Document généré le 4 mai 2024 13:27

Renaissance and Reformation
Renaissance et Réforme

Locating Early Modern Women's Translations: Critical and Historiographical Issues

Marie-Alice Belle

Volume 35, numéro 4, automne 2012

Women's Translations in Early Modern England and France
La traduction au féminin en France et en Angleterre (XVIe et XVIIe siècles)

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1105720ar
DOI : https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v35i4.19697

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (imprimé)
2293-7374 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer ce document

Belle, M.-A. (2012). Locating Early Modern Women's Translations: Critical and Historiographical Issues. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, *35*(4), 5–23. https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v35i4.19697

© Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies / Société canadienne d'études de la Renaissance; Pacific Northwest Renaissance Society; Toronto Renaissance and Reformation Colloquium; Victoria University Centre for Renaissance and Reformation Studies, 2013

Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/

érudit

Cet article est diffusé et préservé par Érudit.

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche.

https://www.erudit.org/fr/

Locating Early Modern Women's Translations: Critical and Historiographical Issues

MARIE-ALICE BELLE
Université de Montréal

When Joan Kelly, in what is now recognized as a foundational essay in women's studies, famously asked whether women had actually had a Renaissance, her provocative answer was explicitly aimed at challenging the virtual invisibility of women in conventional narratives of European social and cultural history.[1] Almost twenty years later, visibility was again at the heart of the historiographical debate within another emerging academic discipline, as Lawrence Venuti's controversial "history of translation" denounced the secondary role to which translation practices had been traditionally relegated in Anglo-Saxon literary cultures.[2] This double call for an increased recognition of the role of women and of translation within Western literary and cultural histories has certainly been heard by early modern scholars, and in the last few decades the field of Renaissance studies has been greatly enriched by an expanding corpus of publications documenting the place of women in the "cultures of translation"[3] of early modern Europe and shedding light on issues as varied as the representation of women through translation, patterns of female readership and ownership of translated works, the role of translation in the education of women, female agency in the production and circulation of translated literature, the translation and diffusion of women's writings across Europe, and, perhaps most prominently, the importance of translation as a gendered interpretive and authorial practice.[4]

As early as the pioneering essays by Margaret P. Hannay and Tina Krontiris,[5] accounts of early modern women's authorial strategies have identified translation as a distinct and essential practice in the making of the female writer. The centrality of translation in the early modern corpus of women's writings has accordingly been reflected in recent gender-oriented literary histories. The *Feminist Encyclopedia of French Literature* (1999) offers a full section on Renaissance translation.[6] So does the 2003 *Encyclopedia of Women in the*

Renaissance, with an entry on "Translation and Women Translators" in which Brenda Hosington and Hannah Fournier respectively discuss the place of women in early modern English and French cultures of translation.[7] The issue of translation also occupies a whole chapter in key publications such as Patricia Demers's volume on *Early Modern England* in the University of Toronto Press Women's Writing Series,[8] or Caroline Bicks's and Jennifer Summit's award-winning *History of British Women's Writing (1500–1800)*,[9] while the recently published *Cambridge Companion to Early Modern Women's Writings* greatly benefits from Danielle Clarke's wide-ranging and authoritative discussion of the importance of translation as a cultural and authorial practice not only for women, but also within the early modern English literary system.[10]

Recent histories of translation have, in turn, sought to acknowledge women's contributions to the production, circulation, and reception of translated literature. Perhaps the most obvious example of this trend is the *Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* (2005–2013). While its first volume, whose chronological range covers the early part of the period, includes a section specifically dedicated to female translators,[11] the second volume offers inclusive titles such as "Translating at Leisure: Gentlemen and Gentlewomen,"[12] devotes one of its "translator case studies" to Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke, and discusses the role of women in the production and circulation of translations in early modern Britain.[13] Similarly, the collection of source texts by Weissbort and Eynsteinsson, *Translation Theory and Practice: A Historical Reader*, published in the wake of the *Oxford History*, offers a selection of female-authored texts under the title "Women Translators from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century." As made explicit in the introductory essay by Jane Stevenson, the inclusion of texts by Mary Basset, Margaret Tyler, Katherine Philips and others seeks to acknowledge the contribution of women to the development of translation in the period—as readers, patrons, practitioners, or theoreticians.[14]

The place of early modern French female translators in the canon of translation history is perhaps more difficult to situate. Jean Delisle's *Portraits de traductrices* (2002) is witness to the growing concern among translation scholars to balance a traditionally male-dominated account of the history of the profession.[15] Yet the earliest translator to be "portrayed" in the volume is the already well-known Classical translator Anne Dacier (1654–1720).[16] Paul Chavy's 1988 biographical dictionary *Traducteurs d'autrefois. Moyen-Âge et Renaissance* does include an entry on Antoinette de Loynes,[17] and registers Anne de Graville's

and Marguerite de Cambis's translations from Boccacio.[18] However, Marie de Cotteblanche is not clearly identified (Chavy's list of sixteenth-century translations of Pierre Messine's work indicates a mere M. de C.),[19] and the entry on Montaigne fails to indicate Gournay's translations for the 1617 edition of his *Essays*, let alone her versions from Ovid, Horace, or Virgil. Whereas the latter omissions may be explained by chronological reasons—the French Renaissance traditionally ends with the sixteenth century—there is no such justification for the absence of early modern women in Van Hoof's *Dictionnaire Universel des traducteurs* (1993).[20] While perhaps reflecting the somewhat fragmentary state of current research on translation in early modern France,[21] these historiographical gaps are also due to enduring difficulties in identifying women translators of the period. As noted by the early bibliographer La Croix du Maine in his 1584 *Bibliothèque française*, texts authored by French women were often not committed to print, and many of them are nowadays lost, or still to be located.[22] Besides, the very gender of translators whose texts we do know, such as Jeanne Flore, has recently been challenged.[23] Some of these critical and historiographical issues have been addressed in the 2004 collection *D'une écriture à l'autre. Les Femmes et la traduction sous l'Ancien Régime*, where Jean-Philippe Beaulieu chooses to examine translation practices by early modern French women as part of broader movements of literary *translatio* across Europe from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century.[24] His approach is best understood in the context of the University of Waterloo's MARGOT project, through which leading Canadian researchers have actively sought to promote the publication and study of a yet under-examined corpus of early modern French women's writings—thereby also contributing to validate the notion of gender as a relevant critical and historiographical category.[25]

Indeed, despite the efforts deployed by translation and literary historians to include women's writings in the canon of translated literature, scholars still lament the fact that these texts remain understudied. In her recent collection, *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production*, Micheline White notes for example that women's translations still represent a "neglected" genre in early modern literary studies.[26] Her concern is echoed by Anne Lawrence-Mathers, who further underlines the difficulty for female-authored translations to achieve canonical status.[27] The status of translations within the corpus of early modern women's writings appears itself somewhat problematic. Long considered a secondary form of literary production, translation has sometimes

been presented as a *pis-aller*, or default solution, which one should study to complement or compensate for the scarcity of female-authored texts belonging to more traditionally accepted, and therefore more easily recognized, modes of writing.[28]

In fact, the perceived inferiority of translation as a literary practice, and its traditional association with women in the early modern period, have lately been identified as the greatest critical pitfalls when approaching early modern women's translations. Doubtlessly, the studies by Hannay, Krontiris, and others were fundamental in establishing the importance of translation as a privileged way to authorship for early modern women; yet the search for a distinctly feminine approach to translation has sometimes resulted in rather reductive portrayals of the female translator, whose activities—to paraphrase Brenda Hosington's critique—were typically described as derivative by nature, more literal in kind, and focused on religious material and modern languages.[29] Coupled with a mistaken understanding of translation as a lesser kind of writing, these perceptions tended to perpetuate the conventionally derogative association of women with translation—"all reputed femal[e]s, delivered at second hand," as Florio (in)famously commented.[30] This in turn sometimes resulted in what Helen Smith has identified as a "critical double bind, through which the devaluing of women's labour as mechanical and the devaluation of translation as derivative perpetuate each other."[31]

However, recent scholarship on Renaissance translation has demonstrated that, far from representing a secondary or marginal writing practice, translating was mainly considered at the time a skilled, high-profile activity.[32] The stereotype of the early modern woman translating devotional or fictional literature as a purely domestic, if not decorative, pastime, has been replaced by a new paradox: the overwhelming presence in women's literary production of an activity that not only was central to humanist pedagogy, but also, as Danielle Clarke notes, "formed the epistemological category […] structur[ing] much of early modern thinking about language, style and meaning."[33]

Early misconceptions have also been proven inaccurate by evidence brought to light in the last decades. As noted for example by Hannah Fournier, literalness was not a distinctive mark of women's translation practices in France.[34] In fact, early modern French male and female translators were equally involved in the eristic and innovative translation strategies derived from the humanistic practice of literary imitation.[35] Similar conclusions have been reached

by Brenda Hosington, Patricia Demers, and Danielle Clarke in their analyses of the linguistic, rhetorical, and literary resources deployed by English women translators.[36] Besides, while religious literature and contemporary fiction constitute an important part of the known corpus of female-authored translation, it is now generally agreed that early modern women's approaches to translation greatly varied, in terms of their contexts, their objects, and the actual translation methods embraced. The recovery and analysis of an increasing number of female-authored translations have further shown—by their choice of texts, their interpretative and literary strategies, or their patterns of circulation—that women's translations could reach well beyond the domestic sphere to participate in the religious, political, and literary debates of the times.[37] These findings have greatly helped to nuance the critical and historiographical category of the "early modern woman," and to bring into light the familial, social, political, or religious factors that intervened in the production and circulation of women's translations in early modern Europe.

Finally, the recent exploration of the social and material conditions in which translations were produced and circulated invites us to redefine the key categories of "genre," "authorship," "text," and "gender" itself. Such questions were naturally at the heart of the inquiry on early modern women's writings from the very beginning.[38] However, re-examination of the corpus from the perspective of book history has highlighted the often collaborative dynamics of translation production, sometimes with contrasting results. Leah Chang and Michèle Clément, for instance, have traced the role of (male) printers and literary coteries in the construction of the female author/translator figure in sixteenth-century Lyon.[39] Other scholars, such as Anne Coldiron and Helen Smith,[40] have instead devoted their attention to the various forms of intervention by women in the production, circulation, and interpretation of translated texts—all of which have been shown to constitute elements of a "composite authorial practice."[41] Recent studies of the compilation and copying patterns of early modern women's manuscripts have also helped to stretch established notions of authorship, and to re-examine common definitions of translation itself. As the works of Victoria Burke have shown,[42] practices as varied as retranslation, partial transformation and variation, linguistic updating, and manuscript arrangement can be considered as interpretive acts, which enable us in turn to gain a better understanding of the way women read, appropriated, and reworked early modern literary and religious texts.

By gathering studies on the practice of translation by early modern French and English women, this collection aims to participate in the creation of a more complete and variegated account of women's translation strategies, and their significance to early modern European culture. While honouring the Canadian tradition of bilingual scholarship in Renaissance and Reformation studies, the joint examination of French and English examples in this issue responds to recent calls by scholars of translation and of women's studies to look beyond the traditional limits of national boundaries.[43] In particular, France and England have lately been identified as exceptionally fertile grounds for the investigation of the interrelated issues of translation, gender, and literary culture. As Anne Coldiron has demonstrated in her study of the English continuation, through translation, of the French *querelle des femmes*, the linguistic, political, economic, and cultural ties that had linked France and England through the Middle Ages continued to shape early modern reading practices, and contributed to the sustained circulation of texts and ideas across the Channel.[44] Besides, comparative histories of the condition of women in England and France have demonstrated that these countries differed greatly in terms of women's access to education, political power, or literary recognition.[45] While the women translators discussed in this issue all belong to the social and intellectual elite, there are significant variations in way they fashion their identities as women and as translators. Through specific attention to their interpretive, textual, and paratextual interventions, this collection seeks to attend to their individual voices, thus underlining the diversity of their responses to a variety of social, cultural, and religious contexts. It is finally hoped that the encounter between the French and English traditions of early modern scholarship, with their subtle differences in method and emphasis, will encourage the exchange of critical approaches and analytical tools. This issue thus aims not only to offer ways of avoiding the "critical double bind" that has long plagued the study of early modern women's translations, but also to underline the benefits of a cross-national, multidisciplinary approach, and to suggest new avenues of study in this expanding field.

The first critical avenue that this collection seeks to explore is the examination of women's discourse on translation, or, in the words of Jean-Philippe Beaulieu, "les modulations particulières du discours féminin."[46] Women's prefaces, among other kinds of critical discourse, have often been presented as reflecting the paradox of the female writer, who had to embrace the paradigms of a patriarchal literary system in order to be published. François Rigolot

has argued for instance that "the only chance for women to become published authors was gleefully to join the theocentric order established by men, often with the complicity of female sovereignty."[47] However, a closer inspection of the metaphors and commonplaces on translation equally used by early modern men and women shows that the very topoi of translation discourse could constitute a powerful way for women to appropriate a male-dominated genre and activity. One can hardly argue, for example, that the humility topos that pervades early modern translation prefaces was actually understood as a genuine demonstration of modesty. In fact, cases abound in which a conventionally ancillary posture was actually part of the translator's indirect, although culturally transparent, self-fashioning strategies.[48] By extension, rather than simply perpetuating the established patriarchal order, outward shows of modesty such as Basset's self-deprecating remarks, Graville's topos of the *peu savante femme*, or Gournay's later self-depiction as a *tres modeste femme* also participated in the indirect assertion of authorship that characterized the early modern rhetoric of translation.[49]

The various cases discussed in this collection offer representative, if selective, examples of the way women translators engaged with current debates on the nature and functions of translation. Early modern defenses of translation heavily relied on the argument of *utilitas*; that is, the profit, public or private, that could be derived from reading translated literature. The paratexts of Lady Lumley's translations from *Euripides* are an eloquent example of the subtle shift from private edification to public utility. The texts Lumley first presents as schoolroom exercises soon turn into mirrors of public wisdom and virtue, as she underlines the political lessons to be learned from them. Similarly, Gournay's prefaces stage the transformation of a private pastime ("un simple passe-temps") into authoritative interventions into the major debates on translation and poetics that shaped the nascent French classical aesthetic. Linguistic, generic, and literary innovations are indeed at the heart of the translation activities explored in this issue. The essay on Anne Graville's *Beau Romant* highlights the link between Graville's re-telling of Boccacio's *Teseida* and the movement of literary and linguistic renovation of the vernacular inherited from Dante—a movement that would reach its apex with Du Bellay's famous *Défense et Illustration*. The rhetorical capacities of the vernacular are similarly "illustrated" and augmented in the translations by Lady Margaret Beaufort and Mary Basset. Their deft and sometimes inventive re-appropriation of their French and Latin sources reveals

their concern for rhetorical efficacy, a major subject in humanist debates on translation and poetics. The case of Lumley, moreover, offers a fine example of a woman's appropriation of the Erasmian model of translation and imitation based on linguistic *copia*, and on the cultural or even personal adaptation of ancient matter to the early modern context.

While confirming the linguistic, cultural, and literary agency of women in the re-creation of their source texts, these examples constitute an invitation to examine early modern women's translations in the broader context of European translation practices. It is striking that the women examined in this issue were involved with texts that were in many ways central to European literary culture. Lumley, Basset, and Gournay translated from (or into) Greek and Latin. Most were dealing with high literary genres: Greek tragedy for Lumley; Virgil's *Aeneid* for Gournay; and in the case of Graville, the modern refashioning of ancient epic in the form of Boccaccio's *Teseida*. Beaufort's translation of the *De Imitatione Christi* participates in the diffusion of one of the most popular devotional texts in Europe; and beyond the obviously Catholic origins of the text, More's meditation on the agony of Christ was deeply rooted in the widespread devotional practice of the *lectio divina*. The centrality of these texts doubtlessly reflects the social position of these women, all members of the educated, social elite; it also helps challenge the idea that translation represented a marginal, secondary cultural endeavour. Even the cases of indirect translation (literally "delivered at second hand") such as Graville's *Beau Romant* and Beaufort's passages from the *Imitation*—both of which were based on earlier French versions—paradoxically testify to the significance of these texts in Renaissance culture, thus illustrating the role of women translators as agents of cultural, linguistic, and literary *translatio* in early modern Europe.

By shedding light on the conditions in which these translations were written, printed, and/or circulated, the essays in this collection address the issue of early modern women writers' often problematic dependence on a patriarchal familial, social, and political order. The case of Lady Lumley's translations from the Greek, which, as Goodrich points out, "remained safely out of the public sphere," and whose readership was most probably limited to Lumley's father and other members of the household, illustrates the restrictions then placed on women's public roles. The other examples examined in this issue seem, however, to paint a different picture. Lady Margaret Beaufort's public roles as mother of Henry VII and major patron of Caxton's translating and printing activities

must have contributed as much to the success of her translation from the *De Imitatione* as Bishop Fisher's commendation of her virtues. Female patronage seems also to have played a crucial role in the publication of More's *English Works*, since, as Brenda Hosington suggests, the inclusion of Basset's translation was probably strongly motivated by the financial support she brought to the project. While her text is framed by male-authored writings—More's works and Rastell's prefatorial material—her mastery of Biblical scholarship, Latin philology, and vernacular eloquence speak against the conventional depiction of Basset's translation as a woman's private pastime, "far too simple" to reach print. A similarly complex interaction between male authorities and a woman's authorial stance is to be found in Gournay's prefaces. As demonstrated by Jean-Philippe Beaulieu's essay, the translator's references to her male patrons, friends, and protectors serve at once as a caution for her work and as a way of staging herself as a participant in the literary debates of her time.

The essays in this collection have been arranged along chronological and/or thematic lines. Mawy Bouchard's analysis of Anne de Graville's *Beau Romant* (1521) explores an early example of linguistic, literary, and cultural *translatio*, as it highlights the complex weaving of rhetorical topoi that accompanies Graville's re-writing of Boccacio's *Teseida*. Graville's choice of verse, against earlier prose translations, reflects the renewed interest in the epic genre that accompanies the Renaissance defense of the vernacular, and Bouchard's careful reading of the prologue to the *Beau Romant* uncovers the literary agenda that underlies the "translation pretext" (*le prétexte traductologique*) put forward by Graville. While appealing to courtly audiences by offering a more compact and elegant version of Boccacio's text, her focus on the character of Emilia anticipates the feminization of romance narratives that would later characterize Hélisenne de Crenne's or Jeanne Flore's writings. This sensitive reading of a translator's linguistic, rhetorical, and interpretive strategies situates Graville's activities within the immediate social and literary context of Queen Claude's court; it also sheds light on her involvement in wider European cultural phenomena such as the rise of the vernaculars, the wide-ranging ideological and literary dispute known as the *querelle des femmes*, and the codification of courtly manners that the success of Castiglione's *Cortegiano* would soon precipitate.

The next two essays focus on the translation of devotional texts by English translators, Lady Margaret Beaufort and Mary Roper Basset. Building

upon recent work on Beaufort by Brenda Hosington,[50] Patricia Demers offers a vigorous demonstration of the literary value of Lady Margaret's understudied *Fourthe boke of the folowynge of Jesu cryst* (1504). Demers interrogates the usual portraits of Lady Margaret as dynastic matriarch, literary patron, or pious benefactress by situating her work within the context of early Tudor approaches to language and translation. Through a close analysis of the linguistic and interpretive choices embraced by Lady Margaret, the essay demonstrates the translator's unusual understanding of the slipperiness of language, but also of its rhetorical and performative capacities. As Demers traces the augmentations and alterations brought to the French version of À Kempis's text upon which Beaufort based her translation, the devotional intensity and didactic exhortations of the English version emerge as key elements in the translator's endeavour to "vivify the sacramental reality of the Eucharist." Lady Margaret's direct addresses to the reader, and her use of homely vernacular expressions, are shown to match the very principles of À Kempis's *devotio moderna*, where reading (and translating) devotional texts represented an intensely embodied and transformative activity. Demers duly notes how difficult it may be for the (post)modern reader to come to terms with the theological and linguistic conceptions that underlie this translation. However, by resorting to Agamben's reflections on the sacramental dimension of language, the essay offers a relevant way to understand the inner dynamics of Beaufort's translation and its popularity in sixteenth-century England.

Catholic devotion is also the subject of Brenda Hosington's essay, which offers an unprecedented study of the translation of Thomas More's *De tristitia… Christi* by his granddaughter, Mary Roper Basset. Published in the 1557 edition of More's *English Works*, Basset's version, Hosington convincingly argues, demands close textual analysis, not only because of its importance in the context of the Catholic restoration under the reign of Mary, but also because of its significance in regard to Tudor translation practices. Hosington first situates the publication of Basset's translation in its theoretical and socio-cultural context, arguing that its inclusion in the volume was motivated by familial and financial reasons, but also as a way to remind Catholic readers of More's death as a martyr. After establishing the origins of More's work and of its translation, the essay offers a detailed analysis of the linguistic, rhetorical, philological, and historical skills deployed by Basset, in a translation that involves linguistic innovations, rhetorical imitation, erudite glosses, and personal commentaries.

Particular attention is devoted to More's rhetorical devices, in particular his use of sustained imagery, emphatic repetition, and alliteration, all of which the English text seeks to convey, offering a striking example of the humanist translation practices that Cheke, Grimald, and Ascham would only later come to theorize.

Finally, the essays by Jaime Goodrich and Jean-Philippe Beaulieu offer examples of the way women re-appropriated ancient texts in order to fashion their identities—domestic, intellectual, or authorial—in the face of contemporary intellectual and literary debates. In her parallel reading of Lady Lumley's manuscript translations from Isocrates and Euripides, Jaime Goodrich revisits the issue of early modern women's education, in particular the "absorption of male values" which, according to Diane Purkiss,[51] was the paradoxical result of the educated woman's humanist training. Goodrich shows that Lumley did incorporate the main tenets of commonwealth theory—a major element in humanist pedagogy—into her Latin translations of both Greek texts. Goodrich's minute examination of the alterations brought to the sources reveals, however, that the "absorption" of commonwealth theory within the translated text was not only motivated by its dedication to male readers involved in state politics—that is, Lumley's father, and potentially her husband. With its focus on Clytemnestra and Iphigenia, the Euripides translation also offered Lumley a way to stage the role of women as wise counsellors, a role she was herself probably schooled for. The essay concludes that, by demonstrating her knowledge of contemporary political theory, and emphasizing the intellectual power and agency of women as political advisers, Lumley's translation can be read as an exploration of the learned woman's opportunities for intellectual and political influence within the circumscribed area of the Tudor aristocratic household.

Marie de Gournay's construction of her identity as a woman translator—or her translation ethos—appears much more self-affirming by comparison. Focusing on the under-studied corpus of Gournay's translations, Jean-Philippe Beaulieu's essay explores the gradual fashioning of Gournay's translating self (*moy traductrice*) through her prefaces. Beaulieu's detailed analysis of the rhetorical strategies deployed in the *Lettre à Monseigneur de Gelas* and of *De la façon d'écrire* reveals that Gournay's articulation of her authorial identity relies on a highly complex manipulation of the contemporary discourse on translation. Whether by staging her literary or social connections, by assimilating the humanist discourse on translation, or by artfully recuperating the modesty

topos expected from her as a woman and a translator, Gournay poses as an independent critic of her times. While the eristic, competitive ethos that supports Gournay's authoritative judgments on translation and aesthetics is to be read in the context of the ongoing debates around Malherbe and the literary models of French classicism, Beaulieu convincingly argues that the issue of gender, explicitly discussed by the translator, should also be considered as a significant element of the translator's self-defined authorial and ethical stances.

Together, these essays participate in the current re-evaluation of translation as a major and authoritative practice, not only for women, but for Renaissance culture at large. While the acts of translation—linguistic, ideological, or cultural—performed by the women encountered here certainly illuminate their individual textual and interpretive strategies, they also point to many aspects of early modern Europe's changing social, cultural, and literary orders. As Danielle Clarke recently underlined the enduring difficulties that scholars of early modern women's translations encountered in order to "locate and interrogate gender in these kinds of texts,"[52] so this issue suggests new ways of reading early modern translation as a gendered practice: far from simply representing a preferred mode of textual production for women, translation emerges as a privileged ground of investigation, offering insight into issues as important and varied as early modern perceptions of women, their access to humanist learning and education, and the fashioning of their identities as social, literary, and cultural agents in early modern Europe.

Notes

* Acknowledgements: This collection originated in a panel at the 2010 annual congress of the Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies. I am indebted to Jean-Philippe Beaulieu, Brenda Hosington, and the anonymous reviewers of *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme* for their precious encouragement and advice in the preparation of this issue.

1. Joan Kelly, "Did Women Have a Renaissance?" in *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*, ed. Renate Bridenthal and Claudia Koonz (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1977), pp. 137–64.
2. Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (London: Routledge, 1995).

3. The expression is used in particular by cultural historian Peter Burke. See his "Cultures of Translation in Early Modern Europe," in *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Peter Burke and R. Po-Chia Hsia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 7–38, and "The Renaissance Translator as Go-Between," in *Renaissance Go-Betweens: Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Andreas Höfele and Werner von Koppenfelds (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005), pp. 17–31.
4. On the representation of women in early modern translations, see Selene Scarsi, *Translating Women in Early Modern England: Gender in the Elizabethan Versions of Boiardo, Ariosto, and Tasso* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2010); Anne Coldiron, *English Printing, Verse Translation, and the Battle of the Sexes, 1476–1557* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009); and Jean-Philippe Beaulieu, ed., *D'une écriture à l'autre. Les Femmes et la traduction sous l'Ancien Régime* (Ottawa: Ottawa University Press, 2004), in particular the first two sections. On translation and the education of early modern women, see the essays by Hilda Smith and Margaret Ferguson in *Women and Literature and Britain 1500–1700*, ed. Helen Wilcox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 9–29 and pp. 143–68 respectively; Chris Laoutaris, "Translation/Historical Writing," in *The History of British Women's Writing 1500–1610*, ed. Caroline Bicks and Jennifer Summit (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. 296–327; Colette Nativel, ed., *Femmes savantes, savoirs de femmes: du crépuscule de la Renaissance à l'aube des Lumières* (Genève: Droz, 1999); and Isabelle Brouard-Arends, ed., *Lectrices d'Ancien Régime* (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2003), in particular the third section on education. Discussions of early modern women's reading practices and the female readership of translations can be found in Heidi Brayman Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender and Literacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Heidi Brayman Hackel and Catherine Kelly, eds., *Reading Women: Literacy, Authorship and Culture in the Atlantic World 1500–1800* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011); or Isabelle Brouard-Arends, ed., *Lectrices d'Ancien Régime*. For examples of women acting as patrons of translation, see, among others, Kathleen Wilson-Chevalier and Eugénie Pascal, eds., *Patronnes et mécènes en France à la Renaissance* (St-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de St-Etienne, 2007); and Helen Smith, *Grossly Material Things: Women and Book Production in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), in particular ch. 2, pp. 53–86. Recent publications on the issue of early modern women's translating strategies are fully discussed below.

5. See Margaret P. Hannay, ed., *Silent but for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1985); and Tina Krontiris, *Oppositional Voices: Women As Writers and Translators of Literature in the English Renaissance* (New York: Routledge, 1992).
6. Tilde Sankovitch, "Translation (Renaissance)," in *The Feminist Encyclopedia of French Literature*, ed. Eva Martin Santori (London and Wesport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), pp. 532–35.
7. Brenda Hosington and Hannah Fournier, "Translation and Women Translators," in *The Encyclopedia of Women in the Renaissance: Italy, France and England*, ed. Diana M. Robin, Anne Larsen, and Carole Levin (Santa Barbara: University of California Press, 2007), pp. 369–75. See also the collection by Helen Ostovich and Elizabeth Sauer, *Reading Early Modern Women's Writing: An Anthology of Texts in Manuscript and Print* (London/New York: Routledge, 2004), which includes a chapter on "Translations/alterations" (pp. 273–309).
8. Patricia Demers, *Women's Writing in English: Early Modern England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), p. 64 ff.
9. Caroline Bicks and Jennifer Summit, eds., *The History of British Women's Writing 1500–1610* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).
10. Danielle Clarke, "Translation," in *The Cambrige Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing*, ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 167–180.
11. Alexandra Barrat, "Religious Writings and Women Translators," in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* (*OHOLTIE*), vol. 1, ed. Roger Ellis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 284–95. According to Anne Lawrence-Mathers, however, the limitation of women's translation practices to the field of religious literature is itself problematic. See her introduction to *Women and Writing, c.1340–c.1650: The Domestication of Print*, ed. Anne Lawrence-Mathers and Phillipa Hardman (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2010), p. 1.
12. Gillian Wright, in *OHOLTIE*, vol. 2, ed. Gordon Braden and Brian Cummings (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 58–67.
13. See the essay by Brenda Hosington on "Commerce, Printing and Patronage" (in *OHOLTIE*, vol. 2, pp. 47–57).
14. Astradur Eynsteinsson and Daniel Weissbort, eds., *Translation Theory and Practice: A Historical Reader* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 128–43.

15. Jean Delisle, ed., *Portraits de traductrices* (Ottawa: Ottawa University Press, 2002). The publication closely follows the volume *Portraits de traducteurs*, also directed by Jean Delisle (Ottawa: Ottawa University Press, 1999).
16. Anne Dacier was included in Edmond Cary's *Les Grands Traducteurs Français* (Geneva: Georg, 1963). Early modern women translators such as Marie de Cotteblanche, Marguerite de Cambis, and others are discussed in Andrée Sirois's 1997 doctoral thesis, *Les femmes dans l'histoire de la traduction, de la Renaissance au XIXe siècle: domaine français* (University of Ottawa, under the direction of Jean Delisle), which remains unpublished to date.
17. Paul Chavy, *Traducteurs d'autrefois. Moyen-Âge et Renaissance* (Paris: Champion, 1988), pp. 893 and 1306.
18. Chavy, pp. 226, 228, and 230 respectively.
19. Chavy, p. 976.
20. Henri Van Hoof, *Dictionnaire Universel des traducteurs* (Genève: Slatkine, 1993).
21. Apart from the exceptionally well-documented field of Biblical translation (see for example the works of Max Engammare), there has been no authoritative study of early modern French translation theories and practices since Glynn P. Norton's *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and Their Humanist Antecedents* (Geneva: Droz, 1984) and Luce Guillerm's *Sujet de l'écriture et traduction autour de 1540* (Paris, 1988). An overview of the main approaches to translation in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century France can however be found in Paul Horguelin's *Traducteurs français du 16e et 17e siècle* (Montréal: Linguatech, 1996) and in Christian Balliu's *Les traducteurs transparents* (Bruxelles: Editions du Hazard, 2002), as well as in the proceedings of various conferences, such as *Traduction et adaptation en France à la fin du Moyen Âge et à la Renaissance*, ed. Pierre Courcelle (Paris: Champion, 1997) and *La traduction à la Renaissance et à l'âge classique*, ed. Marie Viallon (Saint-Étienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Étienne, 2001). Yves Chevrel and Jean-Yves Masson's four-volume *Histoire des Traductions en Langue Française* (Paris: Verdier, 2012–) will in all likelihood offer a more comprehensive treatment of early modern French translation—including women's translations. The two volumes on the fifteenth to the sixteenth century and on the seventeenth to the eighteenth century are to be published in 2014 and 2013 respectively.
22. See for example the case of the *damoiselles parisiennes* Philippe et Anne Du Prat, whose manuscripts are mentioned in La Croix du Maine's *Bibliothèque Française* (Paris, 1584), p. 380. Natalie Zemon Davis notes that more than half of the female

writers listed in La Croix du Maine's *Bibliothèque* kept their work in manuscript (23 out of 40): see her "Printing and the People," in *Rethinking Popular Culture: Contemporary Perspectives in Cultural Studies*, ed. Chandra Mukerji and Michael Schudson (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), p. 80 and p. 94, note 53.

23. "Jeanne Flore" may indeed have represented a pen name for a group of humanist authors from Lyons. See Diane Desrosiers-Bonin and Éliane Viennot, eds., *Actualité de Jeanne Flore: dix-sept études* (Paris: Champion, 2004). The most recent and controversial challenge to the gender of a well-known female literary character has been articulated in Mireille Huchon's *Louise Labé, une créature de papier* (Genève: Droz, 2006). On this debate, see Daniel Martin, "Louise Labé est-elle 'une créature de papier'?" *Réforme, Humanisme, Renaissance* 63 (2006), pp. 7–37. See also Jean-Philippe Beaulieu's remarks in "Les femmes dans le labyrinthe du savoir: à la recherche du fil d'Ariane," in *Dix ans de recherche sur les femmes écrivains de l'Ancien Régime: influences et confluences*, ed. Guy Poirier et al. (Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2008), where he suggests that the recurrent reduction of female authors to "créatures de papier" might be read as a sign of the general reluctance from the French academic milieux to embrace gender as a critical and historiographical category.
24. Jean-Philippe Beaulieu, ed., *D'une écriture à l'autre.* See in particular Beaulieu's introduction, pp. 1–14.
25. See Beaulieu, "Les femmes dans le labyrinthe du savoir," for a full discussion of the MARGOT project and its activities between 1993 and 2008. The MARGOT group had a leading role in the foundation of the Société Internationale d'Études des Femmes de l'Ancien Régime (SIEFAR). Its website offers online resources such as the bilingual, searchable *Dictionnaire des femmes de l'ancienne France / Dictionary of Women in Pre-Revolutionary France*: SIEFAR, accessed June 5, 2012, http://www.siefar.org.
26. Micheline White, "Introduction: Women, Religious Communities, Prose Genres and Textual Production," in *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production, 1500–1625*, ed. Micheline White (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 7–8. See also Deborah Uman, *Women as Translators in Early Modern England* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2012), in particular ch. 1. Jean-Philippe Beaulieu and Diane Desrosiers reach the same conclusion in "Les études sur les femmes écrivains du XVIe siècle français," *French Studies* 65.3 (2011), pp. 370–75.
27. Lawrence-Mathers, pp. 2–3.

28. On translation as a secondary form of textual production, see Margaret Hannay's introduction to *Silent but for the Word*, p. 9, and Mary Ellen Lamb's remarks in the same volume ("Cooke sisters: attitudes toward learned women in the Renaissance," p. 124). The issue is discussed at length in Margaret Ezell, *Writing Women's Literary History* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993); see in particular ch. 2, "The Myth of Judith Shakespeare." One may also note the ambiguity of Lawrence-Mathers's almost apologetic tone in discussing her choice to include translations in the canon of early modern women's writings (*Women and Writing*, pp. 3–4).
29. Brenda Hosington, "Women Translators in England," a sub-entry of "Translation and Women Translators," p. 370. These issues are discussed in more detail in Danielle Clarke, "Translation," p 172 ff. See also Jean-Philippe Beaulieu's remarks on the dangers of an essentialist approach to early modern women's writing practices, in "Les femmes dans le labyrinthe du savoir," p. 10 ff.
30. John Florio, *The essayes (…) of Lord Michaell de Montaigne* (London, 1603), sig. A2^{r}.
31. Smith, *Grossly Material Things*, pp. 31–32.
32. See Smith, *Grossly Material Things*, p. 32, and Clarke, "Translation," pp. 168–72.
33. Clarke, "Translation," p. 168. See also p. 172 ff. for a nuanced discussion of the links between translation and women's roles within the household.
34. Fournier, "Women Translators in France," a sub-entry in "Translation and Women Translators," pp. 373–74.
35. Fournier, "Women Translators in France." See also the various analyses on Gournay by Fournier and Beaulieu; Valerie Worth Stylianou, "Gournay et la défense d'un style," in *Marie de Gournay. Un cas littéraire*, ed. Giovanna Devincenzo (Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1995); and Diane Wood's analysis of Hélisenne de Crenne's translations from Virgil's *Aeneid* in *Hélisenne de Crenne: At the Crossroads of Renaissance Humanism and Feminism* (Madison, WI: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2000), in particular ch. 5: "Renaissance Humanist."
36. See Danielle Clarke's influential *The Politics of Early Modern Women's Writing* (New York: Longman, 2001); or more recently, the essays by Brenda Hosington ("Lady Margaret Beaufort's Translations as Mirrors of Practical Piety") and Patricia Demers ("'Nether bitterly nor brabbingly': Lady Anne Cooke Bacon's Translation of Bishop Jewel's *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*") in Micheline White's collection *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production*, pp. 185–204 and 205–218 respectively.

37. See Clarke, *The Politics of Early Modern Women's Writing*; and more recently, Gemma Allen, "'a briefe and plaine declaration': Lady Anne Bacon's Translation of the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*," in *Women and Writing*, ed. Anne Lawrence-Mathers and Phillipa Hardman, pp. 62–76; and Laoutaris, "Translation/ Historical Writing."
38. See Clarke, *The Politics of Early Modern Women's Writing*, "Introduction."
39. Leah Chang, *Into Print: The Production of Female Authorship in Early Modern France* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2009); and Michèle Clément, ed., *L'émergence littéraire des femmes à Lyon à la Renaissance, 1520–1540* (Saint-Étienne: Publications de l'Université de St-Étienne, 2008).
40. Anne Coldiron, "Women in Early English Print Culture," in *The History of British Women's Writing*, pp. 60–83, and Smith, *Grossly Material Things*, in particular ch. 3, pp. 87–134.
41. Smith, *Grossly Material Things*, p. 13.
42. See for example Victoria Burke, "Medium and Meaning in the Manuscripts of Anne, Lady Southwell," in *Women's Writing and the Circulation of Ideas, 1550–1800*, ed. George Justice and Nathan Tinker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 94–120; or "Reading Friends: Women's Participation in 'Masculine' Literary Culture," in *Early Modern Women's Manuscript Writing: Selected Papers from the Trinity/Trent Colloquium*, ed. Victoria Burke and Jonathan Gibson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 75–90.
43. See for example Coldiron, *English Printing*, or Julie D. Campbell and Anne R. Larsen, eds., *Early Modern Women and Transnational Communities of Letters* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).
44. Coldiron, *English Printing*, in particular the introduction, pp. 1–20.
45. For an overview of these conditions, see Jane Stevenson, "Education, Humanism, and Women" and "Power, Politics and Women," in *The Encyclopedia of Women in the Renaissance*, pp. 117–24 and 298–301 respectively.
46. Beaulieu, "Les femmes dans le labyrinthe du savoir," p. 9.
47. François Rigolot, "The Invention of Female Authorship in Early Modern France," in *Teaching French Women Writers of the Renaissance and the Reformation*, ed. Colette Winn (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 2011), p. 93. See also "La Préface à la Renaissance, un discours sexué?" in *Cahiers de l'association internationale des études françaises* 42 (1990), pp. 121–35.
48. On the humility topos and its various uses in Renaissance translation discourse, see Anne Coldiron, "Visibility Now: Historicizing Foreign Presences in Translation,"

Translation Studies 5.2 (2012), pp. 189–200; and Patricia Pender, *Early Modern Women's Writing and the Rhetoric of Modesty* (London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

49. Or, as Jean-Philippe Beaulieu notes, "l'expression manifeste d'une ambition intellectuelle et langagière sous les dehors convenus d'une humilité de bon aloi" (*D'une écriture à l'autre*, p. 7). Note also that the "anxiety of authority" attributed to women translators by Hannah Fournier is also a trait of male translation discourse; on this point see Neil Rhodes, "Status Anxiety and Renaissance Translation," in *Renaissance Paratexts*, ed. Helen Smith and Louise Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 107–20. On women's "defences" of translation in early modern England, see Uman, pp. 17–40.
50. Hosington, "Lady Margaret Beaufort's Translations as Mirrors of Practical Piety," in *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production*, pp. 185–204.
51. Diane Purkiss, "Blood, Sacrifice, Marriage: Why Iphigeneia and Mariam Have to Die," *Women's Writing* 6.1 (1999), pp. 27–45.
52. Danielle Clarke, "Translation," p. 177.