

Katherine Ibbett

***Andromaque* Translated: John Crowne's Racine and the Refugee**

Racine's *Andromaque* is, Timothy Hampton has argued, a tragedy that through the ambassadorial projects of Oreste explores 'the dynamics of delegation.'¹ In Hampton's reading, Racine's Orestes, the son of the great epic hero Agamemnon, is little more than a bumbling bureaucrat; the 'knightly hero' seventeenth-century audiences might have expected becomes, in Racine's rendering, 'a functionary of the state', and not an effective one at that.² To move from epic to tragedy, in this reading, is to move from heroic action to diplomatic failure. Yet, as Hampton remarks, 'Through diplomatic failure, literature opens the space of its unfolding': the failure of Orestes becomes the ground for a new emotional and political vocabulary that will shift the tragic terrain.

In this essay I want to expand – to unfold – the range of failures explored through *Andromaque*, by turning to a version of the play that, like the move from great Agamemnon to ungainly Orestes, also seems like a step down from greatness. My text is the English Restoration dramatist John Crowne's 1674 translation, *Andromache*, his first staging in a lengthy and fairly successful if second-rate theatrical career.³ Crowne's translation is itself, by many standards, a failure; he switches from prose to verse, for example, in the middle of

¹ Timothy Hampton, *Fictions of Embassy: Literature and Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009), p. 170.

² Hampton, *Fictions of Embassy*, p. 176.

³ The play was first performed at the Duke's Theatre in 1674, and published in 1675: John Crowne, *Andromache. A Tragedy as it is Acted at the Dukes Theatre* (London: T. Ratcliffe and N. Thompson for Richard Bentley, 1675). Page numbers refer to this edition, made available via EEBO; references to Racine's play are to the Forestier edition.

scenes, seemingly when he runs out of juice.⁴ And if Racine's *Andromaque* is, in Hampton's telling, the story of a diplomat as the failed son of a hero, John Crowne's own story of diplomacy and paternal inheritance fails again, better.

To begin an account of his translation, let me begin by telling the story of John Crowne. I do this not to make a biographical claim about Crowne's trajectory, but because the story's confusion of colony, court, regime change, territory, nation, and joint-stock company underline how perilous and how confused early modern international relations could be, how many different forms they could take and how many non-state sites they could unfold in. Though Crowne's *Andromache* is a baldly ponderous undertaking in comparison to Racine's play, it nonetheless makes room for a new language that allows us to trace the affective undertow of this welter of international relations in the early modern period. But where for Racine the figure of tension will be the diplomat, for Crowne, writing eight years later in an England keeping an anxious eye on its neighbours across the Channel, the figure who eventually haunts his text will be the refugee. Why might Crowne choose to think through a figure of international supplication, and how does this figure help us reread Racine?

The Crown v Crowne

Crowne was the son of William Crowne, a one-time junior diplomat who in 1635 had travelled as assistant to the earl of Arundel in his role as ambassador to Ferdinand II, the

⁴ For a thorough account of the translation see Katherine E. Wheatley, *Racine and English Classicism* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1956). Crowne's version is itself an appropriation of an earlier and unfinished translation, and his cuts in and out of that text account for his piecemeal prose.

Holy Roman Emperor.⁵ Crowne senior published an account of the negotiations for what would become the peace of Prague.⁶ John, the diplomat's first son, was born a couple of years after this trip, and perhaps was brought up on stories of it; or perhaps not, because already during his childhood William had left behind those 'old Europe' negotiations – in which an ambassador represented an English king who would be executed by 1649 – and turned instead to other sorts of stories promised by the New World, and allowed by the new worlds unfolding at home in Cromwellian England.

The English had by the 1650s begun to make forays from Boston into New Scotland or Nova Scotia, the territory which since the 1630s the French had occupied as Acadie. In 1654 they captured Acadie's French governor, Charles de Saint-Étienne de La Tour. They might have had high hopes for this: when Charles's father Claude had been taken prisoner by the English in 1628, he had promptly defected and been made Knight Baronet of Nova Scotia in exchange for a parcel of land, showing a degree of extra-national entrepreneurialism that

⁵ For an account of Crowne's life, see especially Arthur Franklin White, *John Crowne: His Life and Dramatic Works* (Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press, 1922). My account of Crowne's American connections is drawn largely from Arthur Franklin White, 'John Crowne and America', *PMLA*, 35: 4 (1920), 447-463. See also Beth S. Neman, 'Crowne, John (bap. 1641, d. 1712)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

⁶ William Crowne, *A True Relation of all the Remarkable Places and Passages Observed in the Travels of the Right Honourable Thomas Lord Howard, Earle of Arundell and Surrey* (London: Henry Seile, 1637).

characterized the first decades of French settlement in the Americas. But Charles, of a different generation, clearly felt more allegiance to the nation across the seas.⁷

The French were horrified by this appropriation of what was, by 1654, no longer the fiefdom of fur traders but firmly something they saw as their territory. In the Treaty of Westminster of 1655, a commercial treaty between France and the new English regime, Mazarin insisted on a clause specifying that Acadie should be returned to the French. Cromwell was not interested; in 1656, ignoring the French, he made William Crowne one of the new proprietors of New Scotland, as joint owner with one Thomas Temple – specifying that he, Cromwell, should from this deal receive twenty moose skins and twenty beaver pelts a year. Crowne and his adolescent son John, future translator of Racine, moved to Boston from where they oversaw Nova Scotia operations.

The Crownes might reasonably think they had made it big, certainly bigger than when Crowne *père* had served as junior diplomat on behalf of a king. (Their attachment to kingship, it seemed, was contingent: a deposition by John Crowne, held at Harvard where he was a student, who speak of him as their first playwright, notes that in their years in Boston the household received English regicides as guests.) But in 1660, still another historical peripeteia occurred: the king's son got his throne back, and the French, to whom the new king Charles II owed a great deal, pressed their Acadian point again. The Crownes returned to London for Charles's coronation, but also to argue their case at court. Hampton notes how Racine's Oreste announces that 'J'entreprends ce voyage' (I. 1. 182), and how distant this mercantile language is from the voyage of epic. Crowne's embassy to Charles II, speaking on

⁷ Andrew D. Nicholls, *A Fleeting Empire: Early Stuart Britain and the Merchant Adventurers to Canada* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010), p. 139.

his own behalf against the French ambassador, is certainly in this new *entrepreneurial* vein of international relations.

The Crowne enterprise, like that of Oreste, did not end well: in still another plot twist, his co-owner Temple argued better and squeezed him out. Crowne fought his loss in the Boston courts to no avail, since the courts had no jurisdiction. Temple got squeezed out in his turn when in 1667 –the same year as *Andromaque* – the treaty of Breda gave the territory back to the French, who had finally insisted that Mazarin's clause of 1655 must be upheld.

In this way Crowne senior, junior diplomat turned colonial success, lost his territory because of a series of clumsy missions in which it was not clear who spoke for what entity and in what interest. Although the father left John his share of Nova Scotia in his will, by the time of his death in 1682 it meant nothing. John Crowne lost his income and inheritance and, turning to the stage to make some money, took up as his first venture Racine's story of both difficult inheritances and failed embassy. Historians of Restoration drama suggest that Crowne would not have done this had he kept the land, and indeed he tried to get it back until 1697: 'Through diplomatic failure', as Hampton writes, 'literature creates the space of its unfolding.' If John Crowne, like Oreste, was muddled in the middle ground of older and newer forms of delegation and representation, the clumsy way in which he navigates this territory via his translation tells us something not only about his own cultural moment, but also about Racine's own play.

Crowne's *Andromache*: Translation as International Relation

Crowne's most obvious innovations in translation strike right at the heart of French *régulier* tragedy – albeit with something of a dull blade. Since the murder of Pyrrhus is, as he puts it in the prefatorial materials, only 'dully recited' in Racine, Crowne chooses instead to put it right on stage for our delectation, turning Racinian reported speech into English declamation;

in his version the Greeks rise up shouting ‘Traitor to Greece thou dyest’ (p. 41), dragging Pyrrhus’s body off stage only after his murder. Crowne also enlivens the wedding scene with love-songs, praising the ‘amorous spirits of the air’ and unleashing the trumpets (p. 40). In this staging, Crowne insists on Pyrrhus’s marital ‘delight’ (which Racine has once as *plaisir* and once as *joie*); the repetition of the term, and the break into song, also allows for a real possibility of audience delight in the midst of suspense, a reprieve which we are not allowed in Racine.

If Crowne saw this restaging as an improvement – ‘what is only dully recited in the French Play is there represented; which is no small advantage’ – history has been less kind to his changes.⁸ François Lecercle, for example, who details how Crowne’s version turns reported action into stage direction, mocks the infantilization (his term) of the spectator that emerges in Crowne’s account of his changes, and drolly accounts for the extraordinary procession of corpses on and off stage occasioned by the clunkiness of Crowne’s ‘didactique’ restaging.⁹ No wonder, writes Lecercle, that this version was not a success.

Yet if Crowne’s insistence on showing the death of Pyrrhus is his downfall, his slow and didactic version nonetheless shows us something else that is new; something that, in folding back on our reading of Racine’s play, has allowed me to see its sad stakes afresh. Crowne’s play makes very explicit negotiations of foreignness. Of course, Restoration London enjoyed official flirtations with Frenchness, from Charles II’s mistress Louise de Kérouailles, whose place at court owed much to the urgings of the French ambassador

⁸ Crowne, ‘Epistle to the Reader.’

⁹ François Lecercle, ‘Réécriture racinienne du crime et réécriture d'un crime racinien: *Andromaque* et ses adaptations anglaises,’ *Littératures classiques*, 67:3 (2008), 147-162 (p. 158, p. 161).

Colbert de Croissy, to Dryden's dramatic theory of 1668, famously a proffering of an English account of French dramatic models.¹⁰ But the English, fearing France's superior cultural and military power, were by the 1670s also trying to develop their own new styles of writing; it was not only John Crowne who had reason to glower across the Channel. Crowne's translation makes a clumsy bash at cultural diplomacy, forming an attempt to parley between English and French audiences, even as the attempt stands as an example of bullish English isolationism. He writes that

If the Play be barren of Fancy, you must blame the Original Author. I am as much inclined to be civil to Strangers as any Man; but then they must be Strangers of Merit. I would no more be at the pains to bestow Wit (if I had any) on a *French* Play, then I would be at the cost to bestow Cloaths on every shabby French-Man that comes over; for neither of e'm (sic) would have qualities to deserve my Charity.¹¹

¹⁰ On restoration drama's French models more broadly, see Robert D. Hume, *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1976); for a more nuanced picture about the relation of French models and English regime change, see David Roberts, *Restoration Plays and Players: An Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014). A more famous English translation of Racine's *Andromaque*, Ambrose Phillips' *The Distressed Mother*, is also significant in this context; its preface praises French culture even as it slams French power.

¹¹ Crowne, 'Epistle to the Reader'.

Our metaphorically shabby Frenchman is also present in the Prologue, which accounts for the play's 'turning' of 'a shabby French-Mans Coat.' Translating a French play is thus repetitively akin to clothing a threadbare arrival; translation becomes an act of hospitality even as Crowne indicates that he bestows this favour grudgingly and with ill grace. In the Prologue, the comparative emotional reaction of French and English audiences shows the English to tolerate Frenchness even where they do not actively welcome it:

True, he has pitcht on an Old musty Tale,
Of Troy and Greece, a story something stale;
And all old things we naturally despise;
But since it drew out Tears from French-Men's Eyes,
The English so much for good nature fam'd,
Of some small pity will not be asham'd.¹²

Here English nature is an affective paradox: the English 'naturally despise' the stale stories of antiquity, but by their 'good nature' they convert that natural hatred to a grudging toleration. Where Frenchmen weep, the English can allow for 'some small pity'.

The apportioning of pity, and its underlined diminution, is of course a gesture to another sort of narrative of antiquity: the long legacy of Aristotelian poetics. If English pity is small, it perhaps indicates a bullish resistance to foreign theories that might imagine pity and its proximate neighbor compassion as emotions that could swamp; Crowne's version appears just a year after René Rapin had written of the capacity of theatrical fellow-feeling to

¹² Crowne, 'Prologue.'

overflow the narrow Aristotelian machine of pity and terror, and to bring about instead an undifferentiated emotional expansion.¹³ Keeping pity ‘small’ keeps it closely confined.

But the gesture of ‘small pity’ to the shabby Frenchman in need of hospitality must also be understood in the context of another kind of text finding its way from French to English in these years, as under Louis XIV persecutions mounted against the French Protestant or Huguenot population. These texts, speaking of the misery of the Protestants looking to leave France, gave rise to a new and extra-diplomatic language for international relations and a nascent language of humanitarianism. Although the influx would increase after 1685’s revocation of the Edict of Nantes, already in 1670s London there were many shabby Frenchmen in need of English charity, and still more in France asking for that English aid, sometimes from the state, sometimes from churches or private patrons. How does Crowne’s work sit in this context?

Crowne’s translation of 1675 took place in the middle of a wave of pamphlet production in London (and elsewhere in Europe) which commented on the sufferings of the Protestants and criticized the policies of France. Pamphlets describing and responding to the French situation solicited and described a new language of international relation brought about through shared emotion and crafting a new form of international humanitarianism and an extra-national political community.¹⁴ The transnational Protestant compassion of these

¹³ On Rapin and emotion, see Katherine Ibbett, *Compassion’s Edge: Fellow-Feeling and its Limits in Early Modern France* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018), pp. 91-94.

¹⁴ On this pamphlet humanitarianism, see Ibbett, *Compassion’s Edge*, pp. 182-3; on arguments around this response, see Catherine Arnold, ‘Affairs of Humanity: Arguments for Humanitarian Intervention in England and Europe, 1698-1715’, *English Historical Review*,

years shifted the traditional structures of state and sovereign delegation, looking to build a new politics out of relations between ordinary people, between what we would now call non-state actors.

One pamphlet published in 1675, the same year as Crowne's text, is a useful example of refuge discourse in 1670s England.¹⁵ The anonymous author is clear as to the emotive import of their work: the 'sad Catalogue' of Huguenot miseries will, they assure us, be 'sufficient to melt the hardest heart.'¹⁶ In another pamphlet of the same year, the author stresses the parliamentary response, with 'The Lords and Commons now assembled' to intervene.¹⁷ This pamphlet reads the Huguenot crisis as the destruction of France's nobility: 'So many Families ruined, and reduced from plentiful estates to want of Bread.' France is reduced to 'mourning and lamentation' as the ruins of its Protestant churches are 'laid level with the ground' (p. 29). The pamphlet's insistence on ruins – it concludes with a list of the demolished churches – and of the emotional reaction that they bring about ('the hardest heart

CXXXIII: 563 (2018), 835-865. On the English reception of Huguenots, see Daniel Statt, *Foreigners and Englishmen: The Controversy over Immigration and Population, 1660-1760* (Delaware: University of Delaware Press, 1995); Bernard Cottret, *The Huguenots in England: Immigration and Settlement c.1550-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991). On earlier English reactions to the first wave of Huguenot immigration in the late sixteenth century, see Scott Oldenburg, *Alien Albion: Literature and Immigration in Early Modern England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014).

¹⁵ *A Brief Relation of the Persecuted Protestants* (London, 1675), A4. Via EEBO.

¹⁶ *Brief Relation*, Preface.

¹⁷ *A True Relation of the Sad Estate of the Reformed Churches in France* (London, 1675; via EEBO), p. 2.

cannot but Pitty and relent', p. 61) suggests that the English response to the refugee crisis sought to ennoble the sufferers, depicting the refugee as a figure fleeing the sort of destruction that would have been familiar to readers of epic. In this figuration, the ruins of La Rochelle are not so distant from those of Troy.

In contrast, in taking up the 'shabby French-man' Racine, Crowne seems to play out a more contemptuous language of international relation. His version is more hierarchical – I condescend to give you my coat – than both the formal languages of delegation that Hampton traces in his reading of a diplomatic Racine, and the graciously emotive language of the pamphlet genre. Yet the pamphlet figure of the noble refugee will prove central to his surprising supplement to Racine's text, in which Crowne's drama looks less like the diplomatic confrontation of nations and more like a set of concerns over questions of hospitality and the civil treatment of strangers.

Indeed, the most striking of Crowne's additions to Racine is not the spectacle of Pyrrhus's death. Instead, Crowne's final supplement to the Frenchman's text speaks both to his own moment of international confusion and to ours. Fresh from his own transatlantic travels, turning to Racine's Mediterranean to make his living, Crowne takes us to still other territories, writing for his Andromache a closing speech. Accompanied onstage by Astyanax, Crowne's Andromache closes the play by declaiming:

Come Child from this unhappy place let's fly!

But whither shall we leave our misery.

Who to the unfortunate will kind appear,

The wretched are unwelcome everywhere.

On the wide sea we rove where Tempestes roar

And are forbid to Land on every shore.

All the Estates of *Greece* are not asham'd,
Gainst a poor Infant to have Wars proclaim'd.
And all the help our wretched fate affords,
Is but to fly from them to seek new Lords.¹⁸

This extraordinary ending picks up on the language of Crowne's preface, giving us an affecting Andromache whose misery is no longer merely a question of captivity or widowhood. Instead, in this telling Andromache is a refugee setting out on the seas, a new kind of figure of Racine's heroine, here 'toujours triste' for still other reasons (I. 4. 301). The language here is distinctly in the register of the Protestant calls for international aid. Where in the first version of Racine's play *Andromaque* ends by acknowledging that she has changed 'seigneur' in mourning now not Hector but Pyrrhus, here she is cast out from that new relation, looking for still other 'Lords'. And where Racine's *Andromaque*'s switch from one lord to another, from Hector to Pyrrhus indicates an intimate change ('Pyrrhus de mon Hector semble avoir pris la place', V. 3. 1522), Crowne's version points more sharply to a public register; perhaps Andromache looks not to yet another husband, but to the assembled Parliamentary Lords looking to intervene in the crisis across the Channel. In its pitch to public significance, Andromache's speech is, like the pamphlet literature introducing the Huguenot crisis to an English audience, couched in distinctly emotive language: the misery of the refugee, the rare kindness of those who assist, the shamelessness of those who do not.

Crowne's supplementary ending, then, links an ancient Mediterranean tragedy to the refugee drama unfolding across the Channel and to scenes about which we are or should be 'toujours triste' today. Andromache's speech can be read as a bid for precisely the charity to

¹⁸ Crowne, *Andromache*, p. 48.

shabby Protestant Frenchmen – or perhaps only to their charmingly melancholic widows – at which Crowne scoffs in his preface. Or, more cynically, it could be read as a bid to borrow the import of that emotional language to beg charity for his own play, a displaced *captatio benevolentiae* to close his shabby rags. Either way, Andromaque, a figure of supplication from Virgil on, here takes on new life as the supplicating refugee; in these final lines, she reaches out from Crowne's un compelling tragedy to the affectively rich language around the refugee, translating herself into a figure for a new set of international crises.¹⁹ Striking out across the sea for worlds as yet un found, her hoped-for ending hangs on a humanitarian response that lies somewhat to the side of the new language of diplomacy in which ambassadors speak for states. Crowne's Andromache waits for an ending perhaps unrepresentable by tragedy, for an ending negotiated only in the plaints of pamphlets, and for a charity that is perhaps outside the scope of the state.

Reading Racine through the Refugee

Crowne's turn to a language of affective international relation recalls Racine's own emotionally resonant address at the start of *Andromaque*, which of course Crowne does not translate: the play's dedication to an Englishwoman, which insists on the voluptuousness of shared emotion. That Englishwoman is Madame, Henriette d'Angleterre, who like Crowne had grown up as the product of a complicated international arrangement: the daughter of Charles I and his French bride known in England as Henrietta Maria, whose foreignness can be figured via a story that would later be important for Racine, too. When Henrietta Maria left France to marry the English king, her mother Marie de Médicis had asked the bishop of

¹⁹ On the early modern legacy of Virgilian supplication see Leah Whittington, *Renaissance Supplicants: Poetry, Antiquity, Reconciliation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

Langres to preach about the Jewish queen Esther, who remained an ambassador for her people even as she married into a foreign court. Racine, of course, will go on to write a play about Esther some years later, and *Andromaque* and *Esther* pair well together as ways to read the ways in which Racinian emotion is repeatedly brought into relief by alien identities, in *Esther* by Jewishness and in *Andromaque* by the reach to a postwar Troy imagined as an affective community. Henriette d'Angleterre – like her mother Henrietta Maria, like Marie de Médicis, like Esther, like Andromaque the character and like Crowne's Andromache – is an alien, and an alien Racine addresses in explicitly emotional terms. What does it mean to consider that status as an affective identity in itself, as an identity which serves as a problematic disruptor of the reigning affective atmosphere?

The critic Sara Ahmed, who often writes through figures or named identities (such as the 'feminist killjoy') has throughout her work turned repeatedly to one she terms the 'affect alien.' That affect alien is someone who is 'out of line with an affective community.'²⁰ Ahmed's work via this figure points to a blind spot in recent work in the history of the emotions. Where, following the work of the historian Barbara Rosenwein, the notion of emotional vocabulary has been central to the development of the subfield of emotion history and to the development of reflections on what Rosenwein calls 'emotional communities', Ahmed's work reminds us that many people are non-native speakers of emotional communities, and make their way through them with differing degrees of success.²¹ Seen in this light, *Andromaque*'s resistant isolation at the court of Pyrrhus makes clear that she

²⁰ Sara Ahmed, *The Promise of Happiness* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010), p. 41.

²¹ Barbara Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006).

cannot speak the emotional vocabulary that dominates in that environment; she is, in Ahmed's terms, an affect alien.²²

You don't have to be a migrant to be an affect alien, but it helps. Ahmed writes that 'The happiness duty for migrants means telling a certain story about your arrival as good, or the good of your arrival.'²³ But Andromaque, eyes on the ruins of Troy, is not a good immigrant. I won't disguise myself, she insists ('Ce n'est point avec toi que mon cœur se déguise', IV.1.1078). Where Racine's dedication to Henriette (a 'good immigrant') insists on the teary pleasure of shared emotions, arguing that the play has been honoured by her tears, Andromaque's affective stance is rigorously and consistently isolationist. Andromaque's alien emotion is greeted with frustration by all around her.

We know Andromaque's foreignness by this firmly held emotional difference, by her tears. Racine also suggests that these tears form a form of international relations created by affect: Achilles and Pyrrhus, Andromaque proclaims, are only known because of her tears ('Et vous n'êtes tous deux connus que par mes larmes', I. 4. 362). Emotion serves as embassy, and the nation of Greece is known only because of the emotional labour of Troy.

²² Reading for such affect aliens across early modern texts gives us a different perspective on the traffic of women from court to court – a standard practice of the transnational aristocracy – and the equally standard criticism of them as too 'alien': think of the language used to describe the princesse Palatine, whose insistence on her dullness cues us into her status as affect alien; she feels differently or performs her feeling differently from the French women at the late seventeenth-century court. In these accounts, do such women figure only someone else's emotional culture, or do they adjust or adjust to their host's affective atmosphere, as well?

²³ Ahmed, *The Promise of Happiness*, p. 158.

Thinking through Andromaque's alien emotion also showcases Racine's own hospitality towards the distinctly unshabby materials of sea-crossing he takes from Virgil, drawing on book 3 of the *Aeneid*: 'Littoraque Epeiri legimus...' ²⁴ In making Henriette weep with Andromaque, Racine makes Virgil known differently through her tears.

In turn, Crowne's thalassopolitics speak in two directions: from an island nation, he looks to a long history of Mediterranean journeys, but brings to that ancient textual tradition a more resentful relation to his own Atlantic histories. Andromaque, 'diversa per aequora vectae' [dragged over distant seas] in the Virgilian passage cited by Racine, could be imagined as a figure for Crowne's own history as transatlantic misfit or affect alien; or he might read himself via Oreste, who describes how he has been compelled to 'Traîner de mers en mers ma chaîne et mes ennuis' (I. 1. 44). The slightest of distinctions, here, lets us read the difference between Andromaque's actual political captivity – dragged over distant seas – and Oreste's abstract and figurative sufferings, in which he manages to drag himself. Similarly, when Hermione is figured as 'errante, et sans dessein' (V. 1. 1403), we know that this is not the same wandering as that of Crowne's wretched Andromache, but that it points to a more privileged and abstracted form of wandering.

Racine counterpoints this language of the suffering seas with a distinct gesture to a language of refuge, 'asile', which at two moments in the play forms a surprising rhyme with the name of that unburied hero, Achilles. In act I scene 4, Andromaque pleads with Pyrrhus

²⁴ *Andromaque*, ed. Forestier, p. 196. Virgil's epic is, as much recent work has shown, significantly engaged with the status of the refugee: Jay Reed has shown how Virgilian epic takes up what he calls 'the peculiar task of tracing the Roman nation from a group of Trojan refugees.' Jay Reed, *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the Aeneid* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), p. 1.

on behalf of her son and asks that ‘Malgré moi, s’il le faut, lui donner un asile:/ Seigneur, voilà des soins dignes du Fils d’Achille’ (I. 4. 309-10); she returns to the hope that for Astyanax ‘J’ai cru que sa Prison deviendrait son asile. / Jadis Priam soumis fut respecté d’Achille’ later on (III. 6. 937). This hope is a double repetition: the repeated rhyme underscores her desire that a previous gracious treatment of prisoners might, for her own son, be repeated as a model. And between Andromaque’s twin rhymings of ‘asile’ and ‘Achille’, this rhyme emerges, surprisingly, in the mouth of Hermione, who in discussing the desires of the Greeks asks what Pyrrhus has to fear:

Tu crois que Pyrrhus craint? Et que craint-il encor?
Des Peuples, qui dix ans ont fui devant Hector?
Qui cent fois effrayés de l’absence d’Achille,
Dans leurs vaisseaux brûlants ont cherché leur asile,
Et qu’on verroit encor, sans l’appui de son Fils,
Redemander Hélène aux Troyens impunis. (III. 3. 839-44)

Affect is not merely the domain of the captive, of course; the emotional world of sovereign power (think *Britannicus*’s Néron) will be richly important to Racine’s creations. Here Pyrrhus’s fear is the fear of a security threatened by the surge of unnamed and repeatedly fearful populations, who, lacking the great hero Achilles to whom they looked formerly, look now for ‘asile’, for a refuge founded in violent revindications.

What can we make of this repeated rhyme? What is the relation between the dead hero and the need for refuge? *Achille* and *asile* mark the two poles of Racine’s affectively charged understanding of political change. On the one hand, we have the hero whose force sets all in motion; on the other, the multiple, unnamed figures who are compelled to move in his wake. We might imagine that the two words would be set against one another; the hero

versus the population of his enemy. But here, significantly, Achilles and those who seek asylum are on the same, Greek side; where once the Greeks took refuge in heroism, now they learn that it alone cannot serve as a lasting protection. Racine ends his play with Pylade seeking refuge for a friend who is wandering in every sense, but behind that urgent scene we can almost glimpse the Greeks themselves, like Crowne's Andromache, beginning to wonder what new Lords they might imagine for themselves.

In their figurations of torturous emotional captivities and searches for liberty, Racine's plays tell us that, when it comes to love, we are all seekers – and potential granters – of refuge. But in reworking epic movements from shore to shore, Racine also posits a wretchedly affective reading of *international* relations, and not merely erotic ones. In response to this, Crowne's aggrieved hospitality of Racine's play does not make for gracious reading. Yet in its resentful relation to the foreigner seeking refuge, and in its extraordinary closing supplement, it brings out something that we often ignore in Racine's own text and in our own British history.

Emily Wilson's translator's note to her recent translation of the *Odyssey* accounts for the 'strangeness' of Homer's text to a modern reader and notes the ways in which the poem revolves around 'the duties and dangers involved in welcoming foreigners into one's home.' Wilson's translation is explicitly figured as an act that facilitates our own readerly hospitality, enabling us 'to welcome and host this foreign poem, with all the right degrees of warmth, curiosity, openness, and suspicion'.²⁵ Crowne's reading of Racine is certainly more suspicious than it is warm. And yet, in its ungenerous act of clothing of a play it sees as shabby, it tells an inadvertent story of a moment of English welcome to the alien. As we

²⁵ 'Translator's Note.' Homer, *The Odyssey*, trans. by Emily Wilson (London: Norton, 2018), p. 91.

know from those ‘forbid to land on every shore’ in the Mediterranean or Channel today, finding an effective governmental response to such emotional pleas marks the failure of almost all of our forms of representation. Through diplomatic failure, then, as Hampton writes, literature creates the space of its unfolding. We are still listening out for the stories of Andromache today.