

Marie-Louise Coolahan

# Reception, reputation, and early modern women's missing texts

The spectre of 'known unknowns' stalks scholars of early modern women's writing as it did Donald Rumsfeld when US Secretary of State for Defense.<sup>1</sup> As Bigold observes, 'Women's literary history . . . has, from its very beginnings, been constructed as a battle against a perceived set of fragmentary, incomplete, or unfinished accounts, if not excluded, forgotten, or erased ones'.<sup>2</sup> Jennifer Summit has examined how 'the idea of loss has served as a powerful fiction that shaped the cultural place of the woman writer as well as the abstract model of a literary history that excluded her'.<sup>3</sup> She argues that the figure of the woman writer was enabling for those engaged in the process of vernacular, and Protestant, canon formation in England from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century, but was thereafter excluded as male classical models were incorporated in the seventeenth century. Bigold and Summit are concerned with the absence of women writers from literary history, the frameworks that have constructed that absence, and our modes of understanding them. However, this article is concerned with women's missing texts rather than the lost woman writer. It examines how their early modern contemporaries attested to the reputations of women writers whose texts have subsequently been lost. Such instances depend on reputation. We only know the text is missing when there is some record of its existence, or of its female author.

The missing text is of paramount importance to archaeological projects of recovery such as the Brown Women Writers and Orlando Projects, the *Perdita* Project on English women's manuscripts, and the recently instituted 'Women's Poetry in Ireland, Scotland and Wales 1400–1800' project, based at Aberystwyth University.<sup>4</sup> Tempting as it is to co-opt Rumsfeld – with his rallying call that 'the absence of evidence is not evidence of absence' – to the feminist cause, those are murky waters for academic scholarship as well as law and politics. This kind of research requires both reliable attributions of primary texts to women and primary texts, period. But texts can be fragile, attrition rates unpredictable and unquantifiable – whether due to the overarching literary historical movements discussed by Summit and Bigold, the material demand for the paper on which they were written, or the challenges to authentication posed by oral modes of transmission. This article views early modern women's missing texts through the prism of reception in

order to examine how the (current) absence of a text that was received and circulated by contemporaries informs and problematises the construction of female literary reputation. It considers the relationship between reputation, which can trans-historically divest itself of the text, and reception, which tends to be grounded in reader engagement. It is concerned with how and why readers transmitted and perpetuated women's reputations, and how networks might offer a means to track the missing texts themselves.

From Summit's perspective, the construction of the English canon as Protestant was predicated on the woman writer being figured as outsider to Catholic tradition, ripe for recovery to the newly emergent canon. If so, this simultaneously rescinded Catholic structures for textual transmission in England, leading to a double dislocation for the post-medieval woman writer, who became missing from English literary tradition. Recusant writing (writing produced by those who refused to attend Church of England services) retained its outsider status throughout the seventeenth century. However, the transnational circulation networks that were the bedrock of early modern Catholicism could ensure the perpetuation of authorial reputation in complex ways. The experience of Catholic religious persecution drove women to narrative composition, and the value of their writings as testimonies to martyrdom ensured their incorporation in Counter-Reformation literary tradition, as in the cases of Dorothy Arundell and Elizabeth Willoughby.

Arundell was an active recusant who relocated with her family from London on her father's death in 1590. They established a vibrant Catholic community at Chideock Castle, Dorset, where they were ministered by Father John Cornelius, whose education in Oxford and Rome had been sponsored by Arundell's father. Their community was raided in 1594. Ultimately, Cornelius was executed, writing a letter to his female protégé the night before, urging her to fulfil her vow to enter religious life. (She became a founder member of the English Benedictine convent in Brussels established in 1598.<sup>5</sup>) She wrote at least one manuscript biography of her spiritual mentor, which formed the basis of accounts of his life in martyrologies that were printed across Europe, from the publication in 1599 of Diego de Yepes's Spanish *Historia particular de la persecucion de Inglaterra*. First cited and quoted as a source in the Italian Daniello Bartoli's *Dell'istoria della Compagnia di Giesu: L'Inghilterra* and last reportedly consulted in 1878 by the historian Henry Foley at the Jesuit archives in Rome, Arundell's original manuscript is now missing.<sup>6</sup> Elizabeth Patton's work on Arundell has aimed to reconstruct, from the fragmentary evidence, the tenor and spirituality of Arundell's original text. Working backwards from Bartoli's attribution, she has traced earlier accounts of Cornelius's martyrdom. Patton argues that, although Arundell is not named as de Yepes's source, 'the intimate knowledge of events in the community at Chideock displayed . . . combined with both intertextual and extratextual evidence, serves to identify

this person as Arundell'. The discrepancies between this 1599 version and the longer, meticulously attributed version in Bartoli, lead to the further suggestion that, rather than a single missing text, there were two different manuscript versions, 'the first written by Arundell almost immediately after the priest's execution in 1594, and the second about five years later, after she entered the Brussels Benedictines in 1598'.<sup>7</sup> If so, the original was translated into both Spanish and Italian. The earliest English version, published by Challoner in 1741, is collated with other relations.

Challoner's methodological statement regarding his sources sheds light on the credibility of his and Bartoli's attributions. Aware of the absolute importance, for the martyrological project, of textual fidelity, he writes:

The first and most necessary Quality, that we ought to recommend History, is *Truth*: . . . And therefore we have given nothing upon Hearsays, or popular Traditions, but upon the best Authorities; either of grave cotemporary [sic] Writers, informed by such as were upon the Spot, or themselves Eye-witnesses of what they write; or of Records and Manuscript Memoirs, penn'd by such as were Eye-witnesses . . . And we have always taken Care, in the Beginning of every Life, to acquaint the Reader from whence we have had our Informations, concerning the Persons we are treating of.<sup>8</sup>

In scrupulously attributing to her the details of his narrative, Bartoli emphasises Arundell's closeness to the martyr ('*Dorotea, discepola del P. Cornelio*') and her unimpeachable moral character ('*Dorotea la vergine*').<sup>9</sup> His repeated assurances of faithfulness to her text (which narrated the circumstances leading to the raid; Cornelius's arrest, disputation with Walter Ralegh, trial, and execution) were necessary in order to establish the account's truthfulness but especially that of two miracles associated with the priest. Explicitly attributed to Arundell are the accounts of Cornelius's vision of her brother in purgatory and her own vision of a crown of light posthumously illuminating the priest's severed head, some days after his execution.<sup>10</sup> Both these events were crucial to the construction of Cornelius's martyrdom (and to any future moves toward canonisation). Hence, Arundell's first-person narrative was highly valuable and Bartoli's editorial integrity vital.

Arundell is not the only example of a female English writer whose now-lost original manuscript was translated and circulated to an international Catholic audience. Elizabeth Willoughby wrote a lively and grisly account of the martyrdom of Father Hugh Green, also at Chideock, in August 1642. This was first printed anonymously in Latin translation by Chifflet in his 1645 *Palmae cleri Anglicani*. It was diligently attributed to Willoughby in Challoner's work, where he also retrospectively identified Chifflet as the first print edition.<sup>11</sup>

Conforming to the policy set out in his preface, Challoner introduces his very substantial passage of direct quotation as ‘copied from Mrs. *Elizabeth Willoughby’s* MSS, who was an Eye-Witness’. His attention to accuracy is mirrored in Willoughby’s relation, in a convincing display of narrative self-reflexivity: ‘Now I beseech our Lord to put his [Green’s] Words into my Memory, that I may expressly relate them, for I have a great Scruple to add or take away’.<sup>12</sup> Willoughby provides Green’s scaffold speech replete with scriptural quotations. Her instinctive sense of drama manifests in her pacing of intermittent moments of dissent from the predominantly Protestant crowd. The affective power of her narrative is aided by the historical episode: Green’s hanging and quartering were prolonged and his biographer – ‘who never left him until his Head was severed from his Body’ – does not flinch from the details as she bears witness to his fortitude. Willoughby’s account concludes in epistolary form, again affirming its status as a contemporary, reliable account intended for circulation: ‘Sir, this briefly is what I conceived myself obliged to signify unto you concerning this Subject, not doubting but you will conceive the same Comfort in reading it, as I did in writing the same unto you, who am,/ Sir, &c./ *E. Willoughby*’.<sup>13</sup> The original may be missing, but the print edition mimics the apparatus of manuscript authorship as a mode of authentication. As with Arundell, the female-authored text is valued for its testimony to male martyrdom; solicited by, transmitted to, and incorporated in to Counter-Reformation martyrology. These were not printed as independent texts but quoted and excerpted as first-hand accounts, subordinated to the larger martyrological project. Their auxiliary authorial role is key to non-attribution in some sources, problematising efforts to retrieve their texts.

In the case of the Irish Poor Clare nun, Mary Bonaventure Browne, a sole surviving text corroborates a number of missing texts. Browne’s work is attested in a Franciscan bibliography compiled by Joanne à s. Antonio Salmantino in 1732. Rather than the martyrological focus of compendia such as those produced by de Yepes, Bartoli and Challoner, this bibliographer is concerned to describe all the writings of the international Franciscan order (of which the female order of St Clare was considered a part because its founder had known St Francis and modelled her Rule for religious life on his). Salmantino’s description provides first-hand testimony – in this case, to the woman writer’s work, not the martyred priest: ‘a huge work in large quarto in the Irish language, presently kept by the commissary of the Irish at Madrid and strengthened by licences and censures. I have seen it.’<sup>14</sup> There are three layers of authentication at play here: it is (ironically) reported as in safe-keeping, certified by relevant church authorities, and witnessed by Salmantino himself. According to him, the manuscript contained eleven separate works embracing history, life writing, devotion and religious polemic, as intimated

by the titles: 'An historical discourse on heresiarchs and their persecutions'; 'The martyrdoms of certain Poor Clares and Tertiaries during the tyrannous cruelty of Ireland'; 'A life of Henry the Eighth'; 'A life of Anne Boleyn'; 'A life of Queen Catherine'; 'The Acts of the Virgin Saint Colette'; 'A life of the Blessed Margaret del Pilar, Poor Clare'; 'A life of D. the holy Queen of Sicily'; 'An historical tract about many persons of most proven life in the world'; 'Concerning the devotion of the Rosary and its origin'; and 'Concerning other Rosaries given by divine generosity to God's own devoted ones'.<sup>15</sup> This quarto is now missing. But we are not dependent on the bibliographer's account, nor on his citation of her work. A contemporary English translation of the second of these tracts survives: Browne's chronicle of her community's history and exile to Spain. Held at the Poor Clare Monastery in Galway and titled: 'How divers Religious women of this holy order dyed in persecutions, Banishments and Calamities for their holy faith and profession, and especially of such of the Irish nation as dyed soe', the combination of this surviving manuscript with Salmantino's description of its larger context renders credible the account of her ten missing texts.<sup>16</sup> Our evidence of absence is corroborated by the surviving text.

These female-authored Catholic texts made an impact beyond their countries of composition. These women's authorial reputations circulated beyond their initial audiences, facilitated by transnational Catholic networks. They were translated, excerpted, even revised into other languages. The mechanism by which they were received and transmitted – the international religious order – provided a forum for the preservation of fragments of their work and it assimilated them to a writerly tradition. But the perpetuation of these reputations was grounded in their choice of Catholic subjects.

English Protestant networks could also facilitate the transmission of a woman writer's reputation, as the example of Elizabeth and Anthony Walker shows. Anthony Walker was chaplain to Mary Rich, countess of Warwick, at her estate in Lees, Essex. On Rich's death, Walker advanced her reputation as a devotional writer by printing, alongside his funeral sermon, selections from her occasional meditations and her letter of Christian instruction to George Berkeley.<sup>17</sup> His commitment to publicising the writerly reputation of the women of this circle continued at his wife Elizabeth's death in 1690, whereupon he published a biography with extracts from her writings.<sup>18</sup> As with Bartoli and Challoner, the printed texts attributed to the female author are all that survive. The Protestant model of exemplary biography functions as a confessional counterbalance, reminding us that circulation channels were not limited to those of international Catholicism. But it also reverses the gender hierarchy. For Arundell and Willoughby, the woman's writing is preserved due to its attestation to male martyrdom. Here, the Protestant female is the central

subject of the life narrative, and her writings are proffered as evidence of her exemplarity.

Walker printed selections from Elizabeth's writings interwoven with his chronological narrative of her life but also separately in an appendix. He describes the body of work from which he has drawn: as well as her 'large Book in *Octavo*', 'she hath left many, both Books and Papers, Copies of good Letters, Meditations, and the like'. The appendix includes two letters of spiritual instruction to her daughters, two consolatory letters to acquaintances, extracts from two letters to a young minister, a letter of advice to her niece and husband, and another to her grandson.<sup>19</sup> Her biographer is torn between the desire to publish her works in their entirety and to manage their volubility. But they are mediated by Walker, who cuts and summarises omitted passages. These works contribute to his ultimate goal: 'to represent, though in too faint Colours, the amiable Beauty of that resplendant Holiness and signal Cha[s]tity, with which the God of all Grace, to whom be all the Glory, vouchsafed to adorn this Blessed Soul'.<sup>20</sup> Not unlike Catholic martyrology, the text is valorised as proof of piety.

But Walker is perennially, anxiously self-reflexive, even defensive, about his methods. For example, he concludes a transcription of Elizabeth's eulogy on the death during childbirth of their daughter, Margaret, with this explication:

I have transcribed this long Paragraph, without altering, or changing the order of a Word; if some may account it tedious, who either have not been exercised with such Tryals, or have other shorter and cheaper ways to relieve themselves against them, let them use their own Methods, without censuring, or despising hers.

This dual compulsion to publish and edit is assigned to an inchoate sense of audience expectation: 'I must by an inforced Brevity deny my self the pleasure of recording more, lest by a seeming Prolivity I displease others, and hasten to finish this Section with transcribing what her dear Pen had prepared for her Children many years ago'.<sup>21</sup> There is an almost Shandean sense of time here, in which the biographer narrates his editorial practice as it happens, justifying it by reference to an imagined impatient readership.

The missing texts – omitted from his printed volume, whereabouts currently unknown – loom large, ever-present. Walker repeatedly refers to the original, unpublished manuscripts as anchor. He

signifie[s] to her Friends, that I shall freely allow them to read the Original, which is fairly legible, or if they think it worth the while, to Copy it out, or at more leisure to Print some few Copies of it, and others

of her usefull Papers, if desired; which I omit at present for fear of swelling this into too great a Bulk.<sup>22</sup>

This assumption of accessibility elides the broader readership broached by print publication but it serves, rhetorically, as a claim to authenticity. Through his accounts of what he's omitted and why, he draws attention to them, even as he aims to secure the reader's trust. As with the Catholic historians, credibility is bound up with editorial accuracy. Where the records of Catholic women's writings are preserved, this is part of a wider ecclesiastical programme. Walker's agenda is ostensibly also confessionally oriented. He claims to publish her writings as models for imitation, for their universal application as well as their certification of her devout life. But the portrait of his wife also has a bearing on the public image of Anthony Walker himself. His publication of Rich's texts served a mutual purpose in propagating her reputation and his place at the centre of their circle. Rich's diaries, meditations, and autobiography do survive, and they indicate that Walker was not averse to emendation. Nine of the thirteen occasional meditations he printed are revised; Walker retained structure and content but excised clauses, substituted words, and corrected grammar.<sup>23</sup> It is likely that a similar editorialism informed the publication of his wife's writings; even the most scrupulous of early modern editors cannot substitute for the missing texts.

I want to conclude with the eighteenth-century Irish Gaelic poet Máire Ní Chrualaoich (d. 1761), the 'Sappho of Munster', in order to tease out the issue of female authors who are known only by reputation. This is an extreme case because we have no surviving texts by her at all – only her contemporaries' reports of her poetic achievements – and this sharpens questions about how we should evaluate reception. Ní Chrualaoich's reputation was propagated by three contemporary male poets based in Cork and Limerick (in the southern province of Munster): Seán Ó Murchadha na Ráithíneach, Seán Ó Tuama an Ghrinn, and Tadhg Gaelach Ó Súilleabháin. Ó Murchadha and Ó Tuama regularly organised regional poetic gatherings known as *cúirt éigse*, or 'bardic courts'; they were immersed in, and well placed to comment on, Munster Gaelic poetic culture.<sup>24</sup> Each composed a poem lamenting Máire Ní Chrualaoich's death. That these were intended as companion pieces, identifiably the product of a poetic community, is clear from their metre and rhyme schemes, which operate in sequence. Each is exact in its literary praise. Ó Murchadha lauds his subject as: '*Sápphó sua-ghníomhach nduan mbinn, startha agus comhad – nGaeilge* [Wise-acting Sappho of metres, couplets, sweet songs].<sup>25</sup> '*Comhad*' here is a technical term, referring to the final couplet of the professional bardic metre known as *dán díreach*. Ó Tuama praises Máire for helping him develop his poetic skills as well as for her own intellectual accomplishments: '*An bháin-chnis d'fhuasclaíodh uaim ríomh*

*ranna agus cló – daornod . . . Máire an stua shníomhadh cnuas cruinn eagna is eoil – éigeas* [The fair one who solved for me dark riddles of verse making . . . Máire, the stately one, weaver of wisdom and poets' learning]. Ó Súilleabháin emphasises the broader impact of her poetry, again employing the literary term, '*comhad*': '*Grá na slua í o n-uaim ghrinn ranna 'gus comhad* [Darling of all in her keen crafting of polished verses]. Moreover, her death is explicitly mourned across Ireland, according to all three.

If, *pace* Summit, the English literary tradition was adopting classical paradigms by the early seventeenth century, this might throw light on the shift toward Sappho as a model for the (singular) woman writer. But there is equally an important element of humanist scholarship at play here. Sappho was first published in the Greek by Henri Estienne in 1546; the first translation into French followed ten years later in 1556.<sup>26</sup> The Continental circulation of her works in Greek, Latin and French throughout the seventeenth century would have been available to the literati of Gaelic-speaking Ireland – and, by the eighteenth century, in English, a language by then making serious inroads. We know from the work of Harriette Andreadis and Martha Rainbolt that the epithet, as applied to women writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, could be a poisoned chalice.<sup>27</sup> On the one hand, to be in the line of Sappho connoted female poetic excellence – and Sappho, of course, is the pre-eminent female author of missing texts. On the other, it contained barbed aspersions of sexual promiscuity. It may be that Ó Murchadha's description of Máire as '*eala 'gus óigh – 's Phoenixis* [swan, virgin, and phoenix] is designed to pre-empt that impression. Ó Tuama's emphasis on her annunciation to heaven may also be contrived to counter and complicate the association.<sup>28</sup>

How seriously should we take these poems? Are they evidence of real poetic achievement or to be interpreted as a literary game? The invocation of both her name and surname in the poems by Ó Murchadha and Ó Súilleabháin, and the latter's concluding stanza solemnly intoning the date of her death, argue against the idea that this is an exercise centred around an invented figure. The impact of her death on the band of poets – the coterie, in more anglicised terms – suggests the sincerity of these elegies: '*Don dáimh is uaill í is cruashnaidhm ceangail ar chló – céadfa, / An bás léir fuadaíodh uainn grinn greanadh san gcomhar – geléire* [That death snatched from the poetic company its keen engraver/ Has left our senses bound in black knots, has caused a cry of lamentation]. Ní Chrualaoich is not the only Munster writer known by reputation alone: a 1943 study of poets who had lived in the barony of Muskerry, county Cork, lists seventeen poets for whom no work of poetry survives – she is the only woman.<sup>29</sup>

In the absence of a primary text, the burden of proof rests on the plausibility of reception. There are solid reasons to weigh up the evidence in

favour of female authorship: the importance of truthful, verifiable accounts to the Counter-Reformation project, the survival of Browne's manuscript chronicle, the corroborating evidence of Mary Rich's manuscripts for women's writerly activities at Lees, and Walker's almost obsessive representations of his editorial practices. In these cases, we might ponder how fragmentary the surviving evidence is; how extensive the missing texts could be. But Máire Ní Chruaíaoich presents the starkest challenge to feminist scholars. The role of cultural mediators – in this case, the male poets who preserved and transmitted her reputation – attains a high (perhaps too high) level of importance as the linchpin of literary reception. In his elegy on Katherine Philips ('Orinda', d. 1664), Abraham Cowley asserted the primacy of the text in substantiating the woman writer's reputation:

Of Female Poets who had names of old,  
 Nothing is shewn, but only told,  
 And all we hear of them, perhaps may be  
 Male Flattery onely, and Male Poetry;  
 . . .  
 The certain proofs of our Orinda's Wit  
 In her own lasting characters are writ.<sup>30</sup>

Distinguishing between past and present, Cowley draws a line between inherited male reception of women as authors and his own act of celebration, grounded in the evidence of Philips's own hand. As Summit has argued, Cowley is also invested here in his own present reputation: 'what is at stake is the need to affirm not only his own authority as a male poet but also the masculinity of the literary tradition of which he claims part'.<sup>31</sup>

If male reception of the woman writer is always self-implicated, we should consider what is gained from documenting women's writing in the early modern period. All the missing texts discussed here have male patronage networks in common. But if the eighteenth-century historian of women, George Ballard, 'perpetuated the construct of loss', these male contemporaries do not.<sup>32</sup> These texts were not missing at the time they were recorded, described, transmitted, and rewritten. What value is attached to the female-authored text? For Catholic martyrologists, it is their first-hand testimony; for the Franciscan bibliographer, it is the contribution to the bigger picture of the order's literary production. The artefact of writing by a woman is not in itself valuable here and that deflection from more modern interests may render their accounts more credible. In the context of English Protestantism, exemplary piety was demonstrated by devotional composition. Hence, the fact of writing is of central importance and this is why Walker is so heedful of his editorial integrity. The Irish poems celebrate

the female poet's accomplishments as a former member of their company, without any obvious prestige accruing to them from the association (unlike Cowley). Furthermore, these records of women's missing texts all share a memorial purpose. Those of Walker and Ní Chruaíoch are explicitly elegiac; that of Browne literary historical; those of Arundell and Willoughby martyrological. Their reputations are embroiled in constructions of and for posterity.

It may be that Cowley was ultimately right. It is, after all, Katherine Philips who currently occupies the position of eminent woman poet. Her reputation can be evaluated against the evidence of her writing and its circulation. The women writers whose missing texts are discussed here are not (currently) well known but caught in shadowy interstices; in the absence of their original texts, their reputations must rest as they are. Scholars working on feminist recovery cannot easily accommodate missing texts, and this leads to the exclusion of such female authors from the canon of women's writing. To focus on reception rather than production offers another way to frame this debate; where there is a vacuum created by the missing text, in which we yearn for the proof of a woman's literary production, this may not matter at all for reception studies where it is the quality of reception that counts. From this perspective, the contexts for reception – the channels through which women's texts were read and their authorial reputations disseminated – are central. The status of these sources shifts from reportage to site of investigation. They yield information as to which networks and circumstances facilitated and encouraged authorial attributions to women, their preservation for posterity, and why. Where the scholarly concern is literary production, we need to test the reliability of such sources as evidence for that production; where reception is at issue, the structures that shape, influence, and perpetuate reputation themselves become the object of scrutiny. Moreover, missing is not the same as irretrievable; it connotes mislaid and misplaced rather than destroyed. The idea of the missing text contains an implicit expectation of return. If, to paraphrase Rumsfeld, we now know what we're missing, we can begin to look and we may find it. On the most basic level, then, records of missing texts can signal directions for research. Location of the texts would illuminate both production and reception, permitting evaluation of the quality of the female author's writing and her patron's claims for it. Indeed, should those claims prove to be false – should evidence emerge, for example, that Máire Ní Chruaíoch was a creature of her contemporaries' imagination – this would enrich our understanding of perceptions and uses of the woman writer in the early modern period. Mediation of the missing text through its contemporary reception places us at one remove from the text itself but reveals how writing found an audience, how it achieved wider circulation, and the conditions for support and endorsement of female authorship.

## Notes

- 1 6 June 2002, Brussels, NATO press conference, <http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2002/s020606g.htm> (accessed 24 June 2013).
- 2 Melanie Bigold, "Bookmaking Out of the Remains of the Dead": George Ballard's *Memoirs of Several Ladies* (1752), *Eighteenth-Century Life*, forthcoming.
- 3 Jennifer Summit, *Lost Property: The Woman Writer and English Literary History, 1380–1589* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 5.
- 4 Brown Women Writers Project: <http://www.wwp.brown.edu/>; Orlando Project: <http://www.artsrn.ualberta.ca/orlando/>; Perdita Project: <http://web.warwick.ac.uk/english/perdita/html/>; and *Perdita Manuscripts: Women Writers, 1500–1700* (Adam Matthew Digital, 2008); Women's Poetry in Ireland, Scotland and Wales 1400–1800: <http://womenspoetry.aber.ac.uk>.
- 5 See 'Who Were the Nuns? English Convents in Exile, 1600–1800': <http://wwtn.history.qmul.ac.uk>.
- 6 Diego de Yepes, *Historia particular de la persecucion de Inglaterra* (Madrid, 1599), 633–40; Daniello Bartoli, *Dell'istoria della Compagnia di Giesu: L'Inghilterra* (Rome, 1667; Bologna, 1676), 371–89; Henry Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus* (London: Burns and Oates, 1878), vol.3, 437, 474.
- 7 Elizabeth Patton, 'From Community to Convent: The Collective Spiritual Life of Post-Reformation Englishwomen in Dorothy Arundell's Biography of John Cornelius', in *The English Convents in Exile, 1600–1800: Communities, Culture and Identity*, ed. Caroline Bowden and James Kelly (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013), 22, 21.
- 8 Richard Challoner, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*, 2 vols (London, 1741–2), vol.1, sig. A2v.
- 9 Bartoli, *Compagnia di Giesu*, 371, 374.
- 10 *Ibid.*, 387, 383–4. See also Elizabeth Patton, 'Dorothy Arundell's "Acts of Father John Cornelius": "We Should Hear from Her, Herself – She Who Left a Record of It in These Words"', *ANQ*, 24 (2011), 53.
- 11 Jean Chifflet, *Palmae cleri Anglicani* (Brussels, 1645), 45–63; Challoner, *Missionary Priests*, vol.2, 217–26. Willoughby addresses Cornelius's death as precedent for the divine punishment of the town of Dorchester, a detail not found in versions of Arundell's account (Challoner, *Missionary Priests*, vol.2, 225).
- 12 *Ibid.*, vol.2, 217.
- 13 *Ibid.*, vol.2, 223, 226.
- 14 '*ingens opus in 4. magno, sermone Hybernico, impra sentiarum asseruatum à Matritensi Hybernorum Commissario, licentijs, & censuris roboratum. Vidi.*'; Joanne à s. Antonio Salmantino, *Bibliotheca uniuersa franciscana*, 3 vols (Madrid, 1732; repr. Farnborough: Gregg Press, 1966), vol.2, 328.
- 15 '*Continet tractatus istos: Discursum Historicum de Hæresiarchis coramque persecutionibus. Quarundam Clarissarum, ac Tertiariorum Martyria durante Hyberniæ tyrannica crudelitate. Vitam Henrici Octavi. Vitam Annæ Bolenę. Vitam Reginæ Catharinæ. Acta Sanctæ Coletæ Virginis. Vitam B. Margarita del Pilar, Clarissæ. Vitam D. Sanctæ Reginæ Siculæ. Tractatum Historicum de plerisque personis vitę probatissimæ in sæculo. De deuotione Rosarij ejusque initio. De alijs Rosarijs Divina largitate, suis deuotis concessis.*'; Salmantino, *Bibliotheca*, vol.2, 328. Translation by Eric Graff.
- 16 For further discussion of Browne's work, see Marie-Louise Coolahan, *Women, Writing, and Language in Early Modern Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 81–101.
- 17 Anthony Walker, *Eureka, Eureka: The Virtuous Woman Found, her Loss Bewailed, and Character Examined* (London, 1678).

- 18 Anthony Walker, *The Holy Life of Mrs. Elizabeth Walker* (London, 1690); repr. as *The Vertuous Wife; or, the Holy Life of Mrs. Elizabth [sic] Walker* (London, 1694).
- 19 Walker, *Holy Life*, 84/ sig. F2v; 229–96/ sigs. O3r-T4v.
- 20 *Ibid.*, 16/ sig. 2A4v.
- 21 *Ibid.*, 160/ sig. K8v; 72/ sig. E4v.
- 22 *Ibid.*, 228/ sig. P2v.
- 23 British Library, Additional MSS 27, 351–27, 357. See also *The Occasional Meditations of Mary Rich, Countess of Warwick*, ed. Raymond Anselment (Tempe AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2009).
- 24 See Lesa Ní Mhunchaile, ‘Ó Murchadha, Seán na Ráithíneach’; Vincent Morley, ‘Ó Tuama, Seán an Ghrinn’, and ‘Ó Súilleabháin, Tadhg Gaelach’, in *Dictionary of Irish Biography*, ed. James McGuire, James Quinn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); accessed 24 June 2013.
- 25 All citations are from *The Field Day Anthology of Irish Writing: Irish Women’s Writing and Traditions*, ed. Angela Bourke et al., 5 vols (Cork: Cork University Press, 2002), vol.4, 442–3.
- 26 Joan deJean, *Fictions of Sappho, 1546–1937* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).
- 27 Harriette Andreadis, *Sappho in Early Modern England: Female Same-Sex Erotics, 1550–1714* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001); Martha Rainbolt, ‘Their Ancient Claim: Sappho and Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century British Women’s Poetry’, *Seventeenth Century*, 12 (1997), 111–34.
- 28 ‘*S ní bás do fuair sí acht nua-shlí in amharc na nOrd – naofa*’ ([She] Has left on a new course in the company of angels’).
- 29 Donnchadh Ó Cróinín, ‘Fíli agus Filíocht Mhúsraighe’, *An Músraigheach*, 1 (1943), 19. Digital version available at [http://www.musgrai.com/foillsiu/musraigheach/1/musraigheach1\\_7](http://www.musgrai.com/foillsiu/musraigheach/1/musraigheach1_7) (accessed 10 July 2013).
- 30 Katherine Philips, *Poems* (London, 1667), sig. f2v.
- 31 Summit, *Lost Property*, 205.
- 32 Bigold, “Bookmaking Out of the Remains of the Dead”.