

## Florio's French Journey: what the French edition of the *Essais* in 1611 owed to the English translation of 1603<sup>1</sup>

The 1611 edition of the *Essais*, published in Paris and with surviving copies bearing the imprint of one of five booksellers,<sup>2</sup> has generally attracted little critical attention. This seems entirely logical, since it is closely derived from the 1608 edition, which contained more significant changes. As Desan showed, 'C'est donc en 1608 qu'un nouveau livre-objet des *Essais* voit le jour.'<sup>3</sup> The 1608 edition was the first to contain summaries in the margin, a full life of Montaigne, and the portrait of the author engraved by Thomas le Leu; it was also the first non-pirated edition with indexes. Yet, in one respect, the 1611 edition deserves closer attention, for it is the first French edition to provide the sources of most of the quotations, in the form of side notes. Although Sayce and Maskell record this bibliographical data,<sup>4</sup> neither they nor other critics have investigated how this came about, or its significance. The answer lies in what I shall term Florio's French Journey.

In *Montaigne's English Journey*, Hamlin has demonstrated and comprehensively analysed the huge impact of Florio's translation on seventeenth-century English readers. The publication, in 1603, of *The Essayes or Morall, Politike and Militarie Discourses of Lo: Michaell de Montaigne* spawned a fascination with Montaigne as author and subject, as Florio 'established the discursive conditions within which English readers might feel most comfortable encountering the Frenchman's extraordinary "composition"'.<sup>5</sup> Two material features of Florio's work made the English translation of 1603 visibly different from its French counterparts: the presence, within the main body of text, of vernacular translations of all but the most licentious of the Latin and Greek quotations,<sup>6</sup> and the inclusion of the sources of most of the quotations in side notes. I have provided elsewhere a critical edition and study of Marie de Gournay's translations into French of the quotations, which appeared some fourteen years after those in Florio's English version: relegated to an appendix at the end of the entire volume of the *Essais* in 1617, the French translations were then placed at the end of each chapter of the *Essais* in 1635, before finally appearing as side notes in the margin in the 1652 French edition prepared by Henri Estienne.<sup>7</sup> In addition, I have recently compared the literary

---

<sup>1</sup> My thanks to colleagues who over the period of research for this article generously shared their knowledge of Montaigne, Florio and the broader historical and cultural context with me, especially: Warren Boutcher, Colin Burrow, Kantik Ghosh, and Roger Kuin. I am particularly grateful to William Hamlin for his generous encouragement, and for sharing his insightful thoughts on a draft of the article. All errors of fact or judgement remain my own.

<sup>2</sup> François Gueffier, Michel Nivelle, Jean Petit-Pas, Claude Rigaud and Charles Sevestre. See the full bibliographic description provided in R.A. Sayce and D. Maskell, *A Descriptive Bibliography of Montaigne's Essais 1580-1700* (London: The Bibliographic Society, 1983), item 16, pp. 62-67.

<sup>3</sup> P. Desan, 'Editer et publier les *Essais* au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle', *Cahiers de l'Association Internationale des Etudes Françaises*, 51 (1999), 205-23: p. 209.

<sup>4</sup> *A Descriptive Bibliography of Montaigne's Essais*, p. 66

<sup>5</sup> *Montaigne's English Journey. Reading the Essays in Shakespeare's Day* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 161-2. Hamlin's rich study will soon be complemented by W. Boutcher's consideration of Florio's translation in *The School of Montaigne in Early Modern Europe*, Volume 2: *The reader-writer* (OUP, forthcoming 2016).

<sup>6</sup> On the nature and consequences of this bowdlerisation, see the detailed appraisal by Hamlin, *Montaigne's English Journey*, 55ff.

<sup>7</sup> *Marie de Gournay: Œuvres complètes*, 2 vol, eds. J.-C. Arnould, E. Berriot, C. Blum, A. L. Franchetti, M.-C. Thomine and V. Worth-Stylianou. (Paris: Honoré Champion: 2002): pp. 56-82, 345-548.

characteristics of the English and French translations of the quotations, and how this shaped the two rather different reading experiences in the earlier seventeenth century.<sup>8</sup> Here, I propose to concentrate on the second distinction between Florio's English text from 1603 and French editions up to 1617: the identification of the sources of the quotations in side notes.

It was in keeping with what we could term the 'domesticating' approach of Florio's project that he both provided translations into English of over a thousand of Montaigne's quotations and also indicated their provenance. He famously cast himself as the 'fondling foster-father, having transported it from France to England; put it in English clothes; taught it to talke our tongue (though many times with a jerk of the French Jargon)'.<sup>9</sup> However, as he acknowledges in the dedication to his two of his six patronesses, Lucy Countess of Bedford and Lady Anne Harrington, his achievement resulted from a collaborative effort.<sup>10</sup> The ladies' role in first encouraging him and then insisting upon the completion of the translation is portrayed with fine humour; Theodore Diodati is credited as his 'bonus genius' for guiding him through the knottier sections of Montaigne's French prose,<sup>11</sup> and Doctor Matthew Gwinne as the scholar who tamed Montaigne's quotations.<sup>12</sup> Florio's tribute to Gwinne, an alumnus and Fellow of St John's College Oxford, Professor of Physic (1597) at Gresham College, and an established English and neo-Latin author in his own right,<sup>13</sup> is fulsome:

'So Scholler-like did he undertake what Latine prose; Greeke, Latine, Italian or French Poesie should crosse my way (which as Bugge-beares affrighted my unacquaintance with them) to ridde them all afore mee, and for the most part drawne them from their dennes [...] So was hee to mee in this bundle of riddles an understanding *Oedipus*, in this perilous-crook't passage a monster-quelling *Theseus* or *Hercules* [...].'<sup>14</sup>

Yet the dazzling metaphors obfuscate the exact division of labours; was Gwinne alone responsible for translating the quotations? It would seem so, but we should perhaps not rule out some collaboration between him and Florio. The prefatory letter 'To the curteous Reader' is more explicit on who identified the quotations. Here, Florio chides Montaigne for wearing his classical learning so lightly, and thanks his dear friend (Gwinne) for his work:

'So he [Montaigne], most writing of himselfe, and the worst rather than the best, disclaimeth all memorie, authorities, or borrowing of the ancient or moderne; whereas in course of his discourse he seemes acquainted not onely with all, but no other but authours; and could out of question like Cyrus or Caesar, call any of his armie by his name and condition. And I

<sup>8</sup> "'Bugge-beares" or "bouquets"? Translations of the Latin quotations in Florio's English and Gournay's French versions of the *Essais*', in *Montaigne in Transit. Essays in Honour of Ian Maclean*, edited by N. Kenny, R. Scholar and W. Williams (Oxford: Legenda Modern Humanities Research Association and Routledge, 2016), pp. 155-170.

<sup>9</sup> Dedicatory letter to Lucy Countess of Bedford and Lady Anne Harrington (1603, fol. A2').

<sup>10</sup> See Hamlin, *Montaigne's English Journey*, pp. 54-55.

<sup>11</sup> 'So was he to me in this inextricable laberinth like Ariadne's threed' (1603, fol. A3').

<sup>12</sup> On the cultural and literary origins of Florio's translation, see F. Matthiessen's *Translation: an Elizabethan Art* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1931); F. Yates's *John Florio, the Life of an Italian in Shakespeare's England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934); W. Boutcher, 'Marginal Commentaries: The Cultural Transmission of Montaigne's *Essais* in Shakespeare's England' (in eds. J.-M. Maguin and P. Kapitanak, *Montaigne et Shakespeare: vers un nouvel humanisme*. Montpellier: Société Française Shakespeare, 2004, 13-27), and 'The origins of Florio's Montaigne: "Of the institution and education of children, to Madame Lucy Russell, Countess of Bedford"', *Montaigne Studies* 24 (2012) 7-32.; and M. Wyatt, *The Italian Encounter with Tudor England: a cultural politics of translation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

<sup>13</sup> In 1590 he and Fulke Greville had edited Sidney's *New Arcadia*; Gwinne's *Nero*, a neo-Latin tragedy, was published the same year as the first edition of Florio's translation of the *Essayes*; his neo-Latin poem *Tres Sibyllae* (possibly a source of Macbeth) was performed to greet James I at Oxford in 1605.

<sup>14</sup> *The Essayes*, London, 1603, fol. A3'.

would for us all he had in this whole body [the *Essais*] done as much, as in most of that of other languages my peerelesse deer-deerest and never sufficiently commended friend hath done for mine and your ears and intelligence. <sup>15</sup>

This remark suggests that Gwinne, not Florio, is responsible for furnishing the classical references ('calling his armie by his name and condition'), which seems entirely plausible, given both Florio's claims to be no Latinist (let alone a Hellenist) and Gwinne's scholarly proclivities. Either the publisher, Edward Blount, or the printer, Valentine Sims, would have been responsible (possibly in discussion with Florio?) for setting them as side notes. The essential result is that the translations and references have visually distinct status: the translations are incorporated within the body of the text,<sup>16</sup> whereas the references appear as marginal annotations. Florio's *Essayes* thus brought about two key changes to Montaigne's work: the bilingual nature of the *Essais* was distinctly muted for English readers,<sup>17</sup> and a new scholarly apparatus accompanied every page of the text. Both changes would have run counter to Montaigne's original conception of his work; neither did they fit easily with the ideals of Marie de Gournay, self-appointed guardian of the French editions of the *Essais* throughout her lifetime.

In assessing editions of the *Essais* in the 17<sup>th</sup> century through the prism of 'le livre objet, c'est-à-dire le texte dans sa gangue matérielle',<sup>18</sup> Desan highlights some of the conflicts between Gournay and the Paris publishers, which he suggests we can see as some of the earliest debates, *avant la lettre*, over intellectual copyright.<sup>19</sup> In essence, Gournay wished to preserve the *Essais* in the form left by Montaigne, whereas publishers and booksellers wanted to produce new editions that would suit readers of the early seventeenth century. Not only prefaces, but the quotations in their original languages, side notes and linguistic modifications were all potential areas for conflict, especially given Gournay's stylistic preference for the French of Ronsard's generation.<sup>20</sup> The first translation of the *Essais* into another language – Italian – had been partial and conservative. We do not know whether Gournay saw a copy of Girolamo Naselli's *Discorsi morali, politici, et militari* (published in Ferrara in 1590), but since the quotations were given only in the original languages, and none of the sources was identified, it could have been of little import to her or to the French publishers.<sup>21</sup> The same is not true of Florio's *Essayes*.

Previous comparisons of English and French editions of the *Essais* in the earlier seventeenth century have viewed them as pursuing distinct and parallel courses. However, I believe that Florio's *Essayes* must have made a French journey, probably between 1608-11, and left a discreet yet indelible mark upon the French edition printed in Paris in 1611, in the shape of the side notes

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., fol. A5<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> Prose quotations run on within the text, with italic font being used for both the original Latin and the English version. Verse quotations are inset, with the Latin in italics but the English in Roman type.

<sup>17</sup> Although, as Hamlin has shown, this did not stop some readers from annotating the perceived shortcomings of the translations (*Montaigne's English Journey*, pp. 19-20).

<sup>18</sup> 'Editer et publier les *Essais* au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle', p. 205.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., pp. 210-14.

<sup>20</sup> See O. Millet, *La Première Réception des Essais de Montaigne (1580-1640)*, (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1995), pp. 10-18 ; my article 'Marie de Gournay et la traduction: défense et illustration d'un style', *Bulletin de la Société des Amis de Montaigne* 7 (janvier-juin 1996), 193-206 ; and C. Blum's comments on Gournay's modifications in 1617 to some of the vocabulary of the *Essais* ('L'éditrice des *Essais*', in Marie de Gournay, *Œuvres complètes*, pp. 42-43).

<sup>21</sup> On Naselli's version, see M. Tetel, 'Idéologie et traductions de Girolamo Naselli à John Florio', *Montaigne Studies* 7:1-2 (1995), 169-182.

identifying the sources; it is also possible that Florio's version added weight by example to the publishers' case for the quotations to be translated in 1617. I shall examine first how the introduction of references is accounted for in French editions between 1611-1635; secondly, the bibliographical evidence that it was the English edition of 1603 that led directly to the inclusion of the side-noted references in 1611; finally, I shall address the question of how an English edition might have reached Paris in 1608-11, and the significance of this for the broader context of cultural exchanges between English and French at the turn of the seventeenth century.

The 1608 Paris edition of the *Essais* looked to enhance the work with paratextual materials of various kinds; however, the side notes, an entirely new feature, contained only summaries of Montaigne's material, not reference to the quotations. It seems reasonable to hypothesise that if these references had been easily to hand, the four publishers<sup>22</sup> would have included them; conversely, if they were not included, it is likely the possibility had not yet presented itself. The 1611 edition is based so closely on its 1608 predecessor that in the cartouche on the title page the date of 1608 is still faintly visible, but scratched out and replaced with 1611. In other respects – apart from the addition of references in the side notes – Sayce and Maskell deem the 1611 edition to be 'a close resetting of the prelims and text [of 1608]'.<sup>23</sup> Desan conjectures that the publication of the 1611 edition may have occurred because the new format of 1608 had been so well received.<sup>24</sup> Is it also possible that the Paris publishers were anxious to publish an edition including the newly-acquired references to the quotations before any other publisher thought to do so? Tellingly, the next edition published outside France, hailing from Cologne (or Geneva) in 1616, also includes the references in the side notes, as does the 1617 edition printed in Rouen, although a pirated edition with the imprint 'Envers', probably in 1617, does not.<sup>25</sup> The references are also present in side notes in the new edition published in Paris in 1617 and closely overseen by Gournay,<sup>26</sup> this being the same edition in which she reluctantly concedes that the publishers may include translations (her own) of Montaigne's quotations in an Appendix at the end of the volume. Thus, from their first appearance, the references in side notes become a quasi-indispensable appendage of French editions of the *Essais*.

The 1611 edition is, surprisingly, silent about the introduction of this new feature, its title page being identical to the 1608 one, with the same general statement 'Edition nouvelle enrichie d'annotations en marge'. In 1608, the 'annotations' could refer only to the side-noted summaries. However, the 1617 edition overseen by Gournay allows us to reconstruct the trail, at least in part. The Privilège used in 1617 appears to have been obtained some two and a half years earlier, since it is dated 28 November 1614.<sup>27</sup> It identifies the new work as 'reveu, corrigé et augmenté, tant des Auteurs Latins en marge, que de la version de tous les passages latins'. So the intention to produce a new edition with translation of the quotations and with side-noted references had existed since late 1614. Equally, the title page in 1617 advertises the references as

---

<sup>22</sup> The same publishers as for the 1611 edition, with the exception of François Gueffier, who had not yet joined Michel Nivelles, Jean Petit-Pas, Claude Rigaud and Charles Sevestre. See Sayce and Maskell, *A Descriptive Bibliography*, item 14, pp 54-59.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 66.

<sup>24</sup> 'Editer et publier les *Essais* au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle', p. 210.

<sup>25</sup> Sayce and Maskell, *A Descriptive Bibliography*, items 17-19, pp. 67-78.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, item 20, pp. 78-84.

<sup>27</sup> The *Achévé d'imprimer*, dated 8 May 1617, refers specifically to the Privilege that Gournay hands over to the printers as 'en date du 28 jour de Novembre, 1614'. (*Les Essais*, Paris, 1617, fol. civ<sup>v</sup>).

one of the new features, together with the translation of the quotations and the corrections to the text: 'Enrichie d'annotations en marge, du nom des Autheurs citez, et de la version du Latin d'iceux. Corrigée et augmentée d'un tiers outre les premieres impressions'. The 'Préface' by Gournay discusses the side-noted references immediately after she has denounced the publishers' inclusion of the side-noted summaries, indexes and the life of Montaigne.<sup>28</sup> She is more balanced in her appraisal of the references, but this is probably because she herself takes the credit for substantially revising them for this 1617 edition. She makes no reference to their provenance, speaking simply of 'tous ceux qui sont en la mesme Impression derniere';<sup>29</sup> in 1625, she changes this to 'qu'un tiers avoit appliquez'; and in 1635 the formula shifts again, 'tous ceux qu'un incongnu y avoit appliquez'.<sup>30</sup> What matters, in Gournay's eyes, is that she has personally checked all the references, correcting errors and, she claims, completing all but about fifty of the twelve hundred – albeit that she deliberately stripped out line numbers for the quotations from poetry, 'tant par mespris de ceste punctille, que pour n'ouvrir un champ plus large aux erreurs d'impression.'<sup>31</sup> She names in the 1617 Préface three established French scholars and one younger one who have helped her in this difficult task: 'trois hommes d'honneur et doctes, les sieurs Bergeron, Martiniere et Machard [...] assistez de ceste honneste jeunesse du sieur Bignon, qui a possédé le sens et la science avant la barbe'.<sup>32</sup> She shows, nonetheless, little more enthusiasm for the inclusion of the references than for the translation of the quotations: 'Après tout, je recognois que cette recherche et ces cottes d'Autheurs, eussent esté desdaignez par mon pere; et moy mesme n'en faisois pas gran comte'.<sup>33</sup> Three reasons are adduced for her acceptance of their inclusion: the fact that approximately half had already been identified; readers' misguided but widespread tendency to trust Montaigne's views more readily when supported by classical authority; and, last but not least, 'l'interest et priere des Imprimeurs'.<sup>34</sup> Here is proof that, in the eyes of the publishers, the side-noted references were a very valuable addition to the evolving text of the *Essais*.

Gournay's Préface of 1617 thus corroborates the commercial significance of the inclusion of the references. However, in the editions of 1617, 1625 and 1635 she consistently denies the original compiler any identity other than 'un tiers' or 'un incongnu'. The letter from the printers to the reader in the new 1617 edition offers a further clue, with an elliptical reference to their previous (i.e. 1611) edition:

'Nous t'estrenons en outre des noms des Autheurs alleguez parmy le Livre: la plupart desquels precedent du labour de la mesme Damoiselle, adjousté à ce qu'un de nos amis y avoit apporté du sien en nostre Impression derniere.'<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> 'Au surplus, l'opinion qu'ont euë les Imprimeurs, que certaines nottes en marge pourroient enrichir la vente des Essais; est cause derechef qu'ils les y ont plantées à leur mode, comme à la derniere Impression: contre mon advis neantmoins, parce qu'un ouvrage si plein, affluant et pressé, n'en peut souffrir, non plus que de tables aussi par mesme raison. Autant suis-je contraire, à ceste vie de l'Autheur, qu'ils ont logée en teste, estant complete dans le volume.' (*Les Essais*, Paris, 1617, fol. ñii<sup>v</sup>).

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> Marie de Gournay, *Œuvres complètes*. p.335.

<sup>31</sup> *Les Essais*, Paris, 1617, fol. ñii<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>32</sup> *Les Essais*, Paris, 1617, fol. ñiii<sup>r</sup>. In 1635 the names are replaced by the simple designation 'des personnes d'honneur et doctes que j'ay nommées autre part' (Marie de Gournay, *Œuvres complètes*. p.336).

<sup>33</sup> *Les Essais*, Paris, 1617, fol. ñiii<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> *Les Essais*, Paris, 1617, fol. ñiii<sup>r</sup>.

Yet, the identity of ‘un de nos amis’ is no less mysterious, and may even be a cover for the an act of wholesale pillaging, for a close comparison of the 1603 edition of Florio’s *Essayes* with the 1611 Paris *Essais* shows that the references are silently lifted from the former to the latter. I have compared five copies of the 1611 edition;<sup>36</sup> I can confirm that in the samples I have analysed, the references are identical in all cases, except for occasional, very minor errors of the kind which would be expected over the course of a print run.<sup>37</sup> In other words, all four publishers collaborated to introduce the new side notes. Moreover, they opted to follow the English referencing system very closely, unlike Gournay who in 1617 introduced her own, significant modifications. For example, in I.6 the last two Latin quotations are referenced as follows in the side notes:

	Florio (1603)	<i>Essais</i> (1611)	<i>Essais</i> (revised by Gournay, 1617)
Malo me [...] pudeat.	Curt.lib.4. <sup>38</sup>	Curt.lib.4 <sup>39</sup>	Curt.l.4. <sup>40</sup>
Atque idem [...] / [...] fortibus armis.	Virg.Aen.lib 10.732. Mezent. <sup>41</sup>	Virg. AEn.li 10.732 <sup>42</sup>	Æneid.10. <sup>43</sup>

This is representative of the pattern throughout the 1611 and 1617 editions: in 1611, the references given in Florio’s *Essayes* are copied verbatim, with the smallest of changes: the capitalisation of a letter may change, ‘lib’ may become ‘li’, or a full stop may be omitted, but such changes are inconsequential. In 1617, in contrast, Gournay adopts her own system of referencing, with, as we have seen, the line numbers omitted for poetry.<sup>44</sup> In some cases, using different editions from Gwinne/Florio, she changes the numbering completely, as for example in Montaigne’s celebrated quotations at the end of I.28 from Catullus:

	Florio (1603)	<i>Essais</i> (1611)	<i>Essais</i> (revised by Gournay, 1617)
O misero frater	Catul. ele.4.20.92.23.95 <sup>45</sup>	Catul.elg.20.92.23.95 <sup>46</sup>	Catul.num.69. <sup>47</sup>

<sup>36</sup> I consulted copies published by: Nivelles (Jesus College Oxford; BnF- Z Payen 60); Rigaud (Chantilly – VIII-D-004); Gueffier (BnF – Z Payen 59); and Petit-Pas (BnF – Z Payen 61). My comparison of samples of the side-noted references were taken from the following chapters of the *Essais*: I.6,7,8,11, 28; II.3,15; III.4.

<sup>37</sup> For example, the copy by Petit-Pas (BnF Payen 61) has an isolated misprint on p. 584, abbreviating Ovid’s *Amores* to ‘Ouid.An.’, whereas the other copies use the expected form ‘Ouid.Am.’; presumably the error was spotted and corrected early in the print run. More strikingly, in the copy held at Chantilly (printed by Rigaud), the side-noted references are absent from the complete first folio (A) of the *Essais*, i.e. they commence only at I.5, at the first leaf of folio B, suggesting perhaps that a 1608 set of folio A was inserted in error into this copy of the 1611 edition.

<sup>38</sup> *Essayes*, London, 1603, p. 13.

<sup>39</sup> *Les Essais*, Paris, 1611, p. 21.

<sup>40</sup> *Les Essais*, Paris, 1617, p. 19.

<sup>41</sup> *Essayes*, London, 1603, p. 13.

<sup>42</sup> *Les Essais*, Paris, 1611, p. 21.

<sup>43</sup> *Les Essais*, Paris, 1617, p. 19.

<sup>44</sup> There is no reason to think she or the publishers had seen the revised 1613 edition of Florio’s translation, since the side-noted references in 1613 are the same as in 1603, with the exception of occasional and minimal changes of spelling or capitalisation.

<sup>45</sup> *Essayes*, 1603, p. 96.

<sup>46</sup> *Les Essais*, Paris, 1611, p. 161.

<sup>47</sup> *Les Essais*, Paris, 1617, p. 144.

[...]/ [...] alebat amor.			
Tu mea [...] / [...] delicias animi.	21.94. 25. <sup>48</sup>	21.94. 52 [sic] <sup>49</sup>	[no further reference]
Alloquar? [...] / [...] semper amabo.	El. 1.9. <sup>50</sup>	elg 19 [sic] <sup>51</sup>	Idem.num.66. <sup>52</sup>

If yet more compelling evidence is required to demonstrate the dependence of the 1611 French edition on the side-noted references in its English precursor, it is useful to point not only to the shared references but the shared omissions.<sup>53</sup> Gwinne/ Florio had not traced a fair number of quotations in 1603, although the two pages of Errata at the end of the volume provide some 120 references which the printers had failed to include in the side notes.<sup>54</sup> A number, though not all, of the references from the 1603 Errata are included in the side notes of the 1611 French version, the inconsistency perhaps suggesting the French printers were working fast.<sup>55</sup> There is, however, no instance of the 1611 French version introducing a reference where none had been present in the 1603 *Essayes*.

Both the positive evidence of borrowed references and the negative evidence of shared omissions thus show that it was clearly the journey of at least one copy of Florio's translation of the *Essayes* to Paris that allowed the four publishers, in 1611, to include Gwinne's side-noted references. For the French reading public from 1611 to the present day, the inclusion of the references was an addition at least as significant as that in 1617 of Gournay's translations of the quotations. No longer were the quotations part of an extraordinarily subtle network of unspoken allusions, intelligible only to skilled humanist readers. Henceforth, each of the 'fleurs estrangeres' of Montaigne's text could be traced and dissected by anyone able to consult a copy of the classical texts (whether in the original or in a translation). It is a rather fine irony that the foreigners Gwinne and Florio should have delivered the secret to the French reading public!

In the absence of any written evidence, to attempt to identify the person(s) who brought a copy of Florio's *Essayes* to the attention of the Paris publishers at some point between 1608-11 risks resembling a search for the proverbial needle in a haystack. The question is, nonetheless, not without interest for our appreciation of Anglo-French cultural relations. There is a general critical consensus that whereas, at the turn of the sixteenth/ seventeenth centuries, many educated English men and women spoke and read French,<sup>56</sup> very few of their French counterparts had any knowledge

<sup>48</sup> *Essayes*, London, 1603, p. 96

<sup>49</sup> *Les Essais*, Paris, 1611, p. 161. This inversion of the reference ('52' for '25') illustrates why Gournay feared the inclusion of line numbers could lead to a proliferation of errors (see note 31 above).

<sup>50</sup> *Essayes*, London, 1603, p. 96.

<sup>51</sup> *Les Essais*, Paris, 1611, p. 161.

<sup>52</sup> *Les Essais*, Paris, 1617, p. 145.

<sup>53</sup> I am grateful to William Hamlin for suggesting the importance of investigating this negative evidence.

<sup>54</sup> The table is entitled 'Errors and omissions of notes escaped in this Booke' (pp. 491-2). Approximately half are from the first quarter of the 1603 volume, suggesting the printers initially struggled with the side notes.

<sup>55</sup> See also the erroneous repetition, in the French edition, of the same reference for two consecutive quotations in III.5 (*Les Essais*, Paris, 1611, p. 867).

<sup>56</sup> See note 17 above.

of English. The only bilingual 'textbooks' intended to teach English to French speakers were Bellot's work of 1580, largely concerned with explaining English pronunciation, and his collection of basic, practical dialogues that appeared in 1586,<sup>57</sup> although works expressly designed to teach French to the English, such as John Eliot's *Ortho-epia Gallica* of 1593,<sup>58</sup> might perhaps also have served in reverse. In his study of what Elizabethan England knew about France, Giry-Deloison acknowledges some growth of interest in England among the elite in France from the 1570s, but suggests it focused largely on translations into French of political or religious pamphlets.<sup>59</sup> In this context, it is highly improbable that any of the four Parisian publishers of the 1611 edition of Montaigne would have read English or sought out a copy of Florio by themselves; however, once they saw one, little or no knowledge of English was required to recognise and copy the side-noted references to the quotations, since the references were in Latin. The intermediary who delivered at least one copy of the 1603 English edition of the *Essays* is likely to have been from one of the three groups that Giry-Deloison defines as the main conduit for printed materials reaching France from England: the English community residing in France, largely composed of 'diplomats, soldiers, students, catholic refugees'; nationals of other countries who were passing from England through France; or French returning home after a stay in England, i.e. 'ambassadors, merchants, students, travellers, Huguenot exiles'.<sup>60</sup>

A chance record of an Anglo-French network ensuring the circulation of printed books survives in Pierre de l'Estoile's journal for 1609.<sup>61</sup> Another possible link could be of even greater literary interest: one of the relatively few surviving copies of the 1611 edition of the *Essays*, held at Chantilly and once part of the collection of the Duke d'Aumale, is recorded as belonging to Charlotte d'Arbalaeste – or rather, since she died in 1606, presumably to her husband Philippe Duplessis-Mornay. Not only did Philippe exchange correspondence with Montaigne,<sup>62</sup> he also had close connections with literary circle in London, where Philip Sidney had stood godfather in 1578 at the

---

<sup>57</sup> Jacques Bellot, *Maistre d'escole anglois pour les naturels françois et autres estrangers* (London: Thomas Purfoote for Henry Dizlie 1580), which continued to be republished through the seventeenth century under the title *Grammaire anglaise et françoise*; and *Familiar dialogues for the instructions of them that be desirous to learne to speake English, and perfectlye to pronounce the same* (London: Thomas Vautrollier, 1586).

<sup>58</sup> See Hamlin, *Montaigne's English Journey*, p. 7.

<sup>59</sup> C. Giry-Deloison, 'France and Elizabethan England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6-14 (2004), 223-242.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 226. In the case of the first group, we might recall that a decade earlier, Gwinne himself had travelled to France with the ambassador Sir Henry Unton. See Warren Boutcher, 'Marginal Commentaries', p. 19.

<sup>61</sup> 'An acquaintance of his in Rouen, M. Justel, wrote to say that he was expecting some books from a friend in England and that he would send him a selection of them as soon as they arrived.' (Giry-Deloison, 'France and Elizabethan England', p. 228). We may surmise that the books alluded to here were French translations of political or religious works published in England precisely for circulation in France, since Pierre de l'Estoile did not understand English. I am grateful to Tom Hamilton for confirming that L'Estoile did not understand English, with reference to the passage in L'Estoile's Journal (*Mémoires-journaux de Pierre de L'Estoile*, ed. Pierre Gustave Brunet (Paris, 1875-1906), IX, 111-2), in which, on attending a Protestant service in English in Paris, L'Estoile refers to 'l'exposition d'un mien ami qui m'y accompagna, qui fust mon trucheman de ce sermon.'

<sup>62</sup> On their relations and surviving correspondence (all these letters dating from 1583-4), see: H. Daussy, 'Montaigne et Duplessis-Mornay: les mystères d'une correspondance', *Montaigne Studies*, 18 (2006), 169-182; and J. O'Brien, 'Intestinal Disorders' in *Writers in Conflict in Sixteenth-century France: Essays in Honour of Malcolm Quainton*, ed. E. Vinestock and D. Foster (Durham: Durham Modern Languages Series, 2008), 239-258.

baptism of Duplessis-Mornay's second daughter.<sup>63</sup> In 1592, the year after Duplessis-Mornay had revisited England to solicit help for Henri IV against the League, Mary Sidney published her translation of his *Discours de la vie et de la mort*.<sup>64</sup> Furthermore, as Greengrass has shown, in the early years of James I's reign, Duplessis-Mornay sought to involve the English king in his project for a pan-European Protestant union.<sup>65</sup> Up until at least 1611, Duplessis-Mornay maintained a correspondence with Robert Le Maçon, sieur de La Fontaine, and pastor of the French Huguenot Church in London.<sup>66</sup> In Kuin's detailed bibliographical study and inventory of the works recorded in Duplessis-Mornay's library, neither Montaigne nor Florio features;<sup>67</sup> however, it is intriguing that a copy of the 1611 *Essais* appears to have belonged to Duplessis-Mornay. Did he purchase this particular edition to have access, as a classical scholar, to the side-noted references? Or is it just possible that he was directly or indirectly responsible, given his contacts with English literary and Huguenot circles, for bringing the 1603 English version of the *Essayes* to Paris? If the identity of the conduit must remain speculative, what we can definitively conclude is that Florio's French Journey transported his friend Gwinne's erudition across the Channel, and influenced the format of almost every subsequent French edition of the *Essais* from 1611 to the present.

Valerie Worth-Stylianou  
Trinity College Oxford

---

<sup>63</sup> On the Sidney's relations with Europe, and more specifically Philip Sidney's with France, see R. Kuin, 'The Sidney's and the Continent: The Tudor Period', in (ed.) M. Hannay, M. Brennan and M. Lamb, *The Ashgate Research Companion to the Sidney's: 1500-1700*, volume I *Lives*. (Farnham and Burlington USA: Ashgate, 2015), pp. 203-222.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 213.

<sup>65</sup> M. Greengrass, 'Philippe Duplessis-Mornay, Jacques VI et Ier, et la réunion du christianisme 1603-19', in *Albineana, Cahiers d'Aubigné, Philippe Duplessis-Mornay*, sous la direction de H. Daussy et V. Ferrer, 18 (2006), 423-461.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 430.

<sup>67</sup> R. Kuin, 'Private Library as Public Danger: the Case of Duplessis-Mornay', in *The Sixteenth-Century French Religious Book*, edited by P. Conner, P. Nelles and A. Pettegree (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), pp. 319-358.