Evelyn joined other dissident nuns (including Bentley) to found a new convent in Aire. Here she served as portress, novice mistress, and eventually the house’s third abbess. Skilled in French and Latin, Evelyn was known within her house as an accomplished author due to her poetry and translations. In fact, Evelyn is an important, if obscure, figure in the history of female translators as she published three translations during the Stuart era, more than any other woman of the time. Evelyn’s translations should also appeal to scholars interested in the reception of women’s writing. While most female translators of the period worked with male-authored source texts, she translated two works written by women (St. Catherine of Bologna and St. Colette). Yet her translations have generated little sustained interest from critics, perhaps because extreme self-abnegation led Evelyn to misattribute two of them to Bentley.

As I have argued elsewhere, Evelyn’s translations are of importance to the history of English Catholicism because they helped advance the English Franciscans’ political agendas. Building on that prior claim, this article offers a new method for approaching early modern translation by employing Gérard Genette’s theory of hypertextuality to situate The Admirable Life within the broader context of Franciscan print in Europe. With the advent of digital humanities, critics working on translation are most likely to associate the term “hypertext” with the new possibilities created by translations published

---


10. Also see St. Colette, The Declarations and Ordinances Made upon the Rule of Our Holy Mother S. Clare, trans. Catherine Magdalen Evelyn (St. Omer, 1622); François Hendricq, The History of the Angelicall Virgin Glorious S. Clare, trans. Catherine Magdalen Evelyn (Douai, 1635).


on the Internet. In Genette’s lesser-known paradigm, a hypertext is any work that is based in some way on a previous text. Translation is a relatively common example of this phenomenon, as Genette himself observes: “La forme de transposition la plus voyante, et à coup sûr la plus répandue, consiste à transposer un texte d’une langue à une autre” (“The most visible form of transposition, and certainly the most widespread, consists in transposing a text from one language to another”). Despite its unmistakable pertinence to translation studies, scholars in this field have largely ignored the theoretical implications of the Genettean hypertext, with the exception of Antoine Berman’s consideration of the ethnocentrism found in hypertextual forms of translation such as adaptation, imitation, and pastiche. Such neglect is all the more puzzling since critics working in literary studies, the history of the book, and translation studies have recently demonstrated the relevance of paratextuality, another of Genette’s structuralist concepts, to the early modern period. While structuralism might seem incompatible with the historicist and materialist methods that inform most current scholarship on early modern translation, hypertextuality complements these approaches by highlighting the genealogical aspects of textual production. In its attention to the way that one work gives rise to another, hypertextuality moves beyond the analysis of intertextuality in order to identify the textual ancestry of a particular composition.

Offering a case study of The Admirable Life that is grounded in both historical context and print culture, this article demonstrates that the

Genettean hypertext can offer a useful means of reconstructing the complex textual lineages involved in translation. In the facsimile edition of Evelyn’s translation, Claire Walker initially observes, “[Its] purpose […] is not made clear in an epistle to the reader or in any dedication.”\(^{17}\) After citing a range of bibliographical and historical evidence that links Evelyn’s publication with the friars’ agendas, Walker suggests that “the translator wanted to instil Clarissan precepts into her community, and through publication to advertise them beyond the enclosure walls.”\(^{18}\) Hypertextuality provides a more exact means of using textual relationships to uncover Evelyn’s potential motivations for reading, translating, and publishing this text. Through analysis of how *The Admirable Life* both transforms and transmits the various texts that informed its production, this article reveals that this seemingly modest work was a rich hypertext responding to a broader European culture of Franciscan textual production. When read in this light, Evelyn’s translation offers a basis for viewing early modern translations in terms of textual genealogies.

During the first half of the seventeenth century, English Franciscans succeeded in revitalizing their order after its near disappearance following Elizabeth I’s accession.\(^{19}\) From 1558 onward, any English Catholic who wanted to become a Franciscan was obliged to profess at Continental convents and friaries. This situation improved for Englishwomen in 1609, when Mary Ward founded an English Poor Clare convent in Gravelines.\(^{20}\) The English Franciscan Province had not yet been reconstituted, and the Gravelines nuns were subject to the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishop of St. Omer before submitting to the supervision of local Franciscans sometime around 1612.\(^{21}\) In 1614, William

\(^{17}\) Walker, xvi.

\(^{18}\) Walker, xvii.


\(^{21}\) MS Gravelines Chronicle, 30, Poor Clares Monastery, Much Birch, Herefordshire. This history of spiritual jurisdiction at Gravelines, which owes a serious debt to Sister Faustina Grealy of the Galway
Stanney, the sole survivor of the Franciscan community briefly re-established under Mary I, sought to revive the English Province by receiving John Gennings into the order. Gennings quickly set about recruiting promising young men, most notably Christopher Davenport, who professed as Franciscus à Sancta Clara in 1618. That same year, the friars established St. Bonaventure’s friary in Douai, and Benignus of Genoa, the minister general of the Franciscans, mandated that the confessor at Gravelines would also serve as a guardian, or superior, of this new friary. Since the English friars founded a new Third Order convent in Brussels under their own jurisdiction the following year, it seems likely that the idea of a similar arrangement at Gravelines was mooted and rejected by Abbess Clare Mary Anna Tyldesley and her convent around this time. Yet as the institutional tie between St. Bonaventure’s and Gravelines suggests, the English friars and nuns enjoyed a mutually beneficial relationship until 1626, when Sancta Clara encouraged the house to depose Tyldesley in favour of Margaret of St. Paul Radcliffe. The latter had recently returned to Gravelines after serving as abbess at Brussels, and Sancta Clara probably viewed Radcliffe’s election as a necessary step toward the English friars’ assumption of spiritual jurisdiction over the Gravelines house. However, his actions led to a breakdown in monastic order since half of the convent rejected the imposition of a new abbess. In a petition sent to Rome the next year, Tyldesley’s supporters successfully requested that the house return to the jurisdiction of the bishop of St. Omer. During 1629, Sancta Clara and his supporters responded to this development by founding a new convent in Aire under the jurisdiction of the English Province, which had been re-established a few months earlier. Sancta Clara then returned to England, where he acted as Henrietta Maria’s confessor and attempted to reconcile the English church with the pope. By the start of the Civil Wars, then, the English Franciscans had experienced an astonishing


and contentious period of growth that was accompanied by increased cultural prestige and visibility.

This resurgence of English Franciscanism was fostered by a concerted effort to publicize the order through print, as shown by Allison’s bibliography of Franciscan publications. Between the founding of St. Bonaventure’s friary in 1618 and the start of the English Civil Wars in 1640, eighteen books with Franciscan connections were published in English. All of these texts were translated by, dedicated to, or otherwise appropriated by English Franciscans (Table 1). Only four of these books were original compositions, meaning that 77 percent of Franciscan publications during this period were translations. Evelyn composed three of these translations, and Abbess Catherine Greenbury of the Third Order convent translated a fourth. As a result, women translated 22 percent of this total Franciscan corpus and 26 percent of the sub-corpus of Franciscan translations. Furthermore, ten translations (55 percent of the corpus, and 71 percent of the sub-corpus of translations) were rendered either by or for members of a Franciscan convent, suggesting the overall importance of translation for these institutions. These figures offer further support for the current scholarly consensus that translation was a key means of textual production for both men and women during the early modern era. Francis Bell, for example, published two translations and only one original work. Both male and female Franciscans valued translation for its polemical and practical applications, especially its ability to reintroduce Franciscanism to English readers. The Franciscans translated or appropriated translations that fell into two broad categories: hagiography and monastic rules. Each branch of the Franciscan order saw its rule translated into English at least once: the First Order (the friars), the Second Order (the Poor Clares), and the less rigorous Third Order. Hagiography was even more central to this corpus as twelve publications (or 66 percent of the corpus) contain hagiographical material. All three branches of the order were once again represented, and this

25. This list is based on Allison’s bibliography.

publishing program attracted at least one novice. Frances Clare Hone professed at Gravelines in 1629 after reading the life of Catherine of Bologna, probably in Evelyn’s translation.\(^\text{27}\) Printed translations of medieval and contemporary texts were thus essential to the spiritual agendas of English Franciscans during this crucial period.

This corpus departs dramatically from earlier Franciscan publications, which emphasized Catholic piety more generally rather than foregrounding their order’s identity. In 1609, Benet of Canfield (William Fitch), an English Capuchin who professed in France, published his influential mystical treatise *The Rule of Perfection*, which he dedicated to his cousins in Augustinian, Benedictine, and Bridgettine convents for Englishwomen. Rather than advance an obviously Franciscan spiritual program, Fitch aimed to “abridge” and synthesize previous mystical guides “for the greater light and profit of devout souls.”\(^\text{28}\) The year 1614 saw the republication of John Gennings’s biography of his martyred brother Edmund Gennings, a secular priest (*The Life and Death of Mr. Edmund Geninges Priest*, ca. 1602).\(^\text{29}\) Published only under Gennings’s initials, this work made no mention of the author’s order but rather sought to fan the flames of Catholic zeal through hagiography: “the historyes of the Lives of Saints doe confirme our fayth, stirre us up to imitate them, and have sundry other most profitable effects.”\(^\text{30}\) Two years later, Bonaventure Jackson, an English friar in a Flemish house in Mechelen, published *Manuductions to the Pallace of Trueth*, a translation of excerpts from classical sources. Jackson’s text had an explicitly missionary purpose, as he hoped it would “serve as a Directorie to guide [readers] unto the Infallible Rule of Faith.”\(^\text{31}\) Significantly, both Canfield and Jackson belonged to Continental communities at the time of their publications. In the first decades of the seventeenth century, then, English friars seem to have viewed print as a means of providing pastoral support to English Catholics rather than conveying a specifically Franciscan point of view.


\(^{28}\) Benet of Canfield, *The Rule of Perfection* (1609), 2.

\(^{29}\) For details on the 1602 publication, see Allison, 41.

\(^{30}\) John Gennings, *The Life and Death of Mr. Edmund Geninges Priest* (1614), 8.

\(^{31}\) Bonaventure Jackson, *Manuductions to the Pallace of Trueth* (Mechelen, 1616), §3v.
From 1618 onward, the Franciscans’ publication program shifted dramatically as Gennings, Stanney, and other English Franciscans recruited new members for the order after the foundation of St. Bonaventure’s friary. The first signs of this new attitude toward print appear in a 1617 publication by Stanney himself, *A Treatise of Penance, with an Explication of the Rule ... of the Third Order of S. Francis*. This work conveyed Franciscan spirituality to laypeople through its three parts: first, an original treatise exhorting readers to penance; second, a translation of the Third Order’s rule from Latin into English; third, an English translation of a Spanish commentary on the Rule by Pedro Gonzales, Commissary General of the Order. As Stanney explains, the growth of Franciscan spirituality had led to a heightened demand for the Third Order Rule that could only be filled by print: “the number of Brothers and Sisters, did increase in such sorte, that it was, and would bee hereafter more troublesome, both to write out large Copies thereof, for every one which desireth it.”

The treatise on penance likewise served a pastoral role, offering monthly reading material on penance as mandated by the Rule: “I have set downe here this little Treatise, to the end that at such times as you want that oportunitie, you might read some of these Chapters following.” Meanwhile, Stanney had undertaken his translation of Gonzalez’s commentary to demonstrate the vitality of the Third Order on the Continent: “every one may both see, how this Rule is observed in Catholike Countries, and also that it is an order much respected.” The first in a series of translations that advertised the spiritual benefits of Franciscanism, Stanney’s publication shows an awareness that print could spread the order’s pastoral and polemic messages much more effectively than manuscript.

As Franciscan translators embarked on this new agenda, they used print—and the relationships between printed texts—to establish the place of English Franciscanism within the spiritual genealogy of their order. Gérard Genette’s theory of transtextuality, or “transcendance textuelle du texte” (the textual transcendence of the text), offers a taxonomy of textual relationships that allows for a more precise understanding of how this process functioned. Genette identifies five different categories of transtextuality: 1) intertextuality,
or “une relation de coprésence entre deux ou plusieurs textes” (a relationship of copresence between two texts or among several texts); 2) paratextuality, or the liminal texts accompanying a work; 3) metatextuality, or critical commentary; 4) hypertextuality; 5) architextuality, or “taxinomique” (taxonomic) qualities such as genre. Of these five forms, hypertextuality is the most relevant to translation. Genette defines it as “toute relation unissant un texte B (que j’appellerai hypertexte) à un texte antérieur A (que j’appellerai, bien sûr, hypotexte) sur lequel il se greffe d’une manière qui n’est pas celle du commentaire” (“any relationship uniting a text B [which I shall call the hypertext] to an earlier text A [I shall, of course, call it the hypotext] upon which it is grafted in a manner that is not that of commentary”). Any work that is based upon another text qualifies as a hypertext, and some of the most obvious forms of hypertextuality discussed by Genette include imitation, parody, pastiche, and translation. Hypertextuality can also function in a subtler manner:

Elle peut être d’un autre ordre, tel que B ne parle nullement de A, mais ne pourrait cependant exister tel quel sans A, dont il résulte au terme d’une opération que je qualifierai, provisoirement encore, de transformation, et qu’en conséquence il évoque plus ou moins manifestement, sans nécessairement parler de lui et le citer

(It may yet be of another kind such as text B not speaking of text A at all but being unable to exist, as such, without A, from which it originates through a process I shall provisionally call transformation, and which it consequently evokes more or less perceptibly without necessarily speaking of it or citing it).

In these cases, the hypertext is implicitly informed by a previous work that is never explicitly mentioned. Significantly, Genette states that the five forms of transtextuality are not “des classes étanches, sans communication ni recoupements réciproques” (“separate and absolute categories without any

reciprocal contact or overlapping”). Rather, one form may often constitute another, as when a paratext reveals the presence of hypertextuality (e.g., the title of Joyce’s *Ulysses*). In its attention to the fluidity and variety of textual relationships, transtextuality provides a powerful and sophisticated means of charting the many texts that lie behind any given work.

The corpus of Franciscan translations published between 1618 and 1640 illustrates how one group of early modern writers manipulated various forms of hypertextuality for polemical purposes. All of these works are naturally hypertexts by virtue of being translations, and this hypertextuality in turn required translators to mediate their source texts so that they better fit an English Franciscan agenda. This reworking of the source text often occurred at the level of the paratext, as shown by Francis (Arthur) Bell’s 1625 translation of a Spanish hagiography of a Third Order nun: *The Historie, Life, and Miracles, Extasies and Revelations of the Blessed Virgin, Sister Joane, of the Crosse* (Antonio Daza, *Historia, Vida, Y Milagros, Extasis, & Revelaciones de la Bienaventurada Virgen Sor Juana de la Cruz*, 1613). Bell made several paratextual adjustments that highlighted the vitality of English Franciscanism while also downplaying recent controversies over Joan’s mysticism. He replaces Daza’s dedication to Philip III with an epistle to Margaret of St. Paul and Barbara of St. Colette Radcliffe, the two Gravelines Poor Clares who were serving as the superiors of the Third Order house: “you are the very first, who are elected for Superiors of an English Monasterie of the third order, newly errected in a forraine contrie, with hope hereafter to transplant the same in to your owne, where Religious discipline is so decayed.” Bell also softens the polemical context of his source text by moving a lengthy series of approbations and defenses of Joan, totalling over sixty pages of his translation, to the end of the book. By subordinating the Continental context of Daza’s work, Bell publicized Third Order spirituality for an English audience while gesturing toward the missionary potential of English Franciscanism.

Intertextuality also offered a potent means of reshaping source texts by linking them to other Franciscan publications. In 1635, Martin Bogart of Douai printed three related works: *The History of the Angelicall Virgin Glorious S. Clare*, translated by Evelyn; *The Life of the Most Holy Father S. Francis*, translated by


Anthony Maria Browne; and The Rule and Testament of ... S. Francis, translated by Angelus à Sancto Francisco (Richard) Mason. Browne’s translation had been published in 1610, but the friars appropriated it for their own purposes by adding an approbation from Gennings and reissuing it in the same volume as Mason’s work. Evelyn’s translation in turn contains an interpolated chapter on the history of the Franciscan order that directly references Browne’s translation.\textsuperscript{41} Intertextuality strengthened the bibliographical ties among these publications, which sought to advertise English Franciscanism at a time when Sancta Clara’s influence in England was on the rise. By using the material codes of the printed book to mediate their translations’ links to other works, English Franciscans transformed their source texts so that they better advanced the cause of their order.

When viewed from the perspective of Genettean hypertextuality, Evelyn’s translation of The Admirable Life is revealed as the product of a complex textual genealogy constituted by Franciscan print throughout Europe. On a bibliographical level, The Admirable Life descends from a key English Franciscan publication: William Cape’s 1618 translation of the first volume of a three-part chronicle of the Franciscan order compiled by Marcos da Lisboa OFM (The Chronicle and Institution of the Order of the Seraphicall Father S. Francis). Volumes 1 and 2 of this text were published in Portuguese (Primeira parte das Chronicas da ordem dos frades menores, 1557; Parte segunda das Chronicas, 1562), with the third volume appearing first in Spanish (Tercera parte de las Chronicas, 1570). Da Lisboa’s chronicle was translated into Spanish (Primera parte de las Cronicas de la Orden de los Frayles Menores, 1562; Parte segunda de las Chronicas, 1566), Italian (Croniche degli Ordini instituti dal P.S. Francesco, 1581–82; Delle croniche de frati minori ... parte terza, 1591), and French (Chronique et institution de l’ordre du pere S. Francois, 1604). Cape, a layman, worked from the French translation by Denis Santeuil, whose version was based on the Spanish translation. Part 1 of the Chronicle contains material from the early history of the Franciscan order, including the lives of St. Francis and St. Clare as well as the Rules for all three orders. The paratexts to Santeuil’s translation punningly link St. Francis to France, appropriating the saint for a French context. Santeuil, for example, dedicates his work to François de Sourdís, Archbishop of Bordeaux as “un grand Prelat, Prince Ecclesiastique, François de

\textsuperscript{41} Hendricq, 60.
nation, François de nom, amy devot, & si grand zelateur de l’Ordre de sainct François” (a great prelate, an ecclesiastical prince, French by nation, Francis by name, a devoted friend and so great an advocate of the order of St. Francis). In turn, Cape eliminates several key paratexts in order to transform his source text into a suitable representation of English Franciscanism: approbations, sonnets, and Santeuil’s dedicatory prefaces to de Sourdies and Princess Henriette de Cleves. In their place, Cape’s translation substitutes an epistle by “CLA FRA” that addresses the translation to the Gravelines Poor Clares. The author of this preface was very likely Franciscus a Sancta Clara, who professed that year. Sancta Clara had benefited from the convent’s financial support during his novitiate, and he unsuccessfully sought to become its confessor in the early 1620s. Significantly, this publication appeared during the same year that the English friars established an official link between St. Bonaventure’s and the Gravelines Poor Clares. In its content as well as its paratexts, Cape’s translation of da Lisboa’s Chronicle linked the convent with the friars’ agenda of restoring English Franciscanism.

Sancta Clara’s preface did so by representing the Gravelines Poor Clares as originators of Cape’s translation, thereby associating the work with Franciscans rather than a layman. He begins by comparing the nuns to the salamander: “contrarie to the inclination of other beastes her life is cherished by the fier.” The translation will “ad fresh coles to kindle or rather cherish your long since kindled fier of Devotion (wherein you live contrarie to those in the world of your Sects).” Besides emphasizing the Poor Clares’ singular zeal as compared with secular women (“those in the world of your Sects”), Sancta Clara implies that the nuns’ “Devotion” is specifically Franciscan since it will be enflamed by the translation. In fact, Sancta Clara notes that the Gravelines nuns themselves requested the translation of da Lisboa’s Chronicle:

   your zealous importune to prevayle with a third, that could and
   would undertake the Translation of this worke from French wherein it was


43. Allison identifies “CLA FRA” as Sancta Clara, but his most recent biographer disputes that attribution: Allison, 44; Davenport, 544n114.

44. MS Gravelines Chronicle, 143.

impressed to our vulgar tounge, for your more facile and pleasant reading of the lives of so famous worthies who are indeed as exemplars, or soe many platfformes for direction of your allreadie initiated journey. (A2r)

This account suggests two things: first, that the Gravelines nuns already possessed a copy of da Lisboa’s text in French; second, that they were eager for English works that could offer models for Franciscan devotion. Describing the nuns as “semie authors, and patronesses” of the book, Sancta Clara presents the convent as having “matronadge” over the work:

I have not therfore enforced you to foster a straunge feture [embryo], but one to which your selves are mothers, neyther have I donne it making myne owne head my counsell howse, but with advise of the Authore and other benefactours of the worke, since therfore yee have daigned to begett it, be contented to conserve it against what difficulties the world shall oppugne it.47

The nuns serve as spiritual mothers who have generated a text documenting the early history of the Franciscan order, establishing their authority as representatives and defenders of Franciscanism writ large.

Cape’s translation subsequently became a hypotext for a series of books that issued from the highly important English press run by Jesuits at St. Omer in 1621 and 1622, making book 8 of the Chronicle more widely available to those who could not afford to purchase Cape’s expensive eight-hundred-page quarto. The Gravelines house must have been one intended audience as book 8 focuses on the Second Order’s first years, containing the life and miracles of Clare, her Rule, and lives of other early Poor Clares. In 1621, The Rule of Our Holy Mother S. Clare appeared as a twenty-fourmo volume, presumably for the use of the Gravelines house. Although Allison identified this work as a reprint of Cape’s translation of the Rule, a recent critical edition of the text has demonstrated that it is essentially a fresh translation of the Rule from Latin

47. Lisboa, Chronicle and Institution, A2r–v.
into English, albeit with some reliance on the versions of Cape and Santeuil.\footnote{Grealy and Goodrich, 18–21, 30–49. For the previous attribution, see Allison, 28; A. F. Allison and D. M. Rogers, The Contemporary Printed Literature of the English Counter-Reformation between 1558 and 1640, vol. 2, Works in English (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1994), no. 118.} That same year, this new version of the Rule was published again as the first half of a sixteenmo volume that also contained Evelyn’s translation of The Admirable Life. While Genette uses the word “greffé” (grafted) metaphorically when speaking of hypertexts, in a bibliographical sense Evelyn’s translation was literally grafted onto an emended version of Cape’s work. The following year, her translation was once again included with further selections from Cape in The Life of the Glorious Virgin S. Clare, which contained the Rule and the hagiographies from book 8 of da Lisboa’s Chronicle. This latter publication featured a dedicatory preface to Clare written by John Wilson, supervisor of the press, who describes the work as being “translated into English for the publik benefit of our Country.”\footnote{John Wilson, dedicatory epistle, in The Life of the Glorious Virgin S. Clare (St. Omer, 1622), *2r.} By separating Cape’s translation of book 8 into two texts (the Rule and saints’ lives), Wilson addressed different markets. The Rule was for the Gravelines convent’s use, and the other books introduced English readers to Clare and her order.

This slate of Franciscan translations included only one completely new work, Evelyn’s Admirable Life, which consisted of three parts: Dionisio Paleotti’s life of Catherine of Bologna, Paleotti’s account of Catherine’s miracles, and Catherine’s own treatise, Spiritual Weapons. Evelyn worked from an intermediary French translation of the Italian text made by Nicolas de Soulfour (La vie tres-religieuse de la bien-heureuse vierge, Catherine de Bologne, 1597). This work is the most immediate hypotext for Evelyn’s translation, and a comparison of their paratexts demonstrates that Evelyn subtly aligns her translation with the English friars’ agendas by emphasizing its hagiographical content. The English title page maintains the format of the French original, providing basic biographical information on Catherine of Bologna as well as the translator’s supposed identity, Sister Magdalen of St. Augustine of the Gravelines Poor Clares. While Evelyn humbly refused public ownership of her work, this misattribution associated the Gravelines convent with her translation and, by extension, with the Franciscans’ print program. Like other Franciscan translators, Evelyn removes paratexts that identified the work as French: its original approbation by two French doctors of theology
Translation and Genettean Hypertextuality

and a dedicatory epistle to the Colettine convent of Ave Maria in Paris. This material is replaced by a brief epistle to the reader advertising the inclusion of Catherine’s writings, which Evelyn based on the subtitle of de Soulfour’s text. By relegating any mention of Catherine’s Spiritual Weapons to the obverse of the title page, Evelyn’s translation privileges Paleotti’s life. Evelyn also prioritizes the work’s hagiographical content by reconfiguring the order of her source text. De Soulfour began with Catherine’s life and ended with her miracles, placing The Spiritual Weapons in the middle. Evelyn relegates Catherine’s writing to the end of her translation, again subordinating this text to Paleotti’s life and miracles. Finally, Evelyn identifies Catherine as a saint both on the title page and throughout the text, even though she had only been beatified at this point. This focus on hagiography confirms the impression conveyed by Cape’s translation: that the Gravelines Poor Clares were zealously producing English-language texts about saints of their order.

These bibliographical and thematic connections to Cape’s translation obscure the fundamental oddity of Evelyn’s publication. Why include the life of a fifteenth-century Poor Clare in a series of translations otherwise focused on the thirteenth-century origins of this order? And even more to the point, why translate texts by and about this beatified Poor Clare in the first place? Yet another hypotext lurking behind Evelyn’s translation offers a starting point for answering these questions. The Admirable Life concludes with an apparently conventional set of liturgical texts: a Latin anthem (or antiphon) and prayer to Catherine of Bologna (“The Ant-hymne of Saint Catharine of Bologna”). This material does not appear in de Soulfour’s translation but originates from the “Antiphona B. Catharinae de Bononia” and “Oratio” published in the third volume of da Lisboa’s Chronicle. Although Evelyn could have found these works in any version of da Lisboa’s third book, only Santeuil’s French translation supplies the full versicle and response that also appear after the antiphon in The Admirable Life (“Vers. Ora pro nobis beata Catharina. Resp. Ut digni efficiamur promotionibus Christ”). The Spanish and Italian versions simply print a shortened version of the versicle (“Ora pro nobis”). Although Catholics would
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have known to supply this traditional formula, it seems most likely that Evelyn
drew on Santeuil’s presentation of the antiphon and prayer.

Assuming that Evelyn was responsible, the inclusion of this material
in her translation suggests several lines of thought. First, it indicates that
the Gravelines house owned at least the third French volume of da Lisboa’s
*Chronicle*, confirming Sancta Clara’s statement that the convent wanted an
English version “for [their] more facile and pleasant reading.” Far from being
mere propaganda, Cape’s translation responded directly to the reading habits
of the Gravelines convent. Second, these liturgical texts imply that Evelyn read
Santeuil’s translation and associated her own translation of Paleotti with da
Lisboa’s *Chronicle*. Third, this material provides a possible glimpse into the
liturgical life of the Gravelines convent. The anthem and prayer are easily traced
to da Lisboa because they were not universally applicable to the Catholic Church,
just to the cities of Bologna and Ferrara. A 1524 bull from Pope Clement VII
permitted only the Poor Clare convents in those towns to celebrate Catherine’s
feast day. As da Lisboa records, “Tous les ans avec l’authorité du Pape, on fait
le jour de sa feste un office tressolemnel audit Monastere de Boloigne, comme
à celuy de Ferrare, où la plus grande partie du peuple de chaque ville y va par
devotion” (every year with papal authority, they make the day of her feast a
very solemn office at the said monastery of Bologna, as at that of Ferrara, where
the greatest part of the people of each city go because of their devotion). This
feast day certainly seems to have been popular in Bologna, as its office was
published there in 1533, 1550, 1588, and 1593. Since these publications were
for a local audience, Evelyn probably never saw them. Da Lisboa’s *Chronicle*
allowed her (and her convent) to encounter and potentially use the anthem and
prayer. Evelyn likely included these texts for liturgical performance since they
remained in Latin, the language of the liturgy. The anthem and prayer thus link
Evelyn’s translation with the French translation of da Lisboa.

While this paratext is obviously intertextual, it also signals a deeper
hypertextual relationship between da Lisboa’s third volume and Evelyn’s
translation. Her work evokes da Lisboa’s representation of Catherine of
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54. *Officium beatae Catharinae Virginis de Bononia, Ordinis Sanctae Clarac* (Bologna: Alexandrum
Benatium, 1533; Anselmo Giaccarelli, 1550; Alessandro Benacci, 1588; Vittorio Benacci, 1593).
Bologna without ever explicitly acknowledging its influence. Evelyn probably encountered da Lisboa’s text shortly after her arrival at the Gravelines convent in 1618, just as Cape’s translation was published and the friars began seeking jurisdiction over the house. Fluent in French, she likely read the remaining two volumes of da Lisboa that Cape had left untranslated. Evelyn’s poetry states that her patron saint was Catherine of Alexandria, but she must have taken an interest in other holy women named Catherine. It thus seems probable that she would have paid special attention to da Lisboa’s chapters on Catherine of Bologna, another Catherine who was both a Poor Clare and a writer. Indeed, da Lisboa identifies Catherine of Bologna as the author of a treatise for novices: “Par commandement & volonté de Dieu elle escrivit un petit livre de grande utilité pour ceux qui commencent d’entrer dans le chemin de la perfection, & qui se veulent consacrer à Dieu, auquel elle mit en avant sept armes ou remedes, pour vaincre & surmonter Satan” (by the commandment and will of God, she wrote a little book of great utility for those who begin to enter into the way of perfection, and who wish to consecrate themselves to God, in which she put forward seven arms or remedies, to vanquish and overcome Satan). This remark may help to explain Evelyn’s decision to read and translate the text: it was appropriate reading material for her and her fellow novices. This rationale, however, is not evident in the printed version of her translation, which privileges hagiography over Catherine’s writings. Clearly, Evelyn’s translation was published not because of its usefulness to novices but because of its relevance to the English friars’ controversial goal of assuming control of the Gravelines convent. Yet neither the life nor The Spiritual Weapons directly outlines the discord that Franciscan jurisdiction caused at Catherine’s convent in Ferrara. How, then, would Evelyn have known of this history? Once again, da Lisboa’s account provides a likely answer, as he comments: “combien elle se peina & supporta beaucoup d’afflictions pour le reformer & le reduire sous la premiere regle de saincte Claire, elle-mesme le raconte en un petit livre qu’elle mesme a faict, adressé aux Novices” (how much she laboured and endured many afflictions to reform it [her monastery] and bring it under the first rule of St. Clare, she herself tells in a little book which she herself made, addressed to Novices). Since Evelyn’s house was experiencing similar strife over Franciscan

identity, this context would have only heightened her interest in Catherine’s writings. In turn, she and the friars may have viewed the publication of this work as a means of publicizing their faction’s views. The hypertextual genealogy of *The Admirable Life* indicates that Evelyn’s translation served a twofold aim: first, to provide the house with suitable reading material; second, to support the friars’ political agendas within and outside the house.

In the translation itself, Evelyn accomplished these aims by reworking her source text to construct a version of Catherine of Bologna that reflects the influence of da Lisboa’s *Chronicle*. As previously noted, da Lisboa presents Catherine’s *Spiritual Weapons* as ideal reading material for those entering “le chemin de la perfection” (the way of perfection), and Evelyn stresses the didactic nature of this work even in her translation of de Soulfour’s title by rendering “Le livre admirable de saincte Catherine de Bologne, contenant les instructions donnees à ses vierges sacrees, composé par elle & delaißé escrit de sa main” as “The admirable instructions of S. Catharine of Bologna, which she gave unto her Sacred Virgins, composed by her selfe, and left written in her owne hand” (my emphasis). Within both the life and *Spiritual Weapons*, Evelyn incorporates language equivalent to “le chemin de la perfection” in order to signal edifying moments. For example, she elaborates on Paleotti’s depiction of Catherine’s deathbed exhortations to the convent: “These and many other things which might confirme and strengthen [confirmer] them in their undertaken course of perfection [service de Dieu] she spake in that her last exhortation, like the swanne whose funerall song is sweetest [elle feist fin].”

Evelyn underscores the didactic nature of this moment by using a doublet for “confirmer,” translating “service de Dieu” (God’s service) as “undertaken course of perfection,” and expanding “elle feist fin” (she made an end). In *The Spiritual Weapons*, Evelyn adds language reminiscent of “le chemin de perfection” when Catherine explains her purpose in writing the text: “because none can runne out this glorious race of perfection [cela ne se peut faire], but such as conquer with great violence themselves [se faict violence]; I will set downe certayne precepts for the sollace and comfort [soulagement] of them” (Evelyn, 197; de Soulfour, 45v). This translation heightens the need for novices to receive proper guidance by rendering “cela ne se peut faire” (this cannot be done) as “none can runne

---

57. Paleotti, trans. Evelyn, 130, the French source being *La vie tres-religieuse de la bien-heureuse vierge, Catherine de Bologne*, trans. Nicolas de Soulfour (Paris, 1597), 30r. These texts will be cited parenthetically hereafter as Evelyn and de Soulfour, respectively.
out this glorious race of perfection” and by elaborating on the “soulagement” (comfort) that can soothe the novice’s self-violence (“se faict violence”). With these changes, Evelyn stresses Catherine’s own stated aim of advancing the spiritual formation of her convent.

Evelyn also emphasizes her source’s didacticism by drawing attention to the lessons learned by Catherine, which in turn can provide guidance for readers. For instance, Paleotti’s life notes that Catherine’s self-presumption led her into great spiritual danger:

she perswaded her selfe that there was no fraud and deceit [fraude] of the enemy so subtile, which she did not know; which fault she redeemed by long and grievous torments which she did suffer and undergo [endura], in so much that she was often mooved and stirred up [meüe] to despayre. And therfore in her little worke she exhorteth with great diligence her sacred Virgins that no one should so much rely and presume [presumant] of her owne perfection, as to trust & confide [fier] in her selfe. (Evelyn, 99–100; de Soulfour, 11r)

Evelyn emphasizes Catherine’s over-confidence in her own powers of perception through a series of doublets on “fraude” (deceit), “endura” (endured), “meüe” (moved), “presumant” (presuming), and “fier” (to trust). These expansions of the source text cumulatively underscore the passage’s primary lesson: nuns must learn to rely on God alone, not their own abilities. Such translation choices reveal that Evelyn carefully reshaped her source text so that it better conformed to da Lisboa’s portrayal of Catherine as an authoritative spiritual educator whose writings were especially relevant to novices.

Da Lisboa also identified The Spiritual Weapons as a response to monastic turmoil, and Evelyn shows a keen awareness of the controversial aspects of Catherine’s treatise. As previously noted, the disputes at Gravelines related to questions of spiritual authority. Evelyn makes changes to a passage on monastic administration that suggest she viewed abbatial authority as contingent on communal will:

A certayne vertuous and auncient Religious man, of very rare and commendable life, Superiour of a certayne monastery, affirmed unto me, that if in the administration of his Office he did any thing without asking
first the *advice & counsell* [advis] of his Religious, (following his owne
*fancy and opinion* [fantasie]) *that he alwayes gayned trouble and anxiety
by the bargayne through unlucky events* [en estre tombé le plus souvent, en
perturbation & chagrin]; whereas contrarywise consulting the matter with
them, that which *the greatest and soundest part* [la plus saine partie] did
approve, had alwayes happy success[e] *to his great comfort and consolation*
[beaucoup de joye]: how unfitting then is it that a Virgin subject to
another, and newly entred into the monastery presume to live according
to her owne fancy and foolish fervour. (Evelyn, 208–09; de Soulfour, 52v)

Evelyn underscores Catherine’s point that monastic leaders should take counsel
from their communities through a series of doublets on “advis” (advice),
“fantasie” (fancy), “la plus saine” (the soundest), and “beaucoup de joye” (much
joy). At the same time, she subtly intervenes in the passage to emphasize the
dangers posed by superiors who do not listen to their spiritual children. By
translating “en estre tombé le plus souvent, en perturbation & chagrin” (to
fall thereby most often into perturbation and chagrin) as “he alwayes gained
trouble and anxiety by the bargayne through unlucky events,” Evelyn refocuses
the passage so that it illustrates the superior’s personal distress over the negative
repercussions, or “unlucky events,” that befall the community. Since the abbess
at Gravelines was less receptive to the English friars than some of her nuns, such
a warning would have had clear applications to the conflict in Evelyn’s house.
This passage implicitly suggests that major monastic decisions—including
those related to spiritual jurisdiction—should reflect the will of the convent,
not its superior.

In addition to identifying potential sources of cloistered discord,
Catherine’s *Spiritual Weapons* offered methods for fostering unity of spirit in a
convent setting. Perhaps recognizing the value of such advice within the context
of the Gravelines house, Evelyn heightens key elements in the description of
how Satan tempted Catherine to disobey her superior, who wanted the house
to remain Augustinian rather than become Franciscan:

her adversaries [Satan … ] beganne daily to suggest unto her *sundry
troublesome* [nouvelles & diverses] thoughts in such sort that almost all
that her Superiour did or said was *misconstrued, and to the worst sense
interpreted* [sinistrement interprété] by her with mentall murmurations
against her, which caused in her wonderfull affliction and anxiety of spirit. She did very often & with great shame and confusion confesse these her thoughts to her Superiour, yet for all that the warre of her inward discontents [sa guerre] ceased not, though this helped her not a little, principally in that heerby she recovered new forces not to consent therunto. Many times [added] she was in a manner violently drawne to disobey and dislike [quoy qu’elle y fust presque violemment tirée] her Superiour, yet having the recourse unto prayer she found some help, so she consented not at all to such thoughts. (Evelyn, 236–37; de Soulfour, 70v–71r)

Evelyn makes Catherine’s spiritual predicament more explicit by rendering “sa guerre” (her war) as “the warre of her inward discontents” and translating “quoy qu’elle y fust [...] tirée” (although she was [...] drawn thereto) as “drawne to disobey and dislike her Superiour.” At the same time, she heightens Catherine’s psychological distress by adding “Many times,” as well as by translating “nouvelles & diverses” (new and diverse) as “sundry troublesome” and “sinistrement interprété” (sinisterly interpreted) as “was misconstrued, and to the worst sense interpreted.” In addition to making the text more vivid, such alterations suggest an awareness of how disagreements between abbesses and nuns over spiritual direction could undermine an individual’s progress toward spiritual perfection while also offering prayer as a remedy for this problem. Although da Lisboa’s account of Catherine of Bologna is never overtly referenced within The Admirable Life, it surreptitiously informs Evelyn’s understanding of Catherine’s life and writings and thus functions as a hidden hypotext.

Taking The Admirable Life as a case study, this article has attempted to demonstrate the value of using Genettean hypertextuality as a means of reconstructing the textual genealogies of early modern translations. The Admirable Life expends considerable effort to sublimate the voice of the translator, presenting itself in a relatively minimalist manner. It contains no dedicatory preface, and the epistle to the reader is taken from the subtitle of her source text. Even the title page misattributes the translation to another nun, further silencing Evelyn. Yet reading The Admirable Life as a hypertext allows us to develop a more detailed, albeit speculative, understanding of its intentions. Bibliographically speaking, Evelyn’s translation is a hypertext to both the 1621 Rule and Cape’s
1618 translation of da Lisboa (and it then becomes a hypotext to the 1622 Life of Clare). Scholars have already used these bibliographical relationships to argue for the political nature of Evelyn’s translation. That polemical aspect is further substantiated by the hypertextual relationship between The Admirable Life and Santeuil’s translation of da Lisboa. This influence is most visible in the paratextual addition of the Latin anthem and prayer to Catherine, which hints at the text’s role in the liturgical practices of the Gravelines Poor Clares. Yet da Lisboa’s portrait of Catherine also affects the way that Evelyn mediates the most obvious hypotext of The Admirable Life, de Soulfour’s translation of Paleotti. Evelyn’s decisions as a translator indicate an understanding of Catherine that is based on da Lisboa, while also demonstrating Evelyn’s interest in the didactic and polemical aspects of de Soulfour’s text. The Admirable Life thus descends from a complex textual genealogy that runs along two lines: first, Catherine’s writings and Paleotti’s account of Catherine and Bologna, as mediated by de Soulfour’s French translation; second, da Lisboa’s history of the Franciscan order, as rendered by his English, French, and Spanish translators. This second line of descent contains an even more remote hypotext accessed through da Lisboa, the office for Catherine of Bologna popularized locally by Franciscans in Bologna. As this dense web of textual connections indicates, hypertextuality opens up a new frontier in translation studies by allowing scholars to reconstitute the broader textual genealogies that influenced the translator’s transformation and transmission of a given work.

Hypertextual analysis and the textual genealogies that it uncovers in turn offer a fresh paradigm for understanding early modern textual production more broadly. As Genette himself comments, hypertextuality “est évidemment un aspect universel (au degré près) de la littérarité: il n’est pas d’oeuvre littéraire qui, à quelque degré et selon les lectures, n’en évoque quelque autre et, en ce sens, toutes les œuvres sont hypertextuelles” (“is obviously to some degree a universal feature of literarity: there is no literary work that does not evoke, to some extent and according to how it is read, some other literary work, and in that sense all works are hypertextual”). Early modern English literature is especially hypertextual, as authors relied on adaptation, imitation, intertextuality, paraphrase, pastiche, and translation in order to explore new literary possibilities. While we have long known that imitation and translation
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helped bring the Renaissance to England, two parallel developments suggest that a critical turn toward hypertextuality is now underway. First, scholars have begun to reassess neglected forms of writing by drawing attention to their hypertextual features. Both Susan Felch and I have used the Bakhtinian concept of heteroglossia to show how the polyvocality of biblical paraphrase and translation respectively enabled the creation of authorial agency. Second, the tenets of genetic editing have led several critics to call for further attention to the relationship between particular works and their textual antecedents. While Jürgen Meyer has modelled how a “genetic dossier” of contemporary and earlier writings can reveal the “[t]extual copiousness” of a work’s production, Felch has argued that editors must cultivate a “backward gaze” by considering the multiple contexts and sources that inform the writing of any given text. Early modern writings exist on a continuum of hypertextuality, ranging from the literal translation of religious works to densely allusive epics, plays, and romances that rewrite classical and Continental precedents. Further analysis of the different forms of hypertextuality on this spectrum will allow for a more nuanced understanding of the textual genealogies—both acknowledged and unacknowledged—that lie behind Renaissance literature of all kinds.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Place of publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Marcos da Lisboa</td>
<td>William Cape&lt;sup&gt;61&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>The chronicle … of the order of … Francis</td>
<td>St. Omer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>St. Clare</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>The rule of our holy mother S. Clare</td>
<td>St. Omer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>St. Clare; Dionisio Paleotti</td>
<td>Anonymous; Catherine Magdalen (Elizabeth) Evelyn</td>
<td>The rule of the holy virgin S. Clare; The admirable life of S. Catharine of Bologna</td>
<td>St. Omer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Marcos da Lisboa; St. Clare; Dionisio Paleotti</td>
<td>William Cape; Anonymous; Catherine Magdalen (Elizabeth) Evelyn</td>
<td>The life of the glorious virgin S. Clare; The rule of S. Clare; The life of S. Catharine of Bologna</td>
<td>St. Omer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>St. Colette</td>
<td>Catherine Magdalen (Elizabeth) Evelyn</td>
<td>The declarations … upon the rule of Clare</td>
<td>St. Omer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623</td>
<td>Jacques Brousse</td>
<td>Robert Rookwood&lt;sup&gt;62&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>The life of … Fa. Angel of Joyeuse Capucin … father Bennet … and father Archangell</td>
<td>Douai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>St. Francis</td>
<td>Francis (Arthur) Bell</td>
<td>Rule … of the thirde order of Saint Francis</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Antonio Daza</td>
<td>Francis (Arthur) Bell</td>
<td>The historie … of … Joane, of the Crosse</td>
<td>St. Omer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Bartholomeo Cambi</td>
<td>George à Sancto Guelimo Perrot</td>
<td>The seaven trumpets of brother Bartholomew</td>
<td>St. Omer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>61</sup> Cape was a layman; this translation was dedicated to the Gravelines Poor Clares, probably by Sancta Clara.

<sup>62</sup> Rookwood was a secular priest; this translation was dedicated to the Gravelines Poor Clares.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Franciscus Paludanus</td>
<td>Catherine Greenbury</td>
<td>A short relation of the life … of S. Elizabeth … Queen of Portugall</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Francis (Arthur) Bell</td>
<td>Christopher à Sancta Clara (Walter) Colman</td>
<td>A shorte declaration … of the corde of Francis</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Christopher à Sancta Clara (Walter) Colman</td>
<td>Egidius à Sancto Ambrosio (Giles) Willoughby</td>
<td>La dance machabre or death’s duell</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>St. Peter of Alcantara</td>
<td>Egidius à Sancto Ambrosio (Giles) Willoughby</td>
<td>A golden treatise of mentall praier</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>St. Bonaventure</td>
<td>Anthony Maria Browne</td>
<td>The life of the most holy father S. Francis</td>
<td>Douai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>St. Francis</td>
<td>Angelus à Sancto Francisco (Richard) Mason</td>
<td>The rule and testament of … S. Francis</td>
<td>Douai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>François Hendricq</td>
<td>Catherine Magdalen (Elizabeth) Evelyn</td>
<td>The history of … glorious S. Clare</td>
<td>Douai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Angelus à Sancto Francisco (Richard) Mason</td>
<td>A manuell of the arch-confraternitie of Francis</td>
<td>Douai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Ludovicus à Nazareth (Robert) Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td>A sacred poem describing … Marie of Aegipt</td>
<td>Douai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63. Browne was a layman, and his translation was first published in 1610; this republication includes a dedication written by Sancta Clara and an approbation from Gennings.