

11-2014

Translation and Community in the work of Elizabeth Cary

Deborah Uman

St. John Fisher College, duman@sjfc.edu

[How has open access to Fisher Digital Publications benefited you?](#)

Follow this and additional works at: http://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/english_facpub



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Publication Information

Uman, Deborah (2014). "Translation and Community in the work of Elizabeth Cary." *Material Cultures of Early Modern Women's Writing: Production, Transmission, and Reception*, 76-98.

Please note that the Publication Information provides general citation information and may not be appropriate for your discipline. To receive help in creating a citation based on your discipline, please visit <http://libguides.sjfc.edu/citations>.

This document is posted at http://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/english_facpub/13 and is brought to you for free and open access by Fisher Digital Publications at St. John Fisher College. For more information, please contact fisherpub@sjfc.edu.

Translation and Community in the work of Elizabeth Cary

Abstract

Explores the role of female community within Elizabeth Cary's translations and her play, *The Tragedy of Mariam*.

Keywords

fsc2015

Disciplines

English Language and Literature

Comments

Uman, Deborah, *Translation and Community in the work of Elizabeth Cary*, 2014, Palgrave Macmillan. Reproduced with permission of Palgrave Macmillan.

This extract is taken from the author's original manuscript and has not been edited. The definitive, published, version of record is available here: <http://www.palgrave.com/us/book/9781137342423>

[Find this book at your library.](#)

[Buy this book on Amazon.](#)

Translation and Community in the work of Elizabeth Cary

Deborah Uman

Elizabeth Cary's literary career was bracketed by translations. Her first known work, *The Mirror of the Worlde* (1598), was written in early adolescence and is a translation from the French of regional descriptions by Abraham Ortelius that he wrote to accompany maps in a world atlas. Cary's last published text, which reportedly she thought of as her finest endeavor, is *The Reply of the Most Illustrious Cardinall of Perron* (1630), a translation that Cary used to gain entry into political and religious debates that were of particular importance to her as a convert to Catholicism. At present her most famous work, *The Tragedy of Mariam* (1631), a Senecan drama that adapts the writings of Josephus, is, I suggest, rooted within and indebted to early modern translation practices, practices that contributed significantly to the material conditions of women's writing during this period.¹ Over the last two decades, critical attention has turned to translations produced by early modern women, quickly shifting from an initial view that the practice limited women to subservient literary roles to analyses of the complex set of authorial choices and negotiations that go into producing even the most 'faithful' translations.² In my own work on the subject, I have argued that translation, which even now is often viewed as an uninspired or menial activity, gave women entry into the rich literary culture of the Renaissance. By considering how female translators represent themselves and their work, we can see that translation reflects the limitations women faced while simultaneously giving them the opportunity to transcend these limitations.³ Additionally, as an activity that is inherently collaborative, translation offers a valuable model for viewing the complexity of female literary authority. I have found a thematic emphasis on female community in the work of many women translators, an emphasis that reflects, revises and complicates the practice of collaboration between female translator and the absent and usually male author. The discursive communities depicted in women's translations may also underscore the historical communities that facilitated women's participation in translation activities. In this essay I revisit my

theories of translation as collaborative authorship, reading *The Tragedy of Mariam* in conjunction with her translations. While Cary's *Reply* is dedicated to Queen Henrietta Maria and recognizes Catholic women's ability and need to cooperate in promoting religious tolerance and acceptance, her *Mariam* amplifies the animosity among women that appears in her source, challenging any easy connection between female community and women's writing and instead highlighting the danger of women's public speech. By looking at Cary's literary output as a whole, I consider how her changing sense of the collaborative potential of translation contributes to our understanding of the authorial roles available to women during the early modern period.

Women and Translation in Early Modern England

When studying the material conditions of women's writing, we need to consider translation both as part of those conditions and also informed by those conditions. Given the remarkable number of female translators during this time, no picture of women's writing in the early modern period would be complete without looking at translation. Working against the belief that public writing was particularly scandalous for them, women may have understood translation as offering a valuable loophole in avoiding the stigma of print, since it was often seen as part of an appropriately virtuous education and the process could be understood as advancing the voice of the original author rather than the translator. Viewed in this context, translation thus helped women enter the literary sphere while seeming to adhere to the holy trinity of chastity, silence, and obedience. Initial discussions of women's translation in the early modern period tended to see the practice as giving women little opportunity to transcend these restrictions. In contrast to Tina Krontiris' suggestion that translation "called for a relatively passive role" and Mary Ellen Lamb's claim that literal translations did not give women access to any authorial voice, Micheline White argues that translators saw themselves as "powerful cultural agents."⁴ The potential for such contrasting opinions, even in recent scholarship, points to the conditions that fostered the practice. Although, as Brenda Hosington has rightly pointed out, the works themselves belie 'old claims that translation was a

safe and silent task,' its appearance as such was, I suggest, a critical factor in the flourishing of translations by women during this time.⁵ The choices in what women translated (and their abilities to translate at all) were similarly linked to innumerable cultural influences both at the micro-level of an individual's education, her linguistic skills, her access to texts, and the support she received from families and friends, and at the macro-level in terms of prevailing views of appropriate female behavior, publishing demands, and religious and political controversies, to name a few. Indeed, historical and cultural developments such as the Protestant Reformation and the concomitant elevation of the written vernacular, the rise of humanism, increasing literacy rates among women and laypeople, and emerging articulations of national sentiment, all contributed to the growing role of translation and women's engagement with it in the early modern period.

As has been widely acknowledged, a number of humanist educators sanctioned the practice of translation, specifically of religious works. Advocates for women's education, such as Thomas More and Richard Hyrde, put their theories into practice and taught the girls and women within their domestic spheres. It is not surprising that several prominent women in these circles, including Margaret More Roper, Elizabeth (Cooke) Russell, and her sister Anne (Cooke) Bacon, encouraged to pursue their desire for knowledge, followed their teachers' advice, and produced some remarkable prose translations of religious works.⁶ Such work was not uncontroversial. That women might bring their interpretive and revisionary skills to the practice of reading and translating religious texts was of grave concern to leaders of church and state even as the Reformation brought about increased access to vernacular Bibles and other sacred works. The new accessibility of the Bible also underscores the polyvalence of scripture. If anyone can read the Bible, then anyone can interpret its meaning. Concern over the fragmentation of biblical doctrine led to an Act of Parliament during the reign of Henry VIII that attempted to abolish this 'diversity of opinions' by forbidding women, except for noble and gentlewomen, and men in various occupations, to read the New Testament.⁷ Elizabeth Cary's most explicitly religious work, her translation of Cardinal Perron's *Reply*, wades directly into such controversy as she engages in a dangerous critique of

the Church of England, including ‘a specific request that the king recognize the spiritual authority of the pope.’⁸

In translating plays about the ancient Greek and Roman empires, Jane Lumley, Mary Sidney Herbert and Katherine Philips forsake religious subjects, though their projects are still closely linked to humanist theories of education. Lumley’s translation of Euripides’ *The Tragedie of Iphigeneia*, in particular, was likely a school project that the young translator then presented to her father, Henry Fitzalan, the twelfth earl of Arundel, who took great care to educate both his daughters and his son. Despite the fact that facility with Greek was less common than leading humanist pedagogues might have wished, Lumley’s exercise of translating a classical play demonstrates that at least one elite young woman received at home a course of instruction that mirrored that of young men educated in Oxford and Cambridge.⁹ Curricula in the sixteenth-century classroom included numerous Latin dramatists, and students frequently translated or imitated sections of plays, particularly orations and declamations that provided models of inquiry and persuasion that would equip young men ‘for responsible public life.’¹⁰ Cary’s translation of Ortelius, which she dedicated to her uncle Sir Henry Lee, is another example of an academic exercise produced by a ‘bookish, multilingual, humanist-educated’ adolescent¹¹ and her presentation of it to the most prominent member of her family suggests that having a scholar-daughter may reflect well on an up-and-coming household.¹² The atlas genre, while not directly about ancient Greece and Rome, demonstrates an interest in the world at large and may offer a critique of imperialism offered from a woman’s perspective, a critique that is also implicit in the dramatic translations of Lumley, Sidney Herbert and Philips.¹³ Additionally, *The Tragedy of Mariam*, often described as the first original play in English by a woman, fits squarely into the genre of Senecan drama, practiced by Lumley and Sidney Herbert, which helped women avoid any obvious stain from the common stage while paving the way for Katherine Philips to craft a dramatic translation for the public stage.¹⁴

In addition to or perhaps because of the number of female translators during the early modern period, the practice was also associated with women on a metaphorical level as is suggested by John Florio’s oft-quoted characterization of his translation of Montaigne as ‘this defective edition (since all

translations are reputed female)' ¹⁵ and the seventeenth-century adage 'like women, translations should be either beautiful or faithful.'¹⁶ Given that he dedicates this work to Lucy, Countess of Bedford and her mother Lady Anne Harrington, Florio's description of translation as female and defective can certainly be read ironically, and the complexity of the allusion, as Jonathan Goldberg has shown, undermines the simplicity of Florio's initial equation.¹⁷ Nevertheless, in examining the language used by translators and theorists, Lori Chamberlain has found frequent gendered metaphors for translation that link women and inferiority, matching the common belief that women are naturally the inferior sex. Chamberlain calls for a feminist theory that does not simply transform translation from a reproductive activity into a productive one but rather uses collaboration as a model for the combined efforts of author and translator.¹⁸ Such a theory is reflected in some early modern perspectives on translation, such as the Earl of Roscommon's use of the language of friendship when advising would-be translators on how to decide what to translate. Describing the ideal author/friend as the translator's other self, as his intimate beloved, Roscommon imitates the rhetoric of Aristotle and Montaigne, a rhetoric that Jeffrey Masten also finds in Florio's translation of Montaigne's *Essays*, revealing 'a complex negotiation of the issues at the nexus of homoeroticism, male friendship and collaboration.' Masten argues that collaboration provides an appropriate interpretive model for Renaissance discourse because it 'acknowledges language as a process of exchange' and does not focus on 'policing discourse off into agents, origins, and intentions.'¹⁹ For Chamberlain, however, Roscommon's emphasis on male friendship and his typical figuring of the text as a female whose chastity must be protected creates the image of a blank page that 'is impossibly twice virgin – once for the original author, and again for the translator who has taken his place.'²⁰ Finally, it is this female chastity that 'resolves – or represses – the struggle for paternity' between author and translator and underlies, and possibly undermines, Roscommon's optimistic view of collaborative translation.²¹

Among early modern female translators, there are numerous examples whose focus on collaboration and female communities seems to answer Chamberlain's call for a feminist theory of translation. For Mary Sidney Herbert, whose coterie of readers and writers was central to her reputation as both a patron and a poet, her method for circulating her writing among her household suggests a

collaborative project that fits well both with the practice of translation and a focus on communal forms of expression and instruction. Sidney Herbert describes a process of collaboration in her prefatory poem ‘To the Angell spirit of the most excellent Sir Phillip Sidney’; here she describes the complicated process of brother and sister working together to translate into English the words of David, who himself is said to have been transcribing the words of God:

To thee pure sprite, to thee alone’s adres’t
 this coupled worke, by double int’reſt thine:
 First rais’de by thy bleſt hand, and what is mine
 inſpired by thee, thy ſecrett power impreſt.
 So dar’d my Muſe with thine it ſelfe combine,
 as mortall ſtuffe with that which is divine.²² (1-6)

The frequent shifting between first and second person pronouns and the images of coupling and combining in this stanza reflect the intricacy of this process and suggest the potential both for rivalry and for intimacy between the sister and brother poets. Sidney Herbert’s language matches Masten’s description of early modern collaboration as a process that seems to reinscribe the hierarchy of male dominance and the superiority of originality but ultimately requires the ‘dispersal of authority’ and is an act of mutual friendship, sexual enjoyment and *jouissance*.²³ Several critics have looked at the feminist possibilities of collaboration, focusing on it as both a strategy for resistance and a reflection of women’s defined identities in relation to others.²⁴ Viewing translation as a collaboration that is neither fully the creation of the original author nor of its translator allows us to understand collaborative practices as a type of ‘third term’ that destabilizes categories of originality and imitation.²⁵ The dispersal of authority present in such works allows Sidney Herbert to challenge the perceived inferiority of her ‘secondary creations’ and to play with preconceived notions of authority. Going even further, Aemilia Lanyer, who prefaces her creative revision of scripture with numerous dedications to various women—Sidney Herbert included—uses *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* to suggest that a community of learned women can challenge the gender hierarchy that insists on women’s secondary status.²⁶ She does this by reimagining Eden as an

all-female paradise in which the love shared among women is of singular importance, as valuable and as dangerous as learning among women can be.

Lanyer's paratextual material also highlights the role of readers within this collaborative model. As Patricia Demers reminds us, 'the act of translation invites and requires company,' which involves at minimum, 'a source text, a target language and audience, including critical, skeptical readers, and a translator (or translators) who is/are willing, eager, capable and, occasionally, commissioned.'²⁷ The community of readers for Cary's *Reply*, including most notably Queen Henrietta Maria, played a vital role in her choice of text and even the shape of her translation. As Karen Nelson explains, Cary's work participates in the religious debates of the 1630s stemming from questions about Henrietta Maria's role in court and the country. While contributing to the conversation defending 'Catholicism's essential nature,' Cary's framing of the translation shows her active engagement with 'a rather large company of connected, powerful Catholics.'²⁸ And if, as Cary suggests in her preface, her goal is proselytizing, then the reader response to her work is equally important to her sense of the translation's purpose. While Cary's final publication fits squarely with the model of female community that I have suggested has been necessary for, or at least emblematic of women's translation, *The Tragedy of Mariam* depicts a fictional landscape in which all the women are at odds with one another. The play's relationships between women stand in stark contrast to several idealized friendships between men. Reading this play in the context of Cary's more straightforward translations gives us the opportunity to reconsider this model of female community as a critical facilitator of female literary authority.

Elizabeth Cary and Translation

Early in *The Lady Falkland her Life* (ca. 1655), Cary's biographer emphasizes the young Elizabeth's facility with learning languages and her lifelong devotion to translation:

When she was but four or five year old they put her to learn French, which she did about five weeks and, not profiting at all, gave it over. After, of herself, without a teacher, whilst she was a child, she learnt French, Spanish, Italian, which she always understood

very perfectly. She learnt Latin in the same manner (without being taught) and understood it perfectly when she was young, and translated the Epistles of Seneca out of it into English; after having long discontinued it, she was much more imperfect in it, so as a little afore her death, translating some (intending to have done it all had she lived) of Blossius out of Latin, she was fain to help herself somewhat with the Spanish translation. Hebrew she likewise, about the same time, learnt with very little teaching; but for many year neglecting it, she lost it much; yet not long before her death, she again beginning to use it, could in the Bible understand well, in which she was most perfectly well read.²⁹

Even if this account is hyperbolic, Cary's extant writings and the many praises she received from other writers focusing on her linguistic abilities confirm her impressive talent for and dedication to translation. Praising Cary in the preface to his 1597 *Heroicall Epistles*, Michael Drayton points to the sweetness of the Italian and French tongues 'if spoken by your admired self.'³⁰ Likewise, John Davies includes Cary in his dedicatory poem to *The Muses Sacrifice* (1612), writing of her, 'Art, Language, yea, abstruse and holy tongues, / they wit and grace acquired thy fame to raise; / And still to fill thy own and others' songs; / thine with thy parts and others' with thy praise.'³¹ Marta Straznicky argues convincingly that by linking Cary to Mary Sidney Herbert and Lucy, Countess of Bedford, Davies strongly suggests that Cary was connected to the 'most prominent female literary figures of her time' and that she was, in some way, included in the network of writers often called the Sidney circle.³² In this way, Davies proposes the importance of a literary community for women. His description also highlights (though cryptically) the collaborative nature of translation, suggesting a practice that requires an act of combination (of Cary's songs and parts with others') that can lead to improvement upon the original and fame for the translator.³³ Although Cary never describes directly her own thoughts or theories about translation, her work suggests contextual shifts in her thoughts on the collaborative potential of her endeavors.

Cary's *The Mirror of the Worlde*, was likely produced in 1597 when she was eleven or twelve years old. In her meticulous edition of this work, Lesley Peterson offers a thorough analysis and comparison of Cary's work to the original, concluding that Cary was relying on the 1588 and 1590 editions of *L'Epitome du Théâtre du Monde d'Abraham Ortelius* and noting that the translation is very close to Ortelius' with only occasional errors, omissions and paraphrasing and 'no instances of extended revision, invention, or interpolation.'³⁴ The few subtle changes that Cary did make, along with the *Mirror's* clear enthusiasm for

Italy and its occasional references to female inhabitants, suggest to Peterson that long before Cary wrote *The Tragedy of Mariam* and *The Reply*, she was balancing her respect for authority with a frequent need to challenge traditional beliefs and that these challenges included an interest in a ‘Roman alternative to Protestantism’ and a keen sense of the limitations placed on women’s intellectual and physical freedom.³⁵ Of particular note to a discussion of translation as collaboration is Peterson’s point that the *Mirror* shows Elizabeth Cary ‘as one who understands herself to be a reader and writer among other readers and writers, and one who is concerned to understand her identity in terms of her relationship to other individuals and other communities. These include communities united by family ties, scholarly interests, national identity, and religion.’³⁶

This sense of seeing herself as part of a community is particularly evident in Cary’s dedication to her uncle, Sir Henry Lee, which I reproduce here in its brief entirety:

To the righte honorable my Singular good
Uncle Sr Henry Lee knighte
of the moste noble order of
the garter.

Receive here honorable Sir my humble presente, the fruite and endeavours of my younge and tender yeares, an acknowledgement of my bounden duty to you[.] for though I can no way sufficiently expresse my gratefulness for many your great favours nor presente to you any thinge worthy of your selfe yet give mee leave I humbly beseech you to present to you this little treatise, the viewe of the whole wolde[,], as a thinge beste awnserable to your moste noble disposition, leaving to your considerate judgemente & wise regarde the controule of what is herein amisse to be reformed by the experience of your many yeares travailes abroade in the worlde. And as riper yeares shall afforde mee better fruite with greater judgement I shall be ever ready to present you with the best of my travailes.

Your ever obediente
Neece
E Tanfelde

Cary’s flattering address, her evident humility, and her choice of metaphors to represent her work are certainly conventional, as is her sense of obligation and gratitude towards her uncle. But she also depicts her translation almost as a living document, something that responds to Lee’s interests and that will change based on his experiences. Her repeated use of the word ‘travailes’ to mean both travels and painful exertion yokes together the physical explorations that her uncle is at liberty to take and her seemingly more limited intellectual explorations of which this translation is an example.³⁷ The additional

meaning of travails as the labor and pain of childbirth only underscores the gendered differences between their possible sets of experiences as well as the view of translation as the product of two parents, one male and one female. In this way we can understand the recurrence of the word (and the related references to her work as ‘fruits’) as highlighting the difference between dedicator and dedicatee. At the same time, Cary’s prediction of her future travails, whether physical or intellectual, suggests that the distinguishing factor between them is their respective ages rather than their genders. Moreover, although Cary takes pains to recognize Lee’s contribution to this treatise, her title, ‘The mirror of the Worlde translated Out of French into Englishe by ET’ curiously omits the name of the text’s ‘true father,’ the French author Ortelius, thus giving Cary considerable room for self-promotion within a genre that features self-effacement.

While Cary’s relationship with her uncle underscores the communal nature of her translation efforts, the translation itself figures the theme of community in its reiteration that geographic parts must function together to create a greater whole. *The Mirror* takes as its premise the constant division of the world; the treatise begins with a section entitled, ‘The universall worlde,’ which is then divided into ‘Europa,’ ‘Asia,’ ‘Africa,’ and ‘The new worlde.’ Descriptions of regions or countries within each of these four sections follow and these too are quickly divided; for example, under the heading of England we learn that the island once called Albion is split into the southern region of England and Northern Scotland, while Spain contains fourteen realms, including ‘Portingall,’ until its split from Spain in the year 1100. In various sections, *The Mirror* discusses the geographical and historical reasons for such divisions, recognizing the political, religious, and linguistic implications of nationalist movements and empire building. The tone used to describe these cultural shifts is generally neutral, but the work’s most laudatory language is reserved for those regions that are nonviolent and recognize the value of cooperation and governance by consensus rather than by conquest.³⁸ For instance, the country of Swetland (Switzerland) ‘is peaceably governed without any superior...by 13 leagued townes confæderate together by oath’ (181), and the inhabitants of Sardinia, while rustic and simple, are kind to strangers and ‘neither make nor have any offensive weapons’ (191).

The Mirror also suggests that community building is a feminine alternative to the masculine model of violent conquest. In its praise of Italy, *The Mirror* links good government and education, referring to the region as ‘the Queene of Christendome, and the princesse of the world which by her force and poure haith bene reduced under her obedience and by her learning and doctrine haith bene instructed and trained up in politique manners, laws and customes’ (182).³⁹ While acknowledging Rome’s empire-building, this passage seems to value *translatio studii* over *translatio imperii* in its emphasis on instruction and its feminine metaphor for Italy as both ruler and teacher. The next sentence shifts to men, but again the focus is not on violent conquest. Instead Italy’s ‘wise men’ are praised for having studied ‘all those things which he thinketh may serve for the attaining of some science, as the knowledge of many tongues, languges, Physick, Lawe, Astronomy or Theology’ (182). We see a literal community of women in the description of Greece, which, Peterson explains, is ‘one of the freer translations’ in Cary’s project.⁴⁰ Here *The Mirror* depicts the mourning habits of women; ‘when any one deceaseth they assemble themselves in a certaine deputed place, and in the mourning before daie they begin to roare, beate their brestes, scratt their cheeks, and teare their haire....Amonge the reste they chuse out a woman that haith a goode voice and smoeth bigger then the reste, to raise the noyse, beginning and letting fall her voice’ (196-197). Peterson links this scene to Cary’s *Mariam* in recognizing the ‘transformative effect’ of women’s suffering. The movement between the group and the individual also provides a model of collaboration that simultaneously facilitates individual expression – a model of collaboration similar to the practice of translation.

Over thirty years after dedicating *The Mirror* to her uncle, Cary published *The Reply of the Most Illustrious Cardinall of Perron*, a text that ‘was the culmination of a controversy begin in 1614-15, when Jacques Davy, Cardinal Du Perron, addressed an Assembly of the Estates General regarding a proposed oath...that was primarily designed to defend the crown against the right of papal deposition.’⁴¹ While clearly a politically dangerous project, the *Reply* is one of several religiously charged translations produced by women on both sides of the Reformation divide, and it demonstrates the critical importance of translation in the lives of recusant women, many of whom were brought to Catholicism through

reading translated texts.⁴² Cary's dedication to England's most visible Catholic woman, Henrietta Maria, builds on the model of female community hinted at in her translation of *The Mirror*; in this case Cary's need for a supportive community was much more than symbolic. After her public conversion and forced separation from her husband, Cary received financial support and assistance with educating her children from several women, including the Queen and the Countess of Buckingham. As Frances Dolan argues, we can see Cary's conversion not only as a loss of her spouse, status, and wealth but also as a gain of female patronage and even authority in regards to her children's upbringing.⁴³ It is likely that without such material support from these women, Cary would never have had the resources to produce her translation of Perron's work.

These gains are evident in Cary's dedication in which she places Henrietta Maria 'farr above other women,' but simultaneously implies a sense of common ground based on gender and religion, defining Henrietta by her female positions, 'daughter of France' and 'Kinge James his Sonns wife' before concluding 'And for the honor of my Sexe, let me saie it, you are a woeman...therefore fittest to protect a womans worke' and 'you are a Catholicke, and a zealous one, and therefore fittest to receive the dedication of a Catholicke-worke.' Noting that the French-speaking Henrietta Maria did not need Cary's translation in order to understand Perron, Gunilla Florby reads this dedication as creating a bridge between women of different social status and acknowledging their shared interest in promoting Catholicism.⁴⁴ Cary's 'To the Reader' continues to build bridges, this time to a more general audience defined not by gender but by common interest. Cary carefully explains that she is not seeking 'glorie from Translation,' but rather that 'I was moved to it by my beleefe, that it might make those English that understand not French, whereof there are maine, even in our universities, reade Perron.' While appropriately humble, this dedication is not especially self-deprecating. Cary does engage in the requisite denigration of her sex, but she also refuses to use the 'worne-out' excuse of being pressured to publish and instead characterizes her translation as 'well done.' In this way she portrays translation as a vehicle to connect those who can read Perron with those who cannot, so that both groups can have access to the same text and work together as a community of Catholics. She admits to her individual talent while

deferring to the importance of the group benefit. Just as highlighting Perron's name, here and in the title of her translation, and focusing on her individual contributions, Cary continues to demonstrate the collaborative nature of this project.

We see this theme further addressed in the several praise poems that follow her dedications. The second, titled simply 'Another' and signed 'F. L. D. S. M.' (Father Leander de S. Martino) compares Cary to three Roman women known for sacred transformations:

Who doth not prayse th' Empresse *Eudoxias* fame,
That made old *Homer* tell our Ghospells story?
Or noble *Proba* Romes immortall glory,
That taught sweet *Virgil* sing our Savious name?
Or gracious *Elpis*, safe *Boetius* love,
Whose sacred hymnes holy Church doth approve?

In describing both centoists, who rearranged epic verses to tell Christian stories, and epic poets with similarly praiseful language, this stanza characterizes the rearrangements created by Proba and Aelia Eudocia as collaborations between equals. Even Elpis, who wrote hymn lyrics of her own, is represented not just as Boethius' love but also as working in a kind of partnership with the holy Church. Cary is then heralded as the paragon of female writers, whose mind is of 'These three great gracious Ladies full compri'sd, / Their worth, their witte, their virtue equaliz'd' and the reader is instructed to 'look on this work, and you shall plainly find / *Eudoxia*, *Proba*, *Elpis* yield in all / To this *Translatresse* of our Cardinall.' With this ending, Martino invites readers to participate in his appreciation of Cary, expecting mutual agreement with his praise of her. In his final two words, he returns to the idea of Cary working in conjunction with Perron and again moves to include the audience in this joint endeavor with the telling phrase, 'our Cardinall.'

The introductory material works in concert with the treatise's thematic emphasis on conversation and communion. The work is set up, as its title indicates, as a dialogue, with each section beginning with an observation made by King James and the response offered by Perron. Despite its potential for hostility based on deep religious differences, the tone remains strategically neutral, even respectful of opposing views. It is what Florby calls an 'eirenic' text, using similarly conciliatory techniques as Henrietta Maria

did in her court entertainments designed ‘to promote a positive image of Catholicism and to calm dissension.’⁴⁵ Nelson explains that in its argument that the king can acknowledge the pope without giving up temporal power, *The Reply* offers a fraught call for political and religious reconciliation.⁴⁶ The first chapter of the treatise responds to disputes over the name ‘Catholic’ and the doctrine of the Communion of the Saints. By defining Catholic as a way for the Christian church to ‘discerne the true Church from hereticall, and schismaticall Societies,’ *The Reply* does offer a model of exclusion and separation, but it takes great pains not to reject the king’s church. By explaining the Communion of the Saints, Perron and Cary offer appeasement by admitting to uncertainty in the interpretation of this controversial doctrine, while at the same time offering a definition that highlights a sense of the church as a community consisting ‘not in the simple number of the faithfull, every one considered a parte; but in the joint Communion of all the bodie faithfull.’ This transcendent view of community is notably gender neutral. It also exceeds the view of collaboration I have identified as critical to the process of translation. However, I would suggest that part of the appeal for Cary in Perron’s text is its sense of the parts coming together to create a more powerful whole—itsself a kind of figurative translation. Moreover, as a woman whose religious faith has ‘forced her into conflict with powerful men,’ and who received significant support from women, Cary’s sense of the potential of community could well be gender specific and confirm Dolan’s speculation that Catholicism may have offered ‘positive ways to construe female authority.’⁴⁷

In contrast to her first and last works, *The Tragedy of Mariam* appears on the surface to offer a very different view of women’s community. Additionally it is not a straight forward translation. The title page of Cary’s *Mariam* confirms Barry Weller and Margaret Ferguson’s characterization of it as “the first original play by a woman to be published in England.”⁴⁸ Nowhere does it suggest that the play is a translation of Josephus’ *Antiquities of the Jews* or a rendition of Thomas Lodge’s translation of the ancient text, just as Shakespeare’s histories and tragedies don’t announce themselves as translations of Holinshed and other source materials.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, I find it warranted and valuable to consider the play as a kind of translation for several reasons. As mentioned above, the term was highly flexible as evidenced by Dryden’s classification of translation detailed in his ‘Preface to the translations of Ovid’s

Epistles.’ Dismissing the word-for-word metaphrase as ‘servile,’ Dryden venerates paraphrase, calling it ‘translation with latitude,’ while pointing out that in imitation ‘the translator (if now he has not lost that name) assumes the liberty, not only to vary from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion.’⁵⁰ Certainly *The Tragedy of Mariam* can be understood as a work of paraphrase or imitation. Her choice of closet drama substantiates this assessment, given that the genre as a whole relies on imitations of Seneca and is derived from the Garnier model, brought to England by Thomas Kyd’s translation of *Cornélie*.⁵¹

To look at *Mariam* as a paraphrase or imitation also allows us to see how Cary’s project fits with the more straightforward translations being produced by other women and how she might use the persistent bias against translation (as evidenced in Dryden’s conflicted praise above) to her advantage. In her choice of genre and subject matter Cary follows the precedent set by other female translators. Sandra Fisher reads this ‘tendency to choose well-known stories from prominent sources,’ as part of a strategy of circumlocution used in other ‘marginal genres as religious writings, translations, and closet dramas’ that helps authors avoid public responsibility for their writings.⁵² Cary’s literary career undercuts this theory to a degree; she certainly accepted the public responsibility of her translation of Perron and seemed careful not to present *Mariam* as a translation. At the same time, as her play demonstrates, Cary was well aware of the restraints placed on women’s public voice. Reading the play within the context of translation, then, helps us explore how Cary navigates material limitations placed on female authority and authorship, limitations that she addressed through translation before and after penning *Mariam*.

The women in *Mariam* are constantly at odds with one another. Both trapped in distasteful marriages, Salome and Mariam are the play’s most obvious enemies, spewing insults, plotting against each other, and unable to recognize their shared predicament. Similarly, Mariam and Doris might realize that they and their families have both been abused by Herod, but instead Doris wishes revenge on the ‘high-hearted Mariam’ (2.3.253), and Mariam in turn defends Herod’s divorce by quoting from scripture ‘That he that being match’d did deadly hate: / Might by permission put his wife away, / And take a more below’d to be his mate?’ (4.8.588-590). Even Mariam’s own mother harshly chastises her daughter for

mourning the reported death of her husband, who in Alexandra's eyes is nothing more than the murderer of Mariam's grandfather and brother. In each case, the potential for women's community is disrupted by their complicated relationships to the tyrannical patriarch. Each woman challenges Herod but never as directly or as venomously as she challenges the other women.

Cary derives this antagonism from her source. In Lodge's translation of Josephus, he writes: 'But Mariamme upbraided and publickely reproached both the kings mother and sister, telling them that they were but abjectly and basely borne. Whereupon there grew a great enmitie and unrecoverable hatred betweene the Ladies; and from thence also there arose an occasion of greater accusations and calumniation th[a]n before' (279).⁵³ Josephus' Alexandra is particularly hateful and cowardly, protecting herself against Herod's wrath by publicly calling the doomed Mariam 'a wicked woman, & ungrateful towards her husband; and that she wel deserved the punishment that was adjudged her' (281). By giving more time and speech to her female characters, Cary adds depth and complexity to these women but she also extends and amplifies the animosity among them.⁵⁴ These expressions of malevolence stand in stark contrast to the articulation of friendship between Constabarus and the sons of Babas and later between Constabarus and his ostensible enemy, Silleus. Laurie Shannon characterizes the relationship between Constabarus and the men he is protecting as an 'uncomplicated friendship,' and she argues that Cary would certainly have known the works of Cicero and Montaigne that are echoed in the play's representation of this alliance.⁵⁵ Constabarus' relationship with Silleus is thornier. As rivals for Salome, the men are in a similar position to Mariam and Doris, but rather than building a mutual hatred, they bemoan Salome's role in standing in the way of their friendship. After wounding Silleus, Constabarus helps him recover, explaining, 'I hate thy body, but I love thy mind' (2.4. 388), to which Silleus responds:

Thanks, noble Jew, I see a courteous foe,
Stern enmity to friendship can no art:
Had not my heart and tongue engag'd me so,
I would from thee no foe, but friend depart.
My heart to Salome is tied [too] fast
To leave her love for friendship, yet my skill
Shall be employ'd to make your favour last,

And I will honour Constabarus still. (2.4.289-396)

With three explicit references, this passage clearly participates in the early modern discourse that depicts male friendship as an idealized relationship requiring perfect equality. From its start, this discourse has excluded women from true friendships both with men and with each other, an exclusion that Cary's play seems to reinforce. Understanding male friendship as 'a counterpoint to absolutism,' that finds its gendered alternative in female chastity, Shannon argues that *Mariam* 'records under protest the fatal effects of a woman's attempt to enact a chaste or constant integrity specifically created for males.'⁵⁶ For Shannon, the play decries women's inability to form friendships in the play as an effect of patriarchal, tyrannical power. Naomi Miller also reads the play's disruption of female bonds as a critique of tyranny and patriarchy, though she is somewhat more optimistic in her suggestion that by exposing the conflict between women, Cary is able to show that women, 'without losing their voices,' can decenter 'standard early notions of fatherly authority.'⁵⁷

Miller's logic demonstrates the difficulty of finding an encouraging view of women's speech, women's writing and women's community in this play. As Margaret Ferguson has shown, *Mariam*'s opening question, 'How oft have I with public voice run on' (1.1.1) challenges 'the play's own mode of material existence' and she reads the play as recognizing the need for but finally rejecting the potential of collective rebellion.⁵⁸ That Ferguson links the play's exploration of female voice to the potential for collective action recognizes a connection between community and voice that the women in *Mariam* find impossible to achieve. However, by viewing the play as a kind of collaborative translation and paying attention to Cary's strategic use of source material, we can understand this lack as contributing to the play's tragedy. In her important analysis of the connection between Cary's *Mariam* and Lodge's translation of Josephus, Alison Shell explains that Lodge, in fairly typical Renaissance fashion, focuses on the 'moral utility' of history; he 'more unusually...stresses his readers' obligation to interrogate their own lives by actively reflecting upon relevant historical exemplars, both good and bad.'⁵⁹ In other words, Shell writes, 'Lodge calls for readers and historians to be partners,' a lesson Cary reflects through her chorus which practices a 'two-stage process of reading and moral digestion.'⁶⁰ Translation too calls for

active engagement by the reader. Using such a process and taking seriously Lodge's prefatory instruction to avoid the pitfalls of bad historical examples,⁶¹ an audience member might not take as final the chorus' condemnation of Mariam's unchaste thoughts and words. In its claim, 'For in a wife it is no worse to find, /A common body than a common mind' (3. 243-244) the chorus speaks against the bridge building celebrated in Cary's *Mirror* and *Reply*, but its rhetoric is not wholly persuasive. Although Mariam may have been spared if she had not voiced her thoughts, she also might have avoided her fate by finding out what she had in common with the other women in the play.

To interpret the play's representation of antagonistic women as a cautionary tale is additionally made possible by the contrast between the play's backbiting women and Cary's dedicatory poem to her sister-in-law, also named Elizabeth Cary, in which the writer embraces the discourse of friendship to celebrate the women's sisterhood:

When cheerful Phoebus his full course hath fun,
His sister's fainter beams our hearts doth cheer:
So your fair brother is to me the sun,
And you his sister as my moon appear.

You are my next belov'd, my second friend,
For when my Phoebus' absence makes it night,
Whilst to th' antipodes his beams do bend,
From you, my Phoebe, shines my second light.

He like to Sol, clear-sighted, constant, free,
You Luna-like, unspotted, chaste, divine:
He shone on Sicily, you destin'd be
T'illumine the now obscured Palestine.
My first was consecrated to Apollo,
My second to Diana now shall follow.

Bearing striking similarities to Mary Sidney Herbert's 'To the Angell Spirit,' which preceded her joint translation of the Psalms, this poem establishes a clear hierarchy between husband and sister, but the references to the sister as 'second' also plays on the view of the ideal friend as a second self. The parallel structure used throughout the poem creates a fragile sense of equality between Cary's male and female muses, representing also the composition process for this play and her earlier one (her lost 'first' play, 'consecrated to Apollo') as a collaborative one.⁶² The last stanza's string of adjectives, however,

reminds us of some key differences between a woman who is ‘unspotted, chaste, divine’ and a man, ‘clear-sighted, constant, free.’ A woman who remains pure in mind and body may have access to sacred knowledge. The bar for a man is set lower; with his constancy comes freedom, the very thing denied to women, the very thing limiting women’s choices as individuals, as friends, as translators, and as writers.

Reading *The Tragedy of Mariam* through the lens of translation studies provides an opportunity to reconsider how we understand the conditions of early modern translation and the ways in which the practice of translation affected women’s access to the role of writer. Although the play itself does not celebrate female friendship discursively as other works have, I would argue that the work still reflects a desire for women’s community by suggesting that part of Mariam’s loss stems from her inability to sympathize with other women. That *Mariam’s* women cannot even see their shared grievances or imagine the value of coalition building reflects how difficult collaboration could be for women, which we can also understand as one of the many limitations that made writing for women such a daunting endeavor. For Cary herself, this challenge may have been felt most keenly as a young wife trying to reconcile her place in the family with her literary aspirations and her shifting religious beliefs. Perhaps ironically, her conversion and forced separation from her husband may have given her the opportunity that Mariam lacked, to forge alliances with other women, to celebrate literary communion, and to reaffirm her voice within the practice of collaboration and translation.

¹ There has been much recent discussion on Cary’s likely authorship of *The History of the Life, Reign, and Death of Edward II* and/or *The History of the Most Unfortunate Prince King Edward II*. I don’t have room to enter into that debate or to offer a full analysis of that work in this essay. I would suggest, however, that many of the reasons I read *Mariam* as implicated in the practice of translation hold true for both versions of *Edward II* as well.

² The debate on the value of faithful translations surfaces frequently. See for example, Mary Ellen Lamb, ‘The Cooke Sisters: Attitudes toward Learned Women in the Renaissance’, *Silent But for the Word*, ed. Margaret P. Hannay (Ohio: Kent State UP, 1985), pp. 107-25; Jonathan Goldberg, ‘The Countess of Pembroke’s literal translation’, *Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture*, eds. Margreta De Grazia, Maureen Quilligan, and Peter Stallybrass (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996), pp. 321-36; and Danielle Clarke, ‘The Politics of Translation and Gender In the Countess of Pembroke’s *Antonie*’, *Translation and Literature*, 6 (1997): 149-66.

³ Many of my general ideas about women’s translation in this chapter are drawn from my book, *Women as Translators in Early Modern England* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2012).

⁴ Tina Krontiris, *Oppositional Voices: Women as Writers and Translators of Literature in the English Renaissance*. NY: Routledge, 1992, p. 20; Lamb, pp. 124-5. Micheline White. 'Renaissance Englishwomen and Religious Translations: The Case of Anne Lock's *Of the Markes of the children of God (1590)*.' *ELR* 29.2 (1999): 337.

⁵ Brenda M. Hosington, 'Tudor Englishwomen's Translations of Continental Protestant Texts: The Interplay of Ideology and Historical Context', in *Tudor Translation*, ed. Fred Schurink (NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 122.

⁶ For an excellent discussion of women's religious writings see Kimberly Anne Coles, *Religion, Reform, and Women's Writing in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) in which she argues for the singular importance of women's religious writings in the sixteenth century and for the 'shaping force' exerted by religious women that led to the English Reformation, pp. 2-5.

⁷ Christopher Hill, *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution* (New York: Allen Lane, 1993), pp. 4-11.

⁸ Karen Nelson, "'To Informe thee aright": Translating DuPerron for English Religious Debates', *The Literary Career and Legacy of Elizabeth Cary, 1613-1680*, ed. Heather Wolfe (NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), p. 147.

⁹ Kenneth Charlton explains that although More and Erasmus strongly advocated for including in the humanist curriculum the study of Greek, which they saw as 'the roots of Christianity', grammar schools rarely paid serious attention to the subject and even in the universities, 'no important school of Greek studies developed', in *Education in Renaissance England* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965), p. 65, 117, 159. Marta Straznicky compares Vives' different instructions for teaching Princess Mary and Charles Mountjoy and the difference is glaring. While he suggests Mary need study only the pronunciation of Greek letters, for Mountjoy he includes 'a separate, detailed regime for the study of Greek language and literature', *Privacy, Playreading, and Women's Closet Drama, 1550-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004), pp. 24-5.

¹⁰ Joel B. Altman, *The Tudor Play of Mind: Rhetorical Inquiry and the Development of Elizabethan Drama* (Berkeley and L.A.: University of California Press, 1978), p. 43.

¹¹ In 'On First Looking into Lumley's Euripides', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 23 (1999): 26, Patricia Demers uses this phrase to describe Lumley, but it seems equally appropriate to characterize the young Elizabeth Tanfield. Although this translation was produced before Elizabeth took the name of Cary, I will be using her married name for simplicity and consistency through this essay.

¹² In her introduction to Cary's translation, Peterson notes that the dedication to Lee seems to correspond to his knighting by Queen Elizabeth. Furthermore, she points out that Cary's father, Lawrence Tanfield, was an ambitious lawyer, knighted just two years after his daughter's strategic marriage, *The Mirror of the Worlde*, ed. and intro., Lesley Peterson (Montreal and Kingston: McGill UP, 2012), p. 16, 4. Later quotations from *The Mirror* are from this edition.

¹³ I have suggested that the plays of Lumley, Sidney Herbert and Philips "interrogate the links between linguistic translation, national rivalry, and political conquest that are particularly relevant during times of civil and religious unrest, of continued conflict in Ireland, and European exploration and colonization in the so-called New World" in *Women as Translators*, p. 73 and Peterson identifies a similar challenge in Cary's translation of *The Mirror*, pp. 22-3.

¹⁴ While the generic name indicates a work designed for the most intimate of spaces, Marta Straznicky's comprehensive study of women's closet drama rightly contextualizes these works in 'a cultural field in which private and public are shifting rather than fixed points of reference'. Even as she explains that closet drama crosses between private and public simply through the printing and publication of the works, she argues for the importance of retaining the category and understanding it as 'a tactical construct which was itself the condition of possibility for women's playwriting,' pp. 1-3. We can see a strategic connection in the reasons women chose to write translations and the reasons to write closet drama as both provide an ostensibly safe outlet for creative expression, while still participating in contemporary political and religious discourse.

¹⁵ John Florio, The Epistle Dedicatorie to his translation of Montaigne's *Essays*, from *The essays of Michael, Lord of Montaigne*, trans. John Florio (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1910).

¹⁶ Lori Chamberlain discusses the implications of this long-lasting phrase and its tag '*Les belles infidèles*', noting that it establishes an 'implicit contract between translation (as woman) and original (as husband, father, or author)'

as well as upholding the double standard of female and male behavior, in ‘Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation,’ in *Rethinking Translation; Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (New York: Routledge, 1992) p. 58.

¹⁷ Jonathan Goldberg, *Desiring Women Writing: English Renaissance Examples* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), pp. 78-79.

¹⁸ Chamberlain, ‘Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation’, 66-7.

¹⁹ Jeffrey Masten, *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 32, 20.

²⁰ Chamberlain, ‘Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation’, 59.

²¹ This discussion of collaboration is drawn from my article, co-authored with Belén Bistué, ‘Translation as Collaborative Authorship: Margaret Tyler’s *The Mirrour of Princely Deedes and Knighthood*’, *Comparative Literature Studies*, 44, 3 (2007): 298-323.

²² Quotation from *The Collected Works of Mary Sidney Herbert Countess of Pembroke*, vol. 1, eds. Margaret P. Hannay, Noel J. Kinnamon, and Michael G. Brennan (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

²³ Masten, *Textual Intercourse*, 19, 34.

²⁴ In her study of female co-authors from the nineteenth century, Holly Laird argues that coauthorship gives women the opportunity to talk together. Like Masten, Laird focuses on the playful *jouissance* of collaboration, which she refers to as a relational process that invokes ‘the genitally female sense of contiguity against the lonely phallic “I”’ in *Women Coauthors* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2000), p. 5. Similarly, Carol Singley and Susan Elizabeth Sweeney note that feminist collaboration is a combination of Bakhtin’s polyvocal play and Irigaray’s multivalent *L’écriture féminine*, ‘In League with Each Other: The Theory and Practice of Feminist Collaboration’, in *Common Ground: Feminist Collaboration in the Academy*, eds Elizabeth G. Peck, Elizabeth G. and JoAnna Stephens Mink (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998), pp. 68-9.

²⁵ In using the phrase ‘third term’, I am borrowing from Marjorie Garber’s *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing and Cultural Anxiety* (New York: Routledge, 1992).

²⁶ In discussing Lanyer’s *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* in the context of translation, I am both relying on the more expansive early modern understanding of the term to include practices such as imitation and acknowledging the debt Lanyer owed (and which she also recognizes) to the women’s translations that preceded her work. I see Cary’s *The Tragedie of Mariam* in a similar light and elaborate on this view later in the essay.

²⁷ Patricia Demers, “‘Nether bitterly nor brabingly’”: Lady Anne Cooke Bacon’s Translation of Bishop Jewel’s *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production, 1500-1625*, ed. Micheline White (Burlington: Ashgate, 2011), p. 206.

²⁸ Nelson, pp. 149-51.

²⁹ Quotation from *The Lady Falkland Her Life*, by one of her daughters. This is included in the edition of *The Tragedy of Mariam The Fair Queen of Jewry* that I will be using later in this essay, eds Barry Weller and Margaret W. Ferguson (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994), p. 186.

³⁰ Michael Drayton, “To my Honoured Mistress, Mrs. Elizabeth Tanfield,” dedication for *England’s Heroicall Epistles* (London: N. Ling, 1597).

³¹ John Davies, ‘To the Most Noble, and no less deservedly-renowned ladies, as well darlings, as patronesses, of the Muses; Lucy Countess of Bedford, Mary Countess Dowager of Pembroke, and Elizabeth, Lady Cary (wife of Sir Henry Cary). Glories of women,’ preface to *The Muses Sacrifice, or Divine Meditations*, in *Readings in Renaissance Women’s Drama: Criticism, History, and Performance 1594-1998*, ed. S.P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies (New York: Routledge, 1998), pp. 13-14.

³² Marta Straznicky, "'Profane Stoical Paradoxes': *The Tragedie of Mariam* and Sidneian Closet Drama', in *Ashgate Critical Essays on Women Writers in England, 1550-1700*, vol. 6 Elizabeth Cary, ed. Karen Raber (Burlington, CT: Ashgate, 2009), p. 142, 145.

³³ Heather Wolfe, in her introduction to *Elizabeth Cary Lady Falkland: Life and Letters*, also notes that Cary was praised for her translating abilities, pointing to an additional reference in 1641 by Father David Codner (Cambridge: RMP Publications, 2001), p. 11.

³⁴ Peterson, pp. 7-8, 10.

³⁵ Peterson, pp. 35, 21-3.

³⁶ Peterson, p. 44.

³⁷ The *OED* explains that the etymology of 'travel' and 'travail' is the same. From the examples presented in both definitions, it appears that distinctions in spelling emerged in the sixteenth century.

³⁸ In this conclusion, I agree with Peterson that the work as a whole offers a subtle critique of tyranny, which is often linked to the practices of imperialism. The several references to Julius Caesar's conquest emphasize this connection.

³⁹ Peterson notes how flattering this description of Italy is, particularly in comparison to the faint praise used to describe England in *The Mirror*, p. 64.

⁴⁰ Peterson, p. 40.

⁴¹ Frances E. Dolan, Introduction. *Recusant Translators: Elizabeth Cary, Alexia Grey. The Early Modern Englishwoman: A Facsimile Library of Essential Works: Series I: Printed Writings, 1500-1640: Part 2*, vol. 13, gen. eds. Betty S. Travitsky and Patrick Cullen (Burlington: Ashgate, 2000), p. x. Quotations from the *Reply* come from this edition.

⁴² Frances E. Dolan, *Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, and Seventeenth-Century Print Culture* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1999), p. 31.

⁴³ Dolan, *Whores of Babylon*, pp. 147-9.

⁴⁴ Gunilla Florby, 'Bridging Gaps: Cary as Translator and Historian', *Writing and Religion in England, 1558-1689: Studies in Community-Making and Cultural Memory*, eds. Roger D. Sell and Anthony W. Johnson (Burlington: Ashgate, 2009), p. 226.

⁴⁵ Florby, p. 226.

⁴⁶ Nelson, p. 148.

⁴⁷ Dolan, *Whores of Babylon*, p. 49, 9.

⁴⁸ "Introduction," *The Tragedy of Mariam The Fair Queen of Jewry*, p.1.

⁴⁹ Like Shakespeare in so many plays, Cary does not invent the plot of her play but rather relies heavily on historical accounts. While the story of Herod and Mariam's tempestuous marriage is detailed in Josephus' *Jewish War* and his *Antiquities of the Jews*, Weller and Ferguson argue that Cary likely relied primarily on book 15 of the *Antiquities* and point out that she (again like Shakespeare) "compresses, amplifies, and transposes material" for dramatic effect. They also note that while it is certainly possible that Cary was able to read Josephus' text in the original Greek, there is significant evidence that she worked closely with Thomas Lodge's 1602 English translation, pp. 17-18.

⁵⁰ From *The Essays of Dryden*, vol. 1, p. 237. Translation was also understood more symbolically as physical and spiritual transformation and as metaphor. In a conversation with Derrida, Eugene Vance looks at the etymology of translation and other similar terms and suggests that today 'we are dealing with a term that has become greatly impoverished', in *The Ear of the Other*, 136-7.

⁵¹ For discussions of how *The Tragedy of Mariam* is part of 12 plays (two of which are translations) written in the neo-Senecan tradition, see Laurie J. Shannon, 'The Tragedy of Mariam: Cary's Critique of the Terms of Founding Social Discourses', *Ashgate Critical Essays on Women Writers in England, 1550-1700*, vol. 6 Elizabeth Cary, ed. Karen Raber (Burlington, CT: Ashgate 2009), p. 358 and Straznicky, "'Profane Stoical Paradoxes'", p. 148.

⁵² Sandra K. Fischer, 'Elizabeth Cary and Tyranny', *Silent but for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators and Writers of Religious Works*, ed. Margaret P. Hannay (Ohio: The Kent State UP, 1985), p. 228.

⁵³ Cited from Josephus selections in Appendix A of Weller and Ferguson's edition.

⁵⁴ Shannon notes that Cary's changes to her source material 'give more prominences to women's psychological struggles', *The Tragedy of Mariam*, p. 356.

⁵⁵ Laurie J. Shannon, *Sovereign Amity: Figures of Friendship in Shakespearean Contexts* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002), p. 73.

⁵⁶ Shannon, p. 57, 79.

⁵⁷ Naomi J. Miller, 'Domestic Politics in Elizabeth Cary's *The Tragedy of Mariam*', *SEL*, 37 (1997): 355, 360.

⁵⁸ Margaret W. Ferguson, 'Running On with Almost Public Voice: The Case of "E.C."', in *Tradition and the Talents of Women*, ed. Florence Howe (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991), p. 49, 59.

⁵⁹ Alison Shell, 'Elizabeth Cary's Historical Conscience: *The Tragedy of Mariam* and Thomas Lodge's Josephus', in *The Literary Career and Legacy of Elizabeth Cary, 1613-1680*, ed. Heather Wolfe (NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), p. 53.

⁶⁰ Shell, p. 56.

⁶¹ Shell, p. 53.

⁶² The reference to a work set in Sicily supports the existence of an earlier tragedy to which Davies refers in his dedication to *The Muses Sacrifice*, Waller and Ferguson, n. 151.