

Review: Robert Garnier in Elizabethan England: Mary Sidney Herbert's 'Antonius' and Thomas Kyd's 'Cornelia', edited by Marie-Alice Belle and Line Cottegnies; Montaigne in Transit: Essays in Honour of Ian Maclean, edited by Neil Kenny, Richard Scholar, and Wes Williams

Auger, Peter

DOI:  
[10.3366/tal.2018.0356](https://doi.org/10.3366/tal.2018.0356)

License:  
None: All rights reserved

Document Version  
Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*  
Auger, P 2018, 'Review: Robert Garnier in Elizabethan England: Mary Sidney Herbert's 'Antonius' and Thomas Kyd's 'Cornelia', edited by Marie-Alice Belle and Line Cottegnies; Montaigne in Transit: Essays in Honour of Ian Maclean, edited by Neil Kenny, Richard Scholar, and Wes Williams', *Translation and Literature*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 353-60. <https://doi.org/10.3366/tal.2018.0356>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

**Publisher Rights Statement:**  
Checked for eligibility 28/11/2018

<https://doi.org/10.3366/tal.2018.0356>

**General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

**Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Download date: 17. Apr. 2024

**Review of *Robert Garnier in Elizabethan England: Mary Sidney Herbert's 'Antonius' and Thomas Kyd's 'Cornelia'*, ed. Marie-Alice Belle and Line Cottegnies (Modern Humanities Research Association, 2017); and *Montaigne in Transit: Essays in Honour of Ian Maclean*, ed. Neil Kenny, Richard Scholar, and Wes Williams (Modern Humanities Research Association: Legenda, 2016).**

Mary Sidney Herbert's translation of the French playwright Robert Garnier's *Marc Antoine* (1578) was edited six times between 1990 and 2005. Two of these editions were for collections of plays by Renaissance women, two are found in editions of Sidney Herbert's works, one was for the online *Renascence Editions*, and one accompanied *Antony and Cleopatra* in *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. Antonius* (1592, called *The Tragedie of Antonie* in the 1595 edition) was previously edited for Geoffrey Bullough's *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare* (1966). Add a collection of women's writing from the eighties and two nineteenth-century editions to reach an impressive total of ten modern versions of the translation.

Marie-Alice Belle and Line Cottegnies's new edition for the MHRA Tudor and Stuart Translations series is the first to offer a modernized text of the 1592 edition that is collated against the 1595 edition, checked against the French, and given full critical apparatus. Theirs is also the first to edit the text as a translation, but what difference does this make? *Robert Garnier in Elizabethan England* throws attention onto Garnier and his English reception history, placing Sidney Herbert's translation alongside a second that is less well-known today, and much less frequently edited, but was at least as popular in the sixteenth century: Thomas Kyd's translation of Garnier's *Cornélie* (1574). After being printed in 1594 and '95, *Cornelia* was re-printed three times between 1744 and 1825, twice more in the nineteenth century, and in the Clarendon edition of Kyd's works in 1901 – and never edited again until now.

The pairing is obvious and overdue. The respective publication dates of the plays point to a moment in the 1590s in which Garnier was an instructive model for English Senecan drama. Kyd almost certainly knew *Antonius*: his translation, printed two years after Sidney Herbert's and also re-printed in 1595, translates one of the earlier plays in Garnier's trilogy of Roman plays, and his dedicatory letter to the Countess of Sussex promises that next summer he will prepare a translation of the earliest of the three, 'the tragedy of Portia' or *Porvie* (1568), which is otherwise not known to have been translated in early modern England. It was once commonplace to suggest that legal troubles prevented Kyd from addressing it to Sidney Herbert herself, though Lukas Erne's recent work argues that Henry Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, was a more likely

dedicatee, highlighting the close ties between the Pembroke and Sussex families, both of which patronized literary and dramatic works.

Patronage exerted pressure on translation practice; so too, Belle and Cottagnies show, did related matters of politics, religion and literary theory. A valuable critical introduction and French and Latin snippets supplied in footnotes do more than compare the French and English texts; they also examine how both Garnier and his English translators worked with multiple sources. During Cleopatra's death scene, for instance, Sidney Herbert pulls back from visceral details in Garnier's text as a noun like 'mes entrailles' ('entrails') becomes 'my breast' (V.185) and the verb 'vomist' ('spews') is replaced with 'rise': 'Mine [eyes] can no more, consumed by the coals | Which from my breast, as from a furnace, rise.' (V.193–4). Yet the footnotes to Cleopatra's final speech quote almost as much from Virgil's *Aeneid* as Garnier's French. Not only does Garnier's text adapt Dido's words from Book IV of the *Aeneid*, but the editors also find Sidney Herbert 'directly translating from the *Aeneid* in the corresponding passage', e.g.:

Happy, alas, too happy! If of Rome  
Only the fleet had hither never come.  
And now of me an image great shall go  
Under the earth to bury there my woe. (V.165–8; cf. *Aeneid* IV.653–8)

Such a resonance 're-activates the Dido/Cleopatra parallel', heightens Cleopatra's queenliness and the scene's epic grandeur, amplifies the tragic pitch, and consequently draws the focus 'away from the rather macabre emphasis in the French text on Antony's bloody corpse and the way it is handled' (p. 31) and onto Cleopatra as tragic heroine.

The editors write that highlighting how 'Garnier and his translators constantly engage in a dialogical relationship with classical precedents [...] seemed all the more important to us as the crucial links between neoclassical drama and Humanist imitation and commonplacings have often been neglected by critics of *Antonius* and *Cornelia*' (p. 10). Sidney Herbert probably returned to North's Plutarch when composing the play, and the footnotes point to intertextual engagement with Seneca, Ovid, Lucan and Horace too. The notes to Kyd's translation also cite Cicero, who is one of the play's speakers. In addition, there are indications of imaginative engagement with contemporaries such as Andrea Alciato, Ludovico Ariosto and Edmund Spenser, though none of them are underpinned by strong verbal parallels. Comparing how these more recent analogues (easily located via the edition's index) are used differently from classical sources and Garnier's original belongs, as the introduction shows, within a wider discussion of the translations' religious and political orientation, which includes how they work as Protestant readings of a

Catholic author's work. Kyd's translation also adds distinctively Christian phrasing. In *Cornelia's* climactic set-piece speech, the Messenger's report of the battle between Caesar and Cornelia's father Metellus Scipio, Kyd supplies a phrase like 'a fresh remembrance of our former sins' (V.228) that recalls the *Book of Common Prayer*: 'the remembrance of them [our sins] is grievous unto us'. In general, Kyd deviates from the French more often than Sidney Herbert does, such as when he inserts an extra couplet, marked in italics as a sententia, to describe how Fortune does not stand still: '*But like the clouds, continually doth range, | Or like the sun that bath the night in chase*' (II.126–7).

The edition provides many examples of how 'the crucial links between neoclassical drama and Humanist imitation and commonplacing' have an impact on how both translators use sources. Both plays (*Antoni*, III.279–81; *Cornelia*, IV.1.155–8) mark lines as sententiae that are not italicized in Garnier. These could be printers' insertions, but on occasion both translators appear to treat italicized text differently as they extract moral lessons from the play's action and study sources for their didactic pith. The editors' commitment to reproducing sixteenth-century *mise en page* allows readers to attend to the special nature of italicized passages (as well as supporting the editors' detailed analysis of metrical innovations). These are places to study when and how sources are used to pack moral exempla into the text. At one point, for instance, Kyd's Cicero says that:

*Nought is immortal underneath the sun,  
All things are subject to death's tyranny:  
Both clowns and kings one selfsame course must run,  
And whatsoever lives, is sure to die.* (II.252–5)

The notes pick up on the 'reminiscence of Ecclesiastes' in the first line, and the echo of Horace's *Odes* in the third (as cited by play's French editor, Jean-Claude Ternaux). The layered references here, as we hear Cicero echoing the Old Testament and Horace in translation from the French, indicate compositional practices distinctive to the late sixteenth century in how old maxims are rewritten using several sources (and with a possible republican inflection in this case).

The italics are evidence that the text as we have it was meant to be read on the manuscript or printed page. There is no evidence that either play was staged, although Kyd's word 'interlocutres' (following Garnier's 'interlocuteurs') to introduce his list of speakers does stress that utterances between characters are spoken, and Sidney Herbert re-assigns some speeches. Conscious that calling the plays 'closet drama' – and, worse, translated 'closet drama' – fostered a critical tendency to treat both plays as marginal texts of 'relatively minor importance'

(p. 4), the editors stress that the translations were written in an environment where ‘manuscript circulation and print publication, private reading and courtly entertainment, as well as support for literary experimentation and public performance, often overlapped’ (pp. 5-6). As well as supplying scene divisions for both plays, the editors also add entrances and exits for characters, and even the Chorus.

We cannot know how closely such stage directions might have corresponded to a historical performance, but treating the plays as staged dramas raises the question of how well auditors, as well as readers, might have heard the play’s dialogue with its sources. The edition succeeds in showing how ‘each translator appropriated Garnier’s neoclassical aesthetics, engaged with his moral and political interpretation of Roman history, reshaped his characters and gave them a distinctive, English voice’ (p. 9). How far, we might keep asking, were these specifically dramatic aesthetics, interpretations, characters and voices? The edition makes it easier to appreciate the unique characteristics of each translation, including their departures from Garnier and local variations. The commentary, limited to supplying extracts that fit into footnotes, is well-suited for directing readers’ attention to what happens at the level of *sententiae*. Page references back to the 1585 *Tragédies* assist extended comparison between how speeches play out.

There are remarks about the translations’ diction in the introduction and notes, as well as a glossary and list of neologisms and first occurrences. In addition to footnote markers alongside the text, degree signs are placed next to words found in the glossary. (There are a small number of places where text, footnote and/or gloss are not fully co-ordinated (pp. 119 n. 29 and subsequent gloss, 128 n. 66 and 210 n. 81)). The glossary is described as ‘context-based’ (p. 284) though there are no line references back to where words occur in the text. Some native English speakers may find words like ‘ope’ (glossed as ‘open’), ‘swift-foot’ (‘swift-footed’) and ‘you-wards’ (‘towards you’) guessable in context, though such glosses potentially accommodate francophone readers of the translations. Commonly-marked words including ‘hap’, ‘mishap’ and ‘hapless’ invite the question of whether or not Sidney Herbert and Kyd are translating the same family of words in French. The glossary only supplies French equivalents where the English and French are cognate, e.g. ‘crispy’ (‘wavy’, *crispé*) and ‘linsel’ (‘shroud’, *linceuil*). It is largely left for the reader to analyze strategies of word choice and how the two translators used dictionaries like Claudius Holyband’s *Treasure of the French Tong* (1580, mentioned on p. 37). Providing line references or French equivalents in the list of neologisms and first occurrences would have helped readers follow up on the editors’ observation that lexical innovations largely comprise loanwords, compound words and Latinate terms.

Word choices shape our sense of the plays' overall creative purpose. The Chorus in *Cornelia* uses the memorable verb 'flee', glossed as 'smile in an enticing manner', to describe Fortune: '*Another while, | She fleers again, I know not how, | Still to beguile*' (III.3.158–60). A few lines earlier, the editors have noted that Kyd adds two lines to the French that harden the association between fickleness and women. The vivid verb, which the *Oxford English Dictionary* notes is possibly of Scandinavian origin, has no direct equivalent in the French. Here, 'flee' brings to mind a forced and unbecoming grin. While we might imagine Kyd giving this verb to actors, thus forcing their mouth into the shape that it describes, it seems likelier that the translator is actually discovering an extra nuance in how to personify Fortune and her false allure.

This example illustrates the potential difficulty of squaring the plays' humanist ends with its possible dramaturgical purpose. However, the patterns of imitation, commonplacing and translation that the edition impressively uncovers offer some of the most promising evidence of continuity with popular theatre. Plays like Marlowe's *Dido, Queen of Carthage* and Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, to give two examples, quote, translate and deploy moral maxims in comparable ways. *Robert Garnier in Elizabethan England* follows the stated aim of the MHRA series to treat these texts as 'literary works in their own right', showing how far these translations are continuous with other forms of Renaissance composition, and were embedded in the literary culture and practices of their time. It places *Antonius* in fresh light, and introduces *Cornelia* to a new generation of readers. By editing the plays as translations, the edition's attention to intertextuality and early modern commonplacing renews our sense of these plays' significance in their own right, as well as in relation to the Sidney Circle, to contemporary women's writing, and to fully theatrical dramas like Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* and Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*.

~

Both Sidney Herbert's and Kyd's texts are defined by a primary relationship to a known source (i.e. they are translations of Garnier's Roman dramas), but also contain a series of secondary quotations and allusions to classical and near-contemporary sources. Translation often overlaps with other varieties of intertextuality. Renaissance writers commonly incorporated quotations from different languages in works that we deem original because the quotations are a small proportion of the whole work and do not come from a single source. Take Michel de Montaigne's *Essais*. In a reading of Montaigne's classical allusions in 'Sur des vers de Virgile', Terence Cave finds the essayist resurrecting the dead: 'The quotations from Virgil and Lucretius are haptic, erotic; they come to life, become bodies. And their life flows palpably over into Montaigne's prose' (p. 13). Cave's is the first of several essays in the wonderful collection

*Montaigne in Transit* to explore metaphors for Montaigne's thought and quotation practice, and to evaluate how we study Montaigne's relation to other texts. Rowan Tomlinson, writing of 'momentary meetings' of Montaigne and Poliziano, argues that 'spoilt by the legion proofs we *do* have of Montaigne's reading and writing, we too happily overlook potential intertexts which in the case of any other author would take pride of place in a study of sources' (p. 42).

As well as studying how Montaigne handled various sources, there is much to learn from how translators dealt with his Latin and Greek quotations. Valerie Worth-Stylianou contrasts Matthew Gwinne's translations of quotations for John Florio's English translation of the essays with Marie de Gournay's 'foreignizing' French translations in her posthumous edition of the *Essais*. Gwinne's translation brings out the 'dialogic qualities inherent in Montaigne's text [... and] lends momentum to the tendency for Montaigne's text to be read almost as a theatrical series of conversations' (p. 164). Within a fine analysis of these qualities in the two translations, Worth-Stylianou herself gives texts in the original language and supplies English translations in endnotes, which fits with her essay's argument about how a reader's eye tends to hop over the foreign text if a translation is provided directly underneath. The volume's editors are alive to the expressiveness of quotational styles, allowing contributors to supply translations of non-English texts in their preferred format.

Whereas some readers will pick up an edition of Garnier in English translation as much from interest in the translators as the translated text (as the editorial history has shown), the modern editor of Florio's translation has a heavier responsibility to offer an edition for those wishing to read Montaigne. Warren Boutcher explains that his selected edition of the translation for Oxford World's Classics is for a readership that 'primarily requires not a critical edition of the translator's text, but a readable English text of the source author's work' (p. 109). His essay examines the problem of how to punctuate and divide up the text in a way that is sympathetic to modern readers' expectations, but also helps these readers break texts down into the rhetorical periods and parts that an early modern reader like Florio would have heard. This is necessary to help readers discern how the translation itself retains 'the traces of the rhetorical building – or building-works – Montaigne disowns' (p. 109).

In these and other essays the collection deals with the movement of texts across time and space, of which translation (dealt with most extensively in the two essays just mentioned) is one kind of transit or transition. Several essays take up the editors' description of 'transit' as a 'complex of processes, ranging from "genesis" and "production" to "diffusion" and "reception"', which places pressure on a 'before-and-after model of literary communication' (p.

2). This model encourages us to think about where translation belongs in a repertoire of literary responses that includes how Denis Diderot read Augustine through Montaigne (Kate E. Tunstall), Isaac D'Israeli's annotations on the *Essais* (Ingrid A. R. De Smet), and how Gustave Flaubert found inspiration in the *Journal de voyage* (Timothy Chesters). Colin Burrow, conscious of how Bullough's *Narrative and Dramatic Sources* nudged critics to concentrate on sources for narratives and plots, observes a different kind of theatricality in Shakespeare's relationship to the *Essais* when noting that 'Shakespeare is prone to make people who are crazy sound like Montaigne' (p. 241). An observation that 'Des noms' ('Of Names'), in Florio's translation, contains a passage with the phrase 'Who letteth [prevents] my horse boy to call himselfe *Pompey* the Great?' unfolds into a reading of how *Measure for Measure* makes a running joke of the character Pompey's name, and that, 'as though to mark his genealogy in the essay "Of Names"', Pompey starts giving names like Master 'Three-pie and young Dizie to a 'whole world of bit-parts' (p. 248) in a way that seems to meditate on Montaigne's link between names and the characteristics of those who hold them.

As well as evoking a group of writers connected through their reading of Montaigne across time, this volume is a record of a present-day intellectual community around Ian Maclean, in whose honour the essays are written (and who, indeed, first proposed the name of the *Legenda* series in which this volume appears). Maclean's afterword mentions 'informal lunchtime gatherings of Montaignistes in Oxford' at which participants read the *Essais* closely, listening hard for echoes in the text 'with the aim of releasing its manifold energies' (p. 253). These activities inform this collection too, along with an 'appreciation of the enduring appeal' (p. 259) of the *Essais*. There would have been fewer sandwiches, but perhaps Montaigne was being discussed in similar ways several centuries ago. And perhaps early modern English interlocutors read Robert Garnier's plays aloud with a similarly fine sensitivity.

Peter Auger (University of Birmingham)

p.auger@bham.ac.uk

May 2018