

Nuns and Community-Centered Writing: The Benedictine Rule and Brussels Statutes

Jaime Goodrich

ABSTRACT Scholars have credited Dame Alexia Grey, an English Benedictine nun in Ghent, with translating two sets of monastic guidelines into English for publication in 1632: the Benedictine Rule and the Statutes of the English Benedictine convent in Brussels. Yet manuscript copies of these works indicate that Grey was not a translator, but rather an editor who participated in a cloistered tradition of community-centered writing. By analyzing the composition and circulation of the Rule and Statutes, this essay demonstrates that collective authorship was an essential form of monastic labor, one with the potential to establish a basis for communal religious life. **KEYWORDS:** early modern writing collaborations; Benedictine spiritual formation and communal life; seventeenth-century monastic education; conflicts within English Benedictinism; editions of monastic texts

IN 1632, A NEW ENGLISH TRANSLATION of the Benedictine Rule appeared in print for the first time in over a hundred years, issued in tandem with the Statutes observed by the English Benedictine convents in Brussels and Ghent. Because Dame Alexia (Margaret) Grey of the Ghent Benedictines dedicated the Rule to her abbess Lady Eugenia (Jane) Poulton, scholars have identified Grey as the translator of the Rule and Statutes.¹ Manuscript evidence, however, indicates that both of these texts were circulating by 1613, long before Grey's profession in 1631. The Benedictine Rule was translated into English specifically for the use of the Brussels community, and that house collaborated with English priests to compile the Statutes. An examination of how nuns edited these texts for circulation in manuscript and print offers new insight into the collective authorial practices of early modern women writers.

1. 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, U.K., 1994), nos. 94, 359. Frances Dolan has more cautiously suggested that Grey "translated and/or subsidised" the Rule and Statutes: Frances Dolan, "Introductory Note," in *Recusant Translators: Elizabeth Cary, Alexia Grey*, ed. Frances Dolan (Aldershot, U.K., 2000), xi.

As scholarship on manuscript coterie and the theater has shown, collaborative forms of writing flourished in a number of spheres during the early modern period.² Drawing on this development, feminist critics have begun to complicate the single-author paradigm that informed the initial recovery of women writers. Work on the Cavendish family has now demonstrated that women's involvement in domestic literary circles could foster collaborations between siblings (Jane Cavendish and Elizabeth Brackley) or spouses (Margaret and William Cavendish).³ Similarly, recent discussions of the authorial multiplicity in Katharine Evans and Sarah Cheevers's *A Short Relation of Their Sufferings* (1662) have refined our understanding of the ways in which communal religious identity legitimated female authorship.⁴ Convents offer another important site for exploring how shared spirituality encouraged collaborative writing practices.⁵ Marie-Louise Coolahan, for example, has already noted that when English and Irish Poor Clares produced and commissioned translations of rules by Saint Clare and Saint Colette, they created "continuities of authorship, each text founded on its previous, female-authored, incarnations."⁶ What follows is an examination of similar "continuities of authorship" involved in the composition and circulation of the Benedictine Rule and Brussels Statutes. As compilers, editors, and transcribers of these works, members of the Brussels and Ghent Benedictines participated in a cloistered tradition of community-centered writing. The resulting texts reveal that collective authorship was an essential form of monastic labor, one that aimed to establish a long-standing basis for communal religious life.

2. See, for example, Paul Trolander and Zeynep Tenger, *Sociable Criticism in England, 1625–1725* (Newark, Del., 2007); Nora Johnson, *The Actor as Playwright in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge, 2003); Margaret J. M. Ezell, *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* (Baltimore, 1999); Jeffrey Masten, *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge, 1997); Arthur F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1995); and Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1993).

3. Katherine R. Larson, *Early Modern Women in Conversation* (New York, 2011), 127–37; Jeffrey Masten, "Material Cavendish: Paper, Performance, 'Sociable Virginity,'" *Modern Language Quarterly* 65, no. 1 (2004): 49–68.

4. Carme Font Paz, "'I have written the things which I did hear, see, tasted and handled': Selfhood and Voice in Katharine Evans' and Sarah Cheevers' *A Short Relation of Their Sufferings* (1662)," *Sederi* 20 (2010): 27–56; Catharine Gray, *Women Writers and Public Debate in 17th-Century Britain* (New York, 2007), 183–97; Rachel Warburton, "'The Lord hath joined us together, and wo be to them that should part us': Katharine Evans and Sarah Cheevers as Traveling Friends," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 47, no. 4 (2005): 402–24. On women's religious writing more generally, see *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production, 1500–1625*, ed. Micheline White (Aldershot, U.K., 2011); Kimberly Anne Coles, *Religion, Reform, and Women's Writing in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2008); Phyllis Mack, *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley, Calif., 1992); and *Silent but for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*, ed. Margaret P. Hannay (Kent, Ohio, 1985).

5. On the relation between communal identity and cloistered writing, see Caroline Bowden, "Collecting the Lives of Early Modern Women Religious: Obituary Writing and the Development of Collective Memory and Corporate Identity," *Women's History Review* 19, no. 1 (2010): 7–20; K. J. P. Lowe, *Nuns' Chronicles and Convent Culture in Renaissance and Counter-Reformation Italy* (Cambridge, 2003); and Charlotte Woodford, *Nuns as Historians in Early Modern Germany* (Oxford, 2002).

6. Marie-Louise Coolahan, *Women, Writing, and Language in Early Modern Ireland* (Oxford, 2010), 65.

☞ The Earliest Origins of the 1632 Benedictine Rule and Brussels Statutes

The mistaken attribution of the Rule and Statutes to Grey exemplifies how the single-author model may obscure certain forms of monastic textual production. While Grey's obituary notice mentions her involvement in the publication of these texts, it presents her as an editor of pre-existing manuscripts rather than as a translator: "having a high esteem of the Least tittle of our holy rule and Constitutions, and because none might be ignorant of the excellent perfections Contain'd in this rule of ruls, she was at the Charge of printing it in English, for before it was only extant in writting hand, the injuries of the Times in our hereticall poor Country having defaced and destroyed those Coppys of former prints in our Mother's tongue."⁷ This impression is substantiated by several manuscripts predating Grey's profession in 1631. Newberry Vault Case MS 4A 10 contains a copy of the Rule that dates from November 21, 1612. Archbishop Mathias Hovius confirmed the Statutes on July 20, 1612, and the 1613 date attached to copies in the Newberry manuscript as well as to British Library Add. MS 6681 may reflect a common exemplar. Furthermore, the Bodleian possesses a 1627 copy of the Statutes (MS Rawlinson A 442), and in 1620 the Brussels nuns noted that Gabriel Colford, a factor for the Brussels house, had "written our statutes two or three times of his own hand."⁸ Grey's 1632 publication is nearly identical to these manuscript versions, even though small variants were introduced in the process of copying.⁹ Grey was therefore editing a manuscript version of these texts rather than translating them anew, and in doing so she continued a legacy of collective textual labor established by the Brussels community itself.

As the first English Benedictine house founded on the Continent after the Reformation, the Brussels convent faced a pressing need for an English version of the Rule. The house probably commissioned a new translation soon after its 1598 foundation. When Archbishop Hovius approved the Statutes in 1612, he reminded the Brussels nuns that they had sought the Statutes as a supplement to the Rule, which suggests that the house's English translation of the Rule existed well before 1612: "you made your humble supplication to the holy Father the Sovereigne Bishopp of Rome, that by us you might have certayne Statutes and Constitutions, in perticuler determining the sayd

7. "Obituary Notices of the Nuns of the English Benedictine Abbey of Ghent in Flanders, 1627–1811," in *Miscellanea XI* (London, 1917), 26. This description might appear to imply that Grey merely reissued one of the English translations published during the early Tudor period, but her edition is distinct from those versions, which are "A Compendious Abstracte Translate into Englysshe out of the Holye Rule of Saynte Benet for Men and Wymmen of the Habyte," in *Book of Divers Ghostly Matters* (1491; STC 3305); and *Here Begynneth the Rule of Seynt Benet*, trans. Richard Foxe (1517; STC 1859).

8. "de sa propre main escript nos statutes par deux ou trois fois"; Unnamed nuns to Jacobus Boonen, March 8, 1620, Archdiocesan Archives of Mechelen-Brussels, Belgium [hereafter AAMB], Engelse Benedictinessen/12.1, my translation. All translations of French and Latin are my own.

9. For example, the seventh chapter of the Rule in the Newberry version states, "if we will reach to the topp of this soverayne humility *and with facility attayne unto that exaltation whereunto in this Life we ascend by the helpe of humility* let us by our actions tending to heaven wardes reare up that ladder which appeared unto Jacob"; Newberry Library, Chicago, Vault Case MS 4A 10, fol. 24, my emphasis. Grey's version omits the italicized clause; *The Rule of the Most Blessed Father Saint Benedict* (1632) in *Recusant Translators*, ed. Dolan, 31.

Rule.”¹⁰ Whether the translator was a nun or one of the house’s priests, he or she revised the Rule specifically for the Brussels house. As Frances Dolan notes, the translator abridged the Rule and adapted it for a female community by changing gendered pronouns (“he” to “she”) and titles (“Abbot” to “Abbess”).¹¹ The Brussels version of the Rule omits fifteen chapters, nine of which contain liturgical directions that were unnecessary because of the house’s adoption of the Roman Breviary: chapter 9 (“How Many Psalms Are to Be Said in the Night Hours”), chapter 10 (“How Matins, or the Night Praises, Are to Be Said in the Summer Season”), chapter 11 (“How Matins, or the Night Watches, Are to Be Celebrated on Sundays”), chapter 12 (“How Lauds Are to Be Solemnized”), chapter 13 (“How Lauds Are to Be Celebrated on Ordinary Days”), chapter 14 (“How Matins Is to Be Said on the Feast Days of Saints”), chapter 15 (“At What Seasons Alleluia Is to Be Said”), chapter 17 (“How the Day Divine Office Is to Be Said”), and chapter 18 (“How Many Psalms Are to Be Said in These Hours”).¹² An additional five chapters were presumably omitted because of the heightened emphasis on enclosure after Trent: chapter 50 (“Of the Brethren Who Work at a Distance from the Oratory or Are on a Journey”), chapter 51 (“Of Brethren Who Go Only a Short Distance”), chapter 53 (“On the Reception of Guests”), chapter 56 (“The Abbot’s Table”), and chapter 60 (“Of Priests Who Wish to Dwell in the Monastery”).¹³ Since Abbess Joanna Berkeley had professed in 1581 at a French convent in Rheims and thus was better acquainted with current monastic practices than the rest of the Brussels house, she may have helped alter the Rule so that it better matched the convent’s needs. Coolahan has argued that when Irish Poor Clares arranged for Irish translations of their Rule and Saint Colette’s *Declarations and Ordinances*, they were participating in a “model of female authorship” based on “informed collaboration.”¹⁴ The Benedictine Rule produced for the Brussels house offers a similar case of spiritual and authorial cooperation, as the Brussels nuns provided the impetus and possibly editorial suggestions for a new version of the Benedictine Rule tailored to their needs.

The Brussels nuns also actively collaborated with English priests in the composition of the Statutes. On December 15, 1611, the convent wrote to Hovius in order to present him with a draft of the Statutes and to request their confirmation. As their letter notes, the nuns had drafted the Statutes according to Hovius’s instructions:

we humbly asked Your Most Illustrious and Right Reverend Lordship to establish the aforesaid Statutes for us, and to order that they be

10. “The Third Parte,” *Statutes Compyled for the Better Observation of the Holy Rule* (1632), ed. Alexia Gray, in *Recusant Translators*, ed. Dolan, 28.

11. Dolan, “Introductory Note,” xii.

12. The Statutes stipulate that the house “shall say or sing their howers, and the devine office, according to the Romane use”; “The First Parte,” *Statutes*, 9. Titles of chapters omitted in the Brussels translation are from *The Rule of Saint Benedict*, trans. Francis Aidan Gasquet (London, 1925).

13. This version also omits chapter 29 (“Whether Brethren Who Leave Their Monastery Must be Received Back”) and chapter 62 (“The Priests of the Monastery”), and it combines chapters 23 (“Of Excommunication for Offences”) and 24 (“What the Manner of Excommunication Should Be”); *Rule*, trans. Gasquet.

14. Coolahan, *Women, Writing, and Language*, 65.

confirmed by your authority. But then Your Lordship gave us this response: “It is most easy for anyone to establish laws for others, or to command: but the difficulty lies in observance.” Therefore Your Lordship commanded us to consult pious, learned, and wise men of our country concerning these things, men who could carefully look into such things and could select constitutions, which would conveniently befit us and our posterity.¹⁵

This account suggests that Hovius expected the priests associated with the convent to compile the Statutes, but the nuns state that they composed and annotated the first draft themselves: “According to your will, from the decrees of different Synods, from the sanctions of various Supreme Pontificates, from the most sacred and most wise Rules and Statutes of some Religious Orders and congregations (beyond those very things which prudence and experience suggested), these Constitutions were collected. . . . Which—thus completed—we often and eagerly read, and if we found any doubtful, obscure, or difficult things, we noted each one with watchful care.”¹⁶ The letter highlights the resourcefulness of the convent itself and does not mention whether priests participated in this stage of composition. Not only do the nuns pore over authoritative documents on monastic governance originating from the pope and other religious orders, but they also rely on their own “wisdom and experience.” A 1630 account written by Eugenia Poulton, who professed at Brussels in 1605, offers further details about this process: “For the space of two months, three or four of the convent’s hours were designated each day for considering and deciding what was best to be done and determined.”¹⁷

After this first stage, the convent added a second layer of authorial input by asking priests to examine their work. As the convent’s 1611 letter to Hovius explains,

Afterward with prayers we conferred with very Reverend and learned men, and in special, with some venerable Fathers of the Society of Jesus—namely, Right Reverend Father Gilles Schoondonck, Rector of our English Seminary at Saint Omer; Father John Holtby, living in

15. “vestram Dominationem Illustrissimam et Reverendissimam suppliciter rogavimus, ut nobis dicta Statuta conderet, suaque autoritate confirmata imperaret. Sed hoc nobis tunc responsi dedit. Facilimum cuius leges aliis condere, vel imperare: ast in observatione difficultatem sitam esse. Nobis igitur precepit, ut de his, pios, doctos, et prudentes nostrates consuleremus, qui tales conquirerent, et seligerent constitutiones, qu[a]e nobis, nostrisque posteris accommodatae convenirent”; Convent to Mathias Hovius, December 15, 1611, AAMB, Engelse Benedictinessen/12.4.

16. “Juxta hanc suam voluntatem, ex diversarum Synodorum decretis, variorum Summorum Pontificum sanctionibus, nonnullorum Religiosorum Ordinum, et congregationum sanctissimis, et prudentissimis Regulis et Statutis (ultra ea quae ipsamet prudentia et experientia suggestit) collectae sunt hae Constitutiones. . . . Quas ita confectas s[a]epe, seduloquo pervolutavimus, et si quae iis ambigua, obscura, vel difficilia reperaramus, singula solerti cura notavimus”; *ibid.*

17. “Conventus assignabantur spatio duorum mensium tres quatuorve singulis diebus hora ad deliberandum et definiendum quid optimum factu et statutu esset”; Eugenia Poulton to Jacobus Boonen, September 17, 1630, AAMB, Amatus Coriache, Reg 15, 267.

England [and] once Superior of the Fathers of the Society; Father William Baldwin, Procurator of the English Mission; and Father Anthony Hoskins, now filling that same office here—moreover with Master John Knatchbull, Doctor and Professor of Sacred Theology and Vice-President of the English Seminary at Douai, and Master Robert Chambers, our Confessor, so that they might thoroughly examine the foresaid Constitutions and make clear those difficulties which either we or they themselves judged to be in them.¹⁸

Significantly for the house's future quarrels over Ignatian spirituality, the nuns turned to Jesuits and pro-Jesuit secular priests, many of whom had already shown a special interest in the convent. Baldwin had arranged for Philip II of Spain to pay the Brussels nuns a monthly pension, while Hoskins served as an extraordinary confessor.¹⁹ Both Chambers and Knatchbull, whose sister had joined the Brussels house, avidly supported Jesuit interests, and Knatchbull would eventually become a Jesuit. This list of collaborators also reveals the reach of the nuns' contacts, as they sought out prominent figures at nearby seminaries and in the English mission. Their access to Holtby is particularly intriguing, since he was in England from 1589 onward. The convent's letter marks the third phase of composition, as the nuns request that Hovius review and confirm the Statutes. While the nuns probably worked in English, Hovius more than likely utilized a Latin translation of their work; his modifications would thus have been translated into English for the nuns, further complicating the text's composition.²⁰ If the nuns did not have final approval of the Statutes, they provided the basis for the final text by compiling the first draft from a range of authoritative sources, a draft that priests and the archbishop in turn edited. These overlapping authorial roles indicate that the nuns were not passive recipients of the Statutes, but rather that they energetically sought and contributed to these regulations, exercising a pious authority that was confirmed by the approbation of male ecclesiastical figures. It is impossible to identify a specific nun or priest as the author of either the Rule or Statutes produced for the Brussels house, but this very authorial multiplicity reflects the shared nature of convent life.

18. "Postea precibus egimus cum admodum Reuerendis, eruditisque viris, et in primis, cum quibusdam venerabilibus Socraticis Jesu Patribus, videlicet, R. R. P. Egidio Schonconco, Anglicani nostri Seminarii Audomari Rectore; P. Johanne Holtbeo, Patrum Societatis in Anglia degentium quondam Superiore: P. Gulielmo Balduino, Anglicanae Missionis Procuratione: et P. Anthonio Huskino, nunc hic eodem Officio fungente: nec non cum Domino Johanne Knatchbullo, Sacrae Theologiae Doctore, et Professore, et Duaceni Anglorum Seminarii Vicepraeside, et D. Roberto Chambero, Confessario nostro, ut dictas Constitutiones perlegerent, et eas difficultates quas vel nos, vel ipismet iis inesse judicarent, enodarent"; Convent to Hovius, December 15, 1611, AAMB, Engelse Benedictinessen/12.4.

19. Anne Neville, "Abbess Neville's Annals of Five Communities of English Benedictine Nuns in Flanders, 1598–1687," ed. Dame Mary Justina Rumsey, OSB, *Miscellanea V*, Catholic Record Society 6 (London, 1909), 5.

20. The Archdiocesan Archives of Mechelen-Brussels hold a seventeenth-century Latin version of the Statutes approved in 1612: Engelse Benedictinessen/1. Nuns who wrote to Hovius in English generally had their letters translated into French or Latin.

Editing the Rule and Statutes for Aspiring Nuns at Brussels

Newberry Vault Case MS 4A 10, which was produced for scholars and novices at Brussels, offers another example of how cloistered authorial practices revolved around the community's needs. Women who entered the house to discern their monastic vocation first completed a probationary year as scholars, after which they became novices as they took the veil.²¹ The noviceship lasted an additional year or two, when the convent voted to approve or deny their profession, the ceremony in which novices took the monastic vows that bound them to the convent for life.²² Although scholars and novices lived within the enclosure and generally followed the monastic routine, they were relegated to a schoolhouse, where the mistress of novices imparted the fundamentals of monastic life. The Statutes dictated that the novice mistress “must see they bee taught how they may use vocall prayer fruytefully, shee is to tea[c]h them the Catechisme and Christian doctrine, and the manner how to roote out all Vice and to overcome all evill habittes and Customes, and finally to mortify their Passions.”²³ Furthermore, the mistress of novices conveyed other vital information such as the fundamentals of deportment and the Divine Office. Such training was crucial to the future of the house, as the admittance of nuns who were improperly trained or screened could cause serious problems. Confronted by the challenge of properly educating scholars and novices, members of the Brussels Benedictines created a handbook of monastic life by contributing to Newberry Vault Case MS 4A 10. As successive nuns added to the texts collected by their predecessors, they participated in a joint endeavor to shape the spiritual formation of would-be nuns.

Edited versions of the Benedictine Rule and Brussels Statutes make up the bulk of Newberry Vault Case MS 4A 10, but the manuscript also contains letters, prayers, and devotional works:

- Fols. 1v–5r: “Of Such thinges as those which are Schollers & Novices in this our Congregation, are to observe” (hand of Ursula Hewick)²⁴
- 5v–31: Chapters 1 to 18, “The Rule of Our Holye Father Sainct Benedict” (hand of Elizabeth Southcott)
- 32–59: A fragmentary treatise on the presence of God (multiple hands; signed on 59v by Joyce Langdale)
- 60: “Serymonis for the Novices & Scholers”
- 61–62r: “St Barnards humble Confessions”
- 62v–65: Blank
- 66r: Prayers sent by John Fisher to his sister, a Benedictine nun
- 66v: “A Coppie of A Letter the 4 of october 1650”

21. “The Second Parte,” *Statutes*, 70.

22. *Ibid.*, 71.

23. *Ibid.*, 30–31.

24. Hewick does not sign her work, but the hand is identical to her letters to the archbishop of Mechelen, extant in AAMB, Engelse Benedictinessen/12.1 and 12.2.

- 67–72: “A breefe treatise of three principall virtues and vowes of religious persons / written by the Reverend father brother hierome of ferara unto a ladie that intended to enter into religion” (signed on 72v by “Elizabeth G.”)²⁵
- 73–77: “The coppie of a letter written by a Reverend Father R. C. of the holy Societie of Jesus, to a gentlewoman that was a Scholler in this Congregation”²⁶
- 78–104r: Chapters 19 to 48, “The Rule of . . . Sainct Benedict” (signed on 104r by Elizabeth Southcott on November 21, 1612)
- 104v–105r: “A Table of the Chapters contained in this part of Saint Benet his Rule” (hand of Ursula Hewick)
- 105v–107: “*Officium Sancti Patris Nostri Benedicti*” (hand of Ursula Hewick)
- 108–135: “Statutes Compiled for the better observation of the holy Rule of . . . Sainct Benedict” (hand of Ursula Hewick)²⁷

The composition of this manuscript occurred in at least three distinct stages over the course of several centuries. In 1612, Dame Elizabeth Southcott transcribed selections from the Benedictine Rule with relevance to scholars and novices. This piece has since been split in two, but remnants of its original pagination reveal continuous numbering across both halves. Dame Ursula Hewick was mistress of novices by 1626, and she made Southcott’s transcription easier to use by inserting a running title, chapter numbers, and page numbers. Besides adding a table of contents that began on the verso of the final leaf of the Rule, Hewick supplemented Southcott’s transcription with texts pertinent to scholars and novices. “Of such thinges” concludes on the recto of the fifth folio and Southcott’s transcription begins on the verso, while the Rule’s table of contents is followed by the Office for Saint Benedict’s feast day as well as the Brussels Statutes. Since Hewick’s pagination is continuous from the Rule through the Office, it seems likely that she decided to augment Southcott’s transcription of the Rule with texts on the liturgy and monastic life. This original core was later trimmed (obliterating most of Hewick’s pagination) and divided, with new material inserted in the middle of the Rule.²⁸ The manuscript now contains miscellaneous texts span-

25. Possibly Columba (Elizabeth) Gage (1565–1641), though the hand differs substantially from an extant letter in her hand; Columba Gage to Jacob us Boonen, circa 1623, AAMB, Engelse Benedicti-
nessen/12.2.

26. Probably Richard Collins, SJ (1562–1618), who was on the Continent in 1600; Thomas M. McCoo, *English and Welsh Jesuits 1555–1650: Part 1: A–F* (Southampton, U.K., 1994), 142, 182n61.

27. Four leaves have been removed from Hewick’s copy between folios 108 and 109, so that it now lacks sections from chapters 7 (“Of the Fasts and the Common Diett”), 8 (“Of the Apparell of the Religious and of Those Things that Appertaine to Their Bedding”), 9 (“Of Letters and Messages”), and 10 (“Of the Chapter”); *Rule*, ed. Grey.

28. Since the paper of Vault Case MS 4A 10 uniformly displays only two watermarks (a dragon and a shield), this material may have originally been written on blank leaves within the same manuscript, possibly after Southcott and Hewick’s transcriptions.

ning the convent's history, including the fragmentary treatise partly copied by Dame Flavia (Joyce) Langdale (1596–1672) as well as remnants of three tipped-in leaves with nineteenth-century writing (fols. 111v, 120v, 126v). The community therefore continued to use this manuscript even after leaving Brussels for England in 1794.

The manuscript probably began as a direct response to Hovius's approval of the Statutes in July 1612, since the Statutes stipulate that the novice mistress should make select parts of the house's guidelines available to scholars and novices: "shee shall often reade unto them those Rules and Statutes which appertayne to them and belong to common discipline."²⁹ Southcott may have been mistress of novices at this time, and she certainly envisions her transcription of the Rule as a permanent, if selective, resource for all future nuns: "This Booke belongeth to the Schoole for Perpetuite: But heare is not all the Chapters Contained in our Holy Father Sainte Benedictes Rule but only those that belonge to all in generall; and ar necessary for Novices and Schollers to knowe and practies to the ande [end] to make them good Religious."³⁰ Southcott omits nine chapters in total, largely those dealing with monastic governance. The Rule laid out the obligations expected of specific monastic officers, including the abbess, the prioress, the deans (assistants to the abbess and prioress), the cellarer (overseer of provisions), and the portress (supervisor of the gate). Apparently believing that scholars and novices had little need for such information, Southcott removes chapter 2 ("What a Kinde of Person the Abbesse Ought to Bee"), chapter 12 ("Of the Deanes of the Monastery"), chapter 20 ("Of the Office and Duty of the Cellarier"), chapter 48 ("Of the Manner and Order How to Elect and Choose the Abbesse"), chapter 49 ("Of the Prioress of the Monastery"), and chapter 50 ("Of the Portresse of the Monastery").³¹ Similarly, she omits sections of the Rule that deal with more general issues of monastic governance, including chapter 21 ("Of the Iron Tooles and Other Things Belonging to the Monastery") and chapter 46 ("How Externe and Foraigne Religious Should Bee Received"). Finally, Southcott excludes chapter 3 ("Of the Manner How to Call and Admit the Sisters to Counsayle"), which gives instructions on chapter meetings, where the nuns counseled the abbess and confessed their faults. These omissions reshape the Rule so that it focuses less on governance and more on monastic piety and customs, functioning as a handy reference guide to cloistered life.

Hewick subsequently augmented Southcott's Rule in order to create an even more complete monastic handbook. By providing the schoolhouse with an excerpted copy of the Statutes, Hewick satisfied the aforementioned proviso that scholars and novices should have access to passages from the Rule and Statutes that were relevant to their spiritual formation. Hewick chose to copy only one portion of the Statutes, the first part, entitled "Of Those Things that appertaine to common discipline & are to be observed of All" (fol. 109). As she explains in a concluding note,

29. "Second Parte," *Statutes*, 31.

30. Newberry Vault Case MS 4A 10, fol. 5v. All future references to this manuscript will be provided parenthetically.

31. For these chapter titles, see *Rule*, ed. Grey.

There are two parts more in our Statutes, the 2 part appertaining to the duties of every particular Officer in the Congregation chosen by the Chapter. The 3 part, of the more extrinsicall affaires of the Monasterie. All which doe no way belong to Novices & S[c]hollers; only they shall read, or heare them before they make their Profession, that they may knowe to what they are to oblige themselves if they proceede to make their Vowes. In the meane tyme if they diligentlie practize, & zealously performe what is required in this first part, it will suffice for their admittance to this Congregation. (fol. 134v)

Like Southcott, Hewick views information on monastic governance as unnecessary for scholars and novices, causing her to omit part two, on monastic offices, and part three, on such topics as visitation and combining monastic congregations. As a result, Hewick's version of the Statutes focuses on the daily routines of life in the Brussels house, mandating how the nuns spend their time, what they eat and wear, and how they practice chastity, obedience, poverty, and silence. Her addition of the liturgy for Benedict's feast day (*Officium*) also helps to fulfill the Statutes' requirement that the novice mistress must "instruct them exactly, in the holy Ceremonies of the devyne Service, and in all the Observances of their Religious State."³² Hewick's transcriptions follow Southcott's model, providing the schoolhouse with essential information on the fundamentals of monastic life.

Hewick also uses greater authorial autonomy while elaborating on the Statutes in "Of Such things as those which are Schollers & Novices in this our Congregation, are to observe." Hewick excludes useful material from §2.6 ("Of the Mistresse of the Novices"), which describes the education of scholars and novices. She remedies this situation by prefacing Southcott's Rule with her own distillation and amplification of this chapter. As she notes at the beginning of this text, "Many of these things following are exacted by our Statutes, as they shalbe marked" (fol. 1v). Although subsequent trimming of the manuscript removed Hewick's marginal annotations, comparison of the Statutes with "Of Such things" reveals that six of the eighteen sections in Hewick's text are based on the Statutes, including information on general confession (§2.6.2), possessions (§2.6.3), spiritual progress (§2.6.4), deportment (§2.6.6), and humble employments (§2.6.9). Hewick adds new information on interacting with monastic superiors and confessors, sending letters, abandoning worldly contacts, following the house's schedule, and practicing obedience. In amplifying the Statutes, Hewick endorses her own spiritual preferences. The Statutes require that entering scholars "examine and discusse their life past, very diligently and soe make their generall confession as soone as they can possibly."³³ Hewick alludes to this mandate in order to praise general confession, itself an important component of the Ignatian Spiritual Exercises: "[they] must immediatlie after their entrance, examine & discusse their life

32. "Second Parte," *Statutes*, 33.

33. *Ibid.*, 30.

past, very diligently, & so make their generall confession as soone as possibly they can, that by this meanes they may the more seriouslie endeavour to banish from their thoughts all memorie of seculer conversation; & begin to laye the sure foundation of humilitie, good will, & zealous diligence to learne the duties of Religous sanctitie, that therby they may daylie raise up in their soules the magnificent building of heavenly perfection” (fol. 1v). Hewick presents general confession as a means of rooting out “secular” experiences and thus as a foundation of “the magnificent building of heavenly perfection,” demonstrating how one nun used the authority of the Statutes to legitimize her own views of monastic spirituality within her community.

Hewick’s augmentation of Southcott’s Rule offered a precedent for the later addition of devotional treatises and prayers, which transformed Newberry Vault Case MS 4A 10 into a repository of the house’s history and devotion. The transcription of two letters sent to aspiring nuns both preserves the institutional history of the house and offers guidance to current scholars and novices. Dame Gertrude (Catherine) Blount, who took the veil on November 13, 1650, was the likely recipient of a letter from October 1650 congratulating a nun on her impending clothing. The letter writer offers precepts on attaining religious perfection, guidance that had broader applications for other scholars and novices: “denie your self renounce your will forsak your owne judgment abandon all into the hands of god and superiours: be deafe nay dead to all but god and obedience” (fol. 66v). A second letter from January 20, 1601, was probably written by Richard Collins, SJ, to Dame Mary Watson. The writer ends by sending his best wishes to the addressee’s companion, Ursula Hewick, who entered the house with Watson on January 14, 1601. This letter emphasizes the Ignatian piety dear to many of the earliest entrants, encouraging Watson to maintain her resolution to join the convent by reading the *Christian Directorie* (1585) of Robert Persons, SJ. Collins also mentions the spiritual dangers that Watson has escaped, a reminder that may have been especially important to scholars and novices suffering from homesickness: “England our Contry . . . is become as full of vices as Sodome & Gomorrha, it is the very sincke of all sinne, but especially of all heresy, & carnalitie, to the utter destruction of infinite soules” (fols. 73v–74). Other works offer guidance on monastic piety, in keeping with the novice mistress’s duty to educate her charges in devotional matters. The fragmentary treatise on the presence of God provides instruction on attaining mystical union as well as performing liturgical duties: “When therfore the bell rings to the Quire, the religious may saye this is the si[gn]e of the great king, lett us goe and make inquiry after him and offer him gifts the sacrifices of our lipps; & with all lett them goe presently to the quire, with all alacrity” (fol. 43). Newberry Vault Case MS 4A 10 thus became a multifaceted guide to monasticism, Benedictinism, and the Brussels community itself. By copying, editing, and glossing authoritative works, the Brussels nuns created a heterogeneous manuscript whose composition modeled the communal nature of monastic life and whose contents sought to influence the spiritual development of generations of aspiring nuns.

☞ Spiritual Rivalries among the English Benedictines: The 1632 Edition

Alexia Grey's 1632 edition of the Benedictine Rule and Brussels Statutes was no less focused on her own convent at Ghent, particularly on establishing its reputation among English Catholics. Besides making these documents more widely available, Grey's edition intervened in an ongoing competition between English Benedictine convents over spiritual primacy. During the 1620s and 1630s, the Brussels house endured a string of controversies over Ignatian spiritual direction, and a group of pro-Jesuit nuns left Brussels in 1624 to found the Ghent house. The Ghent Benedictines' spiritual reputation increased to the detriment of its motherhouse and, as Tobie Matthew noted, the Ghent house quickly established its name: "divers Gentlewomen in England, growing to hear in a very short time, how eminent these new Religious were in this kind, and peradventure understanding that some other [i.e., Brussels] were not so very happy that way, applied themselves presently to these [Ghent], and declined from those."³⁴ It does not seem coincidental that the Ghent Benedictines printed the Rule and Statutes in 1632, a year in which a second group of pro-Jesuit nuns left the Brussels Benedictines to found their own house even as yet another English Benedictine house, in Cambrai, faced accusations of unorthodox spiritual practices. The following discussion will focus on the conflicts within the Brussels house, as this house vied most directly with the Ghent convent for support among English Catholics.³⁵ The Brussels disputes frequently involved accusations that the Rule and Statutes had been infringed, and Grey's edition capitalized on this situation by presenting Abbess Poulton of the Ghent house as an unsurpassed patron of English Benedictinism, whose sound government resulted in the spiritual success of her house.

The disputes in the Brussels house centered on the selection of the house's confessor, who provided the convent with spiritual guidance through such activities as hearing confessions, conducting mass, and delivering sermons. Just as the entire community had compiled the Statutes, some members believed that the convent at large should have a say regarding its confessors. A group of dissident nuns consequently filed a lawsuit in Rome protesting the 1628 appointment of their ordinary confessor Anthony Champney.³⁶ Ignatian spirituality was at the heart of this controversy, as Champney was well known for his anti-Jesuit sentiment. He had appealed to Rome against the creation of a pro-Jesuit archpriest as superior of the English mission, and he had also signed the 1603 Protestation of Allegiance to Elizabeth. Yet the dissident nuns focused on procedural issues, mentioning §3.2.1 of the Statutes as evidence that the convent could choose its ordinary confessor: "The Monastery must have for Ghostly

34. Tobie Matthew, *The Life of Lady Lucy Knatchbull* (London, 1931), 97–98.

35. The Cambrai Benedictines followed an approach based on mysticism at odds with the Ignatian-inflected piety at Brussels and Ghent. They also observed different Statutes, probably written by Father Augustine Baker; Margaret Truran, "Did Father Baker Compile the Cambrai Nuns' First Constitutions?" in *Dom Augustine Baker 1575–1641*, ed. Geoffrey Scott (Leominster, U.K., 2012), 31–42.

36. For overviews of this conflict, see Claire Walker, *Gender and Politics in Early Modern Europe: English Convents in France and the Low Countries* (Houndmills, U.K., 2003), 138–42; and Peter Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558–1795*, vol. 1, *The English Colleges and Convents in the Catholic Low Countries 1558–1795* (New York, 1914), 257–65.

fathers such as are modest, prudent and learned, and first the Convent must be well informed of their sufficiency, vertue, and honesty before they be admitted.”³⁷ Their case hinged on the contention that the archbishop had named Champney as confessor in contradiction of this provision: “the Lord Archbishop sent the Visitor to the Convent with a letter . . . to constitute by my Lords absolute power for Confessarius of our Monastery, Mr Doctor Champney, a man never seene to our knowledg to any of us nor heard of except by some fewe among us, without information, or admittance by our Convent, contrary t[o] our Statutes.”³⁸ Abbess Mary Percy’s faction, however, cited §1.1.7 of the Statutes in support of the Archbishop’s actions: “The Contentes of the Archbishops letter were wholly conformable to the statutes. . . . The statute is this: All must goe to one Ghostly father (whome the Bishop shall appoint for that purpose) if their number will permitt. Otherwise the Abbesse with her Convent shall choose an other approved by the Ordinary unto whome that part of the Convent shall confesse which the Abbesse shall thinke good to appoint.”³⁹ In 1632, the two parties finally agreed to a settlement in which the dissident nuns began their own cloister elsewhere, but this clash seriously affected the Brussels house’s finances and the flow of novices. Only three women professed at Brussels between 1628 and 1651 (the Ghent house professed sixty-eight women during this time), and the house’s income dropped sharply, from 12,164 florins in 1631 to 5,569 florins in 1632, not to recover until the 1650s.⁴⁰

Even as the spiritual rivalry between the Brussels and Ghent houses grew, the mutual esteem between pro-Jesuit nuns at Brussels and the Ghent Benedictines strengthened as they joined forces against Percy and her supporters. Dissident nuns at Brussels frequently cited the Ghent house as a model of monastic order and piety. Some even asked to be translated to the new convent, as Percy disapprovingly noted in a letter to the archbishop: “some of us, having heard of the good welcome and reception that is made for them there, are enflamed with a desire to follow them.”⁴¹ Just before Champney’s appointment in 1628, Percy and several other nuns reported that Dame Mary Vavasour—later a leader of the anti-Champney party—was “enticing everyone’s desire to be governed by the aforesaid [Jesuit] Fathers and at the Ghent monastery.”⁴² In 1630 Abbess Poulton of Ghent sent the archbishop written testimony on behalf of the dissident nuns’ interpretation of the Statutes. Poulton confirmed that the authors of the Statutes had wanted the house to select its ordinary confessor: “as to the question made of the convent’s power of choosing its Confessor, I respond that I

37. British Library [hereafter BL], Harley MS 4275, fol. 6v.

38. *Ibid.*, fol. 10.

39. *Ibid.*, their emphasis.

40. For the house’s finances, see Downside Abbey Archives, Stratton-on-the-Fosse, U.K., MS Haslemere 3140. Caroline Bowden graciously provided me with information on professions at Brussels and Ghent during these years.

41. “quelques Unes des nostres ayants entendu la bonne reception et Recueil qu’on leur fait là, sont enflammées d’ung desir de les suivre”; Mary Percy to Jacobus Boonen, circa 1624, AAMB, Engelse Benedictinessen/12.2.

42. “attirant les affections de tous d’estre gouverné par les dictes Peres et au Monastere de Gant”; Mary Percy et al to Jacobus Boonen, July 2, 1628, AAMB, Engelse Benedictinessen/12.2.

know and am familiar with the statute, and it was defined both by all the nuns, who gave consent and their vote for our statutes, as by the other aforementioned men who assisted in their composition, that the confessor ought first to be chosen by the convent by the majority of votes and then after proposed to the bishop so that he might be approved by him.”⁴³ The dissident nuns clearly knew of Poulton’s support, since a polemic they wrote in 1633 against Percy mentions Poulton’s letter as evidence that the Statutes require the convent’s “election, & presentation” of the confessor: “wee might bringe the attestation of the Lady Abbesse of the English Monastery in Gant, witnessing that this was the intention of them who concurred to the compiling and admittance of our statutes.”⁴⁴ In sum, the Ghent Benedictines and Brussels dissidents viewed themselves as champions of the Benedictine Rule and Brussels Statutes, united in opposing Percy’s perceived infringement of these guidelines.

Alexia Grey’s 1632 edition of the Rule and Statutes implicitly responded to this situation in a number of ways. Many English Catholics were aware of the longstanding quarrels among the Brussels Benedictines, and Grey’s version of the Rule carefully attempted to mitigate any damage these reports might do to the standing of the Benedictine order. The title page, for example, emphasizes Benedict’s primacy as a “Patriarke” who first standardized monastic life: *The Rule of the Most Blissed Father Saint Benedict Patriarke of All Munkes*. In the dedicatory preface to the *Rule*, Grey establishes the prestige of Benedictinism by comparing the Rule to the sun: “Never doe the newe risinge sunne spreede forth his beames, without a newe comfort to the behoulders; neither doth the splendours yealded to so many days, yeares, and ages, any whitt deminish the accustomed solace taken by the newe Spectatours.”⁴⁵ This metaphor suggests both the durability of the Rule, which had lasted for centuries, as well as its continual renewal, attested to by the recent foundation of English Benedictine convents at Brussels, Cambrai, and Ghent. Grey also highlights the accomplishments of the order, which had included “more then 3000 saintes; brought from the obscurity of idolitry, to the light of faith, 33 nations; adorned the Church with 15000 Bishoppes 7000 Archbishops 2000 Cardinalls, and twentye foure Popes, most of which shined unto the world, as brightest starres havinge take ther lustre and light, as from the sunne, from this glorious Rule” (sig. 2v). These numbers are impressive in themselves, but such a catalogue might have had special implications for English Catholics. Those familiar with Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History of England* would know that Benedictine monasteries had helped usher medieval England out of “the obscurity of idolitry.” Besides tacitly reminding readers of the former triumphs of English Benedictinism, Grey asserts that “the whole Occidentall church” has been “inlighted and illustratt” by

43. “ad quaestionem factum de potestate conventus eligendi Confessarium suam, Respondeo scire me et nosse statutum, et definitum esse tum ab omnibus religiosis, qui consensum et sententiam suam ad statuta nostra ferebant, tum ab aliis supradichi hominibus qui eorum compositioni assistebant, quod confessarius deberet primo eligi a conventus ad plures voces et tum postea proponi episcopo ut ab ipso probaretur”; Eugenia Poulton to Jacobus Boonen, September 17, 1630, AAMB, Amatus Coriache, Reg 15, 267.

44. BL, Harley MS 4275, fols. 8v, 9r.

45. *Rule*, ed. Grey, sig. 2r. Subsequent citations of this work will be given in the text.

“the innumerable flourishing monasteries, the shining and illustrious Doctors, and writers, the intyre and purest Virgines” (sig. :r). Grey therefore promotes her order’s ability to bring about spiritual regeneration, an important claim as English Catholics awaited the conversion of their nation.

Grey’s edition also attempted to enhance the status of the Ghent house by portraying her convent as the epitome of Benedictine spirituality, in subtle contrast with the Brussels motherhouse. Not only does Grey dedicate the work to her abbess, but she also identifies herself as a member of the Ghent community by signing the dedicatory preface: “Your Ladishippes Professed and vowed child, Alexia Grey” (sig. :v). Grey may have shown this unusual willingness to disclose her name because she did not compose the work herself.⁴⁶ Yet Grey also uses her role as an editor to advance the reputation of her convent by positioning herself as a credible witness of its dedication to the Rule. For example, Grey depicts the Ghent house as fresh evidence of the Rule’s power, asking, “can I doubt this glorious sunne, our Rule, a bright beame of divine light, newly raised to shine in this place, by your lady shippes predicessour and your indeavour, bringe lesse them wonted joy to the enjoyers, and though itt hath illustrated the worlde, for many days, years, and ages” (sig. 2r–v). As previously mentioned, the Ghent house had been established after a controversy over monastic order among the Brussels Benedictines. By framing this “indeavour” in relation to the Rule, Grey suggests that English Benedictinism flourishes anew at Ghent, implicitly in contrast to the atmosphere at the Brussels convent. Grey furthermore testifies to Poulton’s success in creating an environment where devotion to the Rule results in spiritual bliss: “as an experienced and an eye wittnesse can I avere, newe comfort, joy, and solace, rayseed in the minds, and har[t]es, of the newe Embracers, who under your ladyshipps goverment, happely doe a new enjoy the splendour of that light, and most comfortably, do pertake the fire of charity, which with her beames, she doth inkindle in our hartes” (sig. :r–v). Such a “fire of charity” inherently differs from the Brussels convent’s notorious discord over monastic governance. As the source of this harmony, Poulton is a fit patron for her edition of the Rule: “lett this so holy a rule spread her rayes abroade in our English tonge, under your ladishippes protection, that as you instill the love of it in our hartes, so you would make itt obvious to our Eyes” (sig. 3r). By publicly revealing her membership in the Ghent Benedictines, Grey could both vouch for the spiritual bliss enjoyed by her house and distance it from the clashes among the Brussels Benedictines.

Grey’s edition of the Statutes offered further evidence of the distinction between the Brussels convent and its filiation at Ghent. As the title page of the first part notes, Hovius had approved the Statutes for “the English Religious Woemen of the Monastery of our blessed Lady the perpetuall Virgin Mary in Bruxelles and to all their Successours.” At this time, the only “Successours” of the Brussels convent were in Ghent, as

46. Most English nuns of this period who published their works did so anonymously or through the mediation of a male priest: Isabella Berinzaga and Achilles Galliardi, *An Abridgement of Christian Perfection*, trans. Mary Percy (Saint Omer, 1612; STC 11538.5); François Paludanus, *A Short Relation, of the Life . . . of S. Elizabeth*, trans. Catherine Greenbury (Brussels, 1625; STC 19167); François de Sales, *Delicious Entertainments of the Soule*, trans. Potentiana Deacon (Douai, 1632; STC 11316).

the Cambrai house followed its own statutes under the jurisdiction of the English Benedictine Congregation. While the Statutes do not feature a dedicatory preface, this publication is nevertheless clearly linked to Ghent. The three parts of the Statutes were printed separately, and each title page identifies Joos Dooms of Ghent as the printer. Furthermore, a concluding note at the end of the third part explains that certain phrases in italics represent two modifications observed by the Ghent Benedictines: “Note that the wordes interlived in a divers Carecter are onely observed by this monastery of Gand, by grant of his lordship whoe att lest for the present judged it fitter. For us to singe our office over night and keepe onely one refectory though some for health are ordained to eate flesh when the comunity eateth fish.”⁴⁷ On fasting days, the Brussels house only allowed the sick or aged to eat meat outside of the common dining room, while the Ghent house permitted them to eat at a separate table in the dining room (§1.7.6, §1.7.8). The Brussels house slept from 8 p.m. to 3 a.m., when they observed matins (§1.12.1). The Ghent house, however, slept from 10 p.m. to 5 a.m., holding matins at 5. Such differences may be slight, but the inclusion of these amendments made the publication more useful for the Ghent nuns, its immediate audience. Furthermore, this meticulous notation of small changes suggests the Ghent house’s conscientious fidelity to the Statutes as authorized by Hovius and now altered by their immediate superior, the bishop of Ghent. Since the Ghent nuns sought approval from their bishop for even the most minor changes to the Statutes, readers who were aware of the controversy at Brussels might have viewed this note as evidence of Ghent’s devotion to monastic order. Besides providing her convent with ready access to the Rule and Statutes, Grey’s edition of these texts publicly advanced the spiritual preeminence of her convent. By taking a visible role in the publication of the Rule, Grey legitimized her portrayal of the Ghent house as a bastion of monastic order. Meanwhile, her use of italics to identify the house’s slight divergences from the Brussels convent signaled the Ghent Benedictines’ reverence for the Statutes.

Conclusions

The textual history of the Benedictine Rule and Brussels Statutes demonstrates that compilation, editing, and transcription were essential forms of monastic labor in the Brussels and Ghent houses. By exercising these authorial functions in a collective manner, nuns at Brussels and Ghent helped mold the spiritual life of their communities. A nun may have translated the Benedictine Rule, but even if it was translated by a priest, the Rule nonetheless was clearly created for the Brussels convent, and the Brussels nuns enthusiastically compiled their Statutes in concert with one another and with priests. As Newberry Vault Case MS 4A 10 shows, Hewick and Southcott selectively copied the Rule and Statutes for scholars and novices at Brussels, turning these texts into guidelines on Benedictine piety and cloistered life by eliminating material dealing with monastic governance. Transcription also permitted Hewick and other nuns at the

47. “Third Parte,” *Statutes*, B8r.

Brussels convent to co-opt authoritative texts—including the work of male authors—in order to promote their own spiritual views. Similarly, Grey used the printed edition of the Rule and Statutes to influence outside perceptions of her house as a paragon of Benedictine spirituality by portraying its devotion to monastic order. The erroneous assumption that Grey translated the Rule and Statutes suggests just how effectively she associated these texts with her house through her role as an editor. The nuns involved in creating and editing the Benedictine Rule and Brussels Statutes did not compose literary masterpieces, but they made a significant contribution to the daily lives of successive generations of English Benedictine nuns. Newberry Vault Case MS 4A 10 remained in use among the Brussels community into the nineteenth century, and the Ghent convent continued to observe Grey's version of the Statutes until an 1883 revision appeared.⁴⁸ The production and circulation of the Rule and Statutes therefore indicate that writing practices centered on monastic communities gave nuns a potent agency as authors who could shape the identity of their convents for years to come.

JAIME GOODRICH is an associate professor of English at Wayne State University. She recently published a monograph on early modern Englishwomen's religious translations, *Faithful Translators: Authorship, Gender, and Religion in Early Modern England* (2014). Her current project examines textual production in English Benedictine convents on the Continent.

48. *Annals of the English Benedictines of Ghent* (1894), 19, 140. New translations of the Rule appeared in 1638 and 1700: *The Second Booke of the Dialogues of S. Gregorie the Greate . . . Containing the Life and Miracles of Our Holie Father S. Benedict, To Which is Adjoined the Rule of the Same Holie Patriarche*, trans. Leander Jones and John Fursdon (Douai, 1638; STC 12350.5); *The Rule of the Holy Father Saint Benedict* (Douai, 1700; Wing B1867B).