Critiquing Early Modern White Supremacy: The Function of Medieval English Anti-Semitism in Elizabeth Cary's *The Tragedie of Mariam, The Faire Queene of Iewry*

Jesse G. Swan

In the recent consideration of modern racialized features of early modern English literature, the function of white supremacy often remains under represented, if not entirely absent.[1] Some, however, do attend to the issue. Kim F. Hall, in *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England*[2] is one who does concern herself with "disrupting the language of white supremacy" (266 , and all of her work provides fundamental and cogent models of procedure. One significant model in enunciating the dynamics of early modern white supremacist discourse is Hall's description of a "color complex" or "poetics of color in which whiteness is established as a valued goal" (69, 66 . Drawing on early modern sonnet cycles, especially that of Sir Philip Sidney, Hall documents "several ways in which the English poetic project produced a politics of color that prepares generically, thematically, and economically a poetic for the 'new world' — a world in which blackness is not a purely 'aesthetic' indication of beauty standards but the site for the interplay of sexual politics and cultural and racial difference" (73 . Understanding the cultural currency in early modern England of such a color complex, a complex that is, as is modern color prejudice, white supremacist, is essential if we are to interpret accurately the racialized dimensions of the period' s literature.

Equally important to a precise interpretation of the literature of Renaissance/early modern England, especially in relation to the nascent production of white supremacist discourse, is delineating the literature's medievalism. That is, how newly emerging cultural values, such as those associated with heredity and phenotype, are defined in relation to congeneric preexistent ones contributes to a full description of modern racialized discourse by detailing how established bigoted attitudes are incorporated into neoteric circumstances, such as those occasioned by the institution of colonial exploits. Such specification may be appreciated most in studying early modern English racialized discourse since it is only through such specification that the modern terms of such analysis — significantly "race" and "ethnicity" — can be understood to have developed into what they came to mean by the nineteenth century, but what they did not mean in any simple way in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[3] Terms such as "race" and "ethnicity" did carry prejudiced associations, but these were traditionally familial and religious, not somatic, although they were starting to come to take on imperial, if not Aryan associations, to use John Michael Archer's apt distinction.[4] Distinguishing what early modern authors understood to be medieval

bigoted attitudes as distinct from incipient ones is an additional method of enunciating the ways anti-black, white supremacist assumptions developed in English-speaking cultures. It can also, as I contend it does with Elizabeth Tanfield Cary, help demonstrate a self-conscious critique of the dehumanizing discourse coeval with the discourse's inception.[5]

Like Geoffrey Chaucer's "The Prioress's Tale," Cary's *The Tragedie of Mariam, the Faire Queene of Iewry* assumes more than asserts a culturally current and preexistent anti-Semitism, and like William Shakespeare's *The Tragedy of Othello, the Moor of Venice,* Cary's play draws on what Hall calls a culturally nascent color complex or poetics of color. Such points might be thought to be obvious since Cary advertises them in her title, but, as with Chaucer's "Prioress's Tale" and Shakespeare's *Othello*, the issues and functions of the anti-Semitism and white supremacy have been variously overlooked, discounted, and in other ways avoided. Certainly such a critical condition is changing, as several recent essays on Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Cary indicate,[6] but the changing condition has yet to produce a study that specifically addresses the confluence of a native or medieval English anti-Semitism and an emergent racist white supremacy in Cary's play. This is what I do in this essay. In doing so, I show how Cary draws on culturally current anti-Semitic attitudes to satirize those who hold them, and, further, I show how nascent forms of modern, racist white supremacy are ridiculed for their promotion of "fairness" and "whiteness." The vantage point from which such medieval as well as early modern bigoted attitudes are censured is a classically secular and humanistic one.[7]

A major reason the critiqued prejudice that was so obvious to the play's author and her audience has subsequently been obscured is that the social and generic contexts of the play have been, for whatever reasons or purposes, largely misapprehended, misconstrued, or underappreciated.[8] The most immediate and relevant social context of the play is Cary's elite coterie, the group for whom she wrote the play. Complex, to be sure, the general characteristics of the coterie I will emphasize here are those of the household of the Duke of York, Prince Charles. Having been given to Lady Elizabeth Carey and her husband Sir Robert Carey for rearing, Prince Charles was the center of the salon — if only due to the rigid imperatives of royal protocol. Our author Elizabeth Cary, daughter of the extraordinarily wealthy Chief Baron of the Exchequer and wife of Sir Robert Carey's cousin, Sir Henry Cary, was the literary head of the salon, something akin to what Ben Jonson tried to attain in the household of King James.[9] It is this group that received and read the closet drama that is *The Tragedie of Mariam*.[10]

How this group read the closet drama is the second important misconstruction that has obscured the function of the features advertised in the title. Usually conceived of as being read silently to oneself, the play has been interpreted as what I might call a library play or a study play or a lamp play. That is, ingenious poetic features that reveal themselves only through solitary meditation, done presumably in one's own closet by oneself, have largely dominated published interpretations.[11] I believe these are valid, but not sufficient. Certainly the play can be read to oneself as a poem, much as Shakespeare's plays can. However, viewing the work as an actual production renders alternative interpretations, as with Shakespeare's plays. By production, though, I do not mean what those few who have taken a performance perspective have meant.[12] By production, I mean a salon reading, an event with features of the masque traditions as well as the household readings of sermons.[13] What the salon would do with a closet or coterie drama such as *Mariam* would be to assign the various parts to various members of the group to read aloud. Who read what parts in this salon remains highly speculative, at least with the current documents known. Prince Charles's role similarly is undocumented, but given royal protocol and the Lady of the house's civil duty, it is likely that Prince Charles was the focal point of the lectors' dramatic or at least forensic renditions.

In this context, instead of the print context of Chancery Lane, *The Tragedie of Mariam* reveals itself quite easily as a humanist document that mocks what it, and I, take to be the parochial medieval tradition of what Bernard Glassman says were, in the period, *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes without Jews*,[14] and the absurdly objectivist and reductionist early modern white supremacist equation of phonemic traits with moral worth, or what I call embodied racist white supremacy. That this coterie was intensely humanist, in contrast to the intensely Protestant household of the other prince, Henry, and the crypto-Catholic household of the queen, Anne, and the variously characterized households of the princess, Elizabeth, and the king, James, is suggested in numerous documents.[15] One such document is a report of the Venetian ambassador, Guistinian. Describing the quality of James's affection for the intellectual prince, the ambassador writes: "While talking on this point the young Duke of York, the King's second son, came in; he is the joy of the King, the Queen and all the Court. His Majesty began to laugh and play with him. In the course of his jokes he took up the Duke and said, 'My Lord Ambassador, you must make my son a Patrician of Venice."[16] While Henry gratified James's fantasy of being the defender of the faith,[17] Charles gratified his fantasy of being the learned philosopher king. The Carey salon cultivated such

possibilities for James in Charles through distinguishing itself from the competing cultural currents of the time in a recognizably intellectual manner.

One document suggestive of the learned, philosophical style is Cary's *Mariam*. Cary's play forges its humanistic themes through a layering of perspectives that can best be appreciated by gauging the characters and their statements dramatically in the social and coterie circumstances in which they were written and expressed. The humanist center is expressed simply and literally in Salome's husband's enunciation of the ideal of amicability. In rejecting the humble subordination of two of Herod's enemies who have been secretly preserved by him, Constabarus ingenuously exclaims:

> Oh, how you wrong our friendship, valiant youth!
> With friends there is not such a word as "debt":
> Where amity is tied with bond of truth,
> All benefits are there in common set.
> Then is the golden age with them renew'd,
> All names of properties are banish'd quite:
> Division, and distinction, are eschew'd:
> Each hath to what belongs to others right. (2.2.99-106

Constabarus describes the ideal condition of the Patrician class, and the scene makes clear, especially in contrast to the scenes of Salome and Herod and in comparison with the scenes of Pheroras and Graphina — an ideal romantic couple kept apart by the harsh political machinations of Pheroras's brother, Herod — that it is unironic, literal, pathetic.

In such humanistic context, the vernacular anti-Semitism that persisted in its medieval form can be seen as mocked, especially clearly in the dramatically ironic instances. For example, in the Mariam-Salome exchange that forms the third scene of the first act, Mariam insists upon her racial and moral superiority to Salome. Passionately responding to Salome's claim that Mariam depends upon her office for her status, Mariam snorts:

> Though I thy brother's face had never seen,
> My birth thy baser birth so far excell'd,
> I had to both of you the princess been.
> Thou parti-Jew, and parti-Edomite,
> Thou mongrel: issued from rejected race,
> Thy ancestors against the Heavens did fight. (1.3.232-37

In then insisting that both Mariam's ancestors and Salome's were "born of Adam, both made of Earth,/ And both did come from holy Abraham's line" (1.3.241-42 , Salome makes the common English Reformation argument against racial bigotry, represented conveniently and

contemporaneously elsewhere by Aemilia Lanyer's poem, *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum.*[18] Mariam immediately retorts to this defense by pressing Salome's active depravity:

> I favour thee when nothing else I say,
> With thy black acts I'll not pollute my breath:
> Else to thy charge I might full justly lay
> A shameful life, besides a husband's death. (1.3.243-46

Sensational just in the expression, this exchange is humorous to the salon in its dramatic irony. Although the characters fight over racial superiority, to an anti-Semitic English audience they are both simply Jews, never mind that the Idumeans were forcibly converted to Judaism by Hyrcanus I over the years 134-104 B.C.E. To the humanist coterie, however, the fact that both of the characters would be perceived as Jews by vernacular, Protestant English people and that those people would think in anti-Semitic fashion that the characters' Jewishness was the relevant fact, provided an additional layer of critical irony, since the humanist coterie would understand that the moral difference in the characters is the only thing that matters. Largely because she's not perfect, the heroine Mariam is clearly a sympathetic character, suggesting that the coterie itself is not anti-Semitic. Through its humanist vision, it employs the jokes of the others — here vernacular medievalism — to mock those who hold medieval attitudes towards Jews. English anti-Semites, the dramatically ironic context makes clear, entirely miss the point of being responsible for one's own moral character.

Like the way the play mocks medieval attitudes towards and moral assumptions about Jews, the play also mocks the nascent, proto-empirical white supremacist views of the vernacular culture. For instance, and as if to be highlighting the contrast between the medieval and the new, the scene following that between Mariam and Salome presents Salome alone and complaining in the language of the vernacular color complex which Hall documents as current in England at the time. The scene is rife with the discourse, but I will focus only on the play on words that evoke recognition of the white supremacist ethic. Complaining about not being able to divorce her current husband, Constabarus, in order to take on her new object of sexual passion, Salome moans, "And now, except I do the Hebrew wrong,/I cannot be the fair Arabian bride" (1.4.279-80 . Amphibolously, the locution draws on the color complex in its two parts. "Except I do the Hebrew wrong" is usually, and correctly, interpreted to mean that unless Salome violates Hebrew law forbidding women to seek a bill of divorce from their husbands, she cannot take on Silleus, the Arabian counselor she desires.[19] It also means, though, that unless Salome wrongs her husband, the Hebrew, she cannot take on Silleus. Referring to her obstacle-husband as "the Hebrew" clearly is denigrating in a racist

way. The line, "I cannot be the fair Arabian bride," similarly suggests dual references that draw on a poetics of color, one to herself, and the other to Silleus. Salome wants to be the "fair Arabian bride" in that she would become Arabian by marrying Silleus, and Silleus is the fair Arabian she is to be the bride of. The nascent white supremacy lies in "fair," meaning, of course, beautiful, but also phenotypically light, something the vernacular English considered neither Idumeans nor Arabians. Continuing in this vein, Salome is made to say that had she ever been fair, meaning just, she would have, when plotting to kill her first husband to take on her current husband, "blush'd at motion of the least disgrace:/ But [since she didn't] shame is gone, and honour wip'd away" (1.4.292-93 . The color complex, as Hall details it, played on the inability of darker peoples to blush as light skinned peoples sometimes do, as it also played on the white supremacist association of dark phenotype with the appearance of dirt on lighter phenotypes, so that a very common joke among white supremacists was expressed in pseudo-maxims that asserted the futility of doing something by comparing it to the futility of "washing the Ethiop clean."[20] In these lines, then, Cary's coterie understands that they draw on early modern white supremacist assertions that those who cannot blush are unchaste, since the chaste blush at all things sexual, and so the dark other, such as the Idumean Salome, is by birth unchaste. Moreover, Cary's coterie understands that having honour "wip'd away" is the obverse of "washing the Ethiop clean," which would be why Salome is dark, morally, as she asserts she is, as well as somatically, as the vernacular audience would imagine her to be. Cary's salon would understand these racist jokes and they would then distinguish themselves from those others who laugh at them by themselves laughing at the anti-humanistic absurdity of thinking that her character is hereditarily rather than culturally and personally shaped.

This layering of perspectives to mock vernacular cultural currents and to distinguish the prince's coterie from other cultural currents is pressed most in the presentation of the Chorus throughout the play, which is stipulated in the "Names of the Speakers" to be "a company of Jews" (65 . In the Chorus at the end of the first act, for instance, the company of speakers offers four stanzas of principles and two stanzas of application. The principles draw on a multitude of traditions. In each singular expression, the Chorus sounds cogent, but when coupled with any other of its expressions, it contradicts and is contradicted. For instance, the Chorus ends its first stanza with a statement about how foolish it is to seek when one does not have a single object to obtain: "Fond wretches, seeking what they cannot find,/For no content attends a wavering mind" (497-98 . Cogent enough. The second stanza affirms how foolish it is to have a definite object to seek, in this case, wealth:

"Thus step to step, and wealth to wealth they add,/Yet cannot all their plenty make them glad" (503-04 . Cogent enough, except when coupled with the sententia about needing an object to pursue. Perhaps both sententiae support the ultimate principle, the concluding couplet of the fourth stanza: "That man is only happy in his fate/That is delighted in a settled state" (515-16 , but for a company of Jews to be saying this at the onset of what Cary's culture's historiography construed as the beginning of the Christian era is dramatically ironic, as it is dramatically ironic that a company of Jews would affirm such a principle in medieval England. Cary's coterie laughs at this "company of Jews" in part because the coterie knows the vernacular populace laughs out of anti-Semitic prejudice, but more accurately the coterie laughs at the "company" because it is a "company." That is, a company, as in actors, is generally not educated as is a prince's coterie, and, because of the differences in education, especially in languages, a company often is comprised of persons who hold vernacular values, not humanistic ones. By contrast, the members of Prince Charles's household who spoke the various parts, unlike actors, are not called a company any more than are those who dance in masques. Cary's humanistic coterie, then, can be understood to laugh at those, such as King James and Prince Henry, who employ acting companies, since acting companies can only employ and hold vernacular values, some medieval, others early modern, few classical. In this way, the functions of medieval anti-Semitism and early modern white supremacy serve to delimit the coterie's own identity as classically secular — and so not anti-Semitic — and humanistic — and so not gratified by the operations of the newly formed color complex so popular in the other courts.[21]

Such an identity is clearly appealed to in the Chorus's two stanzas of application. Unequivocally blaming Mariam for her tortured, conflicted reaction to the news of Herod's death, which turns out to be a false report but nonetheless motivates the action of the first act — that is, the first act presents the reactions of Mariam, Salome, and some others to the mistaken news of Herod's death that they all take to be accurate — the Chorus sings in its final stanza:

> Were Herod now perchance to live again,
> She would again as much be grieved at that:
> All that she may, she ever doth disdain,
> Her wishes guide her to she knows not what.
> And sad must be their looks, their honour sour,
> That care for nothing being in their power. (523-28

The heavy-handed tip-off to Cary's humanist salon is the last word, "power," if it had not already thought the Chorus did not understand what it had seen, as many a company of actors seemed not to understand

what they performed. The focus on power and individual responsibility is dramatically ironic coming from a company and from Jews in medieval as well as in early modern cultural environments. Like Mariam subjected to the all-powerful tyrant Herod, companies and Jews were subjected to tyrannical social forces in England, forces that oppressed and exiled them when they did not, as Herod does Mariam, execute them. Cary's coterie, comprising women and men of elite but marginally elite ranks — because of his youth, poor health, intellectual inclinations, and secondary status to his elder brother and heir apparent Henry, Prince Charles possessed minimal influence — emphatically sympathized with Mariam because the group personally understood the utter shaping influence of social power above the individual, especially in a society of absolute monarchy. The Chorus blames Mariam for her conflicted attitudes and feelings, while Cary's coterie, in humanist fashion, would see immediately that the society Mariam is subjected to engenders her suffering. Mariam's tragedy is heightened by the cognizance that she is blamed for suffering at the hands of unjust power, even by those who also suffer from the actions of that power but do not realize their own complicity.

A further irony emphasizes the Chorus's failure to understand reality as humanists conceptualize it. Firmly condemning any desire for any kind of diverseness, the Chorus interprets the foiling of character between Mariam and Salome as one of highlighting similarities rather than differences. The Chorus sings that "Still Mariam wish'd she from her lord were free,/For expectation of variety" (517-18 . While it is true that both Mariam and Salome desire variety, the quality of the variety is markedly different. Salome desires sexual and matrimonial variety, whereas Mariam desires variety of conversation companions, something the grotesquely jealous Herod cannot abide. Mariam also values a variety of emotional experiences as they, like a variety of conversation companions, help her explore the contours of her humanity. In this, Mariam resembles Pico's chameleon, a great emblem of Renaissance humanity.[22] Salome, by contrast, resembles medieval lust.[23] That the Chorus misinterprets kinds of variety and conflates all kinds together would be sardonically contemned by the humanistic coterie. And such sardonic contempt would be humorously elicited through intonation and gesture by the coterie speakers who comprised the company of Jews as well as by the reactions of those who were listening.

Such ironic layering may be obscure to a culture such as ours that values the literal over the ironic, especially in historical documents, and that labours under modem essentialist discourses of the self. To such an audience, the anti-Semitism and white supremacy of *The Tragedie of Mariam,* T*he Faire Oueene of Iewry* may appear to be its author's rather than its culture's. Foucauldian historicism and literary biography, however, can challenge the hegemony of such a modern hermeneutic.[24]

In challenging usual assumptions, not only are Cary and her play represented in a more ethical mode, but the critique of racist white supremacy also gains a history coeval with the construction of the dehumanizing, murderous discourse. Further, the function of Cary's medievalism, that is, of the employment of medieval anti-Semitic prejudice in the critique of early modern white supremacy, locates precisely the confluence of several discourses culturally and socially. And through such locating actions, finally, we can better assess the usefulness of Renaissance humanist texts to our post modern projects, academic, political, personal.

University of Northern Iowa

NOTES

1. See, for instance, the collection of essays edited by Joyce Green MacDonald, *Race, Ethnicity. and Power in the Renaissance*, Cranbury, NJ: Associate UP , 1997, or the "Forum: Race and the Study of Shakespeare," edited by Margo Hendricks, *Shakespeare Studies* 26, ed. Leeds Barroll, Cranbury, NJ: Associated UP, 1998.
2. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1995.
3. For "race" being defined in terms of "a distinct ethnical stock," the OED records the earliest such usage in the nineteenth century (2c. 1971 . For "ethnic" being defined in biological terms (i.e., as "stock" , the OED similarly records the earliest such usage in the nineteenth century (2. 1971 . Before the nineteenth century, "ethnic" was a religious term, not at all inextricably linked to the body. "Ethnic" referred to non-Christian, pagan people, as in John Milton's disdainful treatment of the inclusion of Sir Philip Sidney's "Pamela's Prayer" in the *Eikon Basilike*. Milton writes in *Eikonoklastes* that Charles and his apologists fell into God's "foolish trap as hath exposed them to all derision" for including "without being able to discern the affront [to God] rather than the worship of such an ethnic prayer" (Milton, *The Complete Prose Works*, 8 vols., gen. ed. Don M. Wolfe. New Haven: Yale UP, 1953-1982. VoI. 3, p. 364. . The ethnicity of the prayer does not derive from a genealogy but, rather, from the specifically religious connections. Before the nineteenth century, people could change their ethnicity, as did Leo Africanus, sixteenth-century historian of Africa and convert to Christianity patronized by Leo X, by professing Christian values, or, according to Milton, as did Charles I by falling away from Christian piety.
4. "Antiquity and Degeneration in *Antony and Cleopatra*," *Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance*, ed. Joyce Green MacDonald. Cranbury, NJ: Associated UP, 1997. pp. 145-64.
5. For a history of anti-black, white supremacist attitudes in the west as beginning in the early modern period, see, for example, Jan Nederveen Pieterse, *White on Black: Images of Africa and Blacks in Western Popular Culture*, New Haven: Yale UP, 1992, and, especially, Frank M. Snowden, Jr., *Before Color Prejudice: The Ancient View of Blacks*, Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1983.
6. On Chaucer, see, for instance, John Archer, "The Structure of Anti-Semitism in the *Prioress's Tale*." *Chaucer Review* 19 (1984 : 46-54; Albert B. Friedman, "The *Prioress's Tale* and Chaucer's Anti-Semitism." *Chaucer Review* 9 (1974 : 118-29; Emmy Stark Zitter, "Anti-Semitism in Chaucer's *Prioress's Tale*." *Chaucer Review* 25 (1991 : 277-84. On Shakespeare, see, for instance, Janet Adelman, "Iago's Alter Ego: Race as Projection in *Othello*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48 (1997 : 12544; Dympna Callaghan, "'Othello was a white man': Properties of Race on Shakespeare's Stage." *Alternative*

Shakespeares 2, ed. Terence Hawkes. London: Routledge, 1996. Pp. 192-215; Walter S. H. Lim, *The Arts of Empire: The Poetics of Colonialism from Ralegh to Milton*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1998; Joyce Green MacDonald, " Acting Black: *Othello*, *Othello* Burlesques, and the Performance of Blackness." *Theatre Journal* 46 (1994 : 231-49; Michael Neill, "'Mulattos,' 'Blacks,' and' Indian Moors' : *Othello* and Early Modern Constructions of Human Difference." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 49 (1998 : 361-74; James Shapiro, *Shakespeare and the Jews*. New York: Columbia UP, 1996; Virginia Mason Vaughan, *Othello*: *A Contextual History*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. On Cary, see, for example, Suzy Beemer, "Masks of Blackness, Masks of Whiteness: Coloring the (Sexual Subject in Jonson, Cary, and Fletcher." *Thamyris* 4 (1997 : 223-47; Dympna Callaghan, "Re-Reading Elizabeth Cary's *The Tragedy of Mariam, Faire Queene of Jewry*." *Women, "Race," and Writing in the Early Modern Period*, ed. Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker. London: Routledge, 1994. Pp. 163- 77; Kim F. Hall, "Beauty and the Beast of Whiteness: Teaching Race and Gender." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 47 (1996 : 461-75.

7. Explaining how Cary's play represents "an extended constitutional critique of the basic terms of the civil order" (147 , which is the "founding inequality" (137 of the law subjecting women to men, Laurie J. Shannon, in "The Tragedie of Mariam: Cary's Critique of the Terms of Founding Social Discourse," *ELR* 24 (1994 : 135-53, sees Cary's play elaborating "the moral implications of the issues that absorbed the century before it and would contort the century that followed" (137 in a way that suggests a critical distance on the part of the author as well as "what I salute here as a feminist or reforming wisdom" (153 . Cary is seen as presenting and critiquing early modern anti-feminist founding discourse.
8. On the resiliency of medieval anti-Semitism, see, for instance, Richard Utz, "The Medieval Myth of Jewish Ritual Murder: Toward a History of Literary Reception," *The Year's Work in Medievalism XIV* (1999 : 23-36. For the obscuring tendencies in Shakespearean criticism, see Margo Hendricks, "'Obscured by dreams': Race, Empire, and Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 47 (1996 : 37-60. On how to help people see whiteness, see, for instance, Kim F. Hall, "Beauty and the Beast of Whiteness: Teaching Race and Gender," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 47 (1999 : 461-75; Peter Erickson, "Seeing White," *Transition* 67 (1995 : 166-85; Richard Dyer, *White*, London: Routledge, 1997; and Bell Hooks, *Killing Rage, Ending Racism*, New York: Henry Holt, 1995.
9. Cary and her husband Henry were second cousins to Sir Robert Carey and his wife Elizabeth, the latter "having charge of the Duke of York" during his minority (qt. from CSP-Domestic 1609: 527. The Duke of York at this time is, of course, Prince Charles, later Charles I. . The state papers and extant personal correspondence detail the lavish existence of this group, which includes an extraordinary entry into London by Elizabeth Cary and her husband Henry as well as many royal fund dispersals, a large but not wholly unrepresentative one being on 20 February 1611 for over 4,677 pounds "to Lady Carey" for rearing the royal boy (see *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. Norman Egbert McClure. II vols. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, I: 273- 74; CSP-domestic 1611-1618: 11 *et passim* . Sir Robert was the youngest son of Sir Henry Carey, the first Baron Hunsdon, first cousin of Elizabeth I and her Lord Chamberlain of the Household, and Sir Robert, like his father, was a favorite of Elizabeth I. Sir Robert, though, made his greatest move in being the first to convey the news of the queen's death to James VI in Scotland. From this point on, Sir Robert surpassed all his elder brothers in advancement throughout his career, eventually to the Earldom of Monmouth with Charles's ascension to the throne.
10. Rosemary Kegl, in "Theaters, Households, and a 'Kind of History' in Elizabeth Cary's *Tragedy of Mariam*," *Enacting Gender on the Eng:lish Renaissance Stage*, ed. Viviana Comensoli and Anne Russell. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1999. Pp. 135-53, stresses the household tradition of dramatic performances in interpreting *Mariam* in relation to the more public theatrical tradition more commonly thought of, though she does not

locate a specific household as I am suggesting. The household and theatrical traditions create a crisis in genre for Kegl and lead her to a considerably different conclusion than mine about the play's engagement of racialized issues. Mariam is seen "to offer a dynastic 'kind of history' that would challenge her husband's authority precisely by discrediting his family name," and this dynastic kind of history offered by Mariam also 'solves' what has become a gender problem for the play — subduing Mariam's unseemly challenge to her husband's dynastic authority while managing to retain the ethnic, national, and religious hierarchies on which she had based her objections" (149 . For convenience, all citations to *Mariam* are to the edition by Barry Weller and Margaret W. Ferguson, *The Tragedy of Mariam The Fair Queen of Jewry*, Berkeley: U of California P, 1994.

11. For a recent such essay, see Susan B. Iwanisziw, "Conscience and the Disobedient Female Consort in the Closet Dramas of John Milton and Elizabeth Cary," *Milton Studies* 36 (1998 : 109-22. For a recent analysis of the play in relation to a biography of Cary written by one of her daughters and Cary's historical source, *The Famous and Memorable Works of Josephus*, tr. Thomas Lodge, London: 1602, see Naomi J. Miller, "Domestic Politics in Elizabeth Cary's T*he Tragedy of Mariam*," *SEL* 37 (1997 : 353-69. Two richly rewarding expositions employing such close study are Shari A. Zimmerman, "Disaffection, Dissimulation, and the Uncertain Ground of Silent Dismission: Juxtaposing John Milton and Elizabeth Cary," *ELH* 66 (1999 : 553-89; and Nancy A. Gutierrez, "Valuing *Mariam*: Genre Study and Feminist Analysis," *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 10 (1991 : 233-51.
12. Some performance considerations are given by Alexandra G. Bennett, "Female Performativity in *The Tragedy of Mariam*." *SEL* 40 (2000 : 293-309; Alison Findlay, Gweno Williams, and Stephanie J. Hodgson-Wright, "'The Play Is Ready To Be Acted': Women and Dramatic Production, 1570-1670." *Women's Writing* 6 (1999 : 29-48; and Jonas Barish, "Language for the Study; Language for the Stage," *The Elizabethan Theatre XII.*, ed. A. L. Magnusson and C. E. McGee, Toronto: P. D. Meany, 1987, pp. 19-43, who sees Cary's closet play as being the most theatrical of the closet plays of the period. Also see Kegl, note 10.
13. A superb study of the effect of literary salon customs on literary production is Julie D. Campbell's "'Foolish Sport,' 'Delightful Games,' and 'Sweet Discourse': Intertextuality and the Inscription of Literary Circle Ritual in Sidney's *Arcadia*, Wroth's *Urania*, and Weamys's *Continuation* of the *Arcadia,*" in *Critical Approaches to Eng:lish Prose Fiction* 1520-1640, ed. Donald Beecher, Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 1998, pp. 63-84.
14. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1975.
15. Prince Charles's court was, arguably, the least influential of the royal courts before November 1612, the month Henry, the Prince ofWales and heir apparent, died. The courts of Prince Henry and Princess Elizabeth were very Protestant ones, while the court of Queen Anne was crypto-Catholic if not actually Catholic (see David Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984; David M. Bergeron, *Royal Family, Royal Lovers: King James of England and Scotland*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1991 . James's has been variously characterized, David Norbrook (*Poetry and Politics*, pp. 197-201 doing so by focusing on its preference for the spectacular and sensual over the political or doctrinal. Though initially least influential, Charles's court became, *de facto*, quite important, at least after November 1612. Prince Charles's court is best understood as the product of the interplay amongst the more dominant and influential royal courts during the first decade of James's reign. See also Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I.* New Haven: Yale UP , 1992.
16. CSP-Venetian, 11: 95.
17. See, for example, W. B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. P. 40; and, especially, Roy Strong, *Henry Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1986.

18 . *The Poems of Aemelia Lanyer: Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*. Ed. Susanne Woods. New York: Oxford UP, 1993.

19. Weller and Ferguson's notes suggest such an interpretation, for instance.

20. See the emblem, "Aethiopem lauare" in Geoffrey Whitney's *A Choice of Emblems*. 1586, reproduced by Hall, *Things of Darkness*, p. 68.

21. Famously, Shakespeare's *Othello*, known then simply as "The Moor of Venis," was one of the first plays composed and performed for King James at Whitehall, and Ben Jonson's *Masque of Blackness* was the first masque composed and performed for Queen Anne. See E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1930. Vol. 2, p. 331; *Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques*, ed. Stephen Orgel, New Haven: Yale UP , 1969.

22. See Pico della Mirandola, *Oration on the Dig:nity of Man*. Tr. A. Robert Caponigri. Intr. Russell Kirk. Chicago: Gateway Editions, 1956.

23. On Medieval lust, see St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*. New York: Blackfriars with McGraw-Hill, 1964-1976. 2a2ae, 153 and 154.

24. This is an essay in Foucauldian historicism. In addition to the well known corpus of writings of Michel Foucault, see the cogent collection of lesser known, dispersed writing, *Religion and Culture*, ed. Jeremy R. Carrette. New York: Routledge, 1999.