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Introduction

I.

“What schole-boy, what apprentice knows not Heliodorus?” So demands Joseph Hall during the early part of the seventeenth century. Hall’s rhetorical demand highlights the popularity of Heliodorus’s *An Aethiopian History* during the Renaissance. The *Aethiopica* and other Greek manuscripts found their way to Europe through a concatenation of events. In 1453, Mohamet II invaded Byzantium, causing its intellectuals, who were ardent admirers of the Greek novel, to flee to Italy and other European countries, presumably taking Greek codices with them. When in 1526, Suleiman the Magnificent sacked the Hungarian city of Buda and destroyed King Matthias’s royal palace, “an unnamed, low-ranking German mercenary soldier . . . snatched the manuscript containing Heliodorus’s *Ethiopian History* from the smouldering ruins of King Matthias’s Bibliotheca Corviniana.” As Gerald Sandy observes, that manuscript became the basis of Vincentius Obsopoeus’s 1534 *editio princeps*, which was printed in Basel and in turn served as “the sole basis of the first translation of the *Ethiopian Story*” in 1547 by Jacques Amyot. In 1551, the Polish humanist Stanislaus

---


2. By calling the *Aethiopica* and other Greek works “novels,” I follow Gerald Sandy, John Morgan, Carol Gesner, Margaret Ann Doody, and other classicists and Renaissance scholars. In fact, Doody’s opening sentence in *The True Story of the Novel* sweeps aside any distinction between romances and novels: “Romance and the novel are one” (15).

Warschewiczki translated the *Aethiopica* into Latin, and German and Spanish (1554), Italian (1556), and English (1567) translations soon followed.  

The *Aethiopica* gained popularity in Continental Europe, especially in France, long before it did in England. Because of the Byzantine intellectuals’ flight to Europe and Charles VIII’s military campaign in Italy, where he became acquainted with Hellenism, Hellenistic thought found its way into France. When Charles returned to France, the Hellenist and Byzantine intellectual Janus Lascaris accompanied him. Lascaris, an employee of the crown from the time of Charles VIII to that of Francois I, took “some 40” Greek manuscripts to France, helped improve the teaching of ancient Greek, and taught others “who were positioned to influence the development of ancient Greek in France” (Sandy 740).

By contrast, the *Aethiopica*’s route to Britain was long and circuitous, taking more than twenty-two years before reaching English shores; having no direct access to Greek manuscripts, English writers resorted to French, Italian, and/or Latin translations. In 1567, James Sandford published a versified retelling of Book 4 of the *Aethiopica*, and by 1569 Thomas Underdowne Englished Warschewiczki’s Latin translation of Heliodorus’s text and reissued it several times thereafter. As we shall see, Underdowne’s translation of Warschewiczki’s text provided literary manna for many English writers.

---

4. See Sandy, 735; see, also, Doody, 234; Bautista Avalle-Arce, “*Persilles and Allegory,*” 7-9; Burke, 146; Stechow, “HELIODORUS’ *Aethiopica* in Art,” 144; Hatzopoulou -Yanni, “The Elizabethan View of the Greek Romances,” 46.
5. Sandy, 739-40.
This dissertation illuminates why Heliodorus is of interest to the Renaissance and how our understanding of the Renaissance is enhanced by recovering him. To accomplish this, I argue that Heliodorus was known by and important to a group of early modern writers and that his novel *An Aethiopian History* is the direct source of several plays that established a dramatic tradition for a positive portrayal of black Africans. I also argue that early modern adventure or Mediterranean plays (i.e., dramas set in the Mediterranean which generally feature encounters between European males and native females involved in novel or risky undertakings) are the progeny of Greek novels, and I further explore how *Othello* may be read as an adventure drama in the Heliodoran tradition.

The project has two parts. First, I establish that the *Aethiopica* was a common text throughout the Renaissance and is the direct source of many plays because it was widely known by the Italian poets Ariosto and Tasso, the English poets Sidney and Spenser, and quite probably the English playwrights Shakespeare, Heywood, Jonson, and others. Thus, I look at the relevant works of these authors using analyses of their writings and the findings of various scholars to delineate similarities between Heliodorus’s novel and their works. Second, I analyze the eight extant European and English plays that derive directly from Heliodorus to help reconstruct the three lost plays which enable us to posit a tradition of positive portrayal of black Africans on the English stage. By establishing the importance and popularity of the *Aethiopica* and showing that all extant plays that have the protagonists’ names in their titles follow the plot and storyline of
Heliodorus’s novel, I provide a necessarily speculative yet nonetheless strongly justified reconstruction of the three lost plays.

Following the introduction, this dissertation is divided into three chapters, each fleshing out specific themes from Heliodorus while showing that topic’s connection to the *Aethiopica* in order to argue for his importance to a certain group of writers and a lost stage tradition. Chapter 1 has three sections. The first section discusses plays whose titles reflect their indebtedness to the *Aethiopica*; they help to establish a dramatic tradition that originates from this Greek novel and that presents a positive representation for Africans on the English Renaissance stage. The second section contends that the *Aethiopica* is the source of three popular Renaissance plays by analyzing the connection among these three plays, their other sources, and the *Aethiopica*. The final section examines the positive representations of Africans on the English Renaissance stage in relation to the Helidoran tradition. It also argues that the base African on the early modern English stage is an anomaly, not the norm, in this stage tradition. The second chapter looks at two masques by Ben Jonson and one play by Richard Brome, all of which have affinities with the *Aethiopica* and, consequently, further the connection between Heliodorus and several dramatists of the early modern period. It also explores the English Renaissance commonplace of associating ugliness with Ethiopians, using the conceit of blanching (a technique that transforms what is undesirable) found in Jonson’s twin masques to illuminate issues of gender and race. The final chapter interprets

---

Shakespeare’s *Othello* as an adventure drama that can be read in the tradition of the *Aethiopica*. To support this interpretation, the chapter identifies sections in *Othello* that are not in Cinthio but can be traced to the *Aethiopica*. In a move that can cast new light on one of Shakespeare’s most famous women and provide us with a deeply historicized and fresh angle on the vision of Desdemona, I examine the similarities between the female protagonists of the *Aethiopica* and *Othello*. The chapter concludes by probing the similarities and differences between Desdemona and Othello’s relationship and those of major characters in the Heliodoran tradition, especially that of Charicleia and Theagenes.

In this dissertation, I follow particularly the arguments of Carol Gesner’s *Shakespeare and the Greek Romance*, Daniel Vitkus’s *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630*, Jonathan Burton’s *Traffic and Turning Islam and English Drama, 1579-1627*, and Jean Howard’s “Gender on the Periphery” by contending that Greek writers influenced Renaissance dramatists. I also argue that race, religion, and gender are issues that separate peoples and generate conflict in Mediterranean plays during the English Renaissance. I depart from their arguments by tracing a dramatic tradition stemming from Heliodorus to the English Renaissance. The chapters that follow show the stretch of the dramatic tradition from Ettio Pignatelli’s *Cariclea* (1582), Robert Greene’s *Orlando Furioso* (1594), Alexandre Hardy’s *Les chastes amovrs de Theagene et Cariclee* (1601), to the anonymous *Thracian Wonder* (1661) and the various ways in which early modern dramatists followed, departed from, and reworked the Heliodoran tradition. While English Renaissance dramatists often imitate Heliodorus’s representation of white-skinned Africans, they frequently depart

---

8. Plays that deal with their protagonists’ involvement in novel, risky, and often dangerous and exciting events in the Mediterranean.
from his portrayal of black-skinned Africans by presenting them as lecherous, dishonorable, and evil so as to demonize and belittle them, thereby asserting English/European superiority.

In the rest of this introduction, I outline the widespread use and influence of the *Aethiopica* on Renaissance artists, focusing on French writers and English playwrights because the French were instrumental in advancing the popularity of the *Aethiopica* and because my primary concern is with the English Renaissance stage. The English knew the *Aethiopica* through French and Latin translations, especially through Thomas Underdowne’s Englishing of Stanislaus Warschewiczki’s 1551 Latin translation. In close readings of certain passages, I reference both of these translations. Other times, however, I use the more modern translation of Moses Hadas’s text of the *Aethiopica* because it is a direct translation of Heliodorus’s text and is closer to Warschewiczki’s translation of Helidorus than Underdowne’s is. In the final sections of the introduction, I also discuss the use and influence of the *Aethiopica* during the Renaissance, the lost stage tradition that derived from Heliodorus’s text, and end with an outline of each dissertation chapter. But first let me provide a brief summary of the *Aethiopica* to familiarize my audience with the novel and to facilitate an examination of the text in order to establish what I argue as one of its main concerns.

**II.**

*Summary of the Aethiopica*[^9]

Fearing charges of adultery, Queen Persinna of Ethiopia abandons her newborn daughter because she is born “white.” A priest finds the child and eventually gives her to

[^9]: For a detailed summary of the *Aethiopica*, see the Appendix.
a Greek priest to raise as his own daughter. She grows up as a priestess of Diana in Athens, and at the festival of Neoptolemus, the young princess, Charicleia, meets and falls in love with Theagenes, a Thessalian prince and direct descendant of Achilles.

With the aid of the Egyptian savant Calasiris, they elope, leaving her adoptive father, Charicles, heartbroken. Charicles’s household as well as the city are in uproar. Meanwhile, Calasiris, Theagenes, and Charicleia are stowaways on a Phoenician ship. They are shipwrecked, attacked by pirates and brigands. Theagenes and Charicleia are captured repeatedly by opposing factions and are separated from each other; they also endure attacks upon their virtue, wander in search of each other, and reunite in Memphis, where they become house-captives to Arsace, the wife of the Persian general and the interim ruler of Memphis.

Hearing of the beauty of Charicleia, the Persian general and governor of Egypt, Oroondates, dispatches messages and soldiers to his wife, commanding her to surrender her two prisoners. On their return, the Persian soldiers are ambushed by Ethiopian soldiers, who capture and take Charicleia and Theagenes to Hydaspes, the king of Ethiopia.

As spoils of war, Charicleia and Theagenes are prisoners to be sacrificed to the gods for granting Hydaspes victory over Persian Egypt. Returning to a jubilant nation, Hydaspes orders the braziers to be brought out to test the sacrifices for purity: prospective sacrifices walk a heated iron brazier; those who are unharmed are deemed pure. When the flames flee from Charicleia and Theagenes, the people, astonished at the pair’s beauty and chastity and, believing Charicleia to be a goddess, demand that she not be sacrificed, prompting the High Priest Sisimithres to caution the king about the gods’
displeasure with human sacrifice. But Hydaspes wants to continue the ritual. Before the
priests could leave, Charicleia, to the king’s chagrin, asks the high priest to intercede by
claiming Ethiopian heritage. When she displays the tokens of her Ethiopian lineage,
Persinna and Sisimithres avow that she is the abandoned daughter. An incredulous
Hydaspes sends for the painting of Andromeda to confirm the queen’s story and his
paternity. When the people plead to spare Theagenes’s life and abolish the sacrificial
system, all are saved. The king learns that Theagenes and Charicleia are betrothed. The
people rejoice at the king’s and queen’s good fortune and the imminent marriage of
Charicleia and Theagenes.

III.

Use and Influence of the Aethiopica during the Renaissance

The Aethiopica was the most popular Greek text throughout the Renaissance,
reaching into Italy, France, Spain, Germany, Holland, England, Hungary, Bulgaria, the
former Yugoslavia, and Asia Minor. There are several reasons for the pre-eminence of
the Aethiopica over the other Greek novels. Despite elements of plot--such as piracy,
kidnapping, shipwrecks, and elopement--shared with other Greek novels, the Aethiopica
alone begins in medias res, has a delayed denouement, and a complex narrative with
multiple narrators whose stories are intertwined and revolve around various characters
who tell their stories through flashbacks, dialogues, histories, and/or straight narratives.
These features distinguish Heliodorus’s novel from all other Greek novels. The

10. Sandy, 735; Stechow, 145; Avalle-Arce, 7; Greenhalgh, “Love, Chastity, and Woman’s Erotic Power:
Greek Romance in Elizabethan and Jacobean Contexts,” 15-20; Doody, 234, contends that “Heliodorus had
a strong and constant readership throughout the Eastern Empire.” Given that the Byanzantine intellectuals
fled to various European countries and that the Greek novel was brought from Hungary to Western Europe,
Doody’s claim is not surprising.
popularity of the *Aethiopica* also resulted from the strangers and foreigners who inhabit its pages, its incorporation of sufficient adventure to satisfy the demands of a public reared in the tradition of imitation of the *Amadis*\(^\text{11}\) (thirteenth- to sixteenth-century chivalric romances from the Iberian peninsula, featuring star-crossed lovers, illegitimacy, and knightly combat with the Turks in Constantinople), its emphasis on plain virtues, and the compatibility of its values with those of Christianity. To these, Mara Hatzopoulou-Yanni adds a few other reasons: “the *Aethiopica* provided the Elizabethans . . . with a conception of love similar to the courtly, and reinforced the belief in a divinely ordered universe” alongside “the loftiness of context and the epic structure.”\(^\text{12}\) Additionally, the *Aethiopica*’s popularity came about in England because of England’s burgeoning trade with the Moors and Turks and the novel’s Mediterranean setting—both place and people held a special fascination in the minds of the English. All of these characteristics of the *Aethiopica* along with its popularity and appeal made it an ideal source to many Renaissance playwrights, who wrote plays that were based on it, thus generating a dramatic tradition that represented Africans favorably on the stage.

The popularity of the *Aethiopica* prompts Wolfgang Stechow to observe that “the status of the *Aethiopica* is that of a colossus, and its influence practically boundless” (145), and Sandy, Juan Bautista Avalle-Arce, and others to note that it is impossible to overestimate the importance of Heliodorus on the Renaissance. As we shall see, the

---

11. It would appear that even *Amadis de Gaul* is an imitation of the Greek novel, especially of Longus and/or Heliodorus but closer to the latter. Like Charicleia’s mother, Amadis’s mother exposed her newborn for fear of shame but left him with tokens, including a ring, that would help identify him and his lineage. *Amadis* also echoes the biblical story of Moses who, as a babe, was committed to sea in a basket that also served as a cradle. See John Dunlop, *The History of Fiction: being a Critical Account of the most Celebrated Prose Works of Fiction from the Earliest Greek Romances to the Novels of the Present Age*, 3rd ed. (London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1845), 145-47; Exodus 2:1-5 (NKJV).
12. Stechow, 145. Burke, 146, attributes the popularity of the Greek novel to those factors as well as these: transformation of the romance, introduction of new practices and values, chaste love intertwined with adventure. See, also, Hatzopoulou-Yanni, 46-47.
statements of Stechow and others are not hyperbolic, for very seldom, if ever, has a text been as widely used across genres and fields: prose, poetry, drama, music, and painting.

Among European nations, France led the way in Greek and Hellenistic culture during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by promoting Greek literature and language, which explains why the influence of the Aethiopica on the Renaissance began mainly with French prose writers. Of those who imitated the Aethiopica, Nicolas de Montreux, according to Sandy and Stechow, was the first. His three-part novel\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Oeuvre de la chasté}t (1595), especially the second part, \textit{Le amours de Criniton et Lydie} (1597), derives structurally and thematically from the Aethiopica. Like Heliodorus, Montreux begins his novel \textit{in medias res} and utilizes innumerable scenes, including characters unburdening themselves of their histories to others, and the heroine’s tactical deferment of marriage, and the “cave scene.” In Book 1 of the Aethiopica, rival pirates attack Thyamis and his brigands, prompting Thyamis to order Charicleia’s concealment in a cave. Realizing the futility of victory and determined that no other man should have Charicleia because of his misapprehension of a dream, Thyamis makes his way to the cave where he mistakenly kills another woman whom he believes to be Charicleia. Similarly in Montreux’s novel, when rival factions war with each other, the love-struck brigand who captures Domiphile rushes to the cave where she has taken refuge, but is thwarted in his attempt to claim her. As in Heliodorus, Charicleia stalls Thyamis’ marrying her by claiming that she needs time to put aside her religious vestments in order

\textsuperscript{13} According to Doody, 236-37, “Renaissance novelists tend to write books that have continuations, which is not a part of the original concept,” but is instead a genuine “new part” that is both continuous and disjunctive.” As a result, the reader is able to see how “a thinking mind” changes over time. \textit{Don Quijote} and \textit{The Arcadia} are exempla. Part II of \textit{Quijote} parodies yet comments on Part I, while dealing with material in the same way and differently. Sidney’s revisions to the original \textit{Arcadia} made it an almost “new, more moral and stately and much longer work,” which underwent more revisions to become \textit{The New Arcadia}, and with additional revisions ended up as \textit{The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia} (1593).
to prepare for the marriage; so, too, does Montreux’s Domiphile to the king of Epirus, claiming that she needs to offer sacrifice to Isis in preparation for the marriage. In Montreux, Cleandre, like Theagenes in Heliodorus, claims that his betrothed is his sister to ward off the amorous advances of a princess.\(^\text{14}\)

Other sixteenth- and seventeen-century writings whose plots have affinities with Heliodorus’s include Jorge de Montemayor’s *Diana* (1560), Martin Fumée’s *Du Vray et Parfait Amour* (1599), J. Honoré d’Urfé’s *L’Astrée* (1607-1628), Jean Boudoin’s *Histoire Negre Pontique Contenant la vie, et les Amours d’Alexander Castriot arriereveneu de Scanderberg et d’Olimpe la belle Greque* (1631), Cervantes’s major works—especially *Persiles and Sigismunda*—and writings by, among others, Madeleine de Scudéry. Both Fumée and Boudoin borrow their opening lines from Heliodorus’s novel. In Fumee’s case, the opening line of his novel mirrors the *Aethiopica*’s:

\[
\text{ΗΜΕΡΑΣ ἀρτὶ διαγελώσῃς, καὶ ἥλιον ο̣ τὰς ἀκρα-}
\text{φείας καταγγάζοντος, ἄνδρες ἐν ὀξλοὶς ἀντικοι ὄρους
\text{ὑπερκυψαίτες, ὥς ὐ ὄ κατ’ ἐκβολὰς τοῦ Ἡρακλεοτ, καὶ
\text{στόμα τὸ καλοῦμενον Ἑράκλεωτον ὑπερτείνει, μὲ
\text{κρὸν ἐπιστάντες, τὴν ὑποκειμένην Ἡράκλεοτ ὑδαλ-
\text{μοὺς ἐπήρχοντο.}
\]

[DAY HAD BEGUN TO SMILE and the sun was shining upon the hilltops when a band of armed men scaled the mountain which extends the mouth of the Nile called the Heracleot, where it empties into the sea.\(^\text{15}\)]

---

\(^{14}\) See Sandy, 752-53, for a comprehensive summary of the similarities between both works.

\(^{15}\) Bracketed translations in English that follow the Greek text of the *Aethiopica* are taken from Moses Hadas’s translation (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1957).
In Fumée:

Des-is la belle lueur du Soleil prest a se monster sur la terre.

[The beautiful shining light of the sun was ready to show itself to the earth.]

While Fumee patterns his opening line on Heliodorus’s, Boudoin borrows from Book 5 of the *Aethiopica* for his opening. In typical Heliodoran suspense, Book 5 of the *Aethiopica* begins with the intrigue of darkness, furtive movements, and stowaways:

H **ΜΕΝ ὅθεν τὸλυς ἡ Δελφῶν ἐν τούτοις ἦν, καὶ ὑπάσκων ὃ, τι ὅθεν καὶ ἑπάσκων οὐ γὰρ ἔχω γινώσκειν μοι ὅ ἐ τῶν καλιδῶν τῆς θυγατέρας ἡ ἐκκείνων ἐπιδιώκεις ἐπέ-βαλεν ἀναλαβόν τε τοὺς νέους, ἦγοι ἐπὶ Θάλασσαν, εὐθὺς ὡς εἶχον τῆς νυκτὸς, ἐνεβίβαζον τε εἷς τὴν ναῦν ἔν Θάλασσαν. ἀλλ' ἐ τὰ παθητήτα ὧσις ἑλλοῦσαν.

[In the dark of the night I collected the young pair and took them, just as they were, down to the sea and embarked them on a Phoenician ship, which was ready to loose its moorings; though day was just beginning to dawn, the Phoenicians thought they would not be transgressing their engagement to me . . . 16]

And Boudoin imitates the Heliodoran mystery in his novel:

A nuict n’estoit pas encore bien fermee, & le soliel sembloit auoir de regret de laisser les royalles pompes d’Alger ensueties dans les tenebres quand trios ou quatre personnes ayant le visage enueloppé, fortirent du

---

grand Serrail par la porte des jardinages, & venant tout doucement à la marine, fe faïfèrent de la première chaloupe, qui les conduisit à force de rames auprès d'un vaisseau de moyenne grandeur, ancré demi-mille hors de l'emboucheure du port, là où s'embarquans à la haste, avec l'ayde des matelots, ils firent voile selon qu'il pleust au vent de les conduire, n'ayant point à l'heure d'autre soucy que celui d'aller viste, &: tenant pour la meilleure de leur route, celle qui les eslongneroit le plustost d'Alger.

[The night was not yet finished and the sun seemed sorry to leave the royal richness of Algier when three or four people with their faces covered exited the marketplace from the door of the garden that led slowly to the sea. They entered the first boat that brought them and rowed toward a ship anchored five hundred miles outside the port. They embarked quickly with the help of sailors and sailed according to the wind. They had no worry, except leaving Algier.]

Fumée’s setting is early morning: he mentions that “the sun was ready to” shine--an association easily made with sunrise. Boudoin’s opening specifically resembles that of Book 5 where three people steal away from Athens during the night aboard a Phoenician ship, but it has distant echoes of the opening line in Book 1 as well: just as “the Heracelot empties into the sea,” Boudoin’s “garden leads slowly to the sea.” Boudoin also replicates the sense of mystery and intrigue found in Heliodorus’s opening sentence of Book 1: Heliodorus’s “band of armed pirates” scaling the mountain conjures adventure and danger as do Boudoin’s “three or four people with their faces” hidden stealing away from Algiers under the cover of darkness.
Almost all of Heliodorus’s imitators utilize the scene in which one character unburdens himself of his history to another, such as Cnemon to Theagenes and Charicleia or Calasiris to Cnemon. In the latter scenario, Calasiris, at Cnemon’s request, relates how he came to be looking for Theagenes and Charicleia. In Fumée and Boudoin, both secondary narrators relate their stories to others. Heliodorus’s influence on French writers was so pervasive that, as Stechow notes, it prompted Balzac to complain that most of the French novels then were “nothing but disguised Heliodoruses, degenerate children of Theagenes’s lineage” (145).

Italy, Germany, and Holland provided their share of admirers: Lodovico Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso* (1516), Torquato Tasso’s *Gerusalemme Liberata* (1581), Martinus Crusius’s *Martinus Crvsii Aethiopicae* (1584), and Matthys van (de?) Velden’s *Calasires Sterfdagh* (1631). Ariosto modeled the love affair between Orlando and Angelica on that of Theagenes and Charicleia, and Tasso was so impressed with the *Aethiopica* that he included an entire episode from it in Canto XII of his epic, which has several sections, including the life and death of Clorinda, who is the daughter of the Ethiopian king and queen. Fearing charges of adultery from her jealous husband, the queen places the baby princess in the safe keeping of the eunuch, Arsetes. The parallels between Charicleia and Clorinda are striking and significant: both women are of
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17. According to Sandy, the most frequently borrowed scene from the *Aethiopica* is the cave scene, in which Thyamis stores Charicleia and returns to retrieve her but is unsuccessful. See “Heritage,” 752.
18. Unlike the other works, Martinus Crusius’s is a summary of the *Aethiopica*. See *Martini Crvsii Aethiopicae Heliodori Historiæ Epitome. Cum observationibus ejusdem. Ejusdem de parentibus suis narratio*. (Francofurti,1584); Doody, 224.
Ethiopian royal descent, are born “white,” are abandoned by their mothers for fear of charges of infidelity, and are protected by an Egyptian. They are virtuous, martial maidens, though Clorinda far exceeds Charicleia in arms. Tasso maintains the cross-cultural and transracial love interest between an Ethiopian princess and a Western prince.

Enthusiasm for the *Aethiopica* also registered in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century continental European drama. Italy produced the first play based on the *Aethiopica*: Ettore Pigatelli’s *Cariclea* (1582); eight years later, Battista Guiarini’s *Il Pastor Fido* (1590) followed. In 1605, Wolgang Waldung’s play *Aethiopicus Amor Castus* was published, followed in 1608 by Johannes Schlovin’s *Aithiopissa: Tragicocomedia Nova, Ex Historia Aethiopica Heliodori Espicopi Tricensis*. Six years later, his German compatriot Caspar Brülow’s *Caricleia* (1614) came out. Written and performed in 1601 but published in 1623, Alexandre Hardy’s *Le chastes amovrs de Théagène et Caricléée* is an anthology of plays based on the *Aethiopica*; according to Stechow, Hardy “squeezed a sequence of no less [sic] than eight plays out of Heliodorus’s novel” (145). In 1609, the French dramatist Octave-Cesar Genetay published his *L’Ethiopique*. Racine also wrote a play on the *Aethiopica*, but it is lost. Spain produced dramatic works based on the *Aethiopica* as well: Francisco de Rojas Zorilla’s *Persiles and Sigismunda* (1633) along with Pedro Calderón de la Barca and
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20. Only a small section of *Il Pastor Fido* seems to derive from the *Aethiopica*. In Heliodorus, Charicleia is about to be sacrificed by her father; similarly, Miritillo is about to be sacrificed by his father, who turns out to be his adoptive sire. See *Il Pastor Fido*, trans. Dr Thomas Sheridan, edited and completed by Robert Hogan and Edward A. Nickerson (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1989), Act 5, scene 4. There are no line numbers in this edition.


22. According to Stechow, 145, claimed that the *Aethiopica* was his favorite book. The story goes that, as a member of the Jansenist order, Racine was forbidden to read the novel, a command which he ignored. By the time the novel was finally confiscated from him, Racine claimed to have memorized all of it.

23. Zorilla’s play derives directly from Cervantes’s novel of the same name, which is based directly on the *Aethiopica*. 
Juan Pérez de Mantalbán’s *Los hijos de la fortuna, Teagenes y Cariclea* (1664). In keeping with the *Aethiopica*, these Continental dramas depict black Africans favorably on the Renaissance stage. Additionally, two of them portray the wisdom and courage of African women of royal blood.

The *Aethiopica*’s popularity moved beyond the world of literature, spreading to the realms of music and painting. The Dutchman Frans Demaret composed the 1695 opera *Theagene et Chariclee*. Earlier in the century, however, the French led the way with cycles of paintings based on the *Aethiopica*. Between 1600 and 1606, Ambroise Dubois did a set of paintings commemorating the birth of Louis XIII, who was born at the Chateau de Fontainebleu, Fontainebleu, in the Fontainebleu room, which the paintings were commissioned to decorate. Dubois used scenes from the *Aethiopica* for his compositions, and with the help of his students completed at least forty-six large paintings, thirteen of which still hang in the Gallery of Frescoes and in the Fountainbleau (or Louis XIII) room. He seemed to have captured the entire story of the *Aethiopica* on canvas. In one painting, *Histoire des amours de Théagène et Chariclée: L’Embarquement de Théagène, Chariclée et Calasiris pour retourner en Egypte*, all three characters are boarding a ship (the Phoenician merchant ship in Bk. 5 of the *Aethiopica* that will take them to Egypt). Both Theagenes and Calasiris are solicitous of Charicleia’s safety as they help her aboard the vessel. Theagenes stands abreast of her with his arms wrapped around her for support while Calasiris stands anterior to but below her and stretches out his hands to aid her descent into the ship. The background and foreground
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24. Dubois founded a line of artists; his sons and grandsons were pensioners of Louis XIII and Louis XIV. See Alphonso–Jules Wauters and Mrs. Henry Reed, *Flemish School of Painting* (London: Cassel & Co. 1886), 189.
are peopled with sailors. Some look on, and others, with sacks across their backs, load the ship.

In another painting, *L’Enlèvement de Chariclée par Théagène*, a young man holds a helpless looking Charicleia, whose left arm drapes over his shoulders. The young man and his captive occupy the center of the painting while the others form a sort of linear blockade as if to ensure that the “l’enlevement” is successful. All eyes dart in different directions while the young man, sword sheathed at his side, plants his right foot on the step. Like Dubois, Pierre Vallet drew upon Heliodorus’s novel for his 120 etchings (1613), which he presented to Louis XIII in the form of a book, *Les aventures amoureuses de Theagenes et Cariclée sommairement décrites et représentées par figures*. A shortened version of Heliodorus’s story accompanies each print. In one of the etchings, Vallet conflates two scenes from the *Aethiopica*: the birth of Charicleia and the recognition scene (fols. 111 and 112), in which the painting of Andromeda is pivotal. In Vallet’s rendering of the scenes, the painting of Andromeda hangs on the wall. Vallet’s pictorials in turn influenced another set of *Aethiopica* prints, including those of Crispin de Passe and others in 1620. Jean Mosnier, painter and protégé of Marie de Medici, also executed a cycle of paintings (1630-1635) based on the *Aethiopica* for the Chateau de Cheverny. Mosnier’s paintings, according to Stechow, totaled thirty and “are carefully chosen from the main action of the novel and well arranged” in chronological order (148). The last French painter in the *Aethiopica* series was Nicolas Mignard; his paintings disappeared at the end of the eighteenth century. In 1633, Paul de Fortia
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25. The scene comes from Book 4 of the story, in which Charicleia colludes with Calasiris and Theagenes to “kidnap” her from her home. For this and other images of Dubois’s paintings, see [www.notrefamille.com/collection-privee/oeuvres/Dubois+Ambrose+/L%27Enl%E8](http://www.notrefamille.com/collection-privee/oeuvres/Dubois+Ambrose+/L%27Enl%E8) (downloaded 7/21/2009).
26. McGrath, 1, n. 4.
commissioned Mignard to do a series of eighteen paintings from the *Aethiopica* for the Hotel Montréal in Avignon.

Dutch painters Abraham Bloemaert, Gerard Honthorst, and Karel Van Mander also lauded the *Aethiopica* with their brushes. In 1625 to 1626, Bloemaert painted two scenes from the *Aethiopica* for Frederick Henrik of Orange. In “Theagenes and Chariclea on the Beach,” a ship is moored in the background, and to its left is a table spread for a banquet, evocative of a celebration. In the foreground, bodies litter the beach, while atop the hill are men with weapons. Almost in the center but veering slightly to the left are a wounded Theagenes and a solicitous Chariclea. The painting recalls the scene from Book 1 in which the pirates, divided in their loyalty to Trachinus and Pelorus as to which man should marry Charicleia, slaughter one another. The second painting, “The Crowning of Theagenes,” pictures Theagenes kneeling at Charicleia’s feet and kissing her hand. Seated under a canopy, with a staff in her left hand, Chariclea is surrounded presumably by judges, while in the background, the rest of the runners make their way home--flanked on either side of the track by spectators.27

Approximately ten years later, Honthorst crossed the channel to paint a cycle from the *Aethiopica* for the wedding of Charles I’s sister, Elizabeth, prospective queen of Bohemia. Van Mandel’s cycle of ten paintings includes “Persinna and Hydaspes embracing” and “The Recognition of Chariclea,” from Books 4 and 10 of the *Aethiopica*. In the former, an amorous Hydaspes indulges in foreplay while a somewhat distracted Persinna gazes at the painting of Andromeda in the background. In the latter, Chariclea bares her right arm to reveal the vestigial black skin as proof that the king is her father as

27. The scene is from Bk.4, in which Theagenes defeats the champion to claim the prize; he had vowed that no man, except him, would receive the prize from the hands of Charicleia.
a puzzled Hydaspes surveys his daughter’s arm and, presumably, the Andromeda painting beside her for confirmation of Persinna’s explanation and his paternity. When Van Mandel died, a copy of the Aethiopica was discovered in his pocket.  

By the time the Aethiopica reached England’s shore, according to Sandy, it “had been discovered, studied, translated, plundered and adapted in France” and other continental countries “before extended prose fiction made its way in Great Britain” (764). In spite of the work’s popularity on the Continent, the English would plunder the Aethiopica anew: both major and minor dramatic (and non-dramatic) writers would find Heliodorus’s text an invaluable source from which to cull material for the stage and in the process would develop a stage tradition that, among other things, portrayed Africans favorably on the English Renaissance stage. As it did for continental European writers, Heliodorus’s novel influenced both major and minor English writers, which occurred mainly through the second-hand translation of Thomas Underdowne and the subsequent reprints of his translation. Unlike the French who could read Greek and had access to Greek codices, the English had no access to Greek codices and relied on French and Latin translations for their knowledge of the Aethiopica. Following his 1567 Englishing of Warschewiczki’s Latin translation, Underdowne’s was reprinted in 1577, 1578, 1605, 1622, and 1627. Underdowne’s 1567 version, as Samuel Lee Wolff points out, “brings the “Aethopica” [sic] into Elizabethan hands in plenty of time” (459).

Sir Philip Sidney and Robert Greene made copious use of the Heliodoran material. Greene, as Wolff points out, is full of “matter” from Heliodorus, and

28. McGrath, 5.
Sidney himself echoes Scaliger in the “Defence,” calling the *Aethiopica* a “heroical poem” and imitating it in both versions of his *Arcadia* and even recasting the *New Arcadia* in the structural mold of the *Aethiopica*. While the *Old Arcadia* borrows Heliodorus’s expansive linguistic style, rhetorical embellishments, dialogues, disguises, kidnapping, and the concluding scene in which a father unwittingly condemns his child, the *New Arcadia* appropriates the thematic and structural elements of the *Aethiopica*. Sidney’s *Arcadia*, according to Moses Hadas, “was the principal model for his successors,” influencing, as Donald Stump points out, in particular “nine playwrights, including Shakespeare, Beaumont, and Fletcher.”

Sidney’s influence is observable in James Shirley’s *Arcadia* and Beaumont and Fletcher’s *Cupid’s Revenge*. Shirley’s *Arcadia* is Sidney’s *Arcadia*, dramatized. In both Sidney’s pastoral and Shirley’s play, King Basilius of Arcadia tries to confound the oracle by retreating to the forest with his wife and two daughters to preserve his life. Shortly thereafter two suitors, Prince Pyrocles of Macedonia and his cousin Prince Musidorus of Thessaly, arrive in disguise: Pyrocles as the Amazon Zelmane and Musidorus as the shepherd Dorus. Complications ensue when Basilius and Gynecia, who sees through the prince’s disguise, fall in love with Zelmane/Pyrocles. To disentangle himself, Pyrocles invites Basilius and Gynecia to a cave but leaves to pursue his interest in Philoclea; both princes “kidnap” the princesses. Basilius and Gynecia reconcile, and she gives him a “love potion” and Basilius “dies” from poison. Gynecia and the princes are arrested, tried, and sentenced to death. After condemning all three, Eucharius, king of
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31. Samuel Lee Wolff, *The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Fiction* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1961), 376. Although Heliodorus exerted significant influence on Sidney and Greene, only Greene receives a full treatment in chapter 1 because of the relevance of his play to this study.
Macedonia, discovers that he has condemned his own son; however, the sentences must be executed. As the condemned are led to their deaths, Basilius revives and sits up on his funeral bier, thus fulfilling the oracle that he had tried to thwart.

These episodes of Sidney and Shirley combine several of Heliodorus’s, drawing primarily on those of Cnemon-Demainete and Arsace-Theagenes. In Sidney and Shirley, a husband and wife desire the same stranger; however, something of the reverse occurs in Heliodorus: a wife desires a father and son. In this ménage à trois, similar complications develop in Heliodorus as in Sidney: the desired lover, Cnemon, rejects the advances of his desiring stepmother Demainete. Enraged, she plots his destruction; through her machinations Cnemon bursts into her bedroom threatening to stab her lover, who, as it turns out, is Aristippus, his father and Demainete’s husband. Cnemon is arrested, tried, and sentenced to death. But the sentence is commuted to exile. Aristippus eventually discovers that he has condemned his son unjustly and seeks to repeal his exile. In the Arsace-Theagenes episode, Arsace “kidnaps” Theagenes and Charicleia and tries to poison Charicleia. Arsace schemes to have Charicleia tried and sentenced to death. Failing to kill Charicleia, she tosses Charicleia and Theagenes in the palace dungeon, but word of their captivity reaches Oroondates, Arsace’s husband, who orders their release. Returning to Oroondates, the Persian soldiers are ambushed by Ethiopian soldiers, who take Charicleia and Theagenes to King Hydaspes. By imprisoning and condemning Charicleia and Theagenes, Arsace unwittingly plays a part in fulfilling the oracle that predicts Charicleia and Theagene’s travel to and happy union in Ethiopia.

In Beaumont and Fletcher’s *Cupid’s Revenge*, Duke Leontius of Lycia suspends the worship of Cupid, the patron of the land, at the urging of his daughter and son. A
vengeful Cupid causes the destruction of the royal family. On his deathbed, Leucippus reverses his father’s edict. Because Shirley’s *Arcadia* and Beaumont and Fletcher’s *Cupid’s Revenge* utilize a common source, overlaps such as the missing ruler and the competition between him and another family member for the love of the same person are noticeable. This episode has traces of the Demainete-Cnemon-Aristippus encounter, but also that of Trachinus-Pelor Charicleia, when both the pirate and his deputy fall in love with the same woman and both die as a result. Given that Heliodorus influenced writers who in turn influenced other writers, his tertiary influence is conceivably larger than his direct influence.

IV.

A Lost Tradition

Unlike the English Renaissance writers, the Greeks regarded Ethiopia and its inhabitants with awe, both “as a far-off realm and one inhabited by [a] remarkable people.” According to this understanding, the degradation of black Africans that resonates throughout the literature of the English Renaissance is sparse in the ancient world. The ancient Greeks thought of the Ethiopians “as the best people in the world” and Homer, Herodotus, Aeschylus, Ovid, Seneca, and other ancient writers esteemed Ethiopians and other black Africans, often peopling their works with deeds and descriptions of them. In Book 1 of *The Iliad*, Homer writes that

\[
\text{Zeús γὰρ ἐσ Ὀκεανῷ μετ' ἀμφώνας Αἰθιοπίᾳς Χθελόξε ἔβηκε κατὰ δαίμονα. Θεοὶ δ' ἀμα πάντες ἔποντο.}
\]

Homer uses ἀψιμονας to describe Ethiopians, which several translators of Homer’s text render as “pious,” “blameless” and “worthy.”

34. Ibid.
In his translation for the Loeb Classical Library, A.T. Murray renders the passage as follows: “For Zeus went yesterday to the Oceanus, to the blameless Ethiopians for a feast, and all the gods followed with him . . . ."35 Love motivates the gods to empty Olympus yearly in order to have a twelve-day feast with these black people. Such honor neither the gods nor the poets bestow on any other nation. Homer, however, does not sing only of the Ethiopians’ interpersonal skills; he chants their mental and martial prowess. In the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon, the Ethiopian Eurybates has the distinction of being the only envoy whom Agammenon selects to collect Brisēis from Achilles, to return her to him, and to entreat Achilles to rejoin the war.36 According to The Odyssey, “Odysseus honoured [Eurybates] above his other comrades, because he was like-minded with himself.”37 Like Eurybates, Memnon, king of Ethiopia, fought in the Trojan war, showing nobility, valor, and mercy by slaying Antilochus yet sparing the defenseless father until he himself falls by Achilles’s hand.38 Heliodorus draws upon these and other ancient works to create the Aethiopica, which, in turn, influenced many early modern playwrights’ admirable depictions of Africans on the Renaissance stage, leaving a stage tradition that stretches back to this ancient text.

From the fifth century BCE and on, other writers from antiquity also ascribed bravery, beauty, and nobility to Ethiopians, echoing Homer, who wrote during the eighth

35. References to The Iliad are to The Loeb Classical Library edition, trans. A. T. Murray (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1965), 35 (I. 409-34). Other translations such as W.H.D. Rouse’s (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1960) and E.V. Riev (London: Clays, 1950) use “pious” and “worthy” to describe the Ethiopians. See pages 19 & 34 of these texts.
38. Frank Snowden, Jr., Blacks in Antiquity: Ethiopians in Greco-Roman Experience (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1970), 151. McGrath, 5, and Snowden, 151-53, chronicle the color evolution of Memnon, noting that at one point he is pictured as white, especially on vases. However, over time, Memnon reverted to being black, as depicted by a statue in Ethiopia.
According to the fifth-century BCE historian Herodotus, the Ethiopians inhabited “the ends of the earth” and “are said to be the tallest and fairest [handsomest] of all men [in whole world]”\(^{39}\):

Herodotus uses the word κάλλιστοι to describe Ethiopians. It is masculine plural superlative of καλός, which Liddell & Scott translates as “beautiful, fair.” In *Prometheus Bound*, the dramatist Aeschylus, who also wrote during the fifth century BCE, has Io travel to a faraway land “at the worlds end / where tribes of black people live / where the foundation of the Sun gush / and the river Aethiops flows” (ll. 1214-1218).\(^{40}\) Io has to take some of these people to the “three-cornered land”—i.e., Egypt—and found a colony. The first-century historian Diodorus Siculus notes that Ethiopians “invented writing” and gave it to the Egyptians—which they called hieroglyphics—along with religion and culture. Diordorus also claims that Hercules and Bacchus were “awed by the piety of the Ethiopians,” and testifies to the affection between the Ethiopians and the gods:

> And they say that they [Ethiopians] were the first to be taught to honor the gods and to hold sacrifices and festivals and processions and other rites by which men honor their deity; and that in consequence their piety has been published abroad among men, and it is generally held that the sacrifices practiced among the Ethiopians are those which are the most pleasing to

---


heaven. As witness to this they call upon the poet who is perhaps the oldest and certainly the most venerated among the Greeks [...] (Bk. 2)

Diodorus not only evokes Homer; he also makes his homage more forceful by venerating the already venerated Homer: “... the oldest [i.e., established] and most venerated Greek poet.” Diodorus connects the Ethiopians’ invincibility to their piety and reverence for the gods, noting that Ethiopians enjoy the favor of the gods. This favor that the Gods bestow on the Ethiopians has prevented other nations from conquering and dominating them, which also alludes to the historic attempts of the Persian Cambyses, the Babylonian queen Semiramis, and the mythic Greek hero Heracles and god Dionysus to subdue the Ethiopians.

The Homeric tradition of the pious and blameless Ethiopians also finds repetition in other Greco-Roman voices that chant the praises of Ethiopians. In his “Periegetes,” Dionysus (117-138) wrote that the Ethiopians were godlike and blameless; the fifth-century compiler and author Stobaeus notes their stellar character, and Aelian, writing in the third century, describes Ethiopia as a house of relaxation for the gods. Other works of Greek origin feature Ethiopians’ skill and fortitude. In The Romance of Alexander the Great (third century BCE), (Pseudo-)Callisthenes describes the Ethiopian queen, Candace, “a woman ... endowed with infinite beauty,” and the exchange between her and the mighty conqueror. Alexander wrote admiringly to Candace, referencing the oracle from Ammon and asking her to meet him in Meroe so they could “deliberate together” (132). Suspecting an attack, the queen replies that by remaining at home “to

wreak vengeance on those who attack [her] and to deal with them as . . . enemies,” she is adhering to Ammon’s oracle that countered the initial instruction for her to march upon Egypt. Then she admonishes Alexander:

Do not be mistaken about our color. For in our souls we are lighter than the white men amongst you. And there are enough of us to hold out for time without end. We have eighty squadrons ready for those who come to do us harm (132).

Perhaps the queen thought Alexander had foolishly confused dark skin with a lack of enlightenment and courage. However, Callisthenes notes that Alexander admired Ethiopians, for Alexander’s letter to Candace signals his desire to worship Ammon and to sacrifice to him. Whether Alexander wanted to conquer the Ethiopians or Candace outmaneuvered him psychologically, Alexander ended up helping her son to retake his wife from the king of Bebrycia (133-35).

The Aethiopica typifies the ancient literary tradition in its laudatory presentation of black Africans, especially of King Hydaspes. Although Heliodorus provides no physical description of Hydaspes beyond his black skin, he represents the king as a mighty warrior who exercises power in the Ethiopian tradition. According to Snowden, when Heliodorus created Hydaspes, he probably knew of the legendary and historic Ethiopian kings, especially King Piankhi (751-716 B.C.) who conquered Egypt, for the similarities between factual and fictional kings are striking: like the historic Piankhi, Hydaspes dislikes putting men to death and instructs his men not to slaughter the enemy but to take as many prisoners alive as possible. 43 Hydaspes does not seek to expand his territory by coveting the land of another ruler and waging war over it. Instead, he is

43. Snowden, 148.
content with the size of his territory as demarcated by natural boundaries, and once his objective in the war with Persian Egypt is achieved, he retires to Ethiopia “because of his reverence for justice.”

The innumerable translations of the *Aethiopica* throughout Europe furthured the literary tradition of piety and heroism associated with Ethiopians. Beginning with his 1534 edition, Obsopoeus recommended “the *Aethiopian History* of Heliodorus as the most absolute Image of all humane Affections, a perfect Example of Conjugal Love, Truth and Constancy being wonderfully drawn in the Character of Theagenes and Charicleia” (19). Jacques Amyot is of a similar mind. Even the title of his translation reflects the protagonists’ moral bent: *L’Historie Aethiopique de Heliodorus: contenant dix livres, tritant des loyales et pudiques amours de Theagene Thessalien, et Chariclea une Aethiopiène*. An abstract in and of itself, the title describes the virtues of Theagenes and Chariclea: they are loyal (“loyales”) and chaste (“pudiques”). Amyot’s translation, reprinted at least twenty times, might have contributed to the growth of Heliodoran-like novels that followed, especially when one recalls that only one codex of the *Aethiopica* existed in France then.

Warschewiczki’s translation of the *Aethiopica* applauds the Ethiopians’ noble character, military prudence, and prowess that Obsopoeus and Amyot had already noted in the leading characters. In the dedication, Warschewiczki extols the pacific attitude and moral virtue of the book: “Not only many changes of fortune but also many images of virtue are here displayed. Among these is the description of Hydaspes, the king of Ethiopia, who is to be praised not only for his fortitude but also for his justice, clemency,

44. Ibid.
and kindness towards those whom he has subdued” (a3v). An aristocrat and knight, Warschewiczki was also a Renaissance man, with a humanist education and skill in many areas. Given the Renaissance’s objective of using ancient texts for educational purposes, it is not surprising that Warschewiczki appreciates and applauds Hydaspes for his royal virtues: justice, clemency, and kindness. “Renaissance men,” according to Doody, “believed in the moral good of contemplating examples of virtue” because “such examples” are powerful. Warschewiczki is the only translator to privilege Hydaspes over Charicleia and Theagenes, dedicating “the book . . . to the King of Poland”--for “the Renaissance was interested in pictures for princes, mirrors for magistrates, good examples with which to train rulers.” To Warschewiczki, Hydaspes is a king and a mirror of virtues.

All of the English Renaissance translators--from Sanford to Underdowne, Abraham Fraunce, and William Lisle--note the virtues of loyalty and sexual purity in the Ethiopian Charicleia and her betrothed. Many English playwrights would draw on these virtues as well as the martial activity of Charicleia to create a stage tradition of chaste and intrepid heroines drawn from the Aethiopica. Other English writers saw the chance to capitalize on the model of sexual conduct promulgated throughout the Aethiopica and to offer the public alternative reading to the chivalric romances of the day. As if to reinforce the themes of chastity through comparison, both Sanford and Fraunce annexed their renditions of the Aethiopica to another work. Adjoining Sanford’s The amorous and

46. Stanislaus Warschewiczki, trans. Aethiopicae Historia (Basilae: Johannes Oporinus, 1552).
47. Doody, 237-38.
tragicall tales of Plutarch (1567)\textsuperscript{48} is his translation of Book 4 of the Aethiopica. The overall themes of The amorous tales are sexual permissiveness and murder while that of Book 4 of the Aethiopica is unsullied passion. By juxtaposing Plutarch and Heliodorus, the latter appears even more pristine, especially when one realizes that Book 4 is where Charicleia and Theagenes pledge fidelity and chastity to each other. In The third part of the Countess of Pembroke Yuychurch (1592),\textsuperscript{49} Fraunce yokes Book 1 of his rendition of the Aethiopica to his poem “Amytas Pastoral,” thus complementing and reinforcing the ideal of chastity that is associated with Ethiopians and which Renaissance England so prized. In Fraunce’s poem, Phillis and Amytas die for their love, and although Theagenes and Charicleia do not, they come close. In Book 1 of Fraunce’s text, Theagenes and Charicleia are shipwrecked, and when in danger of losing both her virtue and Theagenes, Charicleia threatens suicide: “. . . poore mayd surprysed by the capten / . . . / cleaved fast to the yongman, / And every way shee declared; Unless yongman went, Shee never meant to be going, / Unles yongman went shee herself meant to be murdering, / And with a knife in her hand to her hart shee begins to be poynting” (47). Charicleia understands the ramifications for herself and Theagenes if they are captured and separated by outlaws: a seriously wounded Theagenes would be left to perish and she would be subject to her captors’ lust.

Like Sanford and Fraunce, Lisle and Underdowne also call attention to the sexual purity of the Ethiopian maiden and her Greek consort. Lisle’s The Faire Ethiopian

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{49} Abraham Fraunce. The third part of the Countess of Pembroke Yuychurch, entituled Amintas dale: wherein are the most conceited tales of the pagan gods in English hexameters, together with their auncient descriptions and philosophicall explications (Lundon [sic]: Thomas Orwin, 1592).
\end{flushright}
(1631)\textsuperscript{50} advertises the “Testimonies of Learned Men concerning Heliodorus.” Among these is the testimony of the scholar Thomas Dempster, who praises Heliodorus as “the Phoenix of Phoenicia, an elegant writer of chast love. . . .” Lisle himself notes Charicleia’s devotion to chastity when he writes that the men she slew “‘Twas in defence of sacred chastity.” The coupling of “sacred” and “chastity” reinforces the importance of sexual purity. Instead of offering the testimonies of others as validation for the sexual purity of Heliodorus’s novel, Underdowne offers his own in “To the gentle Reader” section of the 1577 reprint:

I am not ignorant that the stationers shops are to full fraughted with books of small price, whither you consider the quantitie or contents of them, and that the loosenesse of these dayes rather requireth grave exhortations to vertue, then wanton allurements to leudness, that it were meeter to publish notable example of godly christian life, then the most honest (as I take this to be) historie of love (iii).

The parenthetical “this” refers to the Aethiopica, which Underdowne compares to Mort Darthure, Arthur of little Britain, and Amadis of Gaule—all of which promote murder or fornication. The comparison enables Underdowne, like the other translators, to emphasize the Aethiopica’s focus on virtue through the “notable example of godly christian life” and “honest historie of love” and to extricate himself from any charge of peddling sexual impropriety, which Greek novels were often accused of doing. As the OED explains, “honest” during the sixteenth century also meant “chaste, virtuous” and usually referred to the sexual conduct of a woman. In this case, however, it refers to the female and male protagonists: Charicleia and Theagenes.

\textsuperscript{50} William Lisle, \textit{The Faire Ethiopian} (London: Iohn Haviland, 1631).
By the sixteenth century, the literary tradition of the virtuous Africans underwent significant changes in the hands of English Renaissance dramatists, who ignored the testimonies from antiquity and the international influence of the *Aethiopica*; even as they ironically culled material from the *Aethiopica* for the stage, English Renaissance dramatists nonetheless often represented black Africans as degraded and profligate. Why did this loss (or neglect) occur? Although it is difficult to pinpoint the exact reasons, the outcome of the 1578 war in Morocco, also known as the Battle of Alcazar, the changing taste in theatrical entertainment, and England’s initial entry into global affairs seem to have contributed to the loss. In the summer of 1578, Muly Mahamet fought his uncle Abdelmalek for the sovereignty of Marrakech and Fez. A usurper, Muly had seized the throne by violent means in 1574 but was ousted in 1576 and tried to regain it in 1578. Both sides sought the help of outside forces. Abdelmalek turned to the Turks while Muly Mohamet enlisted the help of the Portuguese, promising to surrender Morocco to King Sebastian. In the aftermath, Muly drowned while trying to flee. Abdelmalek died on the battlefield, as did Sebastian, other Portuguese noblemen, and Thomas Stukeley, the Englishman who supported Sebastian. The news consumed England like a bonfire, and tracts, pamphlets, plays, and histories fueled the market. As Emily C. Bartels points out, “George Whetstone’s *English Myrror* (1586) and John Polemon’s *Second part of the booke of Battailes* (1587) wrote Alcazar into history . . .” 52 and provided material for Peele’s play, *The Battle of Alcazar* (1588/9).

---

51. According to Polemon, Abdelmalek turned to the Turks because he had distinguished himself in Suleiman’s army; when Suleiman’s son Amurrathes ascended the throne, he was eager to help his officer reclaim his birthright: *The Second Booke of Battailes, fought in our age: Taken Ovt of The best authors and writers in sundrie languages* (London: Gabriel Cawood, 1587), 67.
Peele’s *Alcazar*, created during the time when Roger Ascham and other Renaissance figures sought changes in theatrical and other forms of public entertainments and when England was engaged with initial excursions in the Mediterranean, started the tradition of portraying Blacks as degraded and profligate beings. As I have tried to show with ancient texts, black Africans were also represented favorably throughout literature, as well as on the English Renaissance stage. In *A Pretie new Enterlude both pithie & pleasantaunt of the Story of King Darius, Being taken out of the third and fourth Chapter of the third booke of Esdras* (1565), the character of Aethyopia is portrayed positively. As guests of King Darius, Aethyopia along with “Percia, Medya, and . . . Iuda” feast at the king’s table before returning “to theyr owne roofes.” Aethyopia is the earliest extant positive representation of a black character on the early modern English stage and is another indication of a dramatic tradition that presents Africans favorably. Significantly, this drama is an interlude.

Polemon’s account of the battle of Alcazar gave Peele the opportunity to represent black Africans unfavorably and to embrace them as a new dramatic subject probably for at least two reasons: the call for theatrical reformation had perhaps grown too loud for practitioners of the stage to ignore and, as Anthony Gerard Barthelemy suggests, “the old morality play with its world of allegory was being replaced by the new form of mimetic


drama,” necessitating that the figure of the Vice “yield the stage or adapt” (74). Because writers of morality plays promulgated the notion that before Creation “the face of evil was frequently black,” post-Alcazar plays associated color with vice and virtue: black is evil; white is virtue—associations erroneously derived from the fall of Lucifer.55 An agent of Satan, the Vice works in the allegorical world where he personifies a particular evil or human flaw. Hence his deeds are “black.” The Vice evolved into the stage villain: human, physically distinct from Satan, a natural man and so a more effective dissembler and deceiver. Because the Vice wore blackface, according to Barthelemy, and his deeds were black, it was easy for English Renaissance dramatists to fuse the allegory, the symbolic, the metaphor with the mimetic and the actual by conflating black deeds with black skin.56

When Muly Mahamet waged war against his uncle in 1578 and Europeans died on the battlefield, this event cemented the theatrical conflation of black deeds with black skin. Polemon’s account of the battle, on which Peele drew to reinforce the dramatic presentation, makes the fusion of black skin and black deeds easy. Muly was of stature meane, of bodie weake, of coulour so blacke, that he was accompted of many for a Negro or black Moore. He was of a peruerse nature, he would never speak the truth, he did all things subtelly and deceitfully. He was not delighted in armes, but as he shewed in all

55. Anthony Gerard Barthelemy, *Black Face, Maligned Race: the Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1987), 72. There is no biblical evidence associating black with evil or sin. Throughout the *Bible*, sin is associated with scarlet or, in the case of self-righteousness, with ultra-whiteness. When Miriam murmured against Moses for marrying an Ethiopian and taking too much spiritual responsibility unto himself, she sinned and became “as white as snow,” i.e., a leper. Similarly, when King Uzziah became puffed up with self-righteousness and tried to perform the office of the priest, he became a leper. See Numbers 12: 1-12 and 2 Chronicles 26: 1-21 (NKJV).
56. Barthelemy, 75-79.
battailes, of a nature cowardly and effeminate. But he so cruelly hated Christians that he would kill either with famine or nakedness, those that he caught.\textsuperscript{57}

In Muly, all the traits of the Vice are present: deception, dissembling, blackness in deeds and color—a destroyer of humankind’s soul. Polemon’s description of Muly facilitated an easy fictionalization of a historic character as Vice for Peele and thus an easy evolution of Vice into villain, especially when one realizes that of the major players at Alcazar, only Muly is described as black. This fusion, Barthelemy writes, is what occurs in the historic and dramatic accounts of \textit{The Battle of Alcazar}. When the Negro Muly Mahamet mounted the stage in 1588/9, the audience was “presented with the older allegorical form and the new mimetic historical drama; the audience is asked to view the play not as the older dramatic form but as the new form that calls to mind the older one” (79). Muly’s black skin reinforced in the audience’s mind the allegorical representation of blackness, making, in this case, the allegorical actual and the actual allegorical (79), according to Barthelemy. A paradigmatic moment of allegorical and actual fusion occurs in \textit{Lusts Dominion} when Philip, responding to Eleazar’s taunt of bastardy, says, “Thou true stamp’d son of hell / Thy pedigree is written in they face” (1V.ii. 40). Philip’s response alludes to the older dramatic form in its labeling of Eleazar as a “true stamp’d son of hell.” Eleazar has the imprimatur, the characteristics—a black face—of his father, Satan. Here the audience/reader is asked to recall the allegorical representation upon seeing Eleazar and hearing Philip’s words, especially “pedigree,” with its manifold meanings: the literary, which goes back to the morality plays and their associations, and the biological, which points to the offspring of a black individual. Likewise, when Philip

\textsuperscript{57} Polemon, 83.
tells Eleazar that “seeing your face we thought of hell,” his remark encapsulates the Renaissance’s associations of blackness with hell and villany.

Peele’s *Alcazar* sounded the death-knell for dramatic and literary respectability of black Africans on the English Renaissance stage and “rejuvenated for the popular stage in England a metaphor which, without exaggeration, profoundly and adversely affected the ways blacks were to be represented on stage for years to come,”\(^\text{58}\) according to Barthelemy. Bartels would concur with Barthelemy’s assessment, for she writes, “Clearly influential, the play provided the dramatic precursors for Moors who would follow in fairly regular succession: Aaron of *Titus Andronicus* (1594), Eleazar of *Lusts Dominion* (1599), and *Othello* (1604).” The inclusion of *Othello* in this list would seem to undercut the claim that Moors are portrayed negatively, but the connection among these Moors seems to be murder. Each of them has killed someone. Although Bartel’s list is all-male, black females were also subject to debased stage portrayal. Abdella from Fletcher’s *The Knight of Malta* (1644) and Zanche from Marston’s *Sophonisba*, among others, can be added to the list.

Given the Renaissance enchantment with ancient literature, the *Aethiopica*’s influence on the Renaissance, including the stage, and England’s trade with the Levant, it is difficult to see why Renaissance England presented Moors and other black Africans as sub-human. Homer, Herodotus, Diodorus, Callisthenes, and others note the courage, beauty, and sagacity of Ethiopians and other black Africans. Perhaps the clamor of

\(^{58}\) Barthelemy, 78. Bartels claims that “the very first representation of Moors on the English stage” came when “George Peele produced *The Battle of Alcazar* featuring the conflict between Muly Mahamet, the ‘barbarous’ ‘negro’ Moor and Abdelemec, the ‘brave Barbarian lord’ (1 Pro. 6-7, 12).” We know that Moors had been represented on the English stage prior to *Alcazar*, for the *Annals of English History* lists plays performed by Lord Howard’s Men that featured Moors, and Barthelemy reminds us that Moors had appeared on stage in *Tamburlaine* as defeated kings. Bartel’s point, however, is the negative portrayal of black Africans on the English stage and its lasting influence. See “*The Battle of Alcazar*, the Mediterranean, and the Moor,” 98.
strident voices against the theatrical fare of *Amadis, Mort d’Arthur*, and others lessens the difficulty in seeing why “the events at Alcazar [would] prompt Renaissance dramatists to embrace a new dramatic subject.” Besides Bartels, both Burke and Stechow suggest that the Renaissance needed new subject matter for the stage that would introduce new practices and values in the theater. And the Moor, placed in contradistinction to the English, could and did provide the new practices and values for the stage.

V.

**Outline of Dissertation Chapters**

Chapter 1 examines certain themes that the *Aethiopica* offered to playwrights for the English Renaissance stage, including a positive representation of black Africans. The chapter begins with a brief survey of past and recent scholarship on race, then moves into exploring the extant European plays that use the *Aethiopica* as a direct source—*Carichia* (1582), *La comedie des chastes et loyales amours de Theagene et Chariclee* (1601), *Aethiopicus Amor Castus* (1605), *Aithiopissa* (1608), *L’Ethiopique* (1609), *Chariclia* (1614), *A strange discovery: a tragi-comedy* (1640), and *The White Ethiopian* (1641)—before reconstructing the plots of the three lost English plays—*Charicleia* (1572), *Theagenes and Charicleia* (1573), and *The Queen of Ethiopia* (1578)—in order to establish an English dramatic tradition stemming from the *Aethiopica*, especially one that lauds Africans. Although Greene’s *Orlando Furioso* (1594) is a secondhand derivative of Heliodorus, I use it to help elucidate this point because it retains the positive representation of black Africans and the cross-cultural and transracial relationship found

in the *Aethiopica*. In the penultimate section of the chapter, I turn my attention to Heywood’s *The Faire Maid of the West, Part I* and Shakespeare’s *The Winter’s Tale* and argue their connection to the *Aethiopica*. Finally, I look at the representations of black Africans on stage and contend, based on evidence from other early modern plays and texts, that the degraded African of the English Renaissance stage is a deviation from the stage tradition of the *Aethiopica*.

Chapter 2 contends that Book 4 of the *Aethiopica* is pivotal to Jonson’s *Masque of Blackness* and *Masque of Beauty* because Jonson derived the idea of racial metamorphosis for his sixteen princesses from Queen Persinna’s description of birthing a white baby, albeit for different purposes and through different agencies. In this chapter, I also consider the relationship of metamorphosis to the issues of race and gender in Jonson’s twin masques and Robert Brome’s *The English Moor*. Associating Ethiopia with ugliness and England with beauty became an English Renaissance commonplace, which Jonson exploits especially through the elaborate metaphor of “blanching,” and which I argue he uses symbolically to participate in the dramatic tradition that derived from the *Aethiopica*. In the penultimate section of the chapter I explore the intertextuality of *The English Moor*, the *Aethiopica*, and Jonson’s twin masques plus his *Masque of the Metamorphosed Gypsies*, and I conclude the chapter by offering an analysis of Brome’s deviation from the Heliodoran stage tradition, since his comedy utilizes material from the *Aethiopica*.

In chapter 3, I examine *Othello* as an adventure play that may be read as a drama in the Heliodoran tradition. In Mediterranean adventure plays, white European men go to the Mediterranean and become romantically involved with women of color. *Othello*
reverses this motif: an African man goes to the other side of the Mediterranean and becomes involved with a European woman. Both of them are undone because of their union. Despite this and other inversion of motifs in this play, Othello is conversant with other Mediterranean plays. That Cinthio is Shakespeare’s primary source for Othello is well known. Yet there are moments in Shakespeare that do not exist in Cinthio. These moments, Frank Kermode argues, germinate in Shakespeare’s mind—the spirituality of Othello and Desdemona’s love, for example, as well as Desdemona’s elopement, and Brabantio as a blocking father. I, however, suggest that these moments are rooted in Heliodorus and tie them and other episodes to the Aethiopica, probing the parallels between Charicleia and Desdemona. The Mediterranean exerted a magnetic pull on English dramatists of this period, often provoking admiration and repulsion, especially in matters of race and religion. In this chapter, I scrutinize these twin issues in Mediterranean plays, and although I contend that in the Aethiopica the Mediterranean is a site where boundaries between peoples frequently dissolve, I also suggest that in early modern English plays the Mediterranean is a site of conflict because English Renaissance playwrights make religion a tool of tension in the Mediterranean given the religious difference between Christianity and Islam.

Recovering Heliodorus provides another way of looking into the Renaissance and seeing its construct of race and gender through, for example, the masques of Blackness and Beauty and the play Othello. In recovering the connections between Renaissance dramatists and Heliodorus, we cast new light on historical and literary contexts of these works and provide a deeply historicized and fresh angle of vision, thereby enhancing our understanding of the Renaissance itself.
Chapter 1

As demonstrated in the introduction, the *Aethiopica* was one of the most influential ancient literary works in the Renaissance. It influenced the early modern development of romance and romance epic, with its lost-and-found plot of exposure, racial metamorphosis, love, elopement, shipwreck, captivity, deception, separation, disguises, wandering, and reunion, and its intertwined multiple narratives told by flashbacks, dialogues, and interpolated narrators in a disrupted chronology. It also positively affected the early modern English stage representation of Africans by emphasizing their chastity, wisdom, and bravery, and provided material for portraying the interrelationship of race, religion, and gender in the Mediterranean adventure drama. In this chapter, I examine the themes that I contend the *Aethiopica* gave to and popularized on the English Renaissance stage, including, especially, a positive representation of black Africans.

Scholarship on early modern English drama ignored race for much of the twentieth century. For the past thirty years, however, there has been a dramatic increase in scholarship on the representation of race on the Elizabethan stage; critics have established that in Elizabethan and Jacobean England race had multiple meanings, from religious, national, and geographical to color identities. In particular, scholars have discovered that, from approximately the middle of the sixteenth century to the early part of the seventeenth century, English Renaissance dramatists wrote plays which focused on race relations between Islam and England in the Mediterranean, now called “adventure dramas” or more appropriately “Mediterranean plays.” Samuel Claggett Chew was the first scholar on record to investigate the relation between the Mediterranean and
Renaissance England, effectively laying the foundation for scholarship on race. In 1937, Chew published *The Crescent and the Rose*, a “combination of the historical and the typographical” that surveys the period from “the downfall of the Byzantine Empire [1453] to the downfall of the older English drama [1642].” Chew examines the commercial interchange between England and Islam from this period, demonstrating the widespread contact between the two nations.

Chew’s book and a few others documented England’s political involvement with the empires of the Turks and Moors. In 1967, two years after the republication of Chew’s book, G.K. Hunter published his British Academy lecture “Othello and Colour Prejudice.” Countering his audience’s belief that Othello is either “tawny” or incidentally black, Hunter contends that Othello is black for theatrical and typological purposes, that Elizabethans had very little personal contact with real Moors, and that blackness symbolizes death, wickedness, and the devil. Hence Shakespeare’s portrayal of Othello is meant to challenge the audience’s assumptions about blackness while playing out the triumph of Christianity over the black infidel. Hunter’s claim of limited contact between Islam and Protestant England has been refuted by scholars during the late 1990s and early 2000s. The claim, however, would be reiterated a year later by the American historian Winthrop Jordan, whose book, in turn, influenced a great deal of Renaissance scholarship on racism.


---

to argue that racial prejudice predates the Atlantic slave trade, not vice versa.\(^2\) Jordan suggests that blackness produces an instinctive negative reaction in whites. Consequently, whites represent blacks as ugly, immoral, heathen, cruel, lascivious, and barbaric in their literatures, including travelogues. Positing that the “accepted standard of ideal beauty was a fair complexion of rose and white,” Jordon suggests that this form of “ideal beauty” can be seen in English Petrarchism, a claim Kim Hall would amplify several years later.

While early scholarship on blackness such as Eldred Jones’s *Elizabethan Image of Africa* (1971)\(^3\) reiterated the typological interpretation advanced by Hunter and Jordan, by the late twentieth- to early twenty-first century, critics from various disciplines entered the conversation, extending, amplifying, refining, and correcting Hunter’s and Jordan’s arguments, as well as putting forth arguments independent of previous scholarship. Eliot H. Tokson and Anthony Gerard Barthelemy engage Jordan in their individual studies of how travel literatures impact the early modern English imagination. Tokson’s *The Popular Image of the Black Man in English Drama, 1550-1668* (1982) centers on the ways English Renaissance writers “treated the black Africans who had been introduced into their cultures in the middle 1550s, especially how English playwrights dramatized Africans from 1550-1668 based on the material they read and the stories they heard.”\(^4\)

---

2. By looking at Renaissance England to show that racial prejudice predates slavery, Jordan seems to engage in self-fulfilling prophecy. A look at antiquity would have shown Jordan that slavery predates racism. The Egyptians enslaved the Jews, and the Romans enslaved those whom they defeated in war, regardless of race. See *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1968); Exodus 1:8-14. Except as noted, all references to the *Bible* are to the New King James Version (NKJV); see, also, William Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus, The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974), 1.1. Unless indicated otherwise, all references are to *The Riverside Shakespeare*.


Barthelemy’s *Black Face, Maligned Race: Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne* (1987) examines black characters on the English stage from 1589 to 1695, with Peele’s *The Battle of Alcazar* (1594) and Thomas Southerne’s *Oroonoko* (1695) delimiting the period because both plays exemplify important changes in the dramatic representation of Africans on the early modern stage: *Alcazar* marked the start of the negative dramatization of blacks on the English Renaissance stage, while *Oroonoko* with its noble African slave signaled a shift in the opposite direction. In this study, I will suggest that the noble African has important precursors much earlier on the English stage.

Kim F. Hall’s *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England* (1995) refines Jordan’s argument by establishing how literary representations of dark and light, so well known in Anglo-American discourse, are also “descriptions” that “are more than indicators of Elizabethan beauty standards[;] they are conduits through which the English formulated themselves and others during the early modern period.” Hall demonstrates that early modern references to blackness are saturated with gender and racial identity—concerns that Ania Loomba articulated earlier in *Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama* (1989), the first comprehensive study to consider the interconnection of gender and race. Loomba argues that the constructions of “women and black people” are similar and facilitate the othering by “white patriarchal society, and [that] they also reflect upon some sorts of exclusion such as that based on class.”

---

Women, Race, and Writing in the Early Modern Period (1994)\textsuperscript{8} the discourse between blackness and race moves beyond a simple one-to-one correspondence to include gender as a construction of race and the construction of whiteness as a racial category.

This scholarship focuses on Protestant England and Islam, and, so, the Mediterranean becomes a central locus. Jack D’Amico’s \textit{The Moor in English Renaissance Drama} (1991) examines the political implications of the encounter between Europeans and Moors and Shakespeare’s treatment of them in his Roman and Venetian plays. D’Amico also looks at the contracts and diplomatic ties between England and Morocco circa 1550-1603, the great wealth of Morocco, and the ways the Portuguese and other Europeans sought to exploit it. King Sebastian’s decision to fight on behalf of the “Black King,” for example, was not motivated by Christian altruism but by the desire to retain Portugal’s colonial hold on Morocco.\textsuperscript{9}

Nabil Matar, Daniel Vitkus, and Jonathan Burton also examine the political alliances and mercantile and economic exchanges between England and Islam, but cite positive depictions as well as negative portrayals of the Other in early modern English literature. Matar’s \textit{Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery} (1999) charts “the change from a centripetal to a centrifugal” and adversarial relation between Islam and Britain that came about from the Elizabethan to the Caroline era, including the subordinate position of the English relative to the Moors and England’s attempt to compensate for its weakness by demonizing the Moors through negative representations in travel literatures, histories, sermons, and plays. In \textit{Turning Turk: English Theater and

\textsuperscript{8} Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker, eds., \textit{Women, Race, and Writing in the Early Modern Period} (London: Routledge, 1994).
\textsuperscript{9} Jack D’Amico, \textit{The Moor in English Renaissance Drama} (Tampa: University of South Florida Press, 1991).
In this study, I want to add to this conversation by delineating a dramatic tradition based on Heliodorus’s *An Aethiopian History*, a tradition that generally represents Africans, especially black Africans, positively. Because my main concern is with recovering a dramatic tradition stemming from the *Aethiopica* that portrays blacks positively on the English Renaissance stage through three lost English plays based on the *Aethiopica*, I divide the chapter into three sections, beginning with a thematic examination of the six extant Continental plays whose titles are taken from the *Aethiopica* and that use the *Aethiopica* as their direct source. Because each of these six plays retells the Heliodoran story, I look at them thematically rather than individually to avoid redundancy and to establish that works using Heliodorus as a source and having the 

---

names of his title characters or of the Aethiopica itself in their titles follow the original story closely. This, in turn, enables me to use these plays as paradigms to help reconstruct the three lost English plays--Chariclea (1572), Theagenes and Chariclea (1573), and The Queen of Ethiopia (1578)--because their title characters are also taken directly from the Aethiopica, which is also their source. Examining these plays thematically also allows me to explore the claim that the Aethiopica influenced the English Renaissance stage through a collection of themes, including exposing newborns with personal paraphernalia,11 male and female chastity, female martial intrepidity, male wandering and displacement, racial metamorphosis, the Mediterranean story (with its interrelationship of race, religion, and gender) and, as mentioned before, a positive portrayal of black Africans. Although the theme of female chastity was not unfamiliar to the Renaissance stage, the Aethiopica with its conception of virtuous love and concordance with Christian values further popularized the theme of female chastity on the Renaissance stage.

Because Robert Greene’s Orlando Furioso (printed in 1594), a secondhand derivative of the Aethiopica, is the earliest extant English Renaissance play that dramatizes black Africans positively and that retains the positive representation of the protagonists’ cross-cultural and transracial relationship found in Heliodorus’s text, I examine it, along with the two little-known plays, John Gough’s The Strange Discovery: a tragic-comedy (1640)12 and the anonymous The White Ethiopian (1641),13 both of

11. Although Sophocles’s Oedipus Rex has the theme of exposure, it differs from the Aethiopica’s. In a modification of immense importance, Heliodorus added the sexual anxiety and identifying features to his theme of exposure, making Charicleia’s exposure unlike that of Oedipus, who is exposed without personal paraphernalia to prevent any identification of him or his lineage.
which derive directly from the *Aethiopica*. All of these plays allow us to posit the existence of a dramatic tradition stemming from this ancient novel.

In the second section, in order to explore Heliodorus’s work as a source, I tease out the connection between the *Aethiopica* and three popular early modern plays--*The Winter’s Tale*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *The Faire Maid of the West, Part 1*. In the final section, I examine the positive representation of black Africans on the early modern English stage in relation to the tradition derived from Heliodorus.

I.

**Plays Whose Titles Reflect Their Derivation and that Help to Establish a Dramatic Tradition Stemming from the *Aethiopica***

In their titles, six Continental plays—Ettore Pignatelli’s *La Carichia Tragedia* (1582), Alexandre Hardy’s *La comedie de chastes amours de Théagène et Cariclée* (1601), Wolfgang Waldüng’s *Aethiopicus Amor Castus* (1605), Johannes Scholvin’s *Aithiopissa: Tragicocomedia Nova, Ex Historia Aethiopica Heliodori Espicopi Tricensis* (1608), Octave-César Genetay’s *L’Ethiopique Tragicomedie des chastes amours de Theagene et Chariclée* (1609), and Caspar Brülow’s *Chariclia* (1614)—indicate that they are based on the *Aethiopica*. Although each playwright introduces new material, modifies, and rearranges the Helidoran narrative, each play shows its indebtedness to the *Aethiopica* by remaining faithful to the original plot, story, and names of the major protagonists. The titles of Hardy’s, Schlovin’s, and Brulow’s plays, for example, indicate that they deal with the chaste love of Theagene and Cariclee, which ends in marriage;

---

with Ethiopia/Ethiopians in some way; and with a woman named Chariklia, whose name clearly recalls Heliodorus’s Charicleia and her story. The plays dramatize the story of an abandoned Ethiopian baby princess who grows up in another country, falls in love with a Greek prince, and returns home to marry him and to continue the succession and dynastic line. In its dramatization of the story and themes associated with the Aethiopica, each play helps to prove the existence of a tradition that originates from this novel.

The treatment by these plays of the themes of exposure, chastity, racial metamorphosis, wandering and displacement, along with a positive portrayal of black Africans establish their connection to the Aethiopica as well as a dramatic tradition stemming from this ancient work. In each play, the queen exposes her newborn because the baby is born “white.” While four of the plays imply the reason for the baby’s exposure, two of them, Brülow’s Chariclia and Genetay’s L’Ethiopique Tragicomédie des chastes amours de Theagene et Chariclée follow the Aethiopica and give an explicit reason for the baby’s exposure: fearing the charge of adultery for giving birth to a “white” child, the queen abandons her newborn. The focus on the accusation of sexual impurity is evident in the queen’s decision to abandon her daughter: her fear is rooted in would-be allegations of adultery and of the consequences.

Both Brülow and Genetay devote a significant amount of time to the theme of exposure. 14 While Genetay conveys the exposure through a soliloquy that functions as

---

14. Child abandonment and exposure were prevalent during the Renaissance and were “linked to sexual impurity,” although other factors were involved. The prevalence of exposure during this time could also explain the significance Brülow and Genetay give to this theme. See John Boswell, The Kindness of Strangers: The Abandonment of Children in Western Europe from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 166; David Ransel, Mothers of Misery: Child Abandonment in Russia (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1988), 6, n. 36.
background and exposition in his play, Brülow dramatizes the action in his. Charicia opens with a remorseful Persina, consumed by guilt and fear for deceiving “the king” and exposing her daughter. In the Aethiopica, Persinna’s concern for her lost child is conveyed through Calasiris, whom she commissions to search for her daughter. While Brülow excises Calasiris from his play, he retains Persina’s concern for and eventual reunion with her abandoned daughter.

In the Aethiopica and the six derivative plays, the queen exposes the baby princess with royal possessions and precious gems, including the ring Pantarbe, all of which proclaim the child’s royal pedigree. While Heliodorus’s Charicleia is exposed with a “ribbon” on which her genealogy is embroidered in hieroglyphics, Brülow’s Charicia, Pignatelli’s Carichia, and Genetay’s Chariclee are exposed in “swaddling clothes.” Exposure and abandonment were widespread and often deadly social ills that occurred from late antiquity to the Renaissance (and into the nineteenth century). To minimize the deaths of their babies and allow for easy identification of the babies’ lineage, parents frequently abandoned their children near popular sites, such as thoroughfares or temples, leaving identifiers like beads or amulets with the children. As in the Aethiopica, each play presents a priest finding the exposed child, implicitly connecting the child’s abandonment with religious structures to show that exposure was not undertaken without regard to the child. In Brulow, the queen abandons her baby in a grove where Sisimithres finds the child, allowing the conjecture that the temple of the

15. Caspar Brülow, Charicia (Argentorati: excudebat A. Bertramus, 1641), translated by Scott Barker. There is a probability that Brülow’s Carichea, like Waldung’s Aethiphicus Amor Castus, was performed. See Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century (London: C.J. Clay & Son, 1886), 102-3. In treating the topic of exposure, Brülow provides several examples of exposed and abandoned children in Act 1, including Oedipus and Hercules. 16. Groves, forests, marketplaces, and churches were places where parents “from antiquity until mid-nineteenth century . . . exposed” their children. Oedipus, Romulus and Remus, among other mythic
gymnosophists,\textsuperscript{17} Ethiopia’s religious savants who shun all intoxicants and animal flesh, was near one or several groves and putting Sisimithres in a rich tradition of ascetics who lead their lives with concern for others and in harmony with nature. Given that in each of the plays the queen exposes the princess with royal possessions that identify the baby’s lineage and later enquires discreetly about the welfare of her daughter, all six plays present the act of exposure in a context of “parental concern” resulting from intense “duress.”\textsuperscript{18}

Throughout the Renaissance, the \textit{Aethiopica} was best known for its treatment of chastity. Indeed, the love of Theagenes and Charicleia became a paradigm for romantic love. Despite traversing huge geographical spaces often without a chaperone, both Theagenes and Charicliea remain chaste. Each derivative play dramatizes this theme of male and female chastity. Pignatelli opens \textit{La Tragedia de Carichia}\textsuperscript{19} in medias res and focuses on the military conflict between Persian Egypt and Ethiopia, through which he dramatizes the chaste romance between the protagonists, establishing a structural and thematic continuation of the Heliodoran tradition. Although Pignatelli uses the military conflict to stage the romance between Carichia and Teagene, he excludes Carichia from

\begin{itemize}
  \item characters were exposed in forests to thwart oracles. See Carol Sanger’s “Infant Safe Haven Laws: Legislating in the Culture of Life,” \textit{The Columbia Law Review} 6, no. 4 (2006): 23.
  \item In actuality, the gymnosophists, located in India, are a sect of Hindu philosophers who lead ascetic lives. Heliodorus places them in Ethiopia, as John Morgan points out, “on the precedent of Philostratos’s \textit{Life of Apollonius}, and their importance in Hydaspes’s administration reflects Greek beliefs on the power of the Meriotic priesthood.” See “Helidorus,” \textit{The Novel in the Ancient World}, ed. Gareth Schmeling (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 434.
  \item Boswell, 151.
  \item Ettore Pignatelli, \textit{La Tragedia de Charichia} (Naples: Ottanio Beltrano, 1627), translated by Paolo Sorbello, is the first recorded extant drama that owes its name, plot, and story to Heliodorus’s novel. The play stretches the designation of “tragedy” because it ends in marriage. Pignatelli, 1572-1622, was the fourth Duke of Monteleone and the fifth Count of Barrello through his marriage to Countess Caterina Caracciolo. As capitano-generale of Catalogna in 1609, Pignatelli was instrumental in driving the Moors out of Spain. A patron of the arts, Pignatelli received posthumous recognition for his work, which the Italian and Greek Studies Academy honored in 1627, the year of his death. Pignatelli belonged to one of the seven great families of Naples, with ancestry dating back to the kings of Lombards. In 1616, he escorted the Infanta Donna Anna, daughter of Philip III, to France for her marriage to Louis XIII, the Bourbon king of France. Perhaps the play was written and performed for this marriage celebration.
\end{itemize}
any martial activity. Unlike Heliodorus, Pignatelli contracts Carichia’s role but expands that of Teagnes, thereby transforming, as we shall see next, the Greek romance into its new and constrained Renaissance form.

The contracting of Carichia’s role transforms her into a model Renaissance woman by yoking chastity to domesticity and passivity.20 In the Aethiopica, Charicleia’s and Theagenes’s chastity is a manifestation of their thoughts and deeds, both of which the Renaissance incorporated in its definition of chastity. Chastity meant more than just an abstention from sexual intercourse for an unmarried couple: it also included a concern for honor and reputation. Having incorporated the Heliodoran model of chastity into their definition, Renaissance writers then modified the model, adding prescriptions such as domesticity and passivity to define female chastity—which we see reflected in all but Hardy’s La comedie de chastes amours. Except Hardy, the other five Continental playwrights remove from their heroines the characteristics of resourcefulness, independence, and action found in the Greek story. Pignatelli’s Carichia, for example, does not participate in the battles, even though the military conflict is used as a stage for her romance with Teagene. According to Ruth Kelso, the new early modern chaste woman does not raise “evil hopes in . . . men” and must guard against unchaste thoughts infiltrating her mind; “therefore she must avoid all occasions for evil thoughts . . . keeping herself within doors . . . and shunning public affairs.”21 Whenever we encounter Pignatelli’s Carichia, she is always indoors, a domesticated woman, and not the wanderer or the active leader that her Heliodoran predecessor was. Like the emerging, male-

constrained ideal Renaissance woman, Carichia draws her reason for living, her very existence from her man. She tells Teagene that her “life depends and recovers any lost virtue” from his care and concern for her (3.2). Despite being importuned by Morebo with declarations of love, Carichia ignores him. However, she informs Teagene of Morebo’s behavior (2.3)—exemplifying the popular Renaissance construct of the silent and chaste woman who must make herself an open book to her husband.

Brülow’s Charicia is as chaste as Pignatelli’s Carichia and Schlovin’s Chariklia, but less domesticated. When Theagenes encounters Pelorus in battle, Charicia boosts his confidence by cheering him on, reminding him that he is “born from the stock of Achilles” (2.8). However, when things become personal and domestic as Thyamis proposes marriage, she is silent, speaking only at the urging of the men, because she understands that chastity requires women to defer to men. Both Brülow’s Charicia and Schlovin’s Chariklia frequently look to their Theagenes for leadership and solutions to their problems.

Chastity also includes honor and reputation. In general, Renaissance men and women prized honor and reputation, though such a prize had different meanings for each gender. For women, honor meant a good name or good reputation, which they could achieve through chastity. Men, however, achieved honor through excellent conduct in their work and other activities.22 Each of the six plays illustrates the danger and sacrifice that honor and reputation demand of women. Queen Persinna, confronted with the dilemma of her safety or the life of her newborn child, decides to expose her baby, for in doing so she may be able to prevent her death and that of her baby. Her action, designed to protect the life of her child and her family from dishonor, also saves her honor and

---

22. Kelso, 97-98.
reputation from being impugned, for a woman whose honor is questioned, justly or unjustly, could be killed or, as Kelso notes, “had to hide her shame in perpetual seclusion.” Such a woman also brought disgrace to her husband and child(ren).  

If Persinna or her namesakes had not abandoned the baby princess(es), she would have faced charges of adultery and in the worlds of the novel and the plays would (most likely) have been sentenced to death. The princess would have been killed or ostracized, a pariah to society, and the king would have borne the stain of an unfaithful wife and therefore the disgrace of cuckoldry. In *The Winter’s Tale* and *A Woman Killed With Kindness*, Hermione and Anne suffer the consequences that befall a woman whose honor is impugned. Wrongly accused of adultery, Hermione escapes the murderous intent of her husband Leontes but is secluded, monumentalized, for sixteen years. Anne, seduced by her husband’s best friend, is locked away in a house, secluded from her husband, children, and friends, where she dies in isolation.

Unlike Pignatelli’s “closet” drama, Alexandre Hardy’s *La comedie de chastes amours* was performed publicly at the Hotel de Bourgogne in 1601, several years before its publication. Of the six Continental plays that derive from the *Aethiopica*, only Hardy’s play combines chastity with a resourceful and martial heroine. This combination

24. Although there is no source that refers to *La Tragedia de Carichia* as a closet drama, I have chosen this designation because I am operating on the assumption that the play was read, recited, or performed without regard to stage props or directions at least once in a private setting; choosing a category is always a vexed issue for plays which might have seen one performance in an aristocratic household.
25. Hardy, whose influence on the French stage and succeeding dramatists is significant, was a prolific writer, authoring more than 700 plays, with only 34 surviving. Divided into eight plays of five acts, *La comedie de chastes amours* is an anthology comprised of eight journeys. Born around 1569, Hardy was connected to a troupe of actors headed by Valleram LeComote, for whom he wrote. The troupe played at several venues throughout Paris but became established in 1628 at the Hôtel de Bourgogne. Considered the father of the French tragi-comedy, Hardy wrote for popular taste, and with his vast stage experience modified tragedy and tragicomedy by suppressing the chorus and limiting monologues. He died around 1632. See Henry Carrington Lancaster, *The French Tragi-Comedy: Its Origin and Development from 1552-1628* (Baltimore: J. H. Furst Co., 1907), 36, 101-02, 133, & 143.
of themes ties Hardy’s play both to Heliodorus’s novel and the dramatic tradition that originated from it. Hardy combines virtue and valor equally in Cariclee and Theagene as Heliodorus does with his protagonists, distinguishing them from the other Continental heroes and heroines just as Heliodorus’s protagonists are set apart from the other Greek male and female protagonists.

The combination of purity and courage in Cariclee becomes apparent during the first and second journeys of Hardy’s play. Under siege from two groups of pirates, she uses her bow and arrow to deter and kill would-be predators from the first set of pirates. With the second group, she resorts to stratagem. Inflamed with passion for Cariclee, the leader of the second band of pirates, Thiamis, proposes marriage, which she accepts, but outsmarts him by requesting time to visit a temple to lay down her vestal garments before becoming his bride. Anticipating that the marriage will not occur if Thiamis grants her request because of the dangers involved in making the journey, Cariclee assures him that allowing her to put aside her priestly robes will eliminate all obstacles to their marriage because she will then be fully prepared for wifehood. While Pignatelli, Genetay, Schlovin, and Waldung give little or no attention to this episode, Brülow, like Hardy, does, but makes Chariclia defer to Theagenes, speaking only at the urging of the men present. Both Hardy and Brülow, like Heliodorus, make their heroines realize the danger to themselves and their beloved Theagene(s) should they refuse the proposal—a danger Theagene(s) does not grasp immediately but eventually does. The quick-wittedness and daring of Hardy’s heroine bring to mind David Konstan’s observation on the equality between male and female protagonists in Greek novels: “Men are not valiant rescuers: There are no scenes in which the valiant lover comes to rescue his lady. . . . Virtue is not
conceived on the pattern of masculine virility.”  

For the other five Continental plays, virtue is indeed conceived on the pattern of masculine virility.

Hardy’s Caricle is unlike the heroines of the other five playwrights in bravery. Although Genetay uses the prologue and soliloquies to establish background and review the protagonists’ adventures, there is no sense of a martial or intrepid heroine in the soliloquies or the prologue. The closest Genetay’s Charicle comes to this characterization is in her declaration to die with Theagene if Hydaspes sacrifices her beloved. But that declaration is born of desperation prompted by the passions of romantic frustration rather than by courage itself. A similar argument of romantic frustration can be made for Brülow’s Chariclia when she confesses to murdering Cybele and voluntarily ascends the pyre that Arsace prepares for her. Weary of being without Theagene and ignorant of his fate, Chariclia decides to die rather than live in her present state. Perhaps because, as Henry Carrington Lancaster writes, Hardy wrote for a popular audience, he could portray a martial heroine, who would stir great excitement on the stage. Or perhaps Hardy was insightful enough to realize that a daring female on the Renaissance stage made for entertaining theater, or his innovative spirit led him to emulate Heliodorus as closely as possible in creating such a role on the French stage, as it had led him to dispense with the monologue and the chorus in his plays.

The last four of the themes prominent in the Aethiopica which influenced the English Renaissance stage are racial metamorphosis, male chastity, a wandering hero, and a positive representation of Africans. Each Continental playwright depicts his heroine as racially transformed at conception, except Genetay. As in Heliodorus, the
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26. Quoted by Margaret Doody in The True Story of the Novel (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP), 36.
27. Lancaster, 133 & 143.
metamorphosis occurs when the queen gazes at the painting of Andromeda. This kind of transfiguration draws upon Aristotelian theories of reproduction, which credits the mother’s imagination with shaping the fetus. According to Susan Magnanini, one form of this belief held that “by staring fixedly at an image, usually a painting or statue, the mother’s imagination came to imprint upon her child that which she beheld.”

Queen Persinna’s gaze at the painting of a white Andromeda imprints upon her fetus the characteristics of that painting, as Persinna herself explains in the *Aethiopica*: “. . . I looked upon the picture of Andromeda naked, while my husband had to do with me (for then he first brought her down from the rock, had by misshapen engenderd presently a thing like to her)” (Underdowne 108).

Along with a Mediterranean story and setting, the *Aethiopica* influenced English drama through its themes of male innocence and wandering. Drawing upon Heliodorus, all six Continental playwrights depict their Thessalian princes as innocent wanderers. Theagenes and his namesakes traverse huge geographic areas, beginning in Thessaly and ending in Ethiopia. Their wanderings also result in displacement and fracturing of the self to some extent. While the other five Continental plays mute this fracturing, Hardy’s *La comedie de chastes amours* articulates it. A Thessalian embassy arrives in Ethiopia searching for its lost prince to take him back to his home to fulfill his duties (5.1).

Although Hardy does not delve into Theagene’s internal struggle that results from the

---

28. Magnanini relates the story which early modern physicians and surgeons tell about Hippocrates, “who was said to have invoked [the] theory” of racial metamorphosis through visual stimulus “while defending a white woman married to a white man who had been accused of adultery after having given birth to a black child…. Hippocrates explained to the court that the woman had gazed upon the image of a Moor during conception and impressed that image onto the skin of her child[;] the woman was acquitted.” See *Fairy-tale science: monstrous generation in the tales of Straparola and Basile* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 73-74. The belief that women could alter the shape of a fetus had been around from antiquity but gained popularity during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which might help explain its presence in the works of the five playwrights. Such a belief might have also helped to generate interest in the *Aethiopica* itself among early modern readers.
arrival of the Thessalian embassy to reclaim and return him to his home, the play invites us to wonder how Theagene will cope with estrangement from his homeland, despite the attempt of Hydaspes to lessen the ambivalence by marrying Cariclée to Theagene upon learning that Theagene is a prince. Most probably, the embassy awakened some feeling of nostalgia and patriotism in Theagene, which does not prove a strong antidote to his love for Cariclée: he remains in Ethiopia.

All of the Continental playwrights emphasize the sexual purity that Heliodorus assigns to Theagenes. When the Persian princess conspires to seduce Theagene(s), he suffers beatings and imprisonment for refusing to surrender to her demands. All five playwrights, except Pignatelli (who ignores the Arsace episode), dramatize an implacable and punitive Arsace and an unshakeable Theagene(s) in the struggle for his virtue. Rescued by the soldiers of the satrap, Theagene(s) is later ambushed by Ethiopian soldiers and transported to Meroe, where the Ethiopian people are surprised to discover that the prince is uninitiated in the art of Venus. Although Pignatelli ignores the Arsace episode, his Teagene is also sexually pure, garnering the admiration of the high priest, Acasto: despite the long sojourn from Athens to Ethiopia without a chaperone, Teagene and Carichia remain chaste (3.4).

Each Continental playwright dramatizes Ethiopians positively, representing the king and queen as virtuous, chaste, brave, sagacious, and magnanimous, reinforcing my claim of a dramatic tradition of positive portrayal of blacks stemming from the \textit{Aethiopica}. Heliodorus’s King Hydaspes is an example of princely conduct, providing the Renaissance a model of how power should be exercised, which is especially resonant with Medieval and Renaissance writers, such as Boccaccio and Castiglione, who
instructed rulers to embrace virtue and eschew vice.  Each playwright makes his king noble.  Although Pignatelli’s Idaope is old and no longer leads his army into battle, Pignatelli shows that the old king was once a military man of great fortitude, defeating the Persian satrap in their first encounter. Under his rule, Ethiopians enjoy peace and prosperity. Victorious in war, the king treats his conquests with respect and dignity. In Waldung, he frees the captured Oroondates, restoring him to his position, because as Brülow’s Hydaspes explains, a “king does not bring his scepter upon the blood of the subdued . . . and should not seek anything beyond what is just” (4.11). Similarly, Hardy’s King Hydaspe, “content with the honor of victory,” makes peace with the conquered satrap. However, the kings in Genetay and Schlovih seem to have boastful and egomaniacal tendencies. Recounting the war with Persian Egypt to Meroebe, Genetay’s Hydaspes tells his nephew that “although my power is not unknown . . . the satrap Oroondate / . . . pushed by overproud pomp / . . . / Dare[s] to present himself against me” (3.1). Later in that same speech, the king compares Oroondate to a “fly” and himself to an “elephant”: “a fly must not combat with an elephant.” In Schlovih the king displays misogynistic traits, claiming that “a talkative woman is grave trouble” and that he “hates a woman who knows more than is appropriate” (5.1).

Genetay and Schlovih perhaps give their kings a fuller range of human traits than the other four Continental playwrights do with theirs. Those kings seem less prone to human weaknesses. In Brülow and Pignatelli, for example, the kings are circumspect and measured in their speech and actions. When Idaope promotes Teagene over the older and longer-serving Cloanto, he, concerned with the emotional impact on Cloanto, takes
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29. Prof. Maynard Mack, Jr., points out that Machiavelli’s The Prince (1513) can be read as the precise opposite.
counsel on how best to convey Teagene’s promotion to Cloanto. Despite the negative traits of Genetay’s and Schlovin’s two kings, both playwrights endow them with a majority of positive traits. The kings’ sense of justice and their magnanimity are as great in these two plays as in the other four Continental ones, for they pardon and free the Persian generals and the soldiers, each king contenting himself with repossessing only territory that belongs to him.

Although each work represents the queen favorably, Pignatelli makes his queen particularly formidable. In the Aethiopica, as in four of the Continental plays, Persinna’s role is limited. In Books 4 and 10 of Heliodorus’s text, she narrates birthing Charicleia and reunites with her. Otherwise, she is an absent presence, hovering in the marginal spaces of the novel. However, in Pignatelli’s Carichia, she is active throughout the play and, with the possible exception of Acasto, is the most sagacious person in the play. As the king’s confidante, she is wise and shrewd, listening to and advising a careworn Idaspe when necessary (1.1). She participates in public affairs, including the ritualistic robing of Teagene as the Ethiopian general (3.6). A powerful intercessor for Carichia, she reasons the improbability of Carichia’s poisoning Sabea and vanquishes all evidence of Carichia’s supposed guilt, prompting a convinced Idaspe to release Carichia into her custody (4.7).

Despite the modifications that these six playwrights make to Heliodorus’s text, all of them repeat the plot and story of the Aethiopica. Most important to this study are the plays’ titles, which indicate their source, and their positive dramatization of Africans, especially black Africans, based on the Heliodoran story. All six plays dramatize the commitment of their Ethiopian heroines to sexual purity; the faithful adherence of the
Ethiopians, especially of the priests, to their sovereign; the integrity and moral rectitude of King Hydaspes, especially in adjudications; the sagacity of Persinna and Calasirs; the piety of the Ethiopian priesthood and sovereignty; and mental acuity as innate characteristics of Ethiopians and Egyptians.

Although these six plays postdate the three lost English plays, they strengthen the argument for a dramatic tradition originating from the Aethopica that represented black Africans positively on the Renaissance stage throughout England and Continental Europe prior to the major shift in the English theater of demonizing Blacks, and they demonstrate through repetition that plays whose titles reflect the name of the Aethiopica or the names of its characters follow that text closely. Using these plays as models, I attempt to reconstruct the three lost English plays in the rest of this section.

Given that all six Continental European plays whose titles include the names of the protagonists or of the novel itself follow the storyline and plot of the Aethiopica and present black Africans with dignity, it is reasonable to conclude that the three English plays Charicleia (1572), Theagenes and Charicleia (1573), and The Queen of Ethiopia (1578) did likewise and quite probably played a significant role in establishing a positive dramatic tradition of black Africans on the English Renaissance stage originating from the Aethiopica. Although these three English plays are lost, the Annals of English Drama lists them as being performed in 1572, 1573, and 1578 at court by Lord Howard’s Men. Some scholars believe the three plays are actually one play referred to

---
by different titles.\textsuperscript{31} However, there are sufficient reasons to believe that these are separate plays with separate titles: \textit{Hill’s List of Early Plays in Manuscript} cites \textit{Caricilia} as “performed at Court in 1572” and the \textit{Queen of Ethiopia} as “acted by Howard’s Men at Bristol in 1578”; Arthur D. Matthews observes that “. . . in the absence of other evidence, different titles suggest different plays” (xxiv). Additionally, early modern playhouses did not usually revive plays a year apart as the 1572 and 1573 dates of \textit{Chariclea} and \textit{Theagenes} and \textit{Chariclea} suggest.

Using the six Continental plays as paradigms to help reconstruct the three lost British plays, it seems we can assume that the lost plays would have followed the stories of the original title characters in the \textit{Aethiopica}. The \textit{Queen of Ethiopia} (1578) would have centered on the story of the reigning queen, Persinna,\textsuperscript{32} as it is recorded in the \textit{Aethiopica}. Fearing charges of infidelity, Persinna abandons her baby because the princess is born white. An Ethiopian priest rescues the child and places it in the care of a shepherd; later he gives the child to a Greek priest, who raises her as his own daughter. Persinna is eventually banished because the king suspects her of infidelity. With the passage of time, the steadfast friendship of the high priest, and the princess’s return to Ethiopia, the king, persuaded of his wife’s fidelity, restores her to her former position, and both of them prepare for their daughter’s nuptials.

\textit{Chariclea} would almost certainly have the trials of the heroine and the assaults upon her virtue as the primary, if not the only, focus.\textsuperscript{33} The play would have told the

\textsuperscript{31} See Frederick Gard Fleay, \textit{Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama 1559-1642} (New York: Ben Franklin, 1969); and Carol Gesner, \textit{Shakespeare & the Greek Romance} (Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1970), 47.
\textsuperscript{32} Charicleia could also be represented by this title. However, it seems more likely to me that this title refers to Persinna.
\textsuperscript{33} John Morgan tells me that the \textit{Aethiopica} often went under the title of \textit{Charicleia}; so, a play of the same name may not be focused only on the heroine.
story of her elopement, captivity by brigands and pirates, subsequent separation from her beloved Theagenes, and her wanderings, culminating in her Ethiopian captivity, arrival at Meroe, and the eventual revelation of her lineage along with her marriage or impending marriage to Theagenes. Overlap—such as the elopement, captivity, and subsequent adventures—probably would have occurred between this play and *Theagenes and Chariclea*. However, given Theagenes’s Greek nationality and the prevailing Renaissance conception of masculine virtue, a Renaissance playwright would most likely have highlighted the hero’s valor and virtue in a play about the prince and lost princess together, as Pignatelli does in his play. Chances are that Theagenes would have slain many brigands, protected Charicleia from marauding and rapacious males, resisted the allure of the Persian palace (including its voluptuous princess) as in Pignatelli and Brüllow, and eventually arrived in Meroe, where Charicleia’s identity would have been revealed and preparations made for their (imminent) marriage, as seen in all of the six Continental and two later extant English plays.

Unlike the titles of the three lost English plays and the six extant Continental ones, the titles of another four extant plays that drew on the *Aethiopica* do not indicate their source. While Greene’s *Orlando Furioso* (printed in 1594) derives directly from Ariosto’s epic of the same name, which in itself shows the influence of Heliodorus’s novel, it, like the *Thracian Wonder*, borrows only one specific idea from Heliodorus’s text: the transracial and cross-cultural romance between an African princess and her European prince. The other two plays, *The Strange Discovery* and *The White Ethiopian*, whose titles do not suggest that they are direct derivatives of the *Aethiopica* but are indeed so, follow closely the plot and storyline of Heliodorus’s text. These four extant

34. I treat this play in chapter 2.
texts demonstrate the popularity of the *Aethiopica* and also the development of a theatrical tradition of plays drawn from this popular novel. Because Greene’s play is derived directly from Ariosto’s poem and not from Heliodorus’s *Aethiopica*, I want to look at Ariosto’s poem before examining Greene’s play.

Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso* centers on the conflict between Charlemagne, the Holy Roman Emperor, and the kings of North Africa and Spain, Agramante and Marsillo. Agramante’s defeat and death end the conflict, and King Marsilio returns home. Ariosto’s epic has three main stories, each interconnected and overlapping: the wars of Charlemagne and the invading Moors; Orlando’s unrequited love for Angelica, which drives him insane; and the love between the pagan warrior Ruggiero and the Christian warrior Bradamante. My concern is with the Orlando-Angelica story. The tension between Orlando and Rinaldo over Angelica prompts Charlemagne to place her in the custody of the Duke of Bavarie, promising her as a prize to the lover who kills the most Saracens. Angelica flees into the forest, where she eventually encounters Rinaldo, Sacripant, Orlando, and other knights who battle one another for her favor. Ariosto, like Heliodorus, weaves magic into his tale, for Angelica, like Charicleia, possesses a talisman, a ring that protects and makes her invisible whenever she places it in her mouth. Though loved by many, Angelica loves only Medor, a shattering moment for Orlando when he stumbles into a cave and discovers the inscription “. . . fair Angelica, born of Galafron, and loved in vain by many, often lay naked in my arms” (C.23, p.279). Orlando becomes insane, careens around the world destroying everything in his way until

---

35. References to the work of Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso* are to the text translated by Guido Waldman (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1974).
he recovers his wits, losing his passion for Angelica. Meanwhile with typical Ariostan irony, she and Medor sail to India.

Several episodes of Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso* recall Heliodorus’s *Aethiopica*. As Heliodorus does with Charicleia, Ariosto makes Angelica desireable to each man whom she encounters. Although Charicleia’s ring Pantarbe lacks the power to confer invisibility on her, it, like Angelica’s magic ring, protects her from harm, as evidenced at her trial in Memphis where the flames flee from her. The cave scene, though thoroughly reworked here, still evokes that of the *Aethiopica* because of its secret location and dual associations—to Charicleia and Theagenes, the cave proves fortunate, as it does to Angelica and Medor, but unfortunate to Thisbe and Orlando. The cross-cultural and transracial romance between Angelica and Medor reflects another Heliodoran influence, despite Ariosto’s reversal of the relationship between race and gender in his epic. As the African Charicleia loves and prepares to marry Theagenes, so does the “golden-haired, pink-cheeked” Angelica with the African Medor, who becomes king of the East because of her.

Greene’s play reflects the full influence of Ariosto, with each scene having its correlative in the epic, though modified and augmented with Heliodoran material. Greene’s transracial romance has Heliodoran colorings. Greene’s Angelica is the daughter of an African king who is betrothed to a European prince, not an Asian princess who is the daughter of the emperor of the East marrying a simple African soldier, as in Ariosto. A composite of Charicleia and her namesake in Ariosto, Greene’s Angelica is
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36. See Tesumaro Hayashi’s *A Textual Study of Robert Greene’s Orlando Furioso, with an Elizabethan Text* (Muncie: Ball State University, 1973); Charles W. Lemmi’s “The Source of Greene’s *Orlando Furioso*” *MLN*, 31 (1916), 440-41, for detailed and comprehensive comparisons between Greene and his source.
the daughter of Marsillus. Her beauty attracts suitors from around the world, including the French Peer Orlando. With her father’s permission, she selects Orlando as her prospective mate, which ignites jealousy among the other contenders because Orlando, in comparison to the other suitors, is much lower on the socio-economic ladder: a banished peer and the only suitor without a kingdom. As a result, war ensues between the followers of Orlando and Marsillus and those of the rejected suitors. By hanging love poems about Angelica under the trees of the grove, Sacripant suggests Angelica’s unfaithfulness, thereby undermining Orlando and Angelica’s love, precipitating Orlando’s madness, and causing Marsillus to banish his own daughter. The other French peers arrive in Africa, seeking vengeance on Angelica, to which her father consents by disowning her because he, too, believes she is inconstant and responsible for Orlando’s insanity. Instead of a peer curing Orlando as in Ariosto’s epic, in Greene’s play a witch cures him, and he learns the truth about Angelica and pursues his enemies, killing two kings, freeing Angelica from the peers, and awaiting the wedding before returning to France.

Greene follows the Heliodorian tradition of making his African king a model of sagacity and justice. When Marsillus’s enemy, Mandrecard, disguises himself as a common soldier and asks to be pardoned, Marsillus grants the request but enjoins the soldier “never to tell Mandrecard / Nor any fellow soldier . . .” about the pardon. Marsillus’s graciousness strikes Mandrecard to the core, and he resolves not to war against such an honorable man (1.3. E). Mandrecard realizes that Marsillus’s nobility

37. This is another echo from the *Aethiopica*: the old witch raises her son from the dead, who predicts the happy union of Charicleia and Theagenes in Ethiopia (Bk. 6, pp.156-58).
extends to common soldiers as well, and though he prefers peace to war, yet he, like King Hydaspes, is resolute and just in war.

Like the titles of the three lost English plays and their title characters, the characters, plot, and storyline of *The Strange Discovery* and *The White Ethiopian* are taken from the *Aethiopica*, providing additional evidence of English Renaissance playwrights’ indebtedness to the Greek novel, the connection between the plays and the novel, and a positive theatrical representation of Blacks on the early modern stage that derived from the *Aethiopica*. While *The White Ethiopian* ends with the protagonists in the palace dungeon at Memphis but with hopes of going to Meroe, *The Strange Discovery* ends as the novel does: Charicleia’s identity is revealed. Theagenes is saved from the sacrificial pyre, and preparations are made for his and Charicleia’s marriage.

In the scene that foretells Charicleia and Theagenes’s journey from Delphi to Ethiopia, both plays show their affinity to Helidorus’s text. In Act II, scene iv of *The Strange Discovery*, Caricles asks Apollo to accept the Thessalians’ sacrifice, and shortly thereafter the oracle foretells Theagenes and Cariclea’s destiny:

Ye men of Delphos sing of her

and her rare beauties praise,

Who now in grace Ye begin to grow,

but fame shall end her daies,

Who leaving these my temples here

and sailing surging streames

38. *The White Ethiopian* uses Underdowne’s translation of the *Aethiopica* as its immediate source, according to Moses Hadas and Duncan Matthews. Although Charicleia is born with white skin, she is a Negro. The text makes this clear in a few ways, including Persinna’s description of birthing a white baby, which focuses on the child’s complexion: “when I brought you to birth I found you white, a complexion alien to the native Ethiopian tint” (Bk 4. p. 94). I discuss these in depth in chapter 2.
Shall come at length to countrie scorch’d
with Phoebus burning beames,
Where they are recompenses due
that vertue rare doe gaine
In time to come ere it be long
White miters shall obtain.

Similarly, in Act II, scene 1 of *The White Ethiopian*, Charicles recalls the Oracle’s pronouncement:

Glory shutts up that name for whome
The favour is begun at home
Offspringe of the Delphian race
Leaving my Temple and this place
Goe to the Zone where downright rayses
Make the earth smoake by parching dayes
Rewards of virtues shall be found

White garlands on the blacker ground (13-20)

In Book 2 of Underdowne’s version of Warschewiczki’s translation of the *Aethiopica*, when “the young man beganne to do the Sacrifice, having leave firste of the priests, Pythia saide thus”:

Ye men of Delphi sing of her,
and Goddes offspring praise:
Who now in grace beginnes to growe,
but fame shall ende her dayes.
Who leaving these my temples here,
and passing surging streams
Shall come at length to countrie scortchte
with Phoebus blasing beames,
Where they as recompences due,
that vertues rare do gaine.
In time to come ere it be long
white Miters shall obtaine (76).

[And in Warschewiczki’s Latin translation: Cum itaque ingressus Deum venerarer, & quiddam etiam apud me optarem, respondit hæc Pythia--
Fertilis a regione ferens vestigia Nili,
Fortia Parum stamina spontè fugis.
Durato, Aegypti quoniam nigricantia tradem
Arva tibi cito, nunc noster amicus eris (45).]

While the lines from The White Ethiopian are less specific in their reference to the protagonists’ destiny, all three works contain the same message: someone from Delphi will travel to a distant place where (s)he will be rewarded. The verbal parallels, sound, and sense between The Strange Discovery and Underdowne’s translation of the Aethiopica are striking, making clear the play’s indebtedness to the Greek novel: some lines are verbatim and near-verbatim (e.g., ll. 3 & 5, 1& 3); both passages call upon the Delphians to laud Charicleia, talk of leaving “my temples,” evoke the sound of ships (“sailing surging streames”), and anticipate the heroine and hero’s accession in a distant
land of the sun, where they will obtain a “white” crown. Perhaps Gogh also used Underdowne as source for his play.

Central to my thesis of a Renaissance dramatic tradition based on Heliodorus’s novel is the connection that *The Strange Discovery* and *The White Ethiopian* have with the *Aethiopica*, especially the main passage explaining Charicleia’s birth and lineage. In Warschewiczki’s translation of the *Aethiopica*, Persinna recounts her conception and the birth of Charicleia:

obtulisset, & undiquacē ostendisset nudam, (tum primūm enim
cē Perseus ex rupibus deducebat) simile illi in præsentia insœ-
iciter formasset (72).

And in Underdowne’s translations of Warschewiczki’s text, Persinna tells the same tale:

The greatest of all our Goddes, are the Sunne, and Bacchus: The noblest
nexte to these, are Persues, Andromeda, and Memnon after them. Those,
who have by succession edified, and finished the Kinges palace, have
portraited there many things that they did, as for the dwelling houses, and
Galleries, they have set diverse Images, and noble acts of theirs in them:
but all the bedde chambers are garnished with pictures, containinge the
love of Perseus, and Andromeda. After Hidaspes had bene married to mee
tenne years . . . we happened to rest after dinner in the summer . . . at
which time your father had to do with mee, swearing that by a dreame hee
was commaunded to do so, and I by and by perceived my self with childe.
. . . But thou werte born white, which couler is stra\n\nge amongst the
ethiopians. I knew the reason, because I looked upon the picture of
Andromeda naked, while my husband had to do with me (for then he first
brought her down from the rocke, had by misshape ingendered presently a
thing like to her) . . . (Bk. 4, pp.107-8).

*The Strange Discovery* explains the same events, in words that echo the source:

. . . *we happened one time to rest us after dinner in a gallerie where hung
rare pictures and images, amongst which were those of Perseus and
Andromeda portrayed as when he first redeemed her from the rocke. At
this time your father lay with me swearing that by a dream he was commanded so to doe, and I by and by perceive my selfe to be with child: but thou wert borne white which color is strange among the Aethiopians. I knew the reasons, because I looked stedfastlie upon the picture of Andromeda naked, and by that meanes conceived a thing like to her (IV.i.H3).39

And The White Ethiopian tells her story, again in words echoing the source:

the Kinge was warned so that on a day
when in a summer roome I one time lay
I did obtain what I could ne’re before
that made my belly greate . . .

but when I was delivered finding thee white
which might me for the worst of crimes indite
although occasioned by looking on
Andromedas picture at my conception (II.i.595-604).

Although some of Gough’s alterations—“the sunne being author of our stocke,” for example—reflect Renaissance cultural assumptions about climatic explanation for blackness, the parallels between his and the translations of Heliodorus’s passage are unmistakable: the conception occurs in a room decorated with pictures of Perseus and Andromeda, whom Perseus rescues and marries; Persinna looks at the unclothed form of Andromeda and immediately perceives that she herself is pregnant. Although The White Ethiopian lacks such details, it maintains the thrust of the passage: some supernatural

34. Passage is italicized in the text.
force compels the king to consort with the queen, who gazes at Andromeda’s picture during the sexual act, which results in her giving birth to a white-looking child.

Gough and the anonymous playwright make little or no use of the story of King Hydaspes’s military exploits. While *The White Ethiopian* disregards that story, *The Strange Discovery* ignores the details of the combat between the Ethiopian and Persian armies but gives the outcome. Ignoring or passing over the military story detracts from the full development of the Ethiopian characters and, consequently, from the bravery of the Ethiopian soldiers and the overall sagacity and sophistication of King Hydaspes, whose victory over the Persians testifies to his military genius, and his pardon and restoration of their possessions evidence his nobility and wisdom. Hydaspes’s military activities show his mathematical and strategic mind at work: his calculations of the required number of trenches, their depth, and water capacity in order for the water to function as a battering ram to destroy the walls of Syene; and his forcing Oroondates into an envelopment maneuver with the sea at his back and the Ethiopian forces at his front. However, by making Hydaspes and his soldiers victorious over the Persians, Gough maintains the military prowess Heliodorus ascribes to black Africans.

Gough also uses the convocation between the Ethiopian, Egyptian, and Greek priests in Athens as a way to portray black Africans positively. At their first and subsequent meetings, the Ethiopian Sisymethres and the Greek Caricles are equals and accord each other mutual respect. Like Heliodorus, Gough deepens this consanguinity and mutuality through the Egyptian Calisiris at the congress at Delphi: dignitaries of the priesthood of Delphi, including the Chief Priest Caricles, accept the Egyptian priest on equal terms, deferring to his opinion. The Greeks believed in the piety and power of the
Meriotic and Egyptian priesthood, reflected in ancient literatures and histories. Puzzled by Cariclea’s behavior, Caricles seeks and follows Calisiris’s counsel, imploring him not to “Suffer the maid to perish, nor her / Father frustrate of his purpose” (3.7.H). The love between Theagenes and Cariclea is another instance of such equality and reciprocity, for it is no coincidence that a direct descendant of Achilles and the offspring of an African queen and king are enchanted with each other. Besides their beauty, both are of equally noble stock. Their pairing is designed to show Ethiopians as the equals of the Greeks and by extension of the European World, a realization of considerable weight when one considers that Theagenes has never desired or wanted the love of any woman previously.

Although Gough and the author of The White Ethiopian make a few changes to the story, only two of Gough’s changes are important to this study because of their dramatic and cultural weight: Cariclea’s blondness and Sisymethres’s blackness. The princess’s coloring serves two dramatic purposes: aligning her more closely to the Greek and Renaissance ideal of female beauty and underscoring her virtue. Homer and the Greeks pictured Aphrodite with streaming golden mane rising out of the waters off the shores of Cyprus. The Romans also pictured Venus with long blond hair. As the ideal beauty, Aphrodite/Venus was blond, and she eventually became associated with the Virgin Mary, who was also, if improbably, pictured as blond. Blondness came to

40. Besides the slight variations in the names and the avoidance of the in-media-res beginning, Gough, as Matthew Duncan also notes, chooses a chronological structure, starting the story almost at the very beginning when Sisymethres meets Caricles in Egypt and recasting the story of Cnemon as another plot. The story of Cnemon is not really a recasting, for in the Aethiopica it is an important minor plot, used as a foil to the major one. The major change of The White Ethiopian is that it ends in Persia with the protagonists in a dungeon and Theagenes confesses to Arsace that Charicleia is his fiancée, not his sister. The White Ethiopian uses the in-medias-res beginning, which robs the work of dramatic elements and makes the play almost a dramatic monologue, interspersed with dialogue.

represent purity in antiquity, fostered especially by Roman armies who carried their blond captives to Rome as slaves. Botticelli and Raphael painted Venus with blond hair. In England, Queen Elizabeth, despite her scarlet-colored mane, appropriated the blond icon to represent her virginity, and English poets and painters portrayed her that way. Around 1600, Nicholas Hilliard painted Queen Elizabeth, forty-two years after her accession, with long blond hair. The correlation of blondness to beauty and purity was firmly established.

None of the six European playwrights makes Sisimithres’s complexion a concern. However, such is not the case with Gough. His second important change to the Heliodoran story, which opens The Strange Discovery, calls attention to Sisymethres’s blackness. Caricles’s manservant, Nebulo, tells him that “A very sweet fac’d Gentleman so sooty as the Divell himself, / I believe some Ambassador sent from Pluto and the fiend” is at the door (I.i). Nebulo’s statement reflects and departs from early modern cultural assumptions of the demonic and blackness: Nebulo’s description of a black face as “very sweet” is not typical, for the English Renaissance generally associates blackness with ugliness and evil. Sisymethres’s “very sweet” face is reminiscent of “the Divell, Pluto, and the fiend,” which is part of the cultural imperative to delineate and singularize blackness negatively.

The negative valence that this playwright attributes to Sisymethres’s blackness is absent from Greene, the six European playwrights, and the anonymous author of The White Ethiopian. In Orlando Furioso, the African Marsillus is largely admirable and

42. In Titus Andronicus, the ultra blond queen of the Goths, Tamara, and her sons are taken to Rome as captives. Saturninus, inflamed by his passion for her, renounces the dark-haired Lavina for the fair-haired Tamara (1.i.260-337). Although Tamara is anything but pure, Saturninus and the public perceive her as such because she is blond, reinforcing the discrepancy between actuality and representationality.
resolute, despite Tetsumaro Hayashi’s comment that Marsillus “may represent justice, but there is neither mercy nor the milk of human kindness in him.” Marsillus abides by and defends his daughter’s choice of a husband and shows kindness and mercy to a “common” soldier. Each derivative play follows the Heliodoran model, mentioning blackness only when it is essential and only positively.

Because all of the extant plays that derive or borrow material from the *Aethiopica* share similar characteristics about the Mediterranean, the major protagonists, and Africans, a convention associated with these works emerges. The hero and heroine travel across the multicultural Mediterranean. At least one of them is of royal blood, and they are of different racial and cultural background: the female is African, and the male is western European, who forsakes his country for that of his beloved. The Ethiopians and Egyptians are admired. While there were many plays on the English stage that drew on various prejudices in their depictions of Africans, in this Heliodoran line of continental and English plays, playwrights represented black Africans without prejudice and with dignity.

II.

**The Aethiopica as Source for Popular English Renaissance Plays**

The widespread influence of the *Aethiopica* on the Elizabethan stage prompted Stephen Gosson to declare “that the *Palace of Pleasure*, the *Golden Ass*, the *Aethiopian History* . . . have been throughly ransackt, to furnish the Playe houses in London” with material. Besides showing Gosson’s own attitude, the violence of “throughly ransackt”

---

44. See *A Textual Study of Robert Greene’s Orlando Furioso*, 9.
suggests the thorough manner with which Elizabethan dramatists examined each idea, scrutinized each page, probed each Greek text from cover to cover to cull materials for the stage. Because the *Aethiopica* and other Greek novels were commonplace among the literati, Renaissance playwrights could have borrowed stories about disguises, shipwrecks, wanderings, chastity, female abandonment and courage from other sources and not necessarily from the *Aethiopica* itself, especially since Latin and vernacular translations of those other texts were available, as Matthew Duncan and others also point out. However, as I have tried to show earlier, those themes became integral to Renaissance literature because of the *Aethiopica*. Building upon the previously discussed themes of exposure, chastity, female wit and courage, and male wandering, I argue in this section for the *Aethiopica* as a source of Shakespeare’s *The Winter’s Tale* (1610/11), *Antony and Cleopatra* (1606/7), and Heywood’s *The Fair Maide of the West, Part I* (1591).

Heliodorus’s *Aethiopica* and Longus’s *Daphnis and Chloe* are the only Greek novels that use the motif of abandoning newborn babies to the elements of nature (i.e., exposure). Since Heliodorus predates Longus and only the *Aethiopica* concludes with a focus not simply on the theme of return and reunion but more deeply on return and recognition and provides written evidence of the abandoned baby princess’s lineage, the conclusion that the *Aethiopica* is one of the direct sources of the *The Winter’s Tale* is almost inescapable. While Duncan notes the “plot parallel between *The Winter’s Tale* and the *Aethiopica*,” he concludes that this “is certainly interesting and suggestive, but

---

46. Gesner believes that the exposure “was suggested in *Apollonius of Tyre* when the infant Tharisa was left with unloving foster parents to be reared” (9). However, she was not exposed, i.e., swaddled and abandoned to the elements without anyone to care for her as a result of a parent’s anxiety about infidelity.

the fact that Heliodorus had become commonplace makes it impossible to argue strongly for them” (xxv). Many Renaissance scholars, including Bullough, believe that Pandosto is the main source of The Winter’s Tale; they do not see the Aethiopica’s influence in the play and on Greene, who, according to Samuel L. Wolff, “is full of matter from” the Aethiopica. Wolff notes that “amid Greene’s variety of sources, it would be rather strange if he had not drawn upon Greek Romances,” and points out that Pandosto exhibits “the greatest fullness of influence of the Greek Romance upon Greene” and “[that] it was the destiny of one of Greene’s Heliodorean plots . . . to be caught up by Shakespeare, and translated.”

Gerald Sandy cites Wolff’s catalogue of major Elizabethan writers on whom the Heliodoran influence is evident, which also shows the “urgent ransacking” of the Aethiopica. Gesner’s observation regarding the Aethiopica and The Winter’s Tale is especially important: “On first reading, the exposure of Perdita and the pastoral fourth act suggest Longus as the major Hellenistic influence. Reflection, however, leads inevitably to recognition of Heliodorus as the central romance inspiration . . .” (117). The inevitability of this conclusion stems from the baby’s royal status, her exposure and the reason for it, the identifying script, and the theme of return and recognition.

Duncan is equally cautious in positing Heliodorus as a source for Thomas Heywood. Citing Heywood’s Four Prentices of London and Shakespeare’s Two Gentlemen of Verona as plays with the Heliodoran theme of the noble thief, Duncan notes that from the point when Heywood’s noble thief falls in love with a beautiful

49. Wolff, 375-76, 408.
50. Sandy, 765.
“damsel who comes within his power,” the play’s indebtedness “to Heliodorus is more than in Shakespeare.” Yet he concludes that it is tempting “to posit Heliodorus as the common source and so escape the pitfalls of Shakesperian scholarship, but, unfortunately, these are elements common to Heywood’s and Shakespeare’s treatment of this which cannot be explained by reference to the Aethiopica” (xxvii). Although brigands and pirates are staples of the Greek novel, Heliodorus’s Thyamis is the original pirate in literature to claim that he has “never outraged” women and “those of good birth [he] released for ransom or simply because [he] pitied their lot” (Bk.1. p. 21); this magnanimity both Heywood and Shakespeare appropriate for their noble thieves. Thyamis can claim never to have violated women or the military code of conduct associated with captives of noble birth because he is a former high priest turned pirate captain, and though he has changed occupations, his sense of justice and morality has not deserted him. Thematic correlations, allusions, Gosson’s comments that Heliodorus and other Greek writers have been ransacked to furnish material for the stage, and the arguments of scholars like Wolff, Gesner, and Sandy, suggest the probability that Shakespeare, Heywood, and other early modern English dramatists borrowed directly (and indirectly) from Heliodorus. Even if one were to concur with Bullough and Duncan that Shakespeare borrowed mainly from Greene, the argument would still stand that the Aethiopica is ultimately one of the main sources of The Winter’s Tale: it is the source of the source.

The abandoning to the elements of newborn babies with personal paraphernalia because of some sexually deep-rooted fear on the part of a parent is one of the themes that the Aethiopica gave to the English Renaissance stage. The Winter’s Tale depicts
female abandonment in the direct stage tradition of the *Aethiopica*: the exposure of a baby princess because of a parent’s anxiety over infidelity. Leontes’s jealousy threatens his kingdom, marriage, and boyhood friendship with Polixenes, and his fear of raising another’s issue prompts him to order the child’s death. Instead, the courtier Antigonus exposes the baby in the forest of Bohemia, where a shepherd finds and raises it as his own. Perdita matures, falls in love with a prince, and elopes to Sicilia, unwittingly returning to her homeland to continue the succession and dynastic line.

The exposure motif, the theme of parents acknowledging their offspring and reuniting with her, and the security and continuation of the dynasty through a female successor to the throne link *The Winter’s Tale* to the *Aethiopica*. Both baby princesses are exposed with written evidence and personal possessions that reveal their royal heritage, including precious gems. With fewer and less costly personal effects than Charicleia’s, Perdita’s possessions include a scroll and a bundle containing gold and other possessions. Both children, whose destiny the Oracles foretold, are raised by shepherds, but Charicleia is later removed from her shepherd’s care and given to a priest. Although the lack of an heir is not as salient a concern in Ethiopia as in Sicilia, the return of the princesses, precipitated by their elopement, fulfills the Oracle and ensures their nations’ stability and security by establishing the line of succession. Their elopement, a consequence of blocking fathers--Polixenes objects to his son’s choice and Charicles, for all intents and purpose, to his adopted daughter’s--ironically returns them home, where both sets of parents acknowledge their daughters for the first time. Overjoyed, Persinna remembers and reclaims her daughter, and a stunned Hydaspes realizes for the first time that he is a father, that Charicleia is his daughter, whom he accepts as his own flesh and
blood. Like Heliodorus, Shakespeare combines the theme of return and recognition with that of separation and reunion. In a transfiguring moment, Hermione, Leontes, and Perdita behold one another again for the first time in sixteen years. Past wrongs are forgiven and future joys embraced. Perdita pays homage to her mother, who forgives Leontes and honors the gods for protecting her daughter. Leontes reconciles with Polixenes, who accepts Perdita—following the model of Charicles and Charicleia whereby the former accepts the latter’s fiancé. The return of both princesses saves a dynasty and in Perdita’s case unifies a fragmented family.

As perhaps the most frequent borrower of Heliodorus’s material, Shakespeare alludes to the Aethiopica in Twelfth Night. His indebtedness can also be traced to Othello (treated fully in chapter 3) and Antony and Cleopatra. Based largely on Plutarch’s historical account of “The Life of Marcus Antonius,” Antony and Cleopatra concerns the politics of empire building and the historical and legendary namesakes whose love undermines that goal and leads to their destruction. Despite its historicity, Antony and Cleopatra also features themes associated with the Aethiopica: a wandering and displaced male plus the Mediterranean story with its romance between a quick-witted and resourceful black African woman of noble blood and a white Western man also nobly descended. In describing Antony’s military exploits, Plutarch tells of his wanderings and love for Cleopatra: “the last and extreamest mischief of all other (to wit, the love of Cleopatra) lighted on him, who did waken and stirre up many vices yet hidden in him

51. See TN (V.i.121-124).
53. I deal with the dispute surrounding this claim later.
... and if any sparkle of goodnesse or hope of rising were left in him, Cleopatra quenched it straight, and made it worse then before” (273). The words “τελευταίον κακόν” appear in Plutarch’s own text. According to Liddle & Scott, the authoritative Greek dictionary, τελευταίον—neuter form of an adjective, modifying κακόν—means (1) “at the end, last”; (2) “the last, worst, extreme.” κακόν - substantive (a word or word group functioning syntactically as a noun) formed from the adjective kakó̄ς—means "bad, ill, evil." Liddle & Scott defines the substantive as follows: (1) “evil, ill, mischief”; also “woe, distress, loss”; bodily ill, injury; (2) in the moral sense, “evil, vice, wickedness.” The overall sense of the passage is hostility to and blame of Cleopatra for Antony’s fall, conveyed through sentiments such as “waken and stirre up many vices” and “extreamest mischief.”

Throughout his descriptions of her, Plutarch makes no mention of Cleopatra’s race or color. Shakespeare, however, does (as we shall see below), combining the historic with the histrionic. This composite Cleopatra is partly rooted in historical fact (i.e., Plutarch) and, I want to suggest, partly rooted in fiction (i.e., Heliodoran fiction, given the Mediterranean story with its transracial romance).

As a Mediterranean adventure play with an intrepid heroine and a wandering hero, Antony and Cleopatra participates in the stage tradition derived from the Aethiopica. In both the Aethiopica and Antony and Cleopatra, the male protagonists are western, white men who consort with African women of royal blood and face political repercussions. Despite the many similarities in the themes and motifs of both works, the relationship between the Aethiopica and Antony and Cleopatra is not a one-to-one

---

correspondence given the play’s various sources and its historical determinations. Nonetheless, there are moments and details unaccounted for in the other sources (for example, Cleopatra’s ethnicity and race, as we shall see later) that can be traced to or found in the *Aethiopica*. Like all major male characters in the Heliodoran adventure tradition, Marc Antony crosses great geographical spaces. Both he and Theagenes move intentionally and reactively from place to place. Theagenes’s move from Thessaly to Athens is, like Antony’s first move from Rome to Egypt, purposeful: fulfilling political and social obligations. In Athens, Theagenes is a part of the Thessalian delegation that arrives in Athens to participate in the Pythian games and to consecrate as well as celebrate the festival of Neoptolemus in the temple of Apollo (Bks 2 & 3, pp. 64-72). His subsequent move from Athens to Meroe, delayed frequently by war and the vicissitudes of fortune, is less political and more social, satisfying his romantic desires while obeying the dictates of the gods. Antony’s travel through the Alps, Ephesus, Macedonia, and Cilicia is politically intentional as well as historically determined. However, his first excursion into Cleopatra’s Egypt was, according to Plutarch, romantically motivated:

. . . Antonius was so ravished with the love of Cleopatra, that though his wife Fulvia had great warres, and much a doe with Caesar for his affaires, and that the armie of the Pathians . . . was now assembled in Mesopotamia readie to invade Syria: yet, as though all this had nothing touched him, he yielded him selfe to goe with Cleopatra into Alexandria, where he spent and lost in childish sports . . . and idle pastimes, the most pretious thing a man can spende . . . time.55

Mesmerized by Cleopatra, Antony whiled away his time in Egypt. In using this episode, Shakespeare allows Antony to lose himself “in dotage,” but eventually to break his “strong Egyptian fetters” (I.i.116), and return to Rome, where he accepts, if only temporarily, a life of domesticity and politics. Shortly thereafter, he rushes back to Egypt, driven by amorous desires.

Constantly moving between Egypt and Rome, Antony realizes that straddling both countries is untenable, for he finds himself splintering: “I am Antony, / Yet cannot hold this visible shape” (IV.xiv.13-14). Antony cannot hold his shape, i.e. be himself, because, as Linda Charnes points out, “he is at once re-placed and dis-placed. He cannot properly be Egyptian, nor can he continue to meet the requirements of being properly ‘Roman’ in all its implications. . . . Belonging fully in neither [world] yet being pulled by both, he becomes incapable of rooting himself in a position that would enable him to launch an effective strategy of his own.”\textsuperscript{56} Antony’s dis-placement from Rome and re-placement in Egypt help to explain his decision to fight at sea: left with no place of his own, he claims one, which is as shifting and insubstantial as the no-man’s land where he finds himself, as Charnes also remarks. Antony’s inability to return “fully to his one self,” i.e., to become exclusively Roman once again in order to re-occupy “the unified, integral identity that Rome provided for him” results from his love for and loyalty to Cleopatra: a loyalty that splits his responsibilities and duties to Rome, thus giving him what Charnes calls “two sets of coordinates, two places which now claim different Antonys.”\textsuperscript{57} Implicit in Charnes’s analysis is the recognition that Octavius is able to

\textsuperscript{56}See Notorious Identity: Materializing the Subject in Shakespeare (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1993), 113 &115.

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid, 114.
represent his conflict with Antony as war with Egypt because of Antony’s love for Cleopatra and frequent absence from Rome.

The fracturing of Antony’s unified self and his divided loyalties are also part of the Heliodoran tradition. Despite its historical record, if Antony and Cleopatra, with its geographical spread, multiculturalism, and Mediterranean story with its transracial and cross-cultural romance is viewed in the Heliodoran adventure tradition, then except for chastity, Antony’s wandering, displacement, and lack of belonging to one place or another is characteristic of the male protagonists of this tradition. Both Charicleia and Theagenes journey across the Mediterranean world, from Greece, to Egypt, and finally to Ethiopia, as do their namesakes in the six Continental plays, illustrating the geographic instability that characterizes protagonists in this kind of drama.

As the male protagonist in the Aethiopica and dramas of similar derivation, Theagenes and his namesakes experience displacement that Charicleia and her namesakes do not, for the women eventually return to their homeland, but the men do not. Theagenes’s habitation in Ethiopia and initiation into the gymnosophist priesthood signal a complete re-placing and dis-placing of himself. Theagenes the Thessalian no longer exists. The Ethiopian rites, rituals, and domicile that now define him have re-placed and dis-placed him. When the Tyrian merchant who desires to be Charicleia’s husband tells Calisiris to “Say no more of that, father. . . . As for race and country, I shall accept yours,” one hears not only the merchant but Theagenes as well, for all his actions are circumscribed in this man’s words (Bk.5. p.125). Antony’s proclamation that Egypt is his space (1.i.34) resonates with this pronouncement. As Theagenes is not fully Greek or Ethiopian, neither is Antony fully Roman nor Egyptian, as indicated by Theagenes’s
imminent accession to the Ethiopian throne and Antony’s war with Octavius. Both Theagenes and Antony have relinquished all for love, however, the intensity which accompanies Antony’s self-splintering has deeper political complications and more far-reaching consequences than Theagenes’s because Ethiopia and Thessaly do not have competing political strategies as do Egypt and Rome, with each nation exerting opposing claims on Antony. Ethiopia, unlike Rome, is not historically predetermined as nation embarked upon world domination, and Thessaly, unlike Egypt, is not engaged in a struggle to preserve its sovereignty or to resist becoming another territory of the empire-building nation of Rome. Unlike Theagenes, Antony’s divided loyalties ultimately results in his and Cleopatra’s death, making Octavius the undisputed ruler of the world, and Egypt a Roman territory. In seeing Antony in the Heliodoran tradition, we can read him as less capricious, less self-destructive in his desires and more as a character whose struggles with love and loyalty ultimately lead him to his destiny. All of Antony’s self-splintering can be seen as a part of his journey to “self-discovery”; his burial in Egypt may indicate this discovery, reminding us that Egypt is indeed his space and where his loyalty finally lies.

Of the popular English Renaissance plays under discussion, *The Fair Maid of the West, Part 1* demonstrates most effectively the Heliodoran tradition of a female who values her honor and uses martial means to protect it. The play depicts a woman who searches for her beloved, encounters numerous adventures, and finds and marries him, before returning home. This is a large part of Charicleia’s story, though there are

58. The sentiment recalls the title of Dryden’s play, *All for Love*, based on Shakespeare’s *Antony and Cleopatra*.
variations in the details. But Bess also has similarities to Queen Elizabeth, despite being more closely aligned to Charicleia. Although Bess’s exhortation to the crew against the attack of the Spaniards has historical resonance to Queen Elizabeth’s in 1588 to the soldiers at Tilbury against the attacking Spanish Armada, the exhortation also has its parallel in the *Aethiopica*: Charicleia cheers Theagenes in his fight against brigands, who, like the attacking Spaniards, are ultimately defeated. Like her literary prototype’s, Bess’s virtue is constantly under siege because of her beauty. Although chastity is a standard theme in Greek novels, the *Aethiopica* and plays that derive from it give chastity a new spiritual imperative. In the hieroglyphics, Persinna admonishes her daughter to be chaste because chastity is a woman’s only virtue, which is the reason she herself abandons her newborn.

The heroines of the six Continental plays value their chastity more than their lives, voicing a preference for death rather than losing their purity. Heliodorus makes his protagonists’ chastity a spiritual quest, which their wanderings help to refine and to prepare them for the priesthood. Their wanderings also unfold another characteristic of this stage tradition: women are as courageous as men and capable of defending their honor. While other Greek heroines exhibit fearlessness, none of them, like Charicleia, takes a martial role in protecting her virtue. Instead, these heroines talk or “shame” their

60. Besides the obvious similarities such as name and nationality to Queen Elizabeth, Bess also commands and leads men. If we accept that a ship is a microcosm of a country or society, then just as Queen Elizabeth rules England so Bess commands the *Negro*. As Jean E. Howard points out, Bess’s portrayal “owes much to the representation of Queen Elizabeth . . . however, Bess is not simply a screen for Elizabeth. Her depication is much more complicated than a simple identification of a female subject with her monarch would suggest.” For example, Bess has sailed the Mediterranean and is a martial maiden. There is no record of the queen ever sailing the Mediterranean or engaging in martial combat. See “An English Lass Amid the Moors: Gender, race, sexuality, and national identity in Heywood’s *The Fair Maid of the West,*” *Women, “Race,” and Writing in the Early Modern Period*, ed. Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker (London: Routledge, 1994), 107.

61. Despite their innocence, Daphnis and Chloe tried unsuccessfully to have sex, and, as Wolff points out, Leucippe was quite prepared to surrender to Clitophon (129). For Heliodorus’s protagonists, virtue is a spiritual drive.
would-be attackers into repenting their lustful inclination, as Leucippe does with Thersander. In *Fair Maid*, rather than “shame” her would-be ravishers into repentance and trust their conscience to prickle them to reform, Bess becomes a militant protectress of her honor. In the duel between her and the braggar Roughman, Bess triumphs by outsmarting him: dressed as a man, she meets him alone in a field; calls him “a villain, a Coward,” a liar, and strikes him; forces him to throw his sword down; to tie her shoe; to untruss her point; and to lie on the ground so she can straddle him. Sparing Roughman’s life, she warns him about the consequences of reverting to bullyism (II.iii.50-89).

The concern with female courage and Bess’s ability to protect and defend her honor, her wit, along with male chastity and wandering indicates the indebtedness of *The Fair Maid of the West, Part I*, to the dramatic tradition derived from the *Aethiopica*. So closely are Heliodorus’s novel and Heywood’s play related in themes that the *Aethiopica* could have indeed been entitled *The Fair Maide of the East*. Surprisingly, Robert K. Turner argues that “Heywood does not seem to have based any of the components of the play on a specific source.” According to Turner, Heywood could have used an “Elizabethan pamphlet, *The Life and Pranks of Long Meg of Westminster* (1590) . . . [or] ‘a play on Long Meg now lost but acted by the Admirals Men, Henslowe’s company, from 1595.’”62 Besides the established fact that Heywood knew the *Aethiopica* and most likely borrowed from it, Turner makes two critical observations that can allow for the *Aethiopica* as one of Heywood’s sources: first, Heywood’s use of several sources and, second, Long Meg’s “submissive devotion to the man of her choice” (xiii). Heywood’s use of several sources would include rather than exclude the *Aethiopica*, given Bess’s

---

purity and Heywood’s familiarity with Heliodorus’s novel. In noting the difference between Bess and Long Meg, Turner himself remarks that Bess’s virtue “may be superhuman” in comparison to the lack of Long Meg’s. Though devoted, Bess, unlike Long Meg, is not submissive to the man of her choice, as several scenes suggest, especially the scene in which Spencer tells her to remain aboard the ship, but she returns to the palace to seek him. Additionally, neither the pamphlet nor the play about Long Meg concerns itself with male virtue or, for that matter, female virtue. These differences, I submit, have their origins in Heliodorus.

_The Fair Maid_ stages female and male chastity along with female bravery through the exploits of its protagonists, Bess and Spencer. Bess, a tanner’s daughter and the love interest of Spencer, is renowned for her beauty and virtue. Spencer’s accidental killing of a patron forces him to flee England and his rumored “death” prompts Bess to sail the Mediterranean to recover his body. She reunites with him in Fesse, but King Mullisheg’s sexual designs on her goad the queen into a similar desire for Spencer. However, the sleights of the English crewmember, Goodlack and Roughman, aid both Bess and Spencer to maintain their honor.

_The Fair Maide_ delineates numerous attacks upon Bess’s virtue, but those involving King Mullisheg are most conspicuous. Mullisheg is willing to release his Christian prisoners and risk one-half of his kingdom if Bess will gratify his sexual desires. On the night of her honeymoon, Mullisheg plans to deflower her but is outmaneuvered by Goodlack and Roughman, who trick Tota instead into Mullisheg’s bed. Both dramatic incidents recall the designs by Trachinus and the Tyrian merchant on Charicleia. Each man is willing to undertake anything to have her, and both end up
empty-handed because they are outmaneuvered. Both women keep their admirers at bay by making them believe their own romantic projections: Charicleia allows Trachinus to think she will marry him despite finding him repugnant, and Bess plays along with Mullisheg despite a complete lack of romantic interest in him. Both women understand that to escape their admirers’ tyranny they must improvise or playact.

*The Fair Maid* is not only concerned with the virtue of a woman but, in accord with the Heliodoran model, with that of a man. Although Heywood does not equate male and female chastity as Heliodorus does, he nonetheless makes Spencer constant. When Tota decides to avenge herself because of Mullisheg’s infidelity, she settles on a sexual encounter with Spencer, who is uninterested in the queen and ignorant of her design. Although she solicits Goodlack and Roughman’s help, both men dupe her into thinking that Spencer knows her intent. Spencer endures no torture to force him into a sexual surrender because Roughman and Goodlack have outmaneuvered both the queen and the king. Besides, Tota is not a nymphomaniac like Arsace, and Spencer is not being refined for the priesthood. While there are mitigating circumstances, like his ignorance and the bed-trick, that help Spencer maintain his virtue, such is not the case with Theagenes; his unsullied virtue is an internal, moral commitment to purity. When Charicleia demands that he vow not to violate her chastity, he resists pledging because he sees complying as impugning his own virtue and consents only at Calasiris’s urging. Additionally, when she urges him to enjoy Arsace’s bounty, he refuses even a taste despite severe punishments.

In English Renaissance adventure plays, the main protagonist is almost always a man. *The Fair Maid* is unusual because its main protagonist is a female who drives the
dramatic action. With the exception of the play about Long Meg and some of those that derive directly from Heliodorus’s novel, there is no precedent for a female protagonist who drives the action in an early modern English adventure drama. Bess’s role as the leading protagonist in an adventure drama is yet another indication of *The Fair Maid*’s participation in the dramatic tradition derived from the *Aethiopica*. Like the female protagonist in the *Aethiopica, Le comedie de chastes amvors*, and perhaps the three lost English plays, Bess is as active as her male counterpart, defending herself from predators, frequently finding solutions to her employees’ problems, and making decisions by which they and her patrons abide.

Despite *The Fair Maid*’s departure in granting equal social status to its hero and heroine, Heywood retains the Heliodoran tradition of making the heroine and hero equal in other ways. Bess’s successful management of the tavern in Foy, her decision to buy and outfit a ship to comb the Mediterranean in search of Spencer’s body, her resolve to become a privateer, and her courage to challenge the braggart Roughman to a duel and to outwit him illustrate David Konstan’s argument that “women are as intellectual, resourceful, self-conscious, and intelligent as their sweethearts” in this tradition. Disguised as a man aboard her ship, Bess participates in the battles by cheering her crew to victory against the Spaniards and the Turks. Her action is that of a cockswain in a boat-race spurring her teammates on to victory, which recalls the actions of Charicleia
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63. Although there are several early modern plays with leading female protagonists—*Sophonisba* and *Soliman and Perseda*, for example—none of these female protagonists drives the action of the plays, even though that action frequently occurs because of them. Both Sophonisba and Perseda are acted upon more than acting on. They suffer a concatenation of cruel circumstances: having experienced coitus interruptus on her wedding night, Sophonisba is the Senate’s bait to prevent Syphax from attacking Tunis and the object of his unbridled lust, just as Perseda is the target of Soliman’s lascivious yearnings and the catalyst for his murdering her husband and besieging Rhodes. See John Marston, *The Wonder of Women, or The Tragedy of Sophonisba* (New York: Garland, 1977), esp Acts 1 & 2; Thomas Kyd, *Solimon and Perseda* (New York: AMS Press, 1970) Acts IV & V.

64. Quoted by Doody, 36.
and her namesakes cheering their Theagenes in battle against pirates, and her disguise brings to mind Charicleia’s as an old peasant woman roaming the Egyptian countryside in search of Theagenes. Although Bess eventually finds Spencer alive in Fesse, her encounter with Mullisheg plunges her into another adventure that reveals her mental resourcefulness, just as Charicleia’s and her namesakes’ encounters with Arsace land them in intrigue in the Persian palace. Charicleia’s advice to Theagenes to modify his behavior toward Arsace proves insightful, for Arsace had decided to marry Charicleia to the peasant Achaemenes but reverses herself as a result of the change in Theagenes.65 Similarly, when Mullisheg interrogates Bess regarding her age and other personal information to determine if she is sexually suitable, Bess, understanding that a rash or “wrong” answer can jeopardize her entire crew, gives Mullisheg the answer he seeks. After much intrigue, several posturings, and numerous wranglings, Bess and her crew sail for home. Quite probably, the English Renaissance stage had never seen such a female role before, except perhaps with the lost plays of Long Meg and Chariclea.

III.

Black Africans on the English Renaissance Stage

Around the mid-seventeenth century, the Aethiopica came into vogue once more as a result of England’s commercial dealings with the Levant and upper-class gentlemen’s renewed interest in the novel. According to Jonathan Burton, plays dealing with the Mediterranean increased “more than four times,” especially when compared to

65. Theagenes does not succumb to Arsace. He becomes less supercilious toward her and her cupbearer, which Arsace accepts temporarily.
plays “about the New World.” English theatergoers were inundated with representations of Africans as crafty, degraded, and licentious. Yet this was not always the case, as ancient histories, literatures, and the popularity of the *Aethiopica* suggest. Sacred histories and literatures tell of the advancement of Africans. Ethiopia and Egypt were lands of wealth and power, dating back to antiquity. Biblical history and literature show interconnections among Ethiopia, Egypt, and Israel. Moses and Joseph married Ethiopian and Egyptian women, and their sons were among the twelve tribes of Israel. Joseph’s two sons, Ephraim and Manassas, belonged to the tribes of Israel which bore their names. And the Ethiopian Ebed Meleck saved the Prophet Jeremiah from dying in a dungeon.

The Renaissance knew of the accomplishments of Ethiopians and Egyptians from other literary and historical sources. *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey* accord Ethiopians the distinction of feasting with the gods and the qualities of wisdom, loyalty, and piety.

Antiquarians such as Diodorus believed in the primacy of Ethiopian and Egyptian learning. According to Diodorus, the Ethiopians invented the first form of writing, called by the Egyptians hieroglyphics. Following Diodorus and other antiquarians, Louis Le Roy elaborates on the primacy of Ethiopian learning in *Of the Interchangeable Course of Things* (1594):

Antiquitie hath given the first praise of Letters to the Ethiopians, attributing the invention to them, which they communicated with the Egyptians their neighbors; where they have been augmented: from thence

they came to the Libians, Babylonians, and Chaldeans; consequently to the Greeks; then to the Romans; the Arabians, Italians, Frenchmen, Almains, Englishmen, Spaniards, and Polonians (Bk. 2, E 1).

Additionally, the Ethiopians invented sculpting, which the Greeks copied from the Egyptians and perfected. The Egyptian influence of presenting the human figure with one foot in front of the other is still evident in early Greek sculptures.70 Historians, archaeologists, and other recorders of the past, are familiar with the primacy of Ethiopian and Egyptian knowledge. According to Georges Perrott and Charles Chipiez, ancient Greece “entered late into history, when civilization had already a long past behind it, a past of many centuries. . . . In comparison to the Egyptians, Chaldeans, Phoenicians, the Greeks are but children.”71 Heliodorus points to the infancy of Greek and by extension Western learning and the primacy of Ethiopian and Egyptian knowledge in his text. While Charicles, Charicleia, and the other Greeks are unable to read or speak the Ethiopian or Egyptian language, a liability that allows Charicleia’s lineage to remain a secret, the Ethiopian and Egyptian aristocracy and priesthood are literate in each other’s language and Greek. Hydaspes and Persinna speak to Theagenes, Charicleia, and the other Greek captives in Greek. The High Priest Sisimethres explains Charicleia’s genealogy to Charicles in Greek. Additionally, the Egyptians Calasiris and Thyamis speak Greek to the priests at Delphi and to Cnemon. The wisest sage in Greece, Calasiris, travels to Ethiopia “to [augment his] Egyptian attainments with . . . Ethiopian wisdom” (Bk. 4, p. 98). Heliodorus, however, is not negating the intelligence of the Greeks or claiming that all Ethiopians are superior in intelligence to the Greeks. In Book

70. Snowden, 109, 114-15.
10, Theagenes wrestles and defeats an Ethiopian giant, a victory Heliodorus represents as the triumph of Greek intelligence over brute strength.

Renaissance England also knew of the accomplishments of Africans through commercial interchanges and contemporary travel narratives such as that of Purchas, who praises the military skills of Ethiopians and describes the people as “sincere and of very great fidelitie.”

Burton and Matar detail the intimate association between Queen Elizabeth and Ahmad al-Mansur and between the queen and Sultan Murad III. According to Matar, “Queen Elizabeth repeatedly sought military and diplomatic help from” al-Mansur, much to the consternation of Europe. Both Matar and Burton note that Elizabeth’s and al-Mansur’s letters to each other evince a position not of superiority but one of equality and cooperation on Elizabeth’s part. Elizabeth’s letters to these two rulers show a great deal of cordiality to these two heads of state, perhaps because of England’s controversial trade with these two nations and the proposition that “Morocco join with England in an attempt to put the Portuguese Pretender, Don Antonio, on the . . . throne,” to cripple their nemesis, Spain. In one of their correspondences, al-Mansur proposed to Elizabeth that “Moroccan and English troops, using English ships, . . . attack the Spanish colonies in the West Indies, expel the Spaniards, and then ‘possesse’ the land and keep it ‘under our dominion for ever, and . . . joyne it to our estate and yours.’” In al-Mansur’s plan, England, following Morocco’s lead, would help Morocco dispossess Spain and colonize America. Burton describes the correspondence between Elizabeth
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73. Nabil Matar, *Turks and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia UP, 1999), 9; Burton, 57.
75. Matar, 9.
and Murad and their trade agreement as “a watershed moment.” Because the English were neutral in the Ottoman-Venetian War (1499-1503), which disrupted the English import of silk and spices, the “Ottomans were anxious to establish direct relations [with England] to obtain vital materials such as English tin, steel and lead, as well as to give a fatal blow to the Venetian economy.” By 1572, English imports and exports suffered because of Spain’s conquest of Antwerp. A few years later, in March 1579, England and the Ottoman Empire established formal trade relations. And in 1600, a Moorish embassy arrived in England to talk of matters of diplomacy and trade. The Turks and Moors were not only a commercial and maritime power but a military one, as well. Lisa Jardine notes that Europeans, including the Elizabethans, admired the military puissance of the Turks and Moors and the sultan’s ability to maintain a standing army, and feared their “awesome might.”

England’s commercial and social affiliations with Africans and the influences of the Aethiopica throughout the nation tempered some of the early modern dramatists’ representations of Africans on the English Renaissance stage. The three lost plays, along with Greene’s Orlando Furioso, The Merchant of Venice, The Strange Discovery, The White Ethiopian, and several Lord Mayor’s Day pageants all depict black Africans positively, as do Antony and Cleopatra, and Othello, even though the majority of early modern drama represents Blacks negatively. In the tradition of the Aethiopica, Antony and Cleopatra and Othello counter the stereotypical notion of black Africans as subservient creatures, sexual deviants, and debased savages that most Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists portray them to be.

76. Burton, 57-58.
Shakespeare is among the few English Renaissance playwrights and the best known whose representation of black Africans on stage also participates in the Heliodoran tradition. Although at times Shakespeare challenges contemporary racial and gender assumptions, he frequently contributes to them. Certain works embody this tension. Despite the Prince of Morocco’s caprice and presumed sexual threat in *The Merchant of Venice*, he is a majestic figure. His clothes speak to his status, and he departs with dignity after choosing the wrong casket. Even in *Titus Andronicus* the tension of undermining yet reinforcing cultural constraints strengthens the dramatic power of the play. Tamora, the ultra-white, ultra-blonde wife of the Roman emperor Saturninus, is a nymphomaniac, who favors Aaron the Moor over her husband (II.iii.9-41, 66-84). That a blond woman prefers a black manservant to a powerful white male ruler shatters stereotypes and social constraints, which are also reinforced—for Aaron is a villain but with intellectual depth and sexual control. Resisting Tamora’s charms, he conceives and helps to execute the plot that enables Chiron and Demetrius to cut off Lavinia’s tongue and hands, to “pillage her chastity,” and to “wash their hands in Bassanius’ blood” (II.iii.10-50).

In *Antony and Cleopatra*, as well as *Othello*, the tensions are more pronounced: the marginalized and demonized become the center even if they are ultimately defeated. Cleopatra and Othello are Africans whose favorable presentation upon the early modern stage taps into the stage tradition that existed for such representation. Although a majority of scholars agrees that the historic Cleopatra, descended from the Ptolemies, was white, many critics and scholars conflate the factual and the fictive Cleopatra, thereby
constructing Shakespeare’s Cleopatra as white, as well as Othello, despite Shakespeare’s description of her as non-white. However, there is sufficient textual evidence indicating that Shakespeare’s Cleopatra is racially the Other. In one of her musings Cleopatra says, “Think on me, / That am with Phoebus’ amorous pinches black, / And wrinkled deep in time” (I.v. 27-29). While it is likely that Cleopatra is speaking about maturity or superannuation, it is also quite possible that she is making a clear assertion that her blackness is hereditary, generational: hence, “deep in time.” The line, “That am with Phoebus’s amorous pinches black” (I.v.29), alludes to the Renaissance climatic explanation for black complexion, a recurring theme in early modern literature which Jonson’s Masque of Blackness interrogates: Phaeton’s loss of control of Apollo’s chariot supposedly created catastrophic effects in the African temperature, causing its sun’s “intemperate fires” to blacken Africans (Blackness, ll. 130-150). Cleopatra’s reference to “Phoebus’ amorous pinches” draws upon this early modern climatic theory to explain her black complexion. Also, as Imtiaz Habib contends, it is not what “Cleopatra was ethnically or racially, but what she was in the early modern English popular imagination that has more to say about her ethnicity [and race] in Shakespeare.”


79. Historically, Cleopatra’s ethnicity and racial origins are not uncontested issues. The British classicist Sir Paul Harvey believed that Ptolemy IV Philopator’s recruitment of native Ethiopian soliders in his victorious battle against Antiochus III in 217 B.C. facilitated “Egyptian influence in and penetration of Ptolemaic political and civic life to the point that [a] mixed Graeco-Egyptian race was gradually formed” (qtd. in Habib, 164). Elizabeth Cary describes Cleopatra as “a brown Egyptian” in The Tragedie of Mariam. Recently several scholars, including Linda Charnes, concur that Cleopatra is black. Charnes, 111, goes a step farther by enumerating the levels of Cleopatra’s Otherness to Rome: racial, national, gender. Of course, some early modern English writers, including Samuel Daniel and the Countess of Pembroke dramatize Cleopatra as white in their versions of Antony and Cleopatra. In The Virtuous Octavia Samuel Brandon wonders how Cleopatra’s “sun-burnt beauty” was pleasing to Antony. For a comprehensive and in-depth discussion of Cleopatra’s mixed heritage, see Imtiaz Habib, Shakespeare and Race: Postcolonial...
Robert Greene, for example, sees Cleopatra as a “black Egyptian” in his *Ciceronis amor* (1589), and Aemilia Lanyer describes Cleopatra as “a blacke Egyptian” in *Salve Deus Rex Judeorun* (1611). As a black African on stage, Cleopatra, like Othello, is the major protagonist in a major play. A goddess on the river Cydnus, she enthralls the people who surround the river in adoration. She purses up the heart of Marc Antony and scorns Octavius’s request, offering two heads instead of one: hers along with Antony’s. In Cleopatra, and Othello, Shakespeare makes people of color, especially women, transcend the mundane, rising majestically above the degradation that often characterizes them on the English Renaissance stage, despite, as I iterated earlier, her fall. Descended from an ancient line of nobility, Cleopatra, like Othello, undermines the notions that Africans are subservient and that only debased whites consort with or become spouses to blacks. Heliodorus’s influence is especially evident here, particularly in Cleopatra and Antony’s union: an African woman and a Roman man (Antony claims Greek ancestry as well; see I.iii.84, III.ii.59). In Act V, Cleopatra resists and disrupts Octavius’s plans to stage her and her maids in Rome, preferring instead to lie dead and naked “on Nilus’ mud / . . . and let the water-flies / Blow [her] into abhorring!” (ii.49-62, 207-26). Cleopatra’s concern about Rome’s representation of her (V.ii.200-221) transcends the personal. Her concern is not simply how Rome will represent Egypt but also how the West will stage the East, and by extension how England will stage Africa. Cleopatra’s requests for her “best attires” and
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to be shown “like a queen” are a call for authentic portrayal and a remembering of who she and Egypt—and by extension Africa, its people, and their accomplishments—are.

All of the plays discussed in this chapter show indebtedness to the *Aethiopica*. Each of the six Continental plays along with *The Strange Discovery* and *The White Ethiopian* modify and retell the *Aethiopica* in varying degrees, which, along with the three lost English plays, help to establish a dramatic tradition originating from this ancient text. The themes of parental exposure of newborns as a way of preserving a mother’s honor and protecting the life of her child, of woman’s autonomy and capacity to defend herself from rapacious males, of man’s pride in his chastity, and of protagonists’ travel around the world and surrender to love are common in this tradition. Most important, however, is the positive representation of Africans on the early modern English stage. Majestic and unbowed, Cleopatra electrifies the audience with her memorable performance: in preparing to meet her great love Antony, death is not grim, not a sleep, not a forgetting, but the fulfillment of immortal longing. Scripting her own final performance in unmistakable Egyptian fashion (V.i.87), she upstages Octavius, commanding the admiration of this stoic and outmaneuvered man. Cleopatra’s dramatization helps us recall what African characters once were on the Renaissance stage: noble, intrepid, deeply human, and deeply flawed. To Elizabethan and Jacobean England with its admiration and repulsion of Moors and other Africans, its belief in the supernatural, and worship of antiquity, Charicleia’s birth, nationality, and betrothal to Theagenes were a mine from which many of its dramatists prospected. Some extracted dross by portraying Blacks as lechers and other kinds of profligates. A few extracted gold by presenting them as complex human beings with weaknesses and strengths. As
the *Aethiopica* extols the virtues of dark-skinned people, it leaves a legacy of their nobility, sagacity, and cultural sophistication, which is rarely emulated but frequently exploited, distorted, and obscured by the dramatic representations of early modern English playwrights. In the next chapter, I investigate how Ben Jonson and Richard Brome, two playwrights whose works reveal Heliodoran influence, utilize this tradition.
Chapter 2

From King James’s accession to the English throne in 1603 to about 1636 more than a dozen dramatic works dealing with blackness and the Mediterranean were written, including Ben Jonson’s *Masque of Blackness* (1603), his *Masque of Beauty* (1608), and Richard Brome’s *The English Moor; or The Mock-Marriage* (1635). Blackness was the first major court masque to be produced and performed during King James’s reign. “It is no accident,” Kim Hall writes, “that the first court masque is an elucidation of blackness.” Hall’s observation highlights the Stuart court’s fascination with blackness and the exotic, dating back to the reigns of James IV and Mary Stuart. Hall, Habib, and Clare McManus record that many Blacks were present at the Scottish court and that James VI kept blacks as captives, pets on a par with his exotic lions and tigers at his Scottish court. At James and Anne’s wedding, four black boys might have danced naked in the subzero temperature and died of pneumonia a few days later, and at Anne’s

3. References to Brome’s play are to Sara Jayne Steen’s edition, *The English Moor; or The Mock-Marriage* (Columbia: Univ. of Missouri, 1983).
5. According to Clare McManus, black performers entertained the court of James IV as early as 1505. In 1507/8, James IV participated in a court tournament in which a black woman was the prize. As the Black or Wild Knight, James fought for the Black Lady. The winner would kiss the woman’s lips and the loser would approach from behind and kiss her hips. Black performers also participated in the entertainments of “Mary Stuart’s 1558 marriage . . . and again in her 1561 royal entry” into Scotland. See MacManus, 76 & 83.
6. See Hall, 128; Imtiaz Habib, *Shakespeare and Race: Postcolonial Praxis in the Early Modern Period* (Lanham: UP of America, 2002), 163; and McManus, 76. There seems to be discrepancies about this incident. Tokson and Hall claim that four boys died and the incident occurred in Norway. Habib claims
coronation and entry into Scotland, Blacks participated in the ceremony, dancing and acting as a means of crowd control. Given her extensive encounter with black Africans, Queen Anne’s request to have her and her ladies appear as “blackamores” in a court masque is not surprising. However, both Anne and Jonson would have been aware of the controversy that would result from such a performance, because, as Orgel and McManus tell us, blackness was antithetical to the court, the source of beauty and light. To minimize contention, Jonson couches blackness in paradoxical, metaphorical, and ambivalent terms in the twin masques because he would also use the masques to glorify King James and as a platform for James’s agenda for Great Britain.

To other seventeenth-century writers, such as Brome, blackness lacks the multivalency with which Jonson invests it; instead, Brome sees it as a monolithic, negative quality. Despite a difference in perspective regarding blackness, Jonson and Brome found common ground in the associations they make with blackness, connecting it to gender and race through metamorphosis. While Jonson’s Blackness and Beauty decry and laud blackness simultaneously, Brome’s The English Moor vilifies it. In Jonson’s twin masques, sixteen Ethiopian princesses are metamorphosed from black to white women, and in Brome’s comedy an Englishwoman is transformed from white to black. While Jonson uses Heliodorus as a model for transmutation, Brome inverts the model by transforming a white woman into a black woman. In this chapter, I establish the similarities between Heliodorus’s novel and Jonson’s twin masques by looking at Book 4 of the Aethiopica and contending that Jonson used it as a template for the transformation that only one boy died and that the incident occurred in Scotland. McManus believes the incident to be more anecdotal than factual because of its lack of authoritative documentation.

7. McManus, 75.
of his Ethiopian princesses in *Blackness* and *Beauty*. I also argue for a Heliodoran stage tradition that is implicit in *Blackness* through the conceit of blanching. Then I turn my attention to *The English Moor*, looking at the ways it is conversant with the *Aethiopica* and Jonson’s masques. Usually, plays that use a portion or all of the *Aethiopica* participate in the dramatic tradition under investigation. Despite its intertextual discourse with the *Aethiopica* and use of Heliodorus’s material, *The English Moor* does not participate in this stage tradition. Given that *The English Moor* is the first of two plays that use material from the *Aethiopica* but fails to participate in the dramatic tradition originating from this text, I explore Brome’s use of the Heliodoran and Jonsonian materials to create a negative one-dimensional quality of blackness that taps into the dramatic tradition of the degraded African on the English Renaissance stage.

**I.**

**The Aethiopica as Template for Blackness and Beauty?**

Among the most striking examples of transformation in secular literature is that of the Ethiopian princess, Charicleia, in Book 4 of the *Aethiopica*. The transformation of Charicleia from black to white occurred in *utero* when her mother, Queen Persinna, gazed at a painting during sexual intercourse. As we have already seen, the queen explains that she and her husband, King Hydaspes, produce a white-looking child “because I looked upon the picture of Andromeda naked, while my husband had to do with me (as then he [Perseus] had brought her from the rocke, had by mishappe ingendered presently a thing like to her)” (108). Persinna further explains Charicleia’s aberrant complexion: under divine motivation, Hydaspes consorts with Persinna in her
“apartment” which boasts “colorful representations of the love of . . . Perseus and Andromeda.” And the queen knew immediately that she was pregnant. When she gave birth, the baby was “white,” a color she describes, as “strange amonc the Aethiopians” (107-8). In keeping with ancient ideas about the mother’s influence on the fetus, Heliodorus makes Charicleia’s whiteness the exclusive result of Persinna’s gaze at the painting of Andromeda’s image during sexual intercourse. Images and paintings, Doody points out, have “a special place in marking the order of creativity [, which] remind us of the visible world, and thus of the sensible universe, but [which] also speak of stasis, and artifice—of things out of nature.”10 As the white offspring of pure-blooded black Africans, Charicleia is a being “out of nature” because her complexion is inexplicable from a natural, biological standpoint. If she were an albino—the result of genetic mutation—or either or both of her parents had Caucasian ancestry, then nature, not ekphrasis, would explain Charicleia’s color. Ekphrasis, the power of images, paintings, pictures, or icons to transform the gazer into another entity, is generative as well: Hydaspes fathers a white-complexioned child because Persinna gazed at the painting of Andromeda during the procreative act.

Interestingly, Heliodorus allows Persinna and the High Priest Sisimithres to focus only on Charicleia’s complexion to denote her difference from the other Ethiopians. While the text makes it fully plausible to see Charicleia as white, as the preponderance of

9. There is an alternative tradition stretching back to classical time, discussed by Elizabeth McGrath, that represents Andromeda as black. In “The Black Andromeda,” 1-18, McGrath questions the representation of Andromeda in the Aethiopica, asserting that Heliodorus mistakenly makes Andromeda white. Although she mentions several sources from classical literature that accord with Heliodorus’s view, she cites three notable literary figures who affirm Andromeda’s blackness or, at least, her dark skin: “the greatest of all mythographers, Ovid”; “Pacheco . . . who first encountered the idea in Petrarch . . .”; and “Petrarch” in his poem Trionfi (ii.142-44). However, she neglects to mention the myth of Cassiopeia as additional confirmation of Andromeda’s blackness. As we have seen, Pignatelli also makes Andromeda black, citing her as the progenitor of heroic Ethiopians.
scholars and translators have done, including Gesner, Morgan, Sandys, McGraw, Amyot, and Underdowne. Heliodorus makes it equally plausible, I believe, to see Charicleia as phenotypically White (i.e., she looks white) but genotypically Black: although she manifests the characteristics of a Caucasian as a result of the transformative agency of ekphrasis, the seed she derives from is Black because of her ancestors. Heliodorus reminds us of this in a few powerful yet subtle ways: Charicleia has a “black circle etched on her left arm” (Bk.10, 256); Persinna describes her daughter’s “complexion [as] alien to the native Ethiopian tint”; and Sisimithres speaks of the “difficulty concerning the girl’s complexion” (Bk.10, 255). Neither Persinna nor Sisimithres regards Charicleia as different racially. To both of them, Charicleia’s difference is her complexion. As Persinna explains, it is Charicleia’s “complexion [that] is strange.” Neither Persinna nor Sisimithres refers to Charicleia’s features, implying that her features are not unlike those of other Ethiopians. According to some ancient writers, Ethiopians have various features, including those that Iago ascribes to Othello. Both Siculus and Herodotus claim that Indians immigrated to Ethiopia. The inference, then, is that Ethiopian features and

---

11. See, for example, Gesner, 70; Sandy, 430; McGrath, 12.
12. Writers during this time spoke of “seed”—not gene. See Genesis 3:15 (NKJV); Aristotle, “Theory of Knowledge C. Priority of Act. Early modern writers also spoke of “inherent,” according to Orgel: “Marginal Jonson,” The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque edited by David Bevington and Peter Holbrook (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998), 158. The science of genetics, not designated as such then, was around at least during the Renaissance. The French playwright Octave-César Genetay explains Chariclee’s color scientifically, and the embryologist Anton van Leeuwenhoek had described the spermatozoa in 1668. See Walter Libby, The History of Medicine In its Salient Features (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Co., 1922), 238; Leeuwenhoek’s publication indicates that scientific investigation into this area had been going on long before 1668. See, also, Silvia Campesi, Paola Manuli, and Giulia Sissa, Madre materia: sociologia e biologia della donna greca (Torino: Boringhein, 1983)—for the relationship between the Aristotelian theory of reproduction and gynecology, see especially Manuli’s and Sissa’s essays.
13. Diodorus Siculus contends that Indians emigrated to Ethiopia, which would help to explain why Charicleia’s features provoke no comments from her mother, father, or other Ethiopians. Additionally, McGrath cites several sources that claim the existence of two Ethiopias. In note 14, she cites, among others, Herodotus who “distinguishes between the eastern and the African Ethiopians, the latter having very curly hair rather than straight hair. McGrath also cites L.A. Thompson’s Life of Apollonius where Pholotratius allows for a compromise by making the African Ethiopians immigrants from India, p. 10, n. 54.
Caucasian features can also be similar or not strikingly dissimilar. In *L’Ethiopique* (1609), Genetay attributes Chariclee’s whiteness to ancestral heritage.\(^{14}\) In Act 4, the chorus traces Chariclee’s Caucasian ancestry to her forebear “Persee”: “… if someone is born / Of a complexion that is different, / He bears it from some ancestor / In whom it was apparent.” Here Genetay gives a scientific explanation regarding phenotype and genotype: an individual can look different from her or his parents but that difference can be traced to ancestry, as is the case with Chariclee--

> It is then quite a simple matter
> That Chariclee is white,
> The same as Persee,
> First of her royal blood.
> And let us not think that it follows
> From the sight of a painting,
> For black was Andromeda
> Even though she had a very beautiful body (4.1).

Offering a scientific explanation--Chariclee’s Caucasian features are inherited from her ancestor “Persee”--over a magical one, Genetay dismisses the claim of ekphrasis as a transfiguring agent. His seventeenth-century explanation aligns with my contention that despite Charicleia’s appearance, she can be seen as genotypically Black. Genetay also makes Andromeda Black, thereby restoring her to the tradition that McGrath discusses.

---

14. See note 12 of this chapter.
Before discussing the twin masques’ participation in the Heliodoran tradition, it is necessary to show their connection to the *Aethiopica* to establish Jonson’s use of Heliodorus’s novel as a template for *Blackness* and *Beauty*. In *The Jonsonian Masque*, Stephen Orgel traces the tradition of the masque form in which Jonson worked and Jonson himself claimed that it was “her Majesties will to have . . . Black-mores” and that “the invention was derived by” him (*Blackness*, n.19). Jonson does not, however, elaborate on how he derived the invention, which, I want to suggest, is from the *Aethiopica*. Although there is no concrete proof that Jonson read Heliodorus, there are some reasons to believe he did: as we have seen, Stephen Gosson’s 1582 complaint—“that the *Palace of Pleasure*, the *Golden Ass*, the *Aethiopian History* . . . have been throughly ransackt, to furnish the Playe houses in London” with material—though not specific to Jonson, shows the widespread appeal of the *Aethiopica* as source material for English dramatists. It is difficult to see how the erudite classicist Jonson, who boasted of having more Greek and Latin in his little finger than his contemporaries had in their heads, could not have read the *Aethiopica*, especially since it was in the general literary domain. Third, Jonson’s former servant Richard Brome references the *Aethiopica, Blackness, and Beauty* in the same passage (III.i.11-37) and elsewhere in *The English Moor* (III.i. 80-82, III.iii.14-15). While this shows that Brome most probably read the

16. Enid Welsford and David Norbrook note that Jonson and Jones were influenced by the Florentine tournament that commemorated the marriage of Francesco de’ Medici and Bianca Cappello and the Medici court in Florence. See Welsford, *The Court Masque* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1927), 170; Norbrook,160. It is also possible that because Queen Anne and her ladies were to appear in the masque, Jonson had to find the appropriate social milieu for these aristocratic women; hence the “Black-mores” are Ethiopian princesses. Plus the expression “wash an Ethiop white” was a commonplace that seemed ready-made for Jonson’s purpose and perhaps Queen Anne’s, who might have helped with the plot.
17. Gosson, 28. As noted previously, the *Aethiopica* existed in Greek, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, German—languages accessible to Jonson. As noted in the introduction, Amyot’s translation appeared in print as early as 1547 and was reissued at least 25 times, and translations in other languages followed, including in English. Thomas Underdowne also issued several editions of his translations in English, beginning in 1569.
Aethiopica or knew the story well (III.iii.14-30), it can also suggest that Jonson most likely knew the novel because Brome, Jonson’s erstwhile secretary, was familiar with Jonson’s sources or library. Finally, the popularity of the Aethiopica during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries plus similar interests in racial, gender, and national effects of metamorphosis in the twin masques suggest that Jonson read the Aethiopica closely or knew the story thoroughly.

Racially, nationally, economically, and socially Jonson’s protagonists from these two works are identical to Heliodorus’s female protagonist: they are Ethiopian princesses who become transformed from black to white through the agency of ekphrasis, although the means of and reason for their metamorphosis are different from Charicleia’s. In the fashion of imitatio, Jonson reworks the concept of ekphrasis: instead of using the usual painting, image, or another inanimate object as Helidorus does, Jonson uses the animate icon of the sun. Mary Floyd-Wilson contends “that The Masque of Blackness is somewhat equivocal about whether it is the English sun or James I whose ‘beams’ are able to lighten the Ethiopian nymphs.” However, Jonson puns “sun” with “son,” conflating them in James I. The notion of kings as sun and vice versa goes back to Egyptian antiquity and its kings, the Pharaohs, who were believed to be Horus, the god of the sky reincarnated. Horus was also the son of Ra: Pha-Ra-oh. By conflating sun and king, Jonson is also legitimizing James’s divine power mythologically. Britain’s sun/son or king, like the paintings in the Aethiopica, has the power to transform its gazers. Despite Orgel’s quibble about the “literalistic” meaning of King James’s transformative

power in the masque (124), many people in early modern England believed in the transformative and regenerative power of the king. Scrofula sufferers could gaze on the king and be transformed, or the king could touch and heal them as well. James himself believed that he had the power to touch and heal people: in November 1618 when the son of the visiting Turkish official (“Chiaus”) was ill, King James visited the home with the express purpose of touching and healing the boy. As Matar surmises, the king’s willingness “to apply his miracle on a Muslim may have stemmed from his desire to demonstrate . . . the international efficacy of his royal touch to his subjects.”\(^20\) To many English subjects, the king was a representation of a sacred personage, an icon, which, Doody reminds us, is a numinous object and, as such, is transformative\(^21\): as beings who are considered outside the norm of society, Britain’s scrofula sufferers, like Jonson’s sixteen Ethiopian princesses, will behold Britain’s sun-king and be changed.

II.

The Ambi-valence of Blanching in Jonson’s Twin Masques and the Heliodoran Stage Tradition

Having established the likelihood of the *Aethiopica* as a template for Jonson’s *Blackness* and *Beauty*, in this section I argue that his twin masques are part of the Heliodoran dramatic tradition. However, this participation is subtle and complex, concealed with puns, paradoxes, contradictions, ambivalences, equivocations, and the conceit of blanching. In this part, I scrutinize the multidimensionality of blackness in the twin masques, acknowledging the apparently negative associations Jonson ascribes to

\(^{20}\) A “chiaus” is an official messenger or representative from Turkey, frequently with a retinue. See Matar, 35.

\(^{21}\) Doody, 389.
blackness but going against conventional readings to show the physical and spiritual beauty Jonson also posits in blackness as well. Like Shakespeare and Gogh, Jonson reviles blackness by drawing upon cultural stereotypes to represent Ethiopians: ostensibly, the princesses are physically ugly because they are black, but innately beautiful because they are princesses. The first lines of Blackness establish the Ethiopian princesses’ seeming lack of pulchritude. According to the opening song, the dark skin of the princesses makes them physically ugly: “To prove that beauty best / Which not the color but the feature / Assures unto the creature” (ll. 85-87). Were it not for their color, the princesses would have been beautiful. As physical beauty is the prerogative of white women, black women can only be beautiful if they are morphed into white women because blackness is anathema to beauty. Wanting to embody this ideal of beauty, the princesses travel to James’s court to find a cure for their ugliness: transmutation.

Blanching and ekphrasis are the two agents of metamorphosis in Blackness and Beauty. These dual agents are a part of the complexity and ambivalence associated with the twin masques and the reason scholars and critics like Floyd-Wilson and Andrea Stevens find it difficult to distinguish which agent transforms the Ethiopian women. Identifying the agent of transformation is actually unimportant. What is significant, however, is that blanching, like ekphrasis, is effected through the sun and that both agents serve the same purpose: “to [whiten] an Ethiop.” Whether as a culinary or laundry activity, blanching accomplishes the same result: removing what is undesirable. Both activities require water and heat. In cooking, water is heated and the object to be blanched is immersed in it, thereby removing or whitening the unwanted skin. In laundering, clothes are spread flat on a surface and continuously hydrated as the sun’s
heat penetrates and whitens them. “To blanche an Ethiop, and revive a corse” (Blackness, l. 225), Jonson combines both forms but privileges washing, for, among other reasons, it indicates eradicating dirt or impurity to achieve cleansing.

The correlation between impurity and black skin was common during the English Renaissance. In 1587, George Best remarked that he had seen an Ethiopian as black as coal brought into England, who took a fair English woman to wife, begat a son in all respects as black as the father was, although England were his native country and an English woman his mother; whereby it seemeth that blackness proceedeth rather of some natural infection of that man, that neither the nature of the the clime, neither the good complexion of the mother concurring could any thing alter . . .

Despite the whiteness and therefore beauty of this Englishwoman, no alteration or transformation occurred with the “infected” black son. To blanch or “wash an Ethiop white,” then, is a long and arduous process, especially because this kind of blackness, like the princesses’, necessitates individuals’ steeping their “bodies in that purer brine / And wholesome dew called rosmarine” thirty-nine times on thirteen nights and thereafter washing themselves “with that soft and gentler foam” (Blackness, l. 316). Implicit in the “purer brine” and “wholesome rosmarine” treatment is the association of blackness with infection, which the prescribed treatment will cure. Called the dew of the sea, “rosmarine,” like brine, is used for healing and remembrance, in burial preparations,

---
22. Quoted by Orgel in “Marginal Jonson,” 160.
23. See Alice M. Coats, Flowers and Their Histories (New York: McGraw Hill, 1971), 299-301. Shakespeare associates rosemary with remembrance. In Hamlet, Ophelia gives each person flowers that symbolize some characteristics about her or him. To Laertes, she gives rosemary with the injunction
and other forms of preservation. The brine and the rosmarine are “purer” and “wholesome” in order to extract all impurities from the princesses’ bodies, whose prolonged ritualistic washing in “brine” and “wholesome dew” three times each night for thirteen nights suggests an embedded racial impurity/uncleanness—similar to Best’s 1587 pronouncements. It is no accident that the princesses practice this ritualistic cleansing “when all things else do sleep” (l. 312). Such precautions ensure containment of any contamination to man or beast and provide a cover for the “shame” of the princesses. After the prescribed time, the princesses can slough off their infected and unwanted skin and become Venus-like: white and perfect (Blackness, ll. 308-321). The brine and the rosmarine will preserve their newly found state and dispel all malodor. “Their beauties will be scorched no more,” and Britannia can rejoice “to see [each] Ethiopian washed white” (Beauty, ll. 66-67).

Embedded in Jonson’s uneasy, contradictory, and paradoxical treatment of blackness is a positive theatrical portrayal of Ethiopians that is in keeping with the Heliodoran tradition of Africans. Following classical representations, Jonson also describes Ethiopians as beautiful, virtuous, pious, learned, and sagacious, invoking the Heliodoran tradition in three ways: the ambivalence of the opening song, Niger’s paradoxical speech, and the conceit of blanching. Jack D’Amico reminds us that Jonson’s equivocation about blackness exists from the outset of the masque in the opening song and that Jonson prepares the audience/reader to accept the argument that black is beautiful by couching the princesses’ description in oxymoron.24 However,

---

Jonson is also unequivocal in acknowledging the princesses’ physical beauty in the opening song: the sixth line of the song explicitly refers to Niger’s “beauteous race” then hurries on to equivocation and paradox: “To prove that beauty best / Which not the color but the feature / Assures unto the creature” (ll.85-87). The distinction between “color” and “feature” allows for the physical beauty of blackness, which is about features, and color may or may not be a component. Although the lines do not iterate what those features are, we may ascertain what they are by looking at another early modern text that deals with dark-skinned females: Sir Walter Ralegh’s *Discoverie of Guiana* (1599).25

Although Ralegh and Jonson were of different class, they moved within similar socio-economic milieu.26 Given this, Ralegh’s text can be useful in elucidating other features that an English Renaissance man like Jonson might have considered physically beautiful. In one of his many encounters with Guianese women, Ralegh is struck by the beauty of the wife of a certain Cassique: “[I]n all my life I have seldom seen a better favoured woman: She was of good stature with black eyes, fatt of body, of an excellent countenance, her hair almost as long as her selfe . . . she was very pleasant, knowing her comelyness and taking great pride therein.”27 “[G]ood stature, fatt body, excellent countenance, long hair,” pleasantness, and self-assurance, as the passage makes clear, are other designators of beauty. Ralegh finds this dark-skinned Guianese beauty and a fair-skinned English beauty equally comely: “I have seen a Lady in England so like hir, as but for the difference of cullour I would have sworn might have been the same.”28 The beauty of these two women, regardless of complexion, suggests that color was an

26. Besides being courtiers and writers during the reigns of Elizabeth and James, Jonson and Ralegh frequented the same pubs and taverns, according to Imtiaz Habib, 31.
27. Ralegh, 126.
28. Ibid.
inconsequential factor to Ralegh, and might not have been of consequence to Jonson, either. According to Orgel, “Renaissance aesthetician[s]” believed that “color was not essential but merely accidental,” an assertion Jonson also makes by casting his tritons in the Spenserian mold, as Orgel also notes. In *Hymn in Honour of Beautie*, Spenser makes form or feature the essence of beauty: “For of the soul the body form doth take: / For soule is form, and doth the body make” (l.132-33). Yet in *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, Spenser lambastes the Irish and Scots for having “black” blood, making both groups inferior and ugly. In the mold of *Hymn*, Jonson’s “tritons . . . treat the nymths’ blackness as trivial,” to cite Orgel once more. Regarding the other attributes of beauty, both Jonson and Ralegh subscribe to “excellent countenance.” Because long hair is generally associated with beauty from time immemorial, we can also assume that it would have been another marker of beauty for Jonson, as it was for many Renaissance men. In *Paradise Lost*, for example, John Milton makes Eve’s tresses cascade down her back (Bk. IV. 495-97). Additionally, Mary, Queen of Scotland, and Queen Elizabeth I, reputed beauties, had long flowing hair. Since Ralegh and Milton, two of Jonson’s contemporaries, associated long hair with beauty, it is reasonable to surmise that Jonson would also make that association. All these attributes suggest strongly that Jonson saw and appreciated the beauty of Ethiopian women. Jonson might have also wanted his audience to see the beauty of Ethiopian women through the sumptuous costumes of the twelve princesses and, as we shall see shortly, Niger’s spirited disputation of his daughters’ divine hue and “perfect’st beauty.”

29. See the *Jonsonian Masque*, 121.
30. Ibid.
Jonson’s designation of Niger’s daughters as Ethiopian princesses and nymphs is a politic and allusive way of praising blackness. The association of princesses, Ethiopia, water, and nymphs helps us to remember the myth of Cassiopeia and Andromeda, Ethiopians renowned for their beauty. Angered by Cassiopeia for denigrating the beauty of his nymphs, Neptune threatened to inundate her kingdom and demanded her daughter Andromeda, whom Perseus rescued, as a sacrifice. Jonson’s choice of mythological story is telling: it reveals his awareness of a long tradition associating blackness with beauty. 32 Abraham Melamed recalls for us that “in ancient Greece the black was described . . . favourably.”33 Jonson’s invocation of African queens also reveals his knowledge of yet another association with African females: powerful connotations of autonomy. According to David Riggs, “African females, and particularly an African Queen, carried powerful connotations of female autonomy and ethnic diversity[;] 34 Anne’s instructions [therefore] tacitly challenged the Jacobean myth of male supremacy and imperial rule.”35 As the writer for the court, Jonson would have been sensitive to his monarchs’ own views and been “knowledgeable of their interests and character.”36 Jonson’s choice of

32. Although some painters and writers, such as Reubens and Heliodorus, represent Andromeda as white, Jonson follows the other tradition that pictures her as black. Ever the intellectual writer, Jonson knew from Roman mythology, Ovid, and Petrarch that Andromeda, like her mother, was dark-skinned. In “The Black Andromeda,” McGrath cites Ovid and quotes Petrarch’s “I Trionfi” to help establish Andromeda’s blackness:

Perseo era l’uno; et volli saper come
Andromeda gli piaque in Etiopia,
Vergine bruna, I begli occhi etle chiome. (ii. 142-44)

(Perseus was one and I wanted to know
how it was that in Ethiopia the dark-skinned
maiden Andromeda
attracted him with her fine eyes and hair.)


34. African queens such as Hatshepsut, Nefertiti, Semiramis, Sheba, Cleopatra, Dido, and Candace come to mind.


36. Orgel, Helgerson, and Norbrook argue that Jonson’s sensitivity to James’s taste allowed him to be the court poet, ahead of Samuel Daniel, Thomas Campion, and others. See Orgel, Jonsonian Masque, 65;
Ethiopian princesses reflects Queen Anne’s interest in blackness and allows him to focus on African women of royal pedigree and their beauty. His praise of blackness allows him to fulfill “Her Majesty’s will” by using the masque as a metaphor for Anne’s disaffection with James and his court.

Niger’s insistence on his daughters’ beauty (l.119) is yet another way in which Jonson praises blackness and challenges certain common cultural assumptions to participate in the Heliodoran stage tradition. At first glance, Niger’s position borders on the ludicrous, especially in consideration of his English audience and the great distance that he has traveled to secure the color transformation of his daughters. One is tempted to think that Jonson had anticipated negative reactions like Dudley Carletons’,37 which Niger’s position, on one level, is designed to elicit. On another level, as Andrea Stevens observes, Jonson wants “Niger’s defense of black beauty to be taken seriously,”38 evidenced by the staunch defense and sneer at the panegyrics of certain poets who dismiss the beauty of Ethiopians but hymn that of Europeans. In his defense, Niger claims perfection for his daughters’ beauty, citing the immutability of their color and its divine association: “. . . in their black the perfect’st beauty grows, / . . . / . . . / No cares, no age can change, or there display, / The fearful tincture of abhorred grey, / Since Death herself . . . / Can never alter their most faithful hue; / All which are arguments to prove how far / Their beauties conquer in great beauty’s war, / And more, how near divinity they be” (ll. 119-28). Death itself dares not disfigure blackness given the celestial

37. Carleton found the performance ridiculous, bordering on disgust. He calls the performance of the queen and her ladies as blackamores a “loathsome sight.” See McManus, 1.
associations with this color. Niger follows up his defense with an attack on poets who dismiss the beauty of blackness, labeling them “Poor brainsick men” (l. 131). The dysfunction of these men’s brains prevents their appreciation of natural beauty. Niger’s association of blackness with beauty has correlation to other writers’ works, for Jonson is not the only popular English Renaissance playwright to see black women as beautiful. In *The Knight of Malta*, Fletcher *et al.* describe Abdella as a “black beauty” (IV.iv. 39), despite denigrating her throughout the play.

Niger’s disputation prompts Floyd-Wilson to posit that “Jonson portrays the Ethiopians’ complexion . . . in terms of western aesthetics of ‘great beauty’s war.’”

Niger’s challenge to the western concept of beauty and hence to its cultural designations and perspectives is not, as Orgel maintains, “a limited view of nature.” Rather, it is profound and comprehensive. Niger recognizes that Europeans’ designation of beauty is not necessarily correct or the only acceptable one:

. . . since the fabulous voices of some few  
Poor brainsick men, styled poets here with you,  
Have with such envy of their graces sung  
The painted beauties other empires sprung,  
Letting their loose and winged fictions fly  
To infect all climates, yea, our purity;  
As of one Phaeton, that fired the world,  
And that before his heedless flames were hurled  
About the globe, the Ethiopians were as fair

---

39. Floyd-Wilson, 125.  
As other dames, now black with black despair (ll. 130-38).

Besides dismissing these “poets” and their claims, Niger helps to foreground the place of cultural assumption in interpretation and the pamphlet controversy over cosmetics by sneering at “painted beauties.” D’Amico points to the limits of cultural assumptions and Europeans’ inability or unwillingness to take into account the contribution of cultural perspective in their interpretations. Theirs is an automatic belief that what is culturally fair is so in nature. Niger argues otherwise. Each culture has its own parameters of beauty, negating the claim that European women are more beautiful than African women since there is no universal standard of beauty. “The beauties” of which certain poets sing are comely because their pulchritude is cosmetically enhanced, which, in Niger’s estimation, does not constitute beauty because it is made up, i.e., a cosmetic and poetic illusion. Niger realizes that lauding “painted” women as the paradigm of beauty is a fable and the invention of a “few” men, whom he describes as “brainsick . . . poets.”

Niger’s anticosmetic stance reverses Best’s 1587 pronouncement (see page 109 above) by associating infection with Europeans and purity with Ethiopians. This infection, operating on a literal and figurative level, has a three-fold effect on Ethiopians: environmental, physical, and mental. The melding of region and atmosphere in “climate” with the juxtaposition of “infect” and “purity” point to an Ethiopian and worldwide contamination as well as to bodily corruption. Once pure, Ethiopia’s environment or atmosphere is polluted by the noxious fables emitted from the pens of poets. As precursor to literal corruption, literary corruption prefigures the pernicious effects of the actual use of cosmetics. As one writer points out, “Cosmetics were seen as a health threat”; frequent use facilitated an accumulation of harmful substances in the body, such

41. D’Amico, 52-54.
as lead oxide, which corroded the face and resulted in numerous other physical problems, including muscle paralysis and even death. In *The Devil’s Charter* (1606), Lucretia Borgia is a victim of the “rancke poyson” of cosmetics. In Act 4, scene 3, a “richly attired” Lucretia enters “with a Phyal in her hand.” In the midst of reminiscing about her sexual conquests and having her face made up, Lucretia exclaims that her “cheeks . . . burn and sting” and that her “face is scalde” from “rancke poyson” (ll. 2075-84). She dies shortly after. Tanya Pollard interprets Lucretia’s death from “the corrosion of poisoned face-paints” as a fitting end to a corrupt and adulterous woman. Niger’s concern with infecting “our purity” resonates with the sexual laxity that underlies the use of cosmetics (I return to this later), exemplified in the conflation of Lucretia’s use of cosmetics, her sexual exploits, and her death.

Besides environmental disorder and physical disease, the infection also has a psychological impact on the Ethiopians: “black despair.” Hopelessness overwhelms the princesses as they learn that once they were fair-skinned and hence beautiful. Now they are black and brooding. “Black with black despair” reflects the harmony, the synchronicity between the princesses’ internal and external state. Jonson’s varied and complex representation of blackness along with Niger’s assertion and disputation help us realize the social, political, and cultural levels in which blackness operates in Jonson’s text and on his stage.

42. The ingredients of make up included carbonate, hydroxide, and lead oxide. Women’s use of cosmetics was popular throughout the Renaissance and was controversial. White women used cosmetics to achieve a porcelain look on their faces, popularized in England by Queen Elizabeth after a bout of smallpox which left her face scarred (*Beauty Secrets from Ages Past: A Brief History of Makeup*, http://www.erasofelegance.com/fashion/makeup.html).
Jonson’s implicit arguments can be fleshed out by looking at Thomas Middleton’s pageant *The Triumphs of Honor and Virtue* (1622). Honor and Virtue disambiguates Jonson’s argument about blackness and whiteness. Middleton draws upon “a black personage” to embody and stage the qualities of external and internal beauty. In doing so, he also suggests that the association of physical beauty with blackness was not unheard of in early modern England. The pageant features India as a spice capital, represented by a “Black Queen,” who addresses the crowd:

You that have eyes of judgment and discern

Things that best of man and life concern

Draw near: this black is but my native dye,

But view me with an intellectual eye,

As wise men shoot their beams forth, then you’ll find

A change in the complexion of the mind:

I am beauteous in my blackness (358).

Through the “Black Queen,” Middleton makes several moves, referencing the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint, inviting and challenging the audience in its cultural and intellectual complacency to a new perspective, and praising the physical beauty of the

45. References to Thomas Middleton’s pageants are to *The Works of Thomas Middleton* Vol.7, ed. A.H. Bullen (New York: AMS Press, 1964). Pageants do not have lines numbers. For convenience, I include page numbers with each act and scene in parentheses. This pageant celebrates the installation of Peter Proby as Lord Mayor and Chancellor of London.

46. The East India Company, which began on December 31, 1600, supplied cotton, spices, silk, and indigo dye to England. D’Amico speculates that this is one of the reasons for India’s representation. According to Dyce, “the newly-established East India Company . . . had contributed so much to enlarge the sphere of the grocer’s trade (qtd. in Bullen), 239.

Black Queen, all of which supplement the complex subtleties that I contend Jonson interrogates in the twin masques.

In both Bibles, the female speaker of the Song of Songs asserts her beauty and blackness: in the Septuagint 1:5, “μελαινα ειμι και καλη θυγατερες ιερουσαλημ ως σκηνωματα κηδαρ ως δερρεις σαλωμων / 1:6 μη βλεψητε με οτι εγω ειμι μεμελανωμενη οτι παρεβλεψεν με ο ηλιος”; and again in the Hebrew, “I am black and comely, O ye daughters of Jerusalem, as the tents of Kedar, as the curtains of Solomon. . .” Abraham Melamed notes that “black” and “comely” are synonymously positive images reinforcing the speaker’s beauty . . .” and that she, as I believe like Jonson, takes “a stand against” the normalization of fair skin as ideal beauty. Noticeably missing from these lines is the famous disjunction “but” of the Vulgate and the 1611 King James Bible. Both Jerome and the translators of the King James Bible (who had a precedent in Jerome) changed the conjunction “and” to “but” so that the line reads “I am black but comely,” a distortion of the original line, which, according to Ania Loomba, posits “a contradiction between blackness and beauty so that the black exterior of the woman does not explain but clashes with her beauty.”

48. My emphasis.
49. Malamed, 43.
51. Ania Loomba, Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002), 61. Loomba’s observation that “the frank sexuality and passion of the Song seems oddly placed in a religious book . . .” is itself odd because the Bible is replete with human sexuality and passion: Potiphar’s wife’s consuming desire for Joseph (Gen. 39); King David’s murderous carnal yearning for Bathsheba, Uriah’s wife (2 Sam.
beauteous in my blackness,” hearkens back to this female speaker’s declaration. It is worth remembering that King James I was depicted as the English Soloman and that the relationship of the biblical King Solomon and the Queen of Sheba became legendary. Hearing of Solomon’s great wisdom, Sheba journeyed from Ethiopia to Jerusalem to test the king’s wisdom, indicating that she herself was wise. The queen, according to legend, was also beautiful, as is Middleton’s “Black Queen,” who proclaims her beauty from the stage—another reminder that positive dramatization of black individuals occurred on the early modern English stage.

In Middleton’s pageant of *Honor and Virtue*, the Black Queen invites the multitude to discern beauty. Like Jonson’s, the invitation also challenges the audience to move beyond cultural prescriptions to exercise mature judgment through the intellectual rather than the physical eye. The queen’s declaration, “I am beauteous in my blackness,” echoes the first few lines of *Blackness*, which also commend the spiritual beauty of the Ethiopian princesses, who “. . . though black in face, / . . . are bright, /And full of light.” Several scholars, including Hall and Orgel, see these three lines as alluding to the Song of Songs. However, these lines more accurately recall Queen Candace’s reply to Alexander the Great. Thinking that perhaps Alexander could mistakenly correlate black faces with darkened minds, Candace tells him that though Ethiopians have black faces, their “souls

11-12, 1 Kings 1-2, 1 Chr.3-5), Mary Magdalene’s transgressions (Luke 7:36-50), and a woman’s adulterous act (John 8:3-11), among other episodes. Loomba also comments on Medieval and Renaissance allegorical interpretation of blackness, citing one of Abelard’s letters to Heloise as a case in point: “The Ethiopian woman . . . is black without but lovely within, for she is blackened outside in the flesh because in this life she suffers bodily affliction.” Abelard further categorizes blackness as a “disfigurement . . .” (61-62).

52. For a detailed account of the various legends of Solomon and Sheba, see www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/13515-sheba-queen-of.

are ‘lighter’ than the white men among you.”
“Light,” according to the entries of 7a and 8a in the *OED*, is “often associated with spiritual reference; illumination of soul by divine reference; full of virtue, intellect or other excellence.” Jonson’s description of Niger’s daughters as “bright” and “light” picks up the sentiments of the Ethiopian queen and, like her, establishes the contrarities associated with blackness, “defining it as both a superficial and an essential property . . . [and] imbuing it with . . . moral and psychological significance” as well as with mental acuity. Given these associations that Jonson makes with blackness, people will react more positively to blackness, like the Spanish ambassador, previously quoted, and Raleigh, who often compares the beauty of Guianese and European women. Queen Anne’s and the Black Queen’s stage performances help audiences and readers to see some of the subtleties that Jonson associates with blackness.

With the conceit of blanching, Jonson offers perhaps his most complex and subtle laudatory dramatization of blackness. Jonson’s praise of blackness also glorifies King James as a living embodiment of divine qualities: a being with power to transform and recreate people and things. We have already seen Niger’s association of blackness with divinity (*Blackness*, l. 128) and James’s transformative powers with the Ethiopian princesses. In this laudatory dramatization, Jonson combines James’s transformative and

---

54. Candace drew on the traditional association of Ethiopians with piety. Alexander’s action disproved Candace’s assumption. See *The Romance of Alexander the Great*, trans. Albert Mugrdich Wolohojian (New York: Columbia UP, 1969), 132; my introduction, p. 20. Also, the female speaker in the “Song of Songs” asserts her physical beauty, ranking it with that of the daughters of Jerusalem, which is a different argument from that of innate beauty and from the arguments of those scholars.

55. Because of the Spaniards’ brutal treatment of the South American peoples post-1591, description of the native Indians “turned towards emphasizing [their] good nature and hospitality.” English merchants and adventurers such as Ralegh were aware of the benefits of doing so, given that they needed “a new source of raw material and a market for English goods.” Despite Ralegh’s vested interest in praising Guiana and its people—he wanted the country to be as attractive as possible to the English so they would colonize it—his observations should not be dismissed as having no merit. Ralegh, 17, 84.
recreative powers. “[T]o blanch an Ethiop, and revive a corse,” rings with legal and political connotations, implicit reminders of King James’s project to unite England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland as Great Britain and the twin masques’ participation in the stage tradition originating from the *Aethiopica*. In Scottish law, “Blanching . . . is a legal term that denotes the king’s ability to transform a subject’s debt to the crown into a ceremonial display of allegiance.” 

James was well aware of this legal maneuver, for in *Trve Lawe of Free Monarchies* (1598) he cites his ability to blanch his subjects: “the whole subjects being but vassals, and from holding all their lands as their over-lord, who according to good service done unto him, chaungeth their holdings from tacke to few, from ward to blanch, erecteth new Baronies, and uniteth the old.” 

A tacke (or tack) is “a customary payment levied by a ruler, feudal superior, or corporation,” while a few (or feu) is a “feudal tenure of land in which the vassal, in place of military service, makes a return of grain or money (opposed to WARD or military holding and BLANCH or holding at a nominal rent),” according to the *OED*. When subjects do “good service . . . unto him,” the king can reward them however he chooses: with “ward,” “few,” “tacke,” or “blanch.” If the king decides to reward his subjects by blanching, first, he blackens or black-wards his subjects into military service, then “transfers an obligation of military tenure to a nominal fee or payment of honor” onto them. Rather than make regular monetary payments, the subjects make a ceremonial gesture in the form of a penny, rose, glove, or a similar token. Thus the king has transformed his subjects as he sees fit.

56. For the connection between blanching and the legal ramifications, especially in Scotland, I am indebted to Mary Floyd-Wilson’s reading of Blackness in *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama*, 111-131, especially pp. 116-17.
58. Floyd-Wilson, 116-17.
Jonson’s use of “blanch” in *Blackness* reverberates with King James’s usage in *Trve Lawe*, where James notes that all laws originate and spring from him. As overlord of England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, King James can blanch his subjects by changing their status from English, Scotts, Welsh, and Irish to Britons as long as there is provision for doing so within the legal corpus. To “revive a corse,” is, as Floyd-Wilson suggests, to bring “a body of laws to life again,”\(^59\) which James sought to do with the name “Great Britain.” James sought to recreate Britain because he saw it as “the true and ancient Name which God and Time have imposed upon this isle, extant and received in Histories in all Mappes and Cartes, wherein this Isle is described, and in ordinary Letters to our selfe from divers Forraine Princes . . . and other records of great Antiquitie.”\(^60\) In referencing England’s ancient name in histories, James probably had William Camden’s *Britannia* (1586) in mind, for the king, like Camden, whom Jonson references in *Blackness*, wanted “to restore antiquity to Britaine, and Britaine to antiquity.” Camden’s county-by-county description of the land, including Ireland, produced a picture of Roman Britain. Both James and Jonson, however, would find that James’s decision to take “the name . . . King of Great Britain” so as “to discontinue the divided names of England and Scotland”\(^61\) would also rankle many, especially Samuel Daniel and Sir Edward Coke. James and Jonson would also find that certain English subjects, including Daniel and Coke, would challenge the king’s assumption to resurrect old and/or create new laws to restore ancient geographical name and monarchal dignities.\(^62\)

---

59. Ibid., 117.
60. King James, “Proclamation of the Union of England and Scotland (1604).”
62. Daniel’s *Defense of Rime* (1603), an apologetic for English rime over quantitative meter, is, according to Richard Helgerson, also a direct response “to the concerns aroused by the accession of a king who
Jonson’s pun on “blanch” and “corse” and their use in the same expression may indicate that *Blackness* and *Beauty* are analogues for King James’s Great Britain project. Through these analogues, Jonson’s depiction of James’s recreative and transformative powers ties the masques to the Heliodoran tradition, as it depicts blackness positively. The ultimate goal of both masques and the unification project is the attainment and reclamation of Britannia: the name of the place where the princesses will be transformed and the name James wants for himself and his realms. When the parliament of 1604 failed to ratify James’s wishes, the king issued a proclamation, thereby allowing himself to assume the titles he wanted for himself and his realms. The proclamation, issued in October, preceded the performance of *Blackness* by fewer “than three months.”

The proximity between James’s proclamation and the performance of *Blackness* suggests a political interconnection and *Blackness* as a platform for the unification of James’s realms. Commenting on the interconnection between this masque and King James’s agenda, Butler notes that

In . . . *Blackness*, the Ethiopian ladies who visited the court came on a quest which was clearly an analogue to the dilemmas of national and individual identity which Union posed. A . . . dream had made the

---

claimed ancestral conquest as the ultimate sanction of his authority, a king who thought his will should be law.” Given that *Trve Lawe* adumbrates James’s absolutist theory of monarchy, which claims a royal prerogative to impose new laws or resurrect old ones, Daniel might have indeed been responding to the king’s claim, as Coke did in his *Reports*; both Daniel and Coke saw James’s claim as presumptuous. James and Coke clashed repeatedly over the law, and by 1607, all legal challenges to James’s authority became embodied in Coke. The king and his supporters were eager for him to speak the law: “*Rex est loquens.*” And “Coke was as eager not to make the king speak the law . . . *Judex est lex loquens,*” he countered in his *Reports*. Their battle came to a head in 1616 when James “sent order by Francis Bacon, then his attorney general, to the twelve common law judges that they should halt proceedings[,]” should delay “taking any further action, [and] . . . were to consult with the king himself.” Under Coke’s leadership the judges refused. They were then summoned before the king and coerced into submission. Eleven acquiesced. Only Coke resisted,” and his defiance “brought swift retribution” from the king: James removed him permanently from the position of chief justice. See Helgerson, 38, 84, 88 & 89. 63. Martin Butler, “The invention of Britain and the early Stuart masque,” *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in politics and political culture*, ed. R. Malcolm Smuts (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996), 69.
negresses feel discontented with their black skins, and they were seeking a magical name which would solve . . . anxieties about alienation. Though they were received as aliens at Whitehall, the king’s magic proved them to have pale skins of aristocratic ladies . . . and it was James [who] washed the Ethiop white, thereby demonstrating his sovereign power to incorporate alien nations and do the proverbially impossible.64

James’s power to transform and incorporate aliens into his realm also extends to incorporating the alien nation of Scotland into the English nation, thereby indicating that the “‘real point’ of the masque[s] may be more than” the king using his powers to effect “the external metamorphosis of the Ethiopians from black to white.”65 Given the correspondence of national, racial, and gender issues between the Ethiopians’ transfiguration and Jacobean England, the real point of the masques might indeed be the transformation of James I’s alien Scottish and rebellious English subjects into enlightened Britons.

Like Trew Lawe, Blackness and Beauty outline the divine origin of James’s authority (ll. 165, 181, 223; 20, 142) and prerogatives, making resistance to his rule rebellion and ignorance. Tristan Marshall divides King James I’s alien subjects into two distinct categories: the Scottish Lowlanders who “possessed a civic capacity” and the Scottish Highlanders who did not.66 Marshall also relates a story about King James and Thomas Knox that highlights the incivility of the Highlanders: Knox requested help from the king to counter the Jesuits’ proselytizing in Argyll. James refused, “on the basis that

64. Ibid., 74.
65. Floyd-Wilson, 117.
anyone who could civilise the Highlanders, even if Catholic, could go ahead without his blessing. Transformation, then, is a process aimed especially at unifying and civilizing the two groups of prospective British subjects--the Scots and those English who oppose royal absolutism and unification--so that their extreme natures, emblematized by their pale skin, can be brought under the blanching power and therefore refining and tempering influence of the king. In *Beauty*, Jonson depicts pale skin as the embodiment of incivility through the character of Boreas. As a Northerner, Boreas is expected to be enlightened. However, he is “rude,” “rough” and “unkind” to the “reign” of the “prince,” who “shut[s] up wars, proclaim[s] peace and feasts, / Freedom and triumphs, making kings his guest” (ll.31-39). Januarius’s relation to Boreas recalls that of James with his subjects: James stopped English involvement in the Dutch conflict and, calling himself Rex pacificus and the British Solomon, promoted peace throughout his reign--hosting and feasting sovereigns, including King Christian IV of Denmark. Boreas’s hyperwhiteness—“Thy hair, thy beard, thy wings o’er-hilled with snow” (l. 33)—emblematizes the rebellious and ignorant natures of certain English and Scottish subjects. Francesca T. Royster has argued the affinity of hyperwhiteness to rebellion and barbarity. In *Titus Andronicus*, both Saturninus and Aaron call attention to Tamora and her sons’ ultra-whiteness (II. 261-62, 312-14; IV. 2.116). As Royster points out, the play shows how barbaric, how lawless such a “treacherous hue” can be: pretending to be what they are not, Tamora and

---

68. Although Sir John Harrington’s account of King Christian IV’s visit to England in 1606 is perhaps the best known one, Jonson himself also wrote an account of the event. See J. B. Nichols, *The progresses, processions, and magnificent festivities, of King James the First: his royal consort, family, and court; collected from original manuscripts, scarce pamphlets, corporation records, parochial registers, Comprising Forty Masques and Entertainments; Ten Civic Pageants; Numerous Original Letters; and Annotated Lists of the Peers, Baronets, and Knights, Who Received Those Honours During the Reign of King James. Illustrated with notes, historical, topographical, biographical and bibliographical*, Vol. II (London: J.B. Nichols, 1828), 70-74.
her sons wreak havoc in Rome. These “hyperwhite” Goths are barbarians--within Rome’s gate. Like Shakespeare, Jonson problematizes and, again, inverts the received perception of whiteness by connecting it to lawlessness, thereby facilitating positive associations of blackness.

The inversion is yet another subtle way Jonson engages the Helidoran tradition. Britannia, like ancient Rome, has its own hyperwhite barbarians within its gate: prospective British subjects--specifically the rebellious English subjects and the intractable Scots, particularly the Highlanders--who resist King James’s authority. In Beauty, Januarius’s chastisement of Boreas for failing to recognize “Neptune’s son” (ll.21-29) functions as a corrective to those who challenge or resist James’s authority, including Coke, Daniel, and the ungovernable Scots. Jonson uses the twin masques to promulgate the king’s unification platform and to represent the king as having sole authority to execute laws, thereby transforming his realms and subjects. Butler argues that in the masques Jonson “took . . . [a] radical line,” presenting “Britain and Union as revolutionary rather than evolutionary concepts [whose] legitimation came about through the king’s magical powers . . . a power which was rooted solely in the person of the monarch himself and with which there could be little or no prospect of contest.” Both Blackness and Beauty make clear that James, whose authority is divinely conferred,

70. Jonson was fully aware of Daniel’s opposition to King James, for, according to Helgerson, he told “Drummond that he had written a discourse of poesy both against Campion and Daniel, especially the last.” Helgeron adds that in A Defense of Rime, Daniel asserts a “community whose authority can both enable other poets . . . and repel the encroachment of royal invaders who might try to do to English law what Campion wanted to do to English verse. Norbrook also notes that in A Defence Daniel praises “vnlearned Rome” for laying “the foundations of the Roman state” but blames “eloquent Rome” for allowing the state to fall “into disorder and allowed a collapse ‘from the glory of a common-wealth’ to an absolutist empire,” adding that in “his Panegyrike Daniel praised the frugal Henry VII and urged James to avoid luxury” (157-58).
embodies both transformative and (re)creative power, as well as wisdom (ll.226-27, 26-28). In delineating James’s power and authority, Jonson’s glorification of the king also shows the lawlessness of James’s opponents. Jonson reinforces James’s power and superiority through Olympian and cosmological comparisons: James is “Neptune’s son,” and, therefore, like the planet and the god, far-removed from the ordinary; “Mars,” the conqueror; “Hesperus,” the evening star; and “Sol,” the brightest planet in our solar system (Beauty, ll.21-25). He is Prometheus, the symbol of human aspiration and potential (Beauty, l. 26), with knowledge and wisdom to understand and cure all maladies (Blackness, ll. 226-27), including intransigence and barbarity, and to inspire love and obedience in his subjects (Beauty, l. 29).

As a tool that reconciles disjunction between individuals’ interior and external states, blanching signals movement from dark to light. In the world of the masques, James’s blanching the would-be Britons is correlative to his blanching the Ethiopians, for both are transformative and recreative processes. Through these processes, Jonson’s praise of blackness and participation in the Heliodoran tradition emerge. Boreas’s “rude voice” establishes a correspondence with James’s unenlightened and rebellious subjects, for they, like him, are mentally and spiritually dark (Beauty, l. 20). Since early modern England associated dark skin with barbarity and pale skin with civility, the northern complexion or pale skin of the Highlanders and James’s English detractors would suggest that they have qualities such as temperance, piety, and wisdom. Jonson’s association of pale skin with barbarity and dark skin with civility inverts the English Renaissance cultural norm. The inversion is yet another subtle way Jonson participates in the tradition under discussion. To tease out the arguments Jonson makes about blackness and
whiteness through inversion, I want to look once more at another of Middleton’s pageants, *The Triumph of Truth* (1614), which celebrates the installation of Sir Thomas Middleton as Lord Mayor of London.

Although the pageant postdates the twin masques, its inversion of the black-white binary remains relevant. *Truth* helps make explicit the implicit arguments about blackness in Jonson’s twin masques, *Blackness* and *Beauty*. *Truth* relies upon images and symbols to help make its point: fog and mist are symbols of error, while “a robe of white silk” and a “white dove” are those of truth. The pageant features a ship with the words “*Veritate gubernor*” in golden letters and only four occupants: “a king of the Moors, his queen, and two attendants of their own color.” Initially, the king believes that the multitude gapes at him because he is “A king [who is] black.” But he sees that the object of the multitude’s “amazement” is the “city-governor” and that he and his queen attract only passing glances from the hurried crowd (247-48). According to D’Amico, a “striking theatrical moment occurs that ties the appearance of Error” to the English, who are enveloped in mist and fog and, I will add, ties enlightenment to the black king, who sees past the mist and fog. He also realizes that “Where true religion and her temple stand; / [and] being a Moor” himself the English are likely to hold him “in opinion’s lightness” because they perceive him to be “As far from sanctity as [his] face [is] from whiteness[.]” The pun “then in opinion’s lightness” reveals the simultaneity of the black king’s enlightened mind and the slight regard in which the English crowd holds him because he is black.

Nonetheless, the king “forgives the judgings of th’ unwise / Whose censures ever quickens in their eyes, / Only begot of outward form and show[.]” The king “think[s it] meet to let such censurers know / However darkness dwells upon my face / Truth in my

---

72. No relation to the playwright.
soul sets up the light of grace” (248). Although early modern convention associated darkness with black individuals and light with white persons, Middleton, like Jonson, overturns the convention by associating the Moor with “light” and the English with darkness. Middleton’s use of the dark-light symbolism further inverts the convention, for the Moor seeks to correct the common opinion that “dark-complexioned person[s] cannot be enlightened in mind or spirit” (60) and that fair-skinned individuals cannot have darkened minds. Here, Middleton makes explicit the argument of black enlightenment and white ignorance, and his reversal resonates with Jonson’s conceit of blanching: the fair-skinned “Britons” are dark on the inside, while the dark-skinned Ethiopians are light on the inside. Like Middleton’s English who are enveloped in darkness and need enlightenment, so are some of James’s would-be Britons, who need blanching to be brought under the enlightening and civilizing effect of the king.

Through the reconciliation of fair-skinned but mentally and spiritually dark Britons and the dark-skinned yet enlightened Ethiopians by means of blanching, Jonson’s twin masques can be viewed as a part of the Heliodoran stage tradition. Both Blackness and Beauty posit a positive portrayal of blacks by dramatizing admirable traits associated with Africans. The symbolic meaning of the names of the masquers in Blackness also testifies to Jonson’s awareness of the association of knowledge and purity with Ethiopians. Indeed, Jonson explains that he chose the symbolic names “for strangeness as relishing antiquity, and more applying to that original doctrine of sculpture which the Egyptians are said first to have brought from the Ethiopians” (Blackness, n. 240), thereby revealing his knowledge of their accomplishments. By reviving “a corse” to blanch his
subjects, James moves toward enlightening his rebellious subjects and Jonson reveals a complex participation in the Heliodoran tradition.

III.

The Intertextuality of the Aethiopica, Blackness, and The English Moor

When Jonson wrote Blackness, Richard Brome was his apprentice. Brome started in Jonson’s employ in 1614, around the age of 24, and wrote The English Moor73 around 1635, twenty years later.74 A few of Brome’s plays were more successful than his former master’s, according to Sara Jayne Steen.75 Both Steen and Stevens believe that The English Moor was among the first to be acted at the Salisbury Court theater, following the re-opening of the theaters in 1637, after the plague of 1636.76 The main plot of the play centers on the forced marriage between Millicent, a young Englishwoman, and Quicksands, an old usurer who has bankrupted the young English gallants. The gallants plan to avenge their disgrace by cuckolding Quicksands, who employs preventive and counter measures by disguising Millicent as a Moor and staging a lavish counter-masque, the “shew of blackamoors,” which he hopes will outdo the masque of the gallants, thereby nullifying the effects of their masque and guaranteeing his triumph over them, securing his authority over Millicent, and simultaneously ensuring her inaccessibility to the gallants. During the “shew,” Millicent escapes and reunites with her true love.

73. All references to Brome’s text are to The English Moor; or The Mock Marriage, ed. Sara Jayne Steen (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1983).
74. The Stage-keeper’s line from the Induction of Jonson’s Bartholomew Fair (1614) references Brome: “I am looking, lest the Poet heare me, or his man, Master Brome, behind the Arras.” Little is known of Richard Brome. He had at least a grammar school education. As “one of the most popular Caroline playwrights,” Brome wrote for the Blackfriars theater and the Red Bull and was the dramatist for the reorganized Queen Henrietta’s Men from 1635-1639. See the Introducton to The English Moor, 1.
75. Brome’s Lovesick Maid, for example, achieved “extraordinary applause” shortly after Jonson’s New Inn failed at the same theater, much to Jonson’s surprise and chagrin. See Steen, 2.
76. Steen, 3 & 5; Stevens, “Mastering Masques of Blackness,” 420.
Quicksands is exposed and humiliated. Quicksands as an old usurer with Venetian connections recalls The Merchant of Venice, while Millicent’s transformation and the “shew of blackamores” alludes to the Aethiopica, and Jonson’s Blackness, Beauty, and Gypsies. In this section, I look at Brome’s use of specific sections of Heliodorus’s and Jonson’s texts to engage the gendered issues of race and metamorphosis and his parody the Heliodoran material in particular, which he uses to tap into the stage tradition that depicts black Africans negatively.

The first instance of Brome’s rich and complex use of the materials he borrows from Heliodorus and Jonson occurs in Act III, scene i of The English Moor, in which Quicksands suggests that Millicent undergo a racial transformation from white to black. Not wanting to be a cuckold or break his promise not to consummate his marriage until the end of the month, Quicksands resorts to transforming his wife racially. He explains that blackening Millicent will “Kill vain attempts in me, and guard yo[u] safe / From all that seeke subuersion of yo[r] honor,” adding, it will “coole theyr Kidneys, & lay downe their heats” (ll. 63-68). As a “blackamore,” Millicent will be sexually unattractive to Quicksands and the gallants. Brome, like Heliodorus and Jonson, makes metamorphosis an issue of gender and race. In the Aethiopica, Blackness, Beauty, and The English Moor, only women undergo racial transformation, despite the preponderance of male characters in these works.77 None of the men in Jonson’s or Brome’s texts feels that he himself needs to be transformed, perhaps because women’s sense of self and notion of beauty are tied to masculine approval, and Renaissance men frequently saw themselves

77. In Heliodorus, there are approximately eight women and nineteen men, excluding pirates, soldiers, sailors, and contestants in the games at Delphi; approximately seventeen women and ten men in Jonson; and five women and ten men in Brome. Although there are more women than men in Jonson, their ratio is not two to one (2:1), or greater, as in Heliodorus and Brome. Such combined numeric disproportionality supports Hall’s assertion that “[d]iscussions of blackness are inevitably yoked to problems of gender difference” (134).
as proprietors of women as well as authors of women’s existence (see, for example, _A Midsummer Night’s Dream_, I.i. 46-51). The act of transformation shows men’s “power to display [women] as white and beautiful”78 or black and ugly. Millicent recoils at Quicksands’s suggestion to “make _A Negro_ of” her (ll. 56-57) because she associates the blackening of her face with blackening of her reputation and loss of her beauty, which Quicksands understands and exploits: Millicent’s lack of beauty will deflate Quicksands’s libido as well as the young gallants’. Quicksands will be able to keep his promise and will lose his fear of cuckoldry.

Brome also uses Quicksands’s sexual insecurity to engage Jonson intertextually and to dramatize a one-dimensional view of blackness. Quicksands’s fear of cuckoldry prompts his desire to transform Millicent into a Blackamore, which allows Brome to reference _Blackness_. Quicksands’s assurance that “Illustrious Persons, nay even Queenes themselves / Have, for the glory of a Nights presentment / To grace the work, suffered as much as this” (ll. 80-82) alludes to Queen Anne’s participation as a “blackamore” in _Blackness_. Quicksands invokes the legitimizing precedent of Queen Anne in blackface “to assuage [Millicent’s] anxiety about . . . racial change . . .”79 As Stevens points out, by allowing Quicksands to recall Queen Anne in blackface to blacken Millicent during the actual performance in the audience’s sight, and Millicent to re-emerge on stage re-transformed to white shortly thereafter, Brome provides a useful lesson to Jonson on how to stage metamorphosis _successfully and succinctly in a single performance_. It took three years and two performances in Jonson’s _Blackness_ and _Beauty_ to stage the Ethiopian princesses’ transformation as white women. The invocation, especially “the

78. Hall, 134 & 166.
79. Stevens, 421.
mention of Queen Anne, encourages the audience to view Quicksands’ own theatrical activities as grandiosely Jonsonian” because Quicksands’s own attempts at staging a masque of “blackamores” fails, giving “Brome an opportunity both for comedy and for theatrical one-upmanship.”

Quicksands’s statement that “Queenes themselves” have “suffered” being in blackface is curious and provides an opportunity for Brome to associate blackness with unattractiveness through an oblique reference. In this context of negative association, the choice of word, “suffered,” suggests that the queen endured some sort of indignity performing in the masque, bringing to mind Carleton’s quip about the ugliness of “lean-cheek’d Moors” regarding the queen’s performance in Blackness. The word “suffer” along with Carleton’s quip might indicate how the English court audience largely perceived Blackness, a perception in contrast to the foreign audience’s, suggested by the reactions of the Spanish and Venetian ambassadors, who kissed the queen’s hand, danced with her, and found the masque richly decorated and entertaining. Perhaps because both Spain and Venice had known the conquering power of the Turks and Moors and were less rigid and judgmental about race than seventeenth-century England, the two ambassadors were more embracing of blackness than the English appreciating the beauty which Jonson strove to achieve during the performance of Blackness.

In Act IIII of his play, Brome revises, conflates, and parodies Book 4 of the Aethiopica and three of Jonson’s masques, Blackness, Beauty, and The Gypsies Metamorphosed (III.iii.14-60) through Quicksands’s masque, “the shew of blackamores.” As discussed earlier in this chapter, Book 4 of the Aethiopica deals with the conception, birth, and breeding of Charicleia. Persinna gazes at the painting of

80. Ibid, 421-22.
Andromeda during intercourse and births a white-complexioned baby, whom she exposes. The child grows up in Athens and eventually returns home with her beloved Greek prince. In Brome’s revision, however, Persinna is told in a dream that she will give birth to a white child, which terrifies all concerned: “The queene of Ethiope dreampt vpon a night / Her black wombe should bring forth a virgine white / . . . / She told her King, he told thereof his Peeres / Till this white dreame fill their black heads wi th feares” (ll. 14-18). To escape the terror, the Ethiopian aristocracy decides to banish the child to England if the child is born white, presumably because this kind of “prodigee” in Ethiopia is the norm in England. When, however, the queen “was deliuered / Of child black,” she, in keeping with the prognostication of “wizards,” sends the princess “to merry England . . . / The fairest Nation Man yet ever saw / To take a husband,” who will make her “as white as hee” through marriage (ll. 29-38). Instead of marrying a prince as in Heliodorus, the princess will marry an untitled Englishman in Quicksands’s masque.

In rewriting the Aethiopica and Jonson’s twin masque through Quicksands’s “shew of blackamores,” Brome heaps ridicule and disdain on both works. Brome’s Ethiopian princess is born black, unlike Heliodorus’s. But like Heliodorus’s princess, Brome’s princess will marry a western white man, who will morph her into a white woman, as Jonson’s sun/king does with the sixteen Ethiopian princesses in Blackness and Beauty. Brome seems to make royalty and blackness incongruous. In rewriting Heliodorus and Jonson, Brome redirects racial metamorphosis from an exalted position to a debased one. In the Aethiopica, the metamorphosis of Charicleia has associations with Persinna’s gaze at the painting of Andromeda. In Jonson’s twin masques, the transformation of the Ethiopian princesses occurs through the powers of the king.
However, in Brome play, the transformation of the princess will result from a sexual union with a commoner. The disdain and carnivalesque atmosphere surrounding Brome’s revisions of Heliodorus’s and Jonson’s texts reaches its climax when Brome’s Patrico outperforms himself with his sexual quibble: “This is the worthy man [Quicksands] whose wealth & wit / To make a white must the black marke hit” (ll. 59-60). Brome displays virtuosity as a dramatist by conflating these three texts—the Aethiopica, Blackness, and Beauty—that deal with the gendered issue of color transmutation into his play. Brome’s familiarity with Jonson’s texts and his use of them as sources become apparent in Quicksands’s masque.81

The title itself of Quicksands’s masque, “shew of blackamores,” and the elaborate preparations with which Quicksands adorns it recalls that of Jonson’s, The Masque of Blackness. A “shew” is a masque and vice versa. Each work is “a spectacle elaborately prepared or arranged in order to entertain a number of spectators,” according to the OED. In fact, Brome sometimes refers to Quicksands’s “shew” as a masque. Both Jonson’s masque and Quicksands’s “shew” engage blackness through Ethiopian princesses. Indeed, the titles of both works are interchangeable, without each work losing its titular meaning: Jonson’s Masque of Blackness could easily be called The Shew of Blackness and Quicksands’s “shew of blackamores,” could also be “masque of blackamores.” In both instances, each work retains the original meanings of its title. Additionally, Brome’s description of England as “the fairest Nation Man yet ever saw” alludes to the twin masques’ description of “Albion the fair “and “Albion,”82 which means “white land” and is traditionally the name poets use for England, which is also the destination of Jonson’s

81. See The English Moore, 105, n. 37.
82. Blackness describes England as “Albion the fair” (l. 180) and Beauty as “Albion” (l. 20), which literally means “white land.” See the Encyclopedia Britannica.
and Brome’s princesses. By referencing Heliodorus and making England the destination of the Ethiopian princesses, Brome collapses *Blackness* and *Beauty* into the *Aethiopica*, thus engaging three texts concurrently, all of which deal with the racial transmutation of Ethiopian princesses.

Brome expands the intertextual dialogue with Heliodorus and Jonson to include yet another Jonsonian masque, *Gypsies*, which he parodies as well (III.iii.39). The “Egyptian Prophet” of *The English Moor* recalls Calasiris of the *Aethiopica* and the Patrico of *Gypsies*, who are Egyptian diviners or fortune-tellers. In his role as prophet (or priest), Calasiris helps Charicleia and Theagenes to find their destiny and pretends to be a clairvoyant, divining their maladies. The Patrico of *Gypsies*, an Egyptian clairvoyant as well, tells the fortune of the audience by reading each person’s palm favorably. Brome’s fortuneteller, however, gives his audience an unfavorable reading, except for Quicksands. The young gallant Edmond learns that he cannot have the woman of his dreams because he has “forfeited the Mortgage of [his] land” (ll. 43-44). A similar dire prediction awaits Vincent, who apparently has designs on the same woman but must relinquish her because he has “sold & spent [his] Liues Annuity” (ll. 47-48). The Patrico’s enumerations of the young gallants’ failings have correspondences to the financial misdealings of and abuse of trust by the duke of Buckingham, Master of the Horse and King James’s favorite courtier, as reflected in Quicksands’s queries to the gallants: “. . . have you offices to sell? or would you / Deale for some Courtier, that

83. *Gypsies* deals with metamorphosis as well. Interestingly, Jonson felt compelled to explain in *Gypsies* why the removal of theatrical paint was successful in a single performance of this masque but not in *Blackness*: “It was fetched off with water and a ball, /And to our transformation this is all” (1391-92). Earlier at line 1122, Jonson reveals the components of the paint: “walnuts and hog’s grease.” Since this “confection” was easily removed with water and soap, presumably the paint in *Blackness* was much denser and not easily removed, at least not with water and soap. Rather than issue textual explanation on the ease or difficulty in removing theatrical paint, Brome demonstrates the ease in effecting several transformations with and without paint, thereby instructing and correcting Jonson.
has?” (III.i. 64-65). Buckingham came under fire for financial mismanagement of his office and for encouraging the king to sell social titles, including those of the peerage. Brome also rehabilitates the “stained” gallants by allowing them to recover their properties and hence their reputation, just as Jonson rehabilitates Buckingham and family in *Gypsies* by showing “the stain of ‘gypsy’ as only temporary, that Buckingham is always essentially a gentleman.” Brome’s rewriting of Heliodorus and Jonson through parody and disdain facilitates his departure from the Heliodoridan tradition and his participation in the tradition that stereotypes Africans negatively.

Although *The English Moor* borrows material from the *Aethiopica* but does not participate in the Heliodoridan stage tradition, it acknowledges the dualism embedded in blackness. Quicksands admits “Heauven[‘s]” workmanship in African women:

> Why, thinckst thou, feareful Beauty,  
> Has Heauen no part in Egipt? Pray thee tell me  
> Is not an Ethiops face his workmanship  
> As well as the fairst Ladyes? Nay more too  
> Then hers, that dawbes & makes adulterate beauty.  

(III.i.69-73)

Although Quicksands’s admission serves primarily to gain Millicent’s confidence to put her in blackface, it nonetheless echoes the ambivalence that Jonson expresses about black pulchritude. A significant difference between Jonson’s and Brome’s acknowledgements of African beauty is the willingness of the former but the reluctance of the latter to praise

---

85. Stevens, 399.  
African women as comely. We have seen the many ways that Jonson admits to the beauty inherent in blackness (*Beauty*, l.71; *Blackness*, ll.85-87). Brome, however, seems constrained to do so. Quicksands praises Ethiopian and Egyptian women as beautiful because their undaubed, unadulterated faces look beautiful in comparison to the “dawbe[d and] adulterate” faces of European women. In reality, Ethiopian and Egyptian women are not beautiful but appear so because European women mar their beauty by painting themselves. Hamlet voices a similar condemnation of women’s use of cosmetics, raging against women’s use of cosmetics because it blurs the line between the natural and the artificial and makes ascertaining or appraising their natural beauty impossible: “I have heard of your paintings. . . . God hath given you one face and you make yourselves another” (III.i. 148-150). Against this adulteration, this “dawbing,” Quicksands lauds the “Ethiops face,” making her beautiful by default.

A distinct pattern of one-dimensional association with blackness emerges from Brome’s rewriting of the *Aethiopica* and the twin masques. As a quality, blackness is negative, which Brome demonstrates in the stereotypical ways. His Moor is both a comic and inconstant figure. Despite her exoticism, the Moor’s speech and costume are designed to elicit ridicule, which her encounters with Nathaniel demonstrate. In their first conversation, Nathaniel suggests that they meet for a sexual interlude. After a brief moment of self-deprecation, the Moor consents, telling him, “Then I sall speak-a more-a” (III.iii.115). Although the Moor’s native tongue is not English, the audience is not meant to sympathize with her and the difficulties involved in speaking a new language. Rather, her speech is meant to provoke ridicule, as Nathaniel’s witty mocking response
shows: “And I’ll not loose thee for more-a then I’ll speak-a” (III.iii.116). Her encounter with Nathaniel also establishes her promiscuous nature.

Brome’s eroticization of the Moor reiterates the promiscuity that early modern English playwrights frequently ascribed to black women. In that tradition, black women are unappealing and devoid of honor. Zanche from The White Devil (1611)87 and Abdella from The Knight of Malta are examples. Both women publish their availability and eagerness for sexual dalliances. After Flamineo rejects Zanche because she is black (5.1.188-205), she promptly seeks out the disguised Francisoco de Medici, publicly confessing her burning desire for him: “Verily I did dream / You were somewhat bold with me, but to come to’t . . .” (5.3.240-42). The thought of a sexual encounter with him overpowers her, and, in the presence of others, she moves forward to embrace the disguised duke, prompting an attendant to exclaim, “How, how! I hope you will not go to it here,” adding, “. . . she simpers like the suddes / A collier hath been washt in” (5.3.243, 247-48). Insatiable like Zanche, Abdella makes Mountferrat know of her sexual availability and eagerness to pleasure him: “I can blithely work in my loves bed, / And deck thy faire neck, with these Jetty chains, / Sing thee asleep, being wearied, and refresh’d / With the same organ, steale sleep off againe” (I.i.178-181). The metonymy of “jetty chains” links Abdella’s promiscuity directly to her blackness. Like “jetty chains,” the double-entendre of “the same organ” stealing “sleep off againe” refers to a woman’s two mouths and the paradox of sexual intercourse: it refreshes as it wearies. The suggestion is that Abbella is a sexual automaton that enslaves men by refreshing and wearying them simultaneously.

Because black women were reputed to be sexually loose, the cultural constraints of the English Renaissance prohibit respectable white men from consorting with them.\textsuperscript{88} Hence, in \textit{The Merchant of Venice}, the clown Launcelot can consort with and get up the Negress’s belly (III.v.38-39), but Duke Francisco de Medici, who masquerades as a Moor in Webster’s \textit{The White Devil}, must reject the sexual advances of the Moor Zanche--in and out of disguise. Mountferrat’s marriage to Abdella reinforces the proscription of an upstanding white man avoiding sexual congress with a black woman: as a disgraced and debased knight, his relationship with her reflects his fallen status. Brome’s dramatization of the Moor confirms that he is fully aware of these associations with black women. When Nathaniel, the play’s equal-opportunity fornicator, first sees the Moor, he refers to her as “a black Coneybury” and later desires “a snatch / In an od Corner, or the dark to night” (III.iii.68, 103-04). “Coneybury” is slang for a loose woman, and “snatch,” according to the \textit{OED}, is “an unexpected and quick robbery” and “the female pudenda.” Nathaniel desires a “quickie” because he imagines the Moor an easy conquest, which her surrender confirms (III.i.108-116). By making the Moor yield to Nathaniel, Brome follows in the tradition of portraying black females as promiscuous on the English Renaissance stage.

Millicent’s and the Moor’s actions belong to the same tradition of the virtuous white woman and the vile black woman. In this tradition, white women have fathers, brothers, husbands, or uncles, but black women do not. Such male protection ensures the safety of white women’s honor as well as that of their families. Nathaniel’s declaration that fathers are obstacles and his seduction of Phylis, the play’s fallen and symbolic black woman, as a result of her absent father attest to the security women derive from male

\textsuperscript{88} Tokson, 90-91.
protection. Although Quicksands fails to live up to the Renaissance code of conduct to protect his wife’s honor, Brome provides other forms of masculine protection for Millicent. In the male-dominated Renaissance society the protection of women’s honor devolves upon men because women were commodities to be traded to form political and dynastic alliances, were responsible for the purity of the family bloodline, and were perceived as weak. In 1613, King James I married his eldest daughter, Elizabeth, to the Protestant Federick V, Elector of the Palatinate and future king of Bohemia to secure political, dynastic, and religious bonds with members of the Palatinate; approximately seven years later, the king also sought political and dynastic links with Spain by negotiating the marriage of Charles to a Catholic Spanish princess (a marriage which was not realized). In *The Tempest*, both Alonzo and Prospero seek dynastic and political ties with Tunis and Naples through the marriage of their daughters. By allowing his daughter Claribel to marry the king of Tunis, Alonzo forms political and dynastic connections with Tunis to prevent it from attacking Naples. To reclaim his dukedom and establish dynastic and political relations with Naples, Prospero orchestrates the marriage of his daughter Miranda to the heir apparent Ferdinand. Prospero’s vigilance in protecting Miranda’s, and hence his own, honor extends to ensuring that Ferdinand does not break Miranda’s “virgin-knot” prior to marriage (I.ii.345-351, IV.i.1-23). When the gallants decide to make Millicent a common commodity among them, despite Quicksands’s inaction, Brome allows Millicent’s honor to be protected through her imposition of a sexual moratorium on Quicksands, the aid of a gentleman in orchestrating her escape, and the intervention, though late, of her uncle (II.ii.41-49, III.iii.231-48).
Millicent is able to escape her “denne of Miserie” because the structure of male protection is in place for white women, a structure that is unavailable to black women on the English Renaissance stage. Without father, family, or any sort of male protection, the self-authoring and castaway black woman in the non-Helidoran tradition is a sexual profligate on the English Renaissance stage. Brome’s Moor’s “deed of darknes” (III.i.189) with Nathaniel is a foregone conclusion. The preservation of white women’s chastity and the loss of black women’s purity are dramatized repeatedly in plays like *The Devil’s Law Case* (1623), *Monsieur Thomas* (1610/16), and others.

One of the strategies of the writers in the non-Heliodoran tradition is to degrade Africans (and other non-native English individuals) by emphasizing their foreignness. Hall observes that Elizabeth’s virginity came to symbolize the enclosed space and insularity of the English, an insularity played out over decades on the English Renaissance stage and in several texts that made the English suspicious of others, especially of dark-skinned individuals. English writers capitalized on this cultural phenomenon, this xenophobia, in their depictions especially of Africans. In *The Thracian Wonder*, another play that borrows material from the *Aethiopica* but, like *The English Moore*, does not participate in the dramatic tradition stemming from this novel that portrays black Africans positively, we see an example of degradation through xenophobia. Having selected Prince Sophono as the husband for his daughter, Alcade, the black African king and father of the “white” heroine, Lilia Guida, assures the prince

---

89. Hall, 126-27.
90. All references are to *The Dramatic Works of John Webster*, ed. William Hazlitt (London: John Russell Smith, 1857). Lines are unnumbered in this edition. For ease and convenience, I give page numbers after the act and scene. The playwrights, John Webster and William Rowley, invert how the lovers meet. Instead of the African princess being abandoned and taken to Greece, as in the *Aethiopica*, it is the Greek prince who, as a baby, is lost and taken to Africa. Lillia Guida and Eusaniu, like Charicliea and Theagenes, face obstacles to their love because of a blocking father, King Alcade, who has already chosen the man he wants his daughter to marry
that before the close of the fortnight “my child shall call thee husband.” Yet the king betroths his daughter to another man. Later, King Alcade brags that “men [who] have livers [as] . . . pale as their faces / . . . will . . . run” (3.3. 172) because of fright from him and his fellow Africans. As the seat of bravery, the liver and its color indicate men’s temperament: courage or cowardice. The inference is that white men are cowards and black men are brave. By making Alcade a promise-breaker and captive, the playwrights ridicule Alcade, showing the king to be vaunting and untrustworthy and his rhetoric to be bombast. Alcade’s claim that his and his fellow Africans’ visages are so black that they will inflict terror on the pale faces and cause them to flee, though comic and ironic—the supposed terrifying men are captives of the putatively terrified ones—masks a deeply xenophobic reaction to black Africans.

Brome implements the strategy of the alien by emphasizing the Moor’s foreignness: her speech, habit, and dress. But Moors and other Africans were not as foreign in England as Brome’s text may indicate, which Chew, D’Amico, Burton, Vitkus, and Matar demonstrate: Moors interacted with the English extensively from the 1580s to the 1630s, through commerce and habitation. According to Matar, “. . . thousands of Turks and Moors visited and traded in English and Welsh ports; hundreds were captured on the high seas and brought to stand trial in English courts; scores of ambassadors dazzled the London populace with their charm, cuisine, ‘Araby’ horses.” Sometimes, both groups “even ate at the same table,” and some English who made their fortunes in the Levant returned home91 and no doubt told stories of this fascinating land. The question then arises, why do Brome and other early modern English playwrights treat Africans with contempt on the stage, despite the widespread influence of the *Aethiopica*,

91. Matar, 5-6.
the claims of antiquity, and actual encounters among the English, Moors, and other Africans?

Besides the other reasons that I have been exploring for such degradation, Matar suggests that the English encountered a people, a culture to which they could not feel superior, unlike their encounter with the American Indian:

In the Muslim world, Englishmen possessed no invisible bullets because the Muslims were religiously and militarily powerful, were widely influencing English culture, and were dictating their own terms of commercial and industrial exchange. . . . the English found themselves humbled in North Africa and the Levant . . . [and] slaves in Algiers. As a result, and in order to maintain their sense of national superiority and confirm the image of Englishmen as God’s own, they imposed moral constructions they had devised to legitimate . . . the destruction of the Indians on the Muslims: as the American Indians were “sodomites” . . . so too [were] the Muslims . . . .

Superimposing sexual degeneracy on the Moors was a compensatory measure and a face-saving device that English writers practiced because, as Jardine has also shown, England was militarily and economically puny on the world stage during this period. Goran V. Stanivukovic reaches a conclusion similar to Matar’s and Jardine’s: “[a]t a time when England was engaged in difficult diplomacy with the Ottoman Empire over commercial

---

92. A Muslim is also a Moor. See the OED for various categories of Moors. Although Matar quibbles about Renaissance scholars not differentiating among Moors, Turks, and sub-Saharan Africans (6, 15, 16), early modern English playwrights did not make these distinctions, as Jack D’Amico (59) and Elliot H. Tokson have also shown; according to Tokson, the term “black” included “Moors, Black-a-Moors, Negroes, and Aethiopians” (2). Despite “being aware of the differences among these peoples,” Renaissance playwrights made no distinction. Shakespeare, for example, describes Aaron’s son and Cleopatra as “black.”
routes and political domination of the eastern Mediterranean, making the Ottoman Mediterranean a home of sexual vices and transgressions became one of the most common ways in which the early modern English writers defamed the Ottomans.\(^93\) Moors, including Ethiopians and other Africans, during this time were known for their religious scruples; yet English Renaissance playwrights staged them as irreligious with a natural tendency to sexual deviance, a tradition Brome taps into when he eroticizes the Moor. To emphasize the erotic nature of the Moor, Brome transfers the disguise from Millicent to the fallen Phyllis because such a disguise is incompatible with the maidenly Millicent but suitable to the unchaste Phyllis, the symbolic black woman of the play.

Both Jonson and Brome indicate indebtedness to Heliodorus in covert and overt ways. In positing Ethiopians and blackness as physically and mentally attractive, Jonson treads where few English Renaissance writers dared to tread. His association of white skin with ignorance and incivility and dark skin with enlightenment challenges the prevailing cultural norm of white skin with civility and dark skin with barbarity. Thus, the Ethiopians’ journey from East to West is symbolic: they enlighten James’s court with their civility, wisdom, and piety, and he transmutes them into the Western ideal of physical beauty so that their internal light reflects their external appearance. Perhaps Jonson’s equivocations, paradoxes, and conceits create a multidimensional blackness that denies the negative, monolithic quality that English playwrights such as Brome stage blackness to be. In utilizing material from the *Aethiopica* but inscribing blackness as overwhelmingly negative, Brome flattens the complexity, richness, and sophistication that Heliodorus and Jonson associate with black Africans and joins the band of early

---
modern English dramatists for whom blackness was antithetical to beauty and virtue, which often plays out especially in English Mediterranean drama. In the next chapter, I examine the affinity between the *Aethiopica* and the genre of English adventure drama in a play and argue that *Othello* reflects a complex relationship within a framework of race, religion, and gender in the Heliodoran tradition.
Chapter 3

England’s fascination with Africa as the exotic Other, as seen in Jonson’s work and James’s reign, facilitated the production of a plethora of texts dealing with the Mediterranean, a territory which became increasingly important during the seventeenth century. Among the major Mediterranean city-states that interested England was Venice, known for its wealth and political thought. In February 1603, the Venetian “Secretary” Giovanni Sacramelli met with Queen Elizabeth, and his successors Piero Duodo and Nicola Molin “continued . . . negotiations” with the new king, who “with a crowd of nobles [praised] the splendour of Venice.”1 Given England’s and Venice’s mutual interests, commercially and politically, these negotiations focused on “trade conditions concerning the Levant . . . as well as Cyprus and Aleppo . . . .” By 1604, England and Venice had established diplomatic ties, with Sir Henry Wotton as the British ambassador to Venice. Dignitaries such as “Lord Southampton, Lord Bruckhurst, Robert Cecil, and others met frequently with the Venetian envoys.”2 Fernand Baldensperger has argued that Shakespeare, though not an official dignitary, had “direct intercourse with the Venetian envoys,” perhaps at “the Elephant and Castle” near “the Globe Theatre.”3 And on November 1, 1604, Bladensperger notes, Othello, the Moor of Venice was performed

2. Baldensperger, 3.
3. Scholars like Jonathan Burton and Ania Loomba maintain that Shakespeare also consulted Richard Knolles’s General Historie of the Turks (1603) while writing Othello. See Burton, 22; Loomba, 94. Emily C. Bartels and Rosalind Johnson have suggested Philemon Holland’s 1601 translation of Pliny’s Natural History and John Pory’s translation of Leo Africanus’s A Geographical Historie of Africa (1600) as other sources that Shakespeare consulted. See “Making more of the Moor: Aaron, Othello, and Renaissance Refashionings of Race,” Shakespeare Quarterly 41, no. 2 (Winter 1990): 435; “African Presence in Shakespearean Drama: Parallels between Othello and the Historical Leo Africanus,” Journal of African Civilization 7 (1985): 276-87. Shakespeare also drew on the historical wars between Turkey and Venice, especially the Battle of Lepanto (1571) as source material.
in the Banqueting House at Whitehall with “Molin the principal ambassador, who also saw *Masque of Blackness* on January 12, 1606, in attendance.”

*Othello*, set in Venice and Cyprus, was performed several times during James’s reign and is one of the most staged, discussed, and debated plays within the Shakespearean canon. Ever since Thomas Rymer’s infamous attack on the play as a “bloody farce” and a cautionary tale to “all Maidens of Quality,” “all good Wives” and “Husbands,” critics have had disparate reactions to the play, especially to the hero and heroine, ranging from the ignoble to the noble hero and the submissive to the courageous heroine. In joining the scholarly conversation about *Othello*, I find the evidence pushing me toward a reading closer to the idea of a noble Othello and a fearless Desdemona. Placing the play as a drama in the Heliodoran tradition with its dramatization of a Mediterranean setting, positive representation of a black African, and a brave and chaste heroine and hero highlight aspects of the play that sometimes get overlooked. Critics such as Charles Gildon, Samuel T. Coleridge, and F.R. Leavis have inveighed against a black hero as inappropriate, and others such as William Hazlitt and Frank Kermode

---

4. Baldensperger, 5. Some scholars believe that Shakespeare wrote *Othello* earlier, in late 1603, or even as early as 1601/2.
5. See *A Short View of Tragedy, 1693* (Yorkshire: The Scholar Press, 1970), 92.
6. In 1694, Charles Gildon chastised Rymer for indicting the play and the hero. Gildon maintained that despite Rymer’s censure Shakespeare did not violate the Aristotelian unities, that the playwright actually fulfilled these functions by depicting a meritocracy where a virtuous man, regardless of color, can achieve distinction. Gildon noted that there is no social disparity between Othello and Desdemona because Shakespeare creates Othello with “extraordinary Merit and Virtue” that Desdemona would love. He praised Shakespeare for representing “things as they should be, not as they are” and for exposing the “barbarity of confining nations, without regard to their virtue and merits, to slavery and contempt for the mere accident of their complexion.” Almost two decades later (1710), Gildon reversed himself by subscribing to what he had previously decried in Rymer: “making a Negro of the Hero or Chief Character of the Play, wou’d shock anyone” and Desdemona’s love for Othello is “monstrous.” Gildon offered no explanation for his reversal; perhaps the spirit of the times—the prevalence of slavery during the eighteenth century—possessed him. See “Commentary on Rymer’s Othello,” *A Norton Critical Edition on Othello* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2004), 231; “Remarks on the Plays of Shakespeare,” *The Works of Mr. William Shakespeare*, Vol. 7, 1710, ed. Nicolas Rowe (Rpt. NY: AMS Press, 1967), 411-12.
7. Whereas Rymer insinuates racism through sarcasm—“With us a Black-amoor might rise to a Trumpeter; but Shakespeare would not have him less than a Lieutenant-General—”Coleridge is blunt: “Can we imagine...
praise Othello as heroic and noble. While many critics argue against Othello’s blackness, a heroic Othello, or a black hero, I, like Hazlitt, Kermode, and others, contend that Othello achieves heroic and noble status. But I also argue that Shakespeare combines material from Heliodorus with his major source in Cinthio, and fashions it into an Othello that follows the mold of Hydaspes to certain degree, but retains distinct parts of Cinthio’s story. I differ from Kermode and others by positing a stage tradition of which Othello is a part that makes him a positive black character.

[Shakespeare] so utterly ignorant as to make a barbarous negro plead royal birth—at a time, too, when negroes were not known except as slaves.” But Coleridge is disingenuous. During the eighteenth century, England had several accomplished and well known blacks, negating Coleridge’s claim that during this time “Negroes were not known except as slaves.” Ignatious Sancho was a composer, writer, and the first black British playwright and critic. His friends included the duchesses of Queensbury and Northumberland, the actor David Garrick (who also played Othello), and the writer Laurence Sterne. Coleridge, who was twenty-seven when Olaudah Equiano (1745-1787) died, would have known of this famous man. Equiano, a journalist and writer, published his autobiography. The Interesting Narrative of the life of Olaudah Equiano, or Gustavus Vassa, the African, in 1778, and collaborated with fellow anti-slavery campaigner Granville Sharp on numerous issues, touring England and Ireland with public support and admiration. In 1792, Gentleman’s Magazine listed Equiano’s marriage among its “Marriages and Deaths of Considerable Persons,” among several others. Coleridge’s remarks are similar to Immanuel Kant’s sentiments. In “Observation on Feeling of the Beautiful and the Sublime,” Kant notes that the “Negroes of Africa have by nature no feeling that rises above the trifling” (53). See Race and the Enlightenment A Reader (Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 1997), 38-70 for Kant’s manifesto on race. As Allison Blakely remarks, “Kant was not basing his evaluation on the historical experience of blacks in Europe,” or on history itself, for if he had the civilization would have reminded him of his foolish remark just as the lives of eighteenth-century Blacks such as Joseph Boulogne, Le Chevalier de Saint-Georges in France, whose music influenced Mozart; the philosopher Antony William Amo in Germany; the poet and polyglot Jacobus Capitein, who was also a preacher in Holland; and Abram Hannibal, the maternal great-grandfather of Alexander Pushkin, in Russia, would have. See “Problems in studying the role of Blacks in Europe,” Perspectives (May/June 1997):11-12. Coleridge also knew of Toussaint L’Oveture, the Haitian general who defeated the French army and led Haiti, the first country in North America, to freedom through revolution in 1804. Coleridge’s friend, colleague, and collaborator William Wordsworth wrote an ode to Toussaint. See, also, Leavis, “Diabolical Intellect or the Sentimentalist’s Othello,” The Common Pursuit (New York: NY UP, 1954), 136-59.


9. William Kendrick was the first critic to object to Othello as a black hero, asserting that Shakespeare intended Othello to be tawny; otherwise Desdemona’s love for a black Moor would be intolerable. Kendrick’s assertion dominated Victorian stage representation of Othello and spawned scholarship about Othello’s color and racial origin, including Coleridge’s, Lamb’s, and those of many twentieth- and twenty-first century critics. See Shakespeare, the Critical Heritage: 1774-1801, Vol. 6, ed. Brian Vickers (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981), 116-17.
Critics frequently underestimate Desdemona’s courage and intelligence, labeling her passive and charging her with complicity in her own death and the ensuing tragedy of the play. John Quincy Adams, for example, lambastes Desdemona as a “little less than a wanton.” Adams, who must have ignored Shakespeare’s text while reading Iago’s, derides Desdemona for betraying her gender and social status by marrying a black man.\(^\text{10}\) Anna Brownell Jameson depicts Desdemona as passive, offering no resistance to Othello.\(^\text{11}\) Both G. R. Elliott and Gayle Greene\(^\text{12}\) see Desdemona as mentally weak, although Elliott concedes that during the play’s denouement Desdemona achieves understanding. Greene concludes that Desdemona is compliant and accepting of the position society assigns her. In my analysis of Desdemona, I aim to show that such characterizations of her are fundamentally flawed. In creating his heroine, Shakespeare also draws upon the Heliodoran tradition to offer us a medley of personal traits. Instead of the simple romance in Cinthio, Shakespeare, as might be expected, deepens and complicates it by adding the elements of bravery, maidenhood, and elopement found in Heliodorus to his drama, making Desdemona, like other heroines in the Heliodoran tradition, a neophyte in love but one whose courage is comparable to her male counterpart.

Scholars in the twenty-first century initiate a new field of critical inquiry by looking to the Mediterranean to offer fresh insights into \textit{Othello} on race, religion, and national origin. Emily Bartels, Ania Loomba, Daniel Vitkus, and Michael Neill argue for

\(^{10}\) John Quincy Adams, “Misconceptions of Shakespeare upon the stage,” \textit{Notes and Comments upon Certain Plays and Actors of Shakespeare}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed., edited by James Henry Hackett (Carleton Publisher, 1864), 217-18.


“Moor” and “race” as unstable and indeterminate terms with multiple meanings because early modern playwrights used these terms loosely and indiscriminately to categorize people of various hue, religion, and cultural make-up as the same. Loomba contends that Othello’s race and nationality cannot be known and that, indeed, it is unnecessary to know. Vitkus asserts that “Othello as a noble Moor [is] a walking paradox, a contradiction in terms.” In seeing Othello himself as noble and his race, nationality, and color as knowable and necessary, I take a different path from these critics. Nobility, race, color, religion, and nationality are integral to the literary and stage tradition of which Othello is a part. In this chapter, I look at Othello as a drama that can be seen in the Heliodoran tradition by emphasizing its derivation from the Aethiopica through certain motifs: a wandering hero, the romantic union of an African prince and a Venetian noblewoman, a daring heroine who challenges social structures, and a hero and heroine who value sexual purity. Because I contend that Shakespeare also models Othello on Heliodorus’s King Hydaspes to some degree, I begin the chapter by arguing for Othello as an Ethiopian, and I close it by exploring how Othello and Desdemona’s relationship is similar to yet different from others in the Heliodoran tradition.

I.

Othello, An Ethiopian?

Cinthio’s Gli Hecatommithi provides the essential story and is the main source of Othello. Against her parents’ wishes Disdemona marries a Moorish general, whom she

14. Loomba, 92; Vitkus, 92.
accompanies to Cyprus. There, she becomes friends with the ensign’s wife. The ensign, however, desires Disdemona. Incensed by her rejection, he plots her destruction, steals her handkerchief, plants it in the captain’s bedroom, and tells the Moor that she is unfaithful. The captain, recently demoted, tries unsuccessfully to return the handkerchief. When the Moor asks Disdemona about the handkerchief, she becomes flustered, unwittingly confirming his suspicion. The Moor hires the ensign to kill the captain, and later both of them murder Disdemona. The ensign and the Moor eventually quarrel, and their secrets are revealed. The ensign is imprisoned and Disdemona’s relatives murder the Moor. Although Cinthio’s general is a Moor, there is no clue to his race or nationality: he could be a black or a white Moor from anywhere in Africa. Neither is there any designation of nobility or magnanimity to him, though he is valiant. In Othello, these traits are demarcated. In this section, I aim to demonstrate that Shakespeare dramatizes his character Othello as a black African and most probably an Ethiopian.¹⁵

Were Iago to be believed, Othello could be from Mauritania. In Act IV, scene iii, Iago informs Roderigo of Othello’s imminent departure from Cyprus. Roderigo immediately assumes that Othello will return to Venice. But Iago tells him, “O no; he goes into Mauritania and taketh away with him the fair Desdemona, unless his abode be ling’red here by some accident” (l. 225). However, in an earlier scene of the same act, Othello’s erratic behavior prompts Lodovico to offer an explanation to Desdemona for Othello’s uncharacteristic actions. Having just arrived from Venice with a letter from the Senate recalling the general, Lodovico suggests that Othello may be upset because the

---

¹⁵ In 1958, Fernand Baldensperger proposed that Othello is an Ethiopian. Although my contention is similar, my proposal differs from Baldensperger’s in claiming that Othello is in the Heliodoran tradition and is modeled to some extent on the Ethiopian king, Hydaspes.
commission requires his return to Venice: “May be th’ letter mov’d him / For as I think, they do command him home . . .” (IV.i.236-37). A few lines later, Othello clarifies “home”: “Sir, I obey the mandate, / And will return to Venice” (ll. 259-60). Both Lodovico and Othello corroborate each other’s statement that Venice is Othello’s home and destination, which contradicts Iago’s.

“Home” could mean the current abode of Othello or his country of origin. However, the context indicates that “home” is Venice, Othello’s current abode. Additionally, neither Othello nor Lodovico discusses the general’s departure for Mauritania. There is no other conversation between Lodovico and Othello that could support Iago’s claim that Othello is going to Mauritania or that Mauritania is Othello’s country of origin. Iago imparts the information about Mauritania to Roderigo because Roderigo confronts and threatens to expose him for misleading and swindling him: “I will make myself known to Desdemona” (IV. iii.173-217). Needing to prevent this exposure, Iago discloses the general’s imminent departure to Roderigo but misrepresents the destination. Knowing Roderigo’s desire and weakness, Iago torments him emotionally so as to prepare him to do anything to stop Othello from taking “the fair Desdemona” to a strange and far-off land. After delivering the first part of his message, Iago then pauses to gauge Roderigo’s reaction before launching the final attack: “unless his abode be ling’red here by some accident” (IV.iii.225-27). Iago’s claim that Mauritania is Othello’s destination is troublesome, especially since Othello and Desdemona are Christians, and Mauritania during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance was a cradle of the Almoravid movement, which spread Islam throughout the region and for a short time controlled Islamic Spain. The notion that a Christian Othello would take
his Christian wife to a land that is geographically, culturally, and, most important, religiously distant is indeed puzzling, unless, of course, this piece of information is a lie serving Iago’s interest. A significant concern arises out of Iago’s disclosure to Roderigo. There is no independent corroboration of Iago’s assertion or any other hint that Othello is going to or in any way associated with Mauritania. Iago probably invents this story because he understands that by filling Roderigo’s head with visions of Desdemona in some untamed and distant land he can execute his plan to prevent Roderigo from ever exposing him (V.i.60-65). Othello has taught us that Iago is untrustworthy, and, unless his pronouncements are corroborated independently, they are as far removed from truth as he is from honesty. In the absence of corroborating evidence, Iago’s claim is best recognized as one of his many fabrications.

There is also a slight possibility that Othello could be from Egypt. Othello associates his parents with Egypt in Acts III and V. Both associations originate with the handkerchief he gives to Desdemona, which an Egyptian Sybil or his father gave to his mother (III.iv.55-74, V.ii.214-17). In the first instance, Othello says that an Egyptian Sybil gave the handkerchief to his mother, and in the second, that his father gave his wife the handkerchief. The possibilities of the origins of Othello’s parents are many. Either one or both parents could have been Egyptian—though it is unlikely that both parents were Egyptians, given Othello’s religious belief and military position in Venice. If, however, one parent were Egyptian, then the other could have been Ethiopian, for historically Egypt and Ethiopia, besides bordering each other, have always had close

ties. Egyptians and Ethiopians traveled to one another’s country frequently. In the *Aethiopica*, the Egyptian Calasiris goes to Ethiopia to increase his knowledge and his wisdom. If Othello’s father were Egyptian, he could have lived in Ethiopia, or his mother could have emigrated to Egypt. In either case, Othello’s Egyptian heritage would most likely have also given him an Ethiopian one as well. Except for the two vague suggestions dealing with a farfetched and unlikely Egyptian heritage, *Othello* provides no other hint or clue on this subject. Without additional and convincing evidence, Othello’s Egyptian lineage remains a vague speculation at best. As places from where Othello could have originated, neither Mauritania nor Egypt is credible. However, both countries are important to the progress of the play. Mauritania is that wild Other land that holds the potential of lost love for Roderigo and supplies the pretext for his murder, which helps to unravel Iago’s scheme. Egypt, a land of sybils, spells, incantations, and magic, historically noted as the birthplace of all sorts of arcane knowledge, is intricately woven in the handkerchief that becomes the “proof” Iago uses in slandering Desdemona to Othello and the catalyst in their downfall.

Having established the improbability that Othello is from Mauritania or Egypt, I want to explore the probability that he is depicted as a black African from Ethiopia. Besides being familiar with Ethiopia’s Christian history through biblical and other literatures, Shakespeare would have known that no other African nation during his time or before, except Ethiopia, had Christian affiliation. Before reading the character of Othello as Ethiopian, I want to look at critical views of a divided Othello. In his 1998 essay on early modern constructions of human difference, Michael Neill catalogues an

---

17. Ethiopia had conquered and ruled Egypt during antiquity. For its part, Egypt supplied Ethiopia with its high priest. See Snowden, 144-48; Pankurst, 69-73, esp. pp. 71 & 72.
array of meanings for Moors, including “Africans generally (whether white, black, or
tawny).” To Neill, the term “Moor” was “notoriously indeterminate: . . . insofar as it was
a term of racial description it could refer quite specifically to the Berber-Arab people
vaguely denoted as ‘Morocco,’ ‘Mauritania,’ or ‘Barbary’; or it could be used to embrace
the inhabitants of the whole North African littoral[.]”

In his introduction to the 2006 edition of the Oxford Othello, Neill acknowledges that the consensus of sixteenth- and
seventeenth-century critical appraisals of Othello is that he is Black: “the earliest
reference to Othello’s color (Rymer’s critique and the 1709 engraving in Nicholas
Rowe’s edition of Shakespeare) assumes him to be Sub-Saharan while the earliest known
North African interpretation was not until Edmund Keane’s 1814 production of the
play.”

Neill’s quiet placement of “assumes” registers his own doubt. Curiously, the
lone interpretation of Othello as a North African or tawny Moor was in 1774, earlier than
the 1814 date Neill gives, and it was a supposition. William Kendrick was the first
person to suggest that Othello was not a Negro but could be a tawny Moor to explain that
“. . . Desdemona’s delicacy of sentiment could never have fallen in love with a Negro . . .
whereas, supposing him tawny there is nothing very unnatural in it.” Kendrick then
delineates the reasons Othello is a tawny Moor: Christianity, heritage, and relation
between Moorish Spain and Venice. But Kendrick’s supposition lacks textual support.

---

20. My emphasis.
Paul, 1981), 116-17. Kendrick is definitive that Othello is not a “Negro” but only speculative that he could
be “tawny.” Kendrick, a lecturer, translator, literary critic, and playwright, wrote for the Monthly Review,
Gentleman’s Journal, and later for his own periodical The London Review of English and Foreign
Literature. He was notorious for his abuse of other literary figures, especially Samuel Johnson, Oliver
Goldsmith, and David Garrick, among others. The Monthly Review terminated Kendrick in 1765 after his
publication of “A Review of Doctor Johnson’s New Edition of Shakespeare: in which the Ignorance, or
Inattention, of that Editor is exposed, and the Poet defended from the Persecution of his Commentators.”
Kendrick does some prestere-digitation with the tawny Moor’s Christianity, conflating pre-fifteenth-century
Like Neill, Loomba, Vitkus, and E. A. J. Honigmann believe Othello’s nationality and ethnicity to be indeterminate, unknowable, or unimportant. Loomba’s categorization of Othello as “the representation of the idea of the Moor” and Vitkus’s surmise that “Othello is not identified with a specific, historically accurate racial category,” whose identity is derived from a “complex tradition of classical barbarian, Saracen, paynim knight of medieval romance, blackamoor, and Turk”²² may be probable in relation to other Moorish figures, but these assertions do not line up with Shakespeare’s text or how Renaissance and Victorian England as well as Continental Europe viewed Othello. Honigmann’s contention that Othello’s race is ambiguous²³ has shortcomings similar to those of Loomba and Vitkus. To Roderigo’s designation of Othello as “thick-lips” (I.i.66), Honigmann responds that such an insult should not be taken literally. But it should not be dismissed as untrue, for insults seem to be more efficacious when they are true. Additionally, Honigmann ignores Othello’s description of himself as black as well as Brabantio’s characterization of Othello as “sooty” which, according to the OED, is also a descriptive for the devil: “Old Sooty.”²⁴ Brabantio’s immediate contrast of Othello’s “sooty bosom” with “curled [darlings] of our nation” is a comparison of Negro and Caucasian. The combination of Brabantio’s and Roderigo’s epithets along with the

---

²². Loomba, 92; Vitkus, 90.
²⁴. Renaissance England associated black people with the devil. In George Chapman’s The Blind Beggar of Alexandria (1596) Brebitius calls Porus, the Ethiopian king, “a devil.” See The Works of George Chapman, ed. Richard Herne Shepherd (London: Chatto and Windus, Piccadilly, 1889), 21. There are no lines, scenes, or acts in this edition. For ease and convenience, I give the page number instead. Both Iago and Emilia label Othello a devil (I.i.91, V.ii.130-34). Notwithstanding Iago’s racial hatred of Othello and Emilia’s bereavement because of Desdemona’s death, their description of Othello should not be disregarded, because other characters refer to Othello as black.
other textual descriptions of Othello as black, and the characterizations of early moderns of him as a Negro suggest the overwhelming probability that as a character Othello is indeed black. Honigmann also arrives at the conclusion that Othello’s race is ambiguous primarily by dating the play 1601/2 and arguing that “the Moorish ambassador to Queen Elizabeth [from 1601/2] seems right . . . for Othello.” This date, however, presents a major obstacle: the first performance of the play was November 1604. If, indeed, Shakespeare wrote *Othello* during 1601/2, why did he wait until 1604, two to three years later, to stage the play for the first time?

Other critics see Othello as a dark-skinned convert of Islam. Patricia Parker, Karen Newman, and Jonathan Burton all categorize Othello as a dark-skinned convert of Muhammad. Newman sees Othello as an insecure black man who, under Iago’s tutelage, reverts to paganism.²⁵ Parker argues for a splintering of Othello’s Moslem and Christian self, and Burton notes that Othello’s dark skin inscribes him as a Mohammed, describing him as a religious Other, who “in a simultaneous affirmation of his Otherness . . . inhabits the dual role of a ‘malignant and turban’d Turk’ and the redeeming crusader who ‘smote him’” (254).

If, however, we recognize that Othello is meant to be Ethiopian and therefore a Christian prior to his European sojourn, a deeper and more historicized understanding of the character emerges. Ethiopia has been a Christian nation from biblical times. From the Middle Ages to the Renaissance, “white Christian Europe took an emphatic interest in the black Christian state of Ethiopia and its emperor, usually called . . . Prester John” by

---

Europeans, whom they imagined “as a rich and resplendent monarch, exotic but also potentially an engaged ally against intervening powers.”26 In 1400, King Henry IV sent a letter to the “King of Abyssinia” (1380-1411) informing the emperor of his recent trip to Jerusalem where he learned of the emperor’s desire to capture the “Holy Sepulchre from the Saracens.”27 Ethiopians, Italians, Portuguese, and Spaniards traveled to one another’s country. This collaboration had the destruction of the common enemy, the Turks, as one of its objectives, and in 1305, a huge Ethiopian embassy visited Spain with a dispatch from the emperor offering “to help fight the ‘infidels.’”28 To Europeans, Ethiopians were Moors because they were black, not because of religious affiliations.29 Like other Europeans, the English knew of the relationship between Continental Europe and Ethiopia. While the crusading spirit had declined drastically in early modern England, as late as 1511 and perhaps 1536 Englishmen were anxious to join the Crusade.30 In 1694, Gildon (see note 6 above) surmised from one of Othello’s remarks (I.i.21-22) that the Moor might have been “the Son or Nephew of the Emperor of . . . Aethiopia . . . forc’d to leave his Country” and traveled to Europe in a Portuguese ship.31 Gildon’s association of Ethiopia and Portugal has historical significance and textual relevance and indicates that

27. Pankhurst, 71-78.
28. Ibid., 77.
31. It is more feasible that the son or nephew of an Ethiopian emperor would have been captured rather than forced to leave because historically Ethiopia never experienced internal strife but frequently warred with its Muslim neighbors. Also, Europeans, especially the Portuguese, Venetians, and Genoese, were beginning to infiltrate the country. See “Comments on Rymer’s Othello,” *A Norton Critical Edition on Othello* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2004), 231. See, also, “Remarks on the Plays of Shakespeare,” *The Works of Mr. William Shakespeare*, Vol. 7, 1710, ed. Nicolas Rowe (Rpt. NY: AMS Press, 1967), 411-12; Kaplan, 12; Pankhurst, 61-94.
some Englishmen knew of the relationship between Ethiopia and Europe, as England was not cut off from or deaf to news on the Continent. Shakespeare could have known of this religious intercourse between Europe and Ethiopia and of the historical tradition of Ethiopians as soldiers—even in European armies. If this is so, Shakespeare’s decision to make an Ethiopian Othello general of the Venetian army is logical.

In making an Ethiopian the general of a foreign army, Shakespeare had precedent from history and literature. Historically, Ethiopians had a long tradition as soldiers (Snowden 119), some of whom fought in European armies, including Roman and Venetian armies. In 1495, John the Ethiopian served as a Venetian military commander in the war against the French and died in the battle of Farnevo in early July. The Venetian chronicler Marion Sanuto called John a “saracino valentissimo” (“a most valiant black African”). Shakespeare could have known of this story and used it in his play, giving him the precedent for an Ethiopian general in the Venetian army.

As Ethiopian and Christian, Othello’s antipathy toward the Turks is natural, thus validating the Senate’s choice of him as a general. If Othello were indeed a converted Muslim, the Senate would be reckless to entrust the safety of the State to a former enemy to lead its army into battle against this same enemy. To Baldensperger and Gesner Othello is Ethiopian because of his race and religion. According to Baldensperger, “. . . this negro’s Christian faith is attested, not only by his devotional attitude whenever Roman Catholic practice appears in fact . . . or allusion . . . but by a negative argument:

32. Snowden, 119. Besides being familiar with Ethiopia’s Christian history through biblical and other literatures, Shakespeare would have known that no other African nation during his time or before, except Ethiopia, had Christian affiliation.
33. I am indebted to Paul Kaplan’s unpublished paper on Venice for this great find. The Venetian Senate was so filled with gratitude that it “presented to the wife of Giovanni the Moor, now a widow, 72 ducats each year from the treasury and a home forever.” See the final page of this unpublished paper; Marino Sanuto, La spedizione di Carlo VIII in Italia, ed. Rinaldo Fulin (Venice, 1873), 527. See, also, Diaria de bello carolino, ed. and trans. Dorothy M. Schullian (New York, 1967), 142-43.
not for a single moment does Iago hint that Desdemona’s ravisher is, or was, a miscreant—not a bad point.” Not a bad point indeed. Gesner reminds us that Ethiopia “had long been thought of as a stronghold of the [Christian] faith.” Baldensperger also connects the name “Othello” to Ethiopia: it is a possible derivative of the “geographical name OSCELO,” which is contracted to “Oxello”—a word found in Jesuit reports of Ethiopia, which, along with the name “Iago,” carries an Ethiopian coloring. Othello, the Moor of Venice, then, was probably a Christian prior to being in Europe. As a Christian nation, Ethiopians always regarded the Turks as dangerous, as Baldensperger also notes. To critics who claim a Muslim past for Othello, Baldensperger’s observation on Othello’s “Moslem” heritage is incisive and timeless: “Some of Othello’s most ‘moresque’ commentators were forced to suppose that he was made a Catholic convert in Venice. This in the face of Mohammedan impenetrability to what seemed to Moslems, polytheistic Christian ‘paganism.’” In such contexts, Othello’s query “Are we turned Turk and do to ourselves / What heaven forbids the Ottomites?” is not, as Loomba, Burton, and other critics posit, a self-canceling act, a distancing of himself from his former self or kin, but a recall to Christian ideals that have always been familiar to him, for historically Christian Ethiopia considered Islam paganism and frequently had hostile

34. Baldensperger, 7.
35. Gesner, 70. Although Gesner associates Ethiopia’s Christianity with Jesuit missionaries, Ethiopia’s Christianity predates European missionaries’ proselytizing, going back to antiquity.
36. Loomba, however, claims that “Iago’s name recalls the patron saint of Spain, Sant Iago or Saint James, who was known as Santiago Matamoros, St. James the Moor Killer.” Although Loomba’s explanation does not connect Iago to the geography of the play, it captures Iago’s intent toward Othello. Using geographical names to denote a character’s nationality, ethnicity, and/or race is not infrequent in Shakespeare. In Othello itself and The Merchant of Venice, Shakespeare uses the geographical names of Barbary and Morocco to denote the nationality, ethnicity, and race of two characters: the maid of Desdemona’s mother and the prince of Morocco. Compare Vitkus’s belief that “Othello’s name . . . pronounced in Shakespeare’s day with a hard ‘t’ sound for ‘th’ is a compression of ‘O to hell O!’”, 102. See, also, Baldensperger, 9; Loomba, 104.
37. Baldensperger, 7.
relations with its Muslim neighbors Ifat and Adal and occasional animosities with Muslim Egypt, then under Ottoman control.³⁹

For Shakespeare to make Othello a “Moslem” convert “would prove a certain lack of religious psychology on Shakespeare’s part; it would . . . make somewhat base and disgusting Othello’s fixed antipathy for the ‘common enemy’ and the ‘circumcised dog.’”⁴⁰ To Ethiopians, Turks were religious infidels. Othello’s query about turning Turk, then, is a reassertion of Christian ideals, and his suicide is not a self-canceling act, a division of his Muslim half from his Christian half as Patricia Parker⁴¹ and other critics posit, because there is no religious division, no Muslim half within him.

Othello’s Ethiopian origin and Christianity enlarge and solidify his heroic stature. Among the ancients, Ethiopians were reputed to be noble, pious, and brave. Perhaps Shakespeare makes Othello Ethiopian because he was aware of the literary tradition associated with Ethiopians, of their military history, and of their Christian identity. Perhaps, too, he wanted to identify him more closely with the King Hydaspes of the Aethiopica. Hydaspes’s defeat of and subsequent treatment of a conquered people, especially the Persian general, and his relationship to his queen and subjects demonstrate kingly virtues. Like the Polish humanist Stanislaus Warschewiczki, Gesner sees Hydaspes as the classical ideal of nobility and makes correspondences between Hydaspes and Othello: both embody “nobility, greatness in soldiership and leadership, [are] descendant[s] of an ancient line . . . with . . . deep religious consciousness, and a capacity for dignified love.”⁴² The Senate, confident that Othello’s leadership and soldiery will

---

⁴⁰. Baldensperger, 7.
⁴¹. Parker, “Fantasies of ‘Race’ and ‘Gender,’” 98.
⁴². Gesner, 74.
save Venice from the Turks, entrusts the defense of the nation to him. His rebuff of Iago’s initial slander of Desdemona, noting that her conviviality is nothing but a generous heart, testifies to a capacity for dignified love (III.iii.183-186), and his deep religious beliefs attest to his religious consciousness. The generous, great-hearted, and noble-minded Othello of Iago’s, Cassio’s, and Desdemona’s descriptions is more credible if he is an Ethiopian rather than any other black African in Renaissance Venice because of the historical record of Ethiopians in the Venetian army and the shared religious faith of both nations. These ascriptions strengthen the heroic nature of Othello and establish a correspondence between him and Hydaspes while negating or mooting critical opinions such as the nineteenth-century Romantic critic August Wilhelm Schegel’s charge that Othello’s tempered “inherent inclination to fierceness and sensuality reverts to his savage nature” when Iago arouses the Moor’s jealousy and the twentieth-century scholar Karen Newman’s claim of Othello’s recidivism to pagan savagery.43

II.

Othello: A Play in the Heliodoran Tradition

Criticism of Othello has focused on the play as a drama depicting the struggle between good and evil, dealing with love, racism, or language as correlative to character.44 Rarely has scholarship treated it as an adventure drama: a play whose

44. E.K. Chambers, Robert G. Hunter, and Bernard Spivak trace the struggle between good and evil for the protagonist’s soul. Derek Traversi claims that the play deals with the degradation of physical love into sensuality. Susan Synder argues for the paradox of love: the co-dependence of two different people who may never know each other. Eldred Jones examines the ways Moors are frequently portrayed in performative literature, either as black-skinned villains or tawny rulers capable of noble and ignoble deeds. Jane Donawerth focuses on the play’s language. G. Wilson Knight and Wolfgang Clemens concentrate on Othello’s language and the correspondences between characters and speech.
protagonists are involved in novel, risky, unexpected, and often dangerous and exciting events in the Mediterranean. Recently, however, scholars like Jean E. Howard, Vitkus, Burton, Bartels, Loomba, and others have become interested in a set of plays they term “Mediterranean adventure drama.” Burton also terms these plays “Turkish plays.” Both he and Vitkus argue for Othello as a reinscribed barbarian. Vitkus makes Othello’s Muslim past responsible for his reinscription. Burton, however, contends that Othello’s dark skin inscribes him as a “Mahumetan,” regardless of past religious affiliation. I have argued in chapters 1 and 2 that dark skin can also signify civility and enlightenment and white skin incivility and ignorance. A similar argument can be made for Othello. As I have shown, Othello’s dark skin is not a signifier of paganism, barbarity, or a marker of religious difference because “Moor” can easily denote skin color, enlightenment, and national identity, which is the probability in Othello’s case. My argument in this chapter subsumes those racial, national, and religious issues: it engages the crosscultural and transracial romance between the Moor Othello, an African man, and the Venetian Desdemona, a European woman, both of whom are intelligent and courageous. However, my main aim in this section is to examine how Othello may be read as a drama in the Heliodoran tradition.

Shipwrecks, land and/or sea battles, chastity, wanderings, religion, nationalism, and racially and culturally mixed romances and marriages are characteristic of the adventure genre as well as the stage tradition of Mediterranean plays. As we have seen, most of these characteristics can be traced to the Greek novel, in particular to Heliodorus’s Aethiopica. Othello, as Howard also notes, belongs to this Mediterranean

45. Vitkus, 103-06; Burton, 252-54.
tradition. If we see *Othello* with its Mediterranean setting, maritime drama, chaste protagonists, elopement, and the romantic union of its protagonists as an adventure drama in the Heliodoran tradition, then some of the ambiguities that beset critical interpretations of the play will disappear, such as the near-ubiquitous charges of Othello’s recidivism to paganism and savagery, Desdemona’s subservience, Othello’s sensuality, and Peter Stallybrass’s intimation that Desdemona’s elopement could taint her chastity. By emphasizing the hero’s journey from Africa to Europe, his experience with Venetian society through his generalship and marriage to a noblewoman, a heroine who risks parental and societal disapproval for love, and the hero’s value of chastity, I analyze how *Othello* may be seen as an adventure drama in the Heliodoran tradition in this section.

*Othello* is the only play in the English Mediterranean adventure tradition to invert the encounter between its male and female protagonists and to feature a black aristocratic hero. In English Mediterranean adventure plays, the hero is almost always a white commoner and occasionally a gentleman—but never royalty. A derivative of the Heliodoran tradition, English Mediterranean adventure dramas frequently modify the social status of the Heliodoran male protagonist by making a non-aristocratic European male travel to the Mediterranean and fall in love with a native, aristocratic woman of color or by allowing the hero to engage in notable actions in the Mediterranean that enable him to rise above his station. In Philip Massinger’s *The Renegado* (1623/4), for

---

48. Although *The Blind Beggar of Alexandria* has traces of the Heliodoran tradition, Porus is not the hero or a wanderer.
example, the Italian gentleman Vitelli travels to Turkey and falls in love with the Turkish princess, Donusa. *The Battle of Alcazar* and *The Famous History of Captain Stukeley* feature a commoner, Stukeley, engaged in notable actions in distant lands\(^{49}\) in an effort to improve his social status. Although the historical Stukeley was an impoverished gentleman, the plays do not describe him as such. In *Othello*, Shakespeare reverses the English tradition of aristocrat/commoner and European male/African female binaries by making Othello, an African prince, go to the Mediterranean where he meets a native aristocratic Venetian girl, Desdemona, and they fall in love.

In “Gender on the Periphery,” Howard notes that “*Othello* is in the tradition of the adventure plays, which informed Shakespeare’s creation of *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Pericles* as well.” Although *Othello* “reverses the dynamics of most adventure drama, [it] is thoroughly conversant with them”:

> In most such plays an English hero goes to the Mediterranean, interacts with the alien peoples he encounters there, and is threatened by that encounter, often through contact with a foreign woman. In *Othello*, a . . . Moorish hero comes to the other side of the Mediterranean, to Venice, and is eventually undone by this experience, in part through his encounter with the white daughter of a Venetian senator.\(^{50}\)

*Othello’s* conversance with other English adventure drama lies in the hero’s Mediterranean experiences: his adventures and romantic contact with a native woman of different cultural and racial background. Although Howard points out that adventure

\(^{49}\) Howard, “Gender on the Periphery,” 346.

\(^{50}\) Ibid., 359.
plays were part of a stage inheritance for Shakespeare,⁵¹ she makes no connection to Greek romances, including Heliodorus’s *Aethiopica*. While Mediterranean setting and adventures are standard practices in Greek novels, the transcultural and crossracial romance between the hero and the heroine is strictly Heliodorus’s. Shakespeare also inherited his hero and heroine’s mixed cultural and perhaps racial romance from Cinthio, but the pair’s elopement, sexual innocence, grief of the heroine’s father on losing his daughter, the wanderings of the hero, and the pair’s aristocratic status are Heliodorus’s, not Cinthio’s. In Cinthio, the social status of the Moor and Desdemona is not a focal point; neither is the heroine as a desiring subject, as they are in Shakespeare and his Greek source. In the *Aethiopica*, both Charicleia and Theagenes desire each other the moment they meet—so, too, in *Othello*: the protagonists simultaneously desire each other.

In both works, the simultaneous desires of the protagonists play out in a protracted manner. Despite the moment of enchantment when Theagenes and Charicleia know they are destined for each other, neither one speaks to the other. Instead, both convey their desire for the other through an intermediary. To Calasiris, Theagenes confesses his love for Charicleia, who, sick from love, resorts to her bed. Concerned for her daughter’s well being, Charicles seeks the help of Calasiris, who, privy to the secret longing of both young lovers, assures each of the other’s love. Shakespeare retains the protracted moment in his text, but modifies the meeting place and the manner in which his protagonists confess their love to each other. *Othello*’s spellbinding narratives of captivity, enslavement, and near death “scapes” that he experiences also become the vicarious sufferings of Desdemona. Overcome with pity and passion, she lets drop a hint

⁵¹. Ibid.
of her emotional feelings: “. . . she wished / That heaven had made her such a man” (I.iii.162-63). And Othello, hoping for such a hint, speaks. Remarking on the equality, social and other, between Greek lovers, David Konstan notes that Greek romances revolutionized the novel by making the lovers social, intellectual, and emotional equals, especially in their devotion to each other.\(^ {52} \) Doody adds that usually the protagonists’ noble status is unknown to at least one of them until a later time.\(^ {53} \) In *Othello*, we see the intellectual and emotional equality of Desdemona and Othello. Each has the capacity to stand up for her or his belief, to find solutions to their romantic and other problems, and to love as deeply as the other. Both of them are of noble birth. Shakespeare, however, keeps elements of the noble status unknown by making Othello’s royal pedigree a secret to the Venetian populace (I.i.21-22) and, one can surmise, to Desdemona until perhaps some time shortly before the marriage.

Othello is a wanderer in the Heliodoran tradition and an outsider in the country of his beloved, as several critics have noted. In Charles Marowitz’s view, Othello “is an outsider who pretends he isn’t . . .”\(^ {54} \) And Greenblatt concludes that Othello must embrace the norms of another culture because he has lost his own origin and identity.\(^ {55} \) Lost origin and identity, and outsider status, however, are integral to the hero in the Heliodoran tradition. Theagenes, the prototypical Mediterranean adventurer, loses his origin and identity by crossing geographical, religious, racial, and cultural boundaries. His investiture in the gymnosophist religion signals his transformation from Greek prince to Ethiopian king through his imminent marriage to the Ethiopian princess, Charicleia.

\(^ {52} \) Quoted by Doody, 36.
\(^ {53} \) Ibid, 35-36.
\(^ {55} \) Greenblatt, 245.
Similarly, Othello is no longer a mysterious African national and not fully a Venetian, either. However, he, like the other heroes in the Heliodoran tradition, must embrace the cultural norms of the country of his beloved. As wanderers and outsiders, protagonists in the Mediterranean adventure tradition are individuals, Howard reminds us, who cross not only “natural boundaries but religious and racial ones, as well.”\(^\text{56}\) In Robert Daborne’s *A Christian Turned Turk* (1612), the Englishman John Ward crosses these boundaries by going to Tunis, falling in love with Vaoda, converting to Islam,\(^\text{57}\) and marrying her. Daborne’s play, like Massinger’s *Renegado*, also functions as a recuperative locus for European, especially English, masculinity (Burton 30-32) and as an exposé for the Mediterranean as a site of religious contestation in English adventure dramas. In these plays, English playwrights deploy religion as a tool of conflict by assigning the hero and heroine different religious beliefs. Shakespeare, however, follows Heliodorus in making the Mediterranean a place where boundaries frequently disappear for lovers, instead of a site for religious conflicts. While Shakespeare maintains the hero’s wanderings and outsider status through geographical, cultural, and racial crossings, he, however, makes his protagonists share the same religious persuasion, as Heliodorus does in the *Aethiopica*, thereby negating the tension that usually accompanies religious crossings in English Mediterranean adventure drama.

Roderigo’s description of Othello as “an extravagant and wheeling stranger / Of here and every where” (I.ii.135-36) is the first textual identification that Othello is a wanderer and an outsider in Venice. Iago seconds Roderigo’s observation of Othello by labeling the general “an erring barbarian” (II.i.355-56). Etymologically, “extravagant”

---

56. Howard, 351.
57. Ward does not actually convert to Islam. As Jonathan Burton explains, no sincere conversion to Islam exists in the canon. Instead, Ward only acts the apostate to preserve his Christianity (30-32).
and “erring” are related. “Extravagant,” from the Latin verb “extrāvagārī” (extrā=outside + vagārī=to wander) means “wandering out of bound.” “Erring,” from the Latin verb “errare,” means “to wander.” *The Riverside Shakespeare* glosses Roderigo’s description of Othello as “. . . literally, wandering beyond his due limits.” It also glosses “wheeling” as “roving” (1205, n.136). Roderigo’s grouping of “wheeling” and “stranger” with “extravagant,” along with Iago’s “erring barbarian” stress Othello’s wandering and outsider status and make Roderigo’s statement especially pointed, given Brabantio’s denial of his suit to Desdemona, causing the lovesick Roderigo to see Othello’s marriage as nationally and racially transgressive--a “wandering beyond . . . due limit.” To Roderigo and Iago, Othello has no community or homeland of his own. Brabantio’s adamant opposition to Othello as a son-in-law along with his charges of witchcraft, “foul charms,” and enumeration of Othello’s “defects” also register Othello’s outsider status. According to Brabantio’s logic, Desdemona could not have married the sooty-bosomed Othello voluntarily because she has spurned the “wealthy curled [darlings] of our nation” (I.ii.65-70). Iago’s discourse on the “pranks” of Venetian women also points to Othello’s outsider status (III.iii.201-204): the inference is that culturally Othello the outsider does not understand the ways of Venetian women, including Desdemona’s, for Venetian women cuckold their husbands and zealously conceal their “pranks,” as Desdemona conceals her marriage from her father and, so, must be concealing her “affair” with Cassio from Othello.

In the *Aethiopica* and plays that draw on it, Mediterranean marriages are between European men and African women: generally a white male goes to the Mediterranean, encounters an African woman, forms a romantic union with her, and relinquishes
everything for her love. The relationship between Theagenes and Charicleia, Eustanius and Lillia Guida, and Antony and Cleopatra, as I have argued, exemplifies the traditional racial and national make-up of couples in the Heliodoran or Mediterranean adventure drama. While English dramatists hold on to the mixed race tradition, they, nonetheless, modify it so that Mediterranean romance becomes a “convention . . . related to the expansion of property through the subjugation of a non-Christian female body to that of a [white] Christian male,” as Hall explains. 58 In other words, European males of lower social order can improve their rank by marrying upperclass native females and inheriting their property or becoming executor of their patrimony. Besides reversing the dynamics of English Mediterranean plays, Othello also complicates and vexes the issues by making the female relinquish all and by subjugating a white European female body to a black African male body. While the subjugation of a black female body to that of a white male is acceptable, the reverse is censured in English Renaissance drama. The majority of Mediterranean plays--The Fair Maide of the West and The Merchant of Venice, for example--scrupulously avoids subjugating a white female body to that of a black male. Plays like The Tempest and The Blind Beggar of Alexandria explicitly criticize such subjugation. In The Tempest, Sebastian berates Alonzo for enforcing the marriage of Claribel to the Tunisian king (II.i.125-135), although the marriage is politically pragmatic: preventing war between Tunis and Naples by forming political and dynastic alliances. Similarly, in The Blind Beggar of Alexandria King Brebritius chastises Elimine for choosing the Ethiopian king as a husband: “Out on thee, foolish woman,

58. Hall, 153.
thou hast chose a devil!” (21). In *Othello*, the subjection of Desdemona’s white body to Othello’s black body sparks condemnation throughout all levels of Venetian society. Brabantio’s disinheritance of Desdemona registers his complete disapproval of the marriage and ensures that no patrilineal property passes to Othello.

*Othello* deals with a crosscultural and transracial romance of its protagonists, which also characterizes the Heliodoran tradition. Although Cinthio’s story also deals with the diverse cultural background of his protagonists, we are not sure if the story is racially diverse as well, for Cinthio’s Moor could be coded by religion, color, or both. Additionally, his heroine experiences no animosity to marriage. In fact, she is a widow. In the *Aethiopica*, Charicleia and Theagenes are of different racial and cultural backgrounds. Charicleia, however, is a maiden. Like Heliodorus, Shakespeare makes his heroine a maiden. Both heroines, known for their antipathy to marriage according to their fathers’ accounts, recognize the transcendence of their love and are receptive to wedlock only upon meeting Theagenes and Othello. Previously, Charicleia finds a romantic union with Alcamenes odious, and Desdemona ignores Roderigo, rejecting even the “wealthy curled (darlings) of [the] nation.” Now they elope rather than heed the objections of their fathers and live without their beloved or marry others. In the case of Desdemona and Othello’s secret marriage, G. G. Gervinus, and J. A. Heraud fault both

---


60. Although Charicleia spends a good deal of time growing up in Athens and is phenotypically white, the text consistently reinforces her Ethiopian heritage and returns her to her country.

61. Charicles remarks that Charicleia “rejects matrimony and insists on a virgin life. . . . Neither entreaties nor promises. . . can move her” (63). In a similar manner, Brabantio observes that Desdemona is “So opposite to marriage that she shunn’d / The wealthy curled [darlings] of our nations . . .” (I.ii.56-58). Although Brabantio speaks in anger, his statement should not be dismissed as untrue or exaggerated. Despite unanimous agreement on Desdemona’s beauty and her breeding, we see no prospective lovers, no romantic attention from any man--except the rejected and lovesick Roderigo--lending support to Brabantio’s assertion.
protagonists for filial disrespect and impiety. However, it is difficult to imagine Brabantio consenting to Othello and Desdemona’s union. Brabantio’s own comments certainly imply that if he had known of Desdemona’s feeling for Othello, he would have tried to marry her to another man (I.ii.176), a move Desdemona would certainly have opposed.

One of the characteristics of the heroine in the Helidoran tradition is the right to choose her own mate, a prerogative Desdemona exercises by choosing Othello—not however, without consequences. Remarking on the equality of the lovers’ spirits and minds, Bradley writes that “[w]hen Desdemona’s soul came in sight of the noblest soul on earth, she made nothing of the shrinking of her senses, but followed her soul until her senses took with it . . . .”63 “[T]he shrinking of senses” and similar sentiments are Bradley’s, Brabantio’s, Iago’s, and several critics’ assertions, not Desdemona’s or Shakespeare’s, for, as Elaine L. Robinson reminds us, “Shakespeare does not want us to find it monstrous that Desdemona loves a black man, and does not think we should find it so. It would defeat his purpose in writing the play if we found it monstrous that Desdemona loved coal-black Othello.”64 Because the Mediterranean is a site where cultural and racial boundaries frequently dissolve and Othello is in the tradition of the Aethiopica, in which heroes and heroine of diverse cultural and racial backgrounds encounter one another in the Mediterranean and fall in love, it becomes less improbable for the heroine to find the hero unsuitable.

Desdemona’s wit, bravery, resourcefulness, and chastity put her in the tradition of a Heliodoran heroine. Although many critics underestimate her wit, will, and bravery, *Othello* is replete with examples of them. In the Senate, she divines the conflict between her father and husband and settles it with tact and aplomb:

My noble father,

I do perceive here a divided duty:

To you I am bound for life and education;

My life and education both do learn me

How to respect you: you are the lord of duty;

I am hitherto your daughter. (I.iii.180-85)

Her answer also recognizes her husband’s role, but to remind her father of the duties of a wife, including hers, she draws on his own experience:

. . . here’s my husband;

And so much duty as my mother show’d

To you, preferring you before her father,

So much I challenge that I may profess

Due to the Moor, my lord. (I.iii.185-89)

Such a response moots any argument Brabantio could have had. Desdemona’s acknowledgment of the importance of both men in her life but with preference to her husband indicates courage and intelligence. For a daughter to oppose a father, especially in public, requires courage. It also takes great intelligence to nullify his argument and to do so with respect while allowing him to maintain his dignity and preserving that of her husband. When Charicleia opposes both her adoptive and biological fathers’ choice of
husbands for her, she does so more in the form of passive resistance than active defiance: she refuses to see the man Charicles wants her to marry and pleads with Persinna to stop Hydaspes from sacrificing Theagenes. Desdemona is active and vocal in her resistance. It bears pointing out that it is Desdemona’s speech, not Othello’s, that settles the dispute.

Despite Desdemona’s dexterity in handling the situation and standing up to her father in public, Allardyce Nicoll dismisses her as unintelligent, mentally deficient, passive, and unable to face the consequence of telling the truth. To see Desdemona in this light is a fundamental misunderstanding of her character and the tradition of which she is a part. Heroines in the Heliodoran tradition are not passive, weak-willed, or unintelligent. A passive or weak-minded female could not have opposed her father, or foreseen and accepted the estrangement that results from her disagreement with him. In a way that neither Brabantio nor Othello does, Desdemona articulates why she will not return to her father’s home and how her constant presence in his home would result in his distemper by re-opening the emotional wounds of losing her to a husband whom he vehemently disapproves. Her counter-proposal to accompany her husband to Cyprus solves several problems: finding a home suitable to her status within such a short time, not separating the newly-weds, and not interfering with or suspending consummation of the marriage. Desdemona is not the aggressive or ruthless individual like Queen

66. T. G. A. Nelson and Charles Haines claim that Othello and Desdemona’s marriage is unconsummated. See “Othello’s Unconsummated Marriage,” Essays in Criticism 33 (1987): 1-18. Although the possibility of unconsummation could occur in Venice, in Cyprus that possibility does not exist, for the text shows otherwise. Othello talks about not finding Cassio’s kisses on Desdemona’s lips and dying rather than keep a corner in the thing he loves for another’s use (III.iii.331 & 270-73). Like “kisses,” “things” is a double-entendre. For additional evidence regarding the consummation of the marriage, see Lynda Boose’s brilliant and compelling argument on the symbolism of the handkerchief.
Margaret, Goneril, or Regan, but she is, in all the possible meanings of Othello’s encomium, a “fair warrior.”

Among the most notable example of Desdemona’s courage as a heroine in the Heliodoran manner is her public declaration of her love for Othello. Brabantio charges that Desdemona could not love Othello because such a love would pervert nature:

> To fall in love with what she fear’d to look on!
> Is a judgment maim’d, and most imperfect,
> That will confess perfection so could err
> Against all rules of nature . . . (I.iii.98-101)

Although Desdemona is absent when Brabantio makes these charges, her declaration of love for Othello is a direct negation of her father’s charges:

> That I love the Moor to live with him,
> My downright violence and storms of fortunes
> May trumpet to the world. My heart’s subdu’d
> Even to the very quality of my lord . . . (I.iii.248-51).

Undaunted by the sea of men, Desdemona firmly yet modestly tells her father that she loves Othello. Although Shakespeare prepares us for the courage of his heroine from the start of the play, we are awed by her fearlessness and intelligence when we finally meet her. Her refutation of her father’s charges fills us with admiration for her and an appreciation of her love for Othello: noble, pure, and unspotted with the color of racial prejudice. Frank Kermode notes that the marriage, “founded upon [Desdemona’s] just understanding of [Othello’s] virtues, is a triumph over appearances; it is grounded in reality and independent of such accidents as color or the easy lusts of the flesh. It is more
like the love of Adam and Eve before than after the Fall” (1200), or, more pertinently, like the love of Theagenes and Charicleia.

Desdemona’s admission that she “saw Othello’s visage in his mind” (I.iii.250-51) validates Kermode’s observation and is, in fact, a gentle rebuke and corrective to her father’s foreshortened vision. Although the admission can be twisted to support Brabantio’s charge that “she fear’d to look on” Othello, which makes Martin Orkin and other critics associate Desdemona with racism,67 the speech is a complete repudiation of this charge. Aware of her father’s and others’ view of her marriage to Othello, Desdemona puts forth the ancient concept of the mind as the measure of the man to challenge the notion of race or skin color as determinative and to invite the all-white male senate to move beyond the complacency of prejudicial limitations and see Othello. Curtis Brown Watson’s observation on the Renaissance hierarchy of value helps give us a context for Desdemona’s statement: “If a choice had to be made between the exterior beauty of the body and the inner beauty of the mind and soul, it was immediately made.”68 Desdemona has made the choice and articulates the concept, which the duke seems to grasp, for he tells Brabantio, “[Y]our son-in-law is far more fair than black” (I.iii.291)—even if his response is self-serving and is still mired in the vocabulary, though not necessarily the spirit, of racial bigotry. Shakespeare uses Desdemona’s Senate speech to validate publicly the relationship between his protagonists, to show the remarkable courage of his heroine, and to remind us that Desdemona is a heroine in the Heliodoran tradition.

67. Martin Orkin writes that Desdemona “refers to or draws upon racist discourse” and that “Desdemona herself [possibly] incorporates in her ‘revolt’ an element of racism.” But this is a misunderstanding of her discourse. See “Othello and ‘The Plain Face’ of Racism,” Shakespeare Quarterly 38, no. 2 (Summer 1987): 170, 175.
Desdemona’s speeches in the Senate serve as notice of her intelligence, independence, and being “half the wooer” (I.i.176) of a partnership that can be characterized as in the Heliodoran tradition. Generally, female characters in early modern dramas wait to be desired, keeping their romantic feelings sealed until then. However, heroines in the Heliodoran tradition operate at higher levels of intellect and independence than do traditional Renaissance heroines, giving these heroines the freedom of desiring subjects and of expressing those feelings as they see fit. Desdemona does not rely on Othello to explain to the Senate how his separation from her will affect her. Instead, she forthrightly tells the all-male Senate how she will be affected:

... if I be left behind
A moth of peace...
The rites for why I love him are bereft of me,
And I a heavy interim shall support
By his dear absence. Let me go with him.

(I.iii.255-259)

Desdemona’s claim to marital rites is self-explanatory, and her language--“heavy interim”--is layered. Besides the meaning of a difficult period or “a temporary or provisional arrangement” that is challenging (3.b.), “heavy interim” has ecclesiastical undertones through “marital rites,” giving women the sacred right to claim sexual intercourse from their husbands. Desdemona’s assertion that any provisional arrangement made for her to adjust to the denial of the fruits of marriage will be heavy
for her to bear is a claim for her marital right and an explanation of the difficulty denial
will cause.69

Desdemona’s candor about and refusal to accept separation from Othello
contradicts critics such as Gayle Greene, who argue that Desdemona is submissive,
passive, and compliant, which make her complicit in her own destruction. Such
passivity, Greene charges, renders Desdemona incapable or unable to understand the evil
Othello attributes to her and to challenge it.70 However, Evelyn Gajowski shows
otherwise: comparing Desdemona to Mariana in Measure for Measure, whose lack of
self makes her vulnerable to exploitation, Gajowski notes that Shakespeare does not
depict Desdemona in this way. When “Othello strikes her, she stoutly responds, ‘I have
not deserved this,’” and “resolutely defends herself from the moment she comprehends
[Othello’s] accusations of [strumpetry] until she dies”71 (IV.i.240, IV.ii.81-85, V.ii.48-61).
Like Brabantio, Greene confuses Desdemona’s quietness with passivity and
stillness. Desdemona’s response to Othello’s striking her is a defense. Using the only
weapon—speech—at her disposal, she makes Othello aware of the double wrong he has
inflicted upon her. Neither is she a blind adherent to patriarchy, as Greene and others
imagine. When necessary and appropriate, Desdemona also challenges masculine
notions of women’s role in regard to men’s, as Valerie Wayne demonstrates. Regarding
Iago’s slander of women, Desdemona advises Emilia not to “learn” from Iago, although

69. It is possible that Desdemona furthers the burden of being denied her marital rights by using the words
“heavy” and “support” to image herself as a caryatid, the “female figure used as a column to support an
entablature” (OED); caryatids were also captives and slaves of the Greeks. Desdemona’s imagery projects
the onerous burden of captivity and servitude that Othello’s absence will impose on her.
70. Gayle Greene, “‘This That You Call Love’: Sexual and Social Tragedy in Othello,” Journal of
he is her husband.72 “As a woman,” Robinson writes, Desdemona “is unique in taking [these] position[s]. She has a mind of her own . . . and is not limited by the prescribed boundaries of her sex or paternity.”73

Although Robinson does not categorize Desdemona as a heroine in the Greek mold, the characteristics and actions she attributes to her are also those associated with the archetypical Greek heroine, Charicleia. When we recall the courage of both women,74 then the Desdemona whom Brabantio describes as “a maiden, never bold, / Of spirit so still and quiet that her motion / Blush’d at herself” is an illusion, a projection, for like her prototype Charicleia, Desdemona defies the “never bold” and “still” spirit by choosing and marrying her mate despite societal disapprobation. While Shakespeare does not provide details of his protagonists’ elopement as Heliodorus does with his, he, like Heliodorus, gives us detailed and dramatic glimpses of how the courtship began and progressed and the effects of the elopement on the household and city: both elopements throw the households and cities into chaos and uproar, with both fathers raising arms and kinsmen to apprehend their offending sons-in-law. In Othello, Shakespeare deepens the chaos and uproar by making Brabantio’s search for Othello coincide with the State’s because of the terror the Turks pose in their threat to Venice. With torches ablaze and a multitude of kinsmen and servants who brandish glittering swords, Brabantio orders the arrest of Othello while pelting him with epithets, including “thief” and seducer. However, we learn from Othello that he is neither a thief nor a seducer, for Desdemona made the first overture (I.iii.159-161). Only then did Othello reciprocate: “Upon this hint

73. Robinson, 107.
74. I am not suggesting that all brave heroines in early modern plays draw on Charicleia. Rather, I am arguing that those who are desiring subjects and in the Heliodoran tradition do.
I spake” (I.iii.166). As Robinson puts it, “. . . it was Desdemona who came, saw, and conquered.”

To the Renaissance, chastity was woman’s primary, if not her only, virtue. Because of its connection to male governance, women’s sexuality became the concern of society. Accordingly, women were bombarded with various forms of literature that stress the need for them to shun sexual defilement. In the drama of the period, we see this imbalance between male and female sexual requirement and behavior. Almost all Renaissance dramatic literatures stage female infidelity as heinous but male adultery as venial. In A Woman Killed With Kindness, Frankford banishes his adulterous wife Anne, who eventually dies. However, her seducer, Wendoll, only loses Frankford’s friendship. Shakespeare, in keeping with the Heliodoran tradition, departs from this theatrical and cultural norm by investing his hero and heroine with an equal sense of chastity, thus holding them equally accountable sexually. In these concluding pages, I examine the importance of chastity to Othello and Desdemona and the difference and similarity in their relationship to the Heliodoran tradition.

The love between Theagenes and Charicleia helped to popularize the importance of chastity on the early modern stage. Renaissance writers emulated the constancy of Charicleia in their female protagonists’ sexual conduct. In the six Continental plays that derive directly from the Aethiopica, the heroes and heroines are equally chaste. While Heliodorus invests Charicleia with other positive traits beside chastity, English Renaissance writers invariably associate her with chastity to the exclusion of the others. They also ignore Theagenes’s chastity. However, in Othello, Shakespeare continues the Heliodoran tradition by making chastity equally important to Othello and Desdemona.

75. Robinson, 105.
All the characters, except Iago, acknowledge Desdemona’s chastity. When Iago tries to smirch her by suggesting that she is of easy virtue, both Roderigo and Cassio reject Iago’s malicious suggestions—the latter even when thoroughly drunk. Roderigo states incredulously, “I cannot believe that of her, she’s full of the most blessed condition” (II.i.250). Similarly, Cassio dismisses Iago’s equally rank notion that Desdemona is a tease (II.iii.15-28). To Othello’s false accusations, Desdemona reminds him of her Christian virtue and faithfulness to him: “. . . I am a Christian / If to preserve this vessel for my lord / From any other foul unlawful touch” (IV.ii.82-85). Desdemona’s demand that Othello send for Cassio to speak truth attests to her purity, a fact Othello remembers too late.

Othello, like Theagenes, is a chaste man. However, Othello’s chastity is not as obvious to a twentieth- or twenty-first century audience, as it was to an early modern audience. The designation of Othello as honest and “honorable” (V.ii.293-95) is an indicator of his sexual innocence, as well as his rectitude. In Act V, Othello describes himself as “honorable” and tells us that what he did was for the sake of “honor.” Although Othello invokes the popular Renaissance meanings associated with masculinity, he underpins them with the sexual meaning as well. We have seen that the definitions of “honor” and “honest” in the OED include “chastity.” According to Watson Brown, “Honor for the Renaissance was the same as honesty,” and both words were sometimes used as synonymous with integrity; “honesty had both its present meaning and the more inclusive one of honor and moral rectitude[,]” including sexual purity—meanings Shakespeare invokes in other plays as well as in Othello.

76. Although there are several designations of Iago as honest, these are dramatic ironies to expose Iago.
In *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, for example, Falstaff is bent on cuckolding the husbands, but the wives are equally bent on making a laughingstock of Sir John, who, in one of his visits to Mrs. Ford, learns that Mr. Ford is “hard by” (IV.ii.40) and all means of escape seem impossible. As the women devise Falstaff’s escape, Mrs. Ford expostulates, “Hang him, dishonest varlet! we cannot misuse [him] enough. / . . . / Wives may be merry, and yet honest too” (IV.ii.102-5). The antonyms, “dishonest” and “honest,” capture the sexual interplay between Falstaff and the wives. Despite the absurdities and weaknesses of Falstaff, which are stressed throughout the play, his desire to have sexual intercourse with other men’s wives, however, still make him dishonest. Because the wives have no intention of indulging Sir John’s sexual desire but to compound his absurdities and make him a public laughingstock, they are honest. In *The Tempest*, Prospero claims to enslave Caliban after the latter sought to “violate the honor of” Miranda (I.ii.350). Prospero’s treatment of Caliban has generated fiery disagreements, with some critics charging him with the familiar yarn of the natives’ lust for white women as a cover for imperialist and colonialist aggression. Others see Caliban’s enslavement as just punishment for the attempted rape. Caliban, however, freely admits to the misdeed: “. . . would’t had been done! / Thou didst prevent me; I had peopled else / This isle with Calibans” (I.ii.349-51). Notwithstanding the controversy among scholars, both Caliban and Prospero agree on the sexual definition of “honor,” for Caliban’s response shows that he understands and accepts Prospero’s meaning.

In *Othello*, Shakespeare captures and conflates the sexual meanings of “honest” and “honor” in Desdemona. Othello’s ambivalent assertion--“I think my wife be honest, and I think she is not” (III.iii.384)--and his testy interrogative--“She is protectress of her
honor. May she give that?” (IV.i.14-15)—capture the sexual meanings of both words. Generally, “honor” and “honest” as signifying chastity apply to women; however, they can also apply to men. Mrs. Ford describes Falstaff as dishonest to denote his lack of chastity. Othello’s description of himself as honorable invokes his chastity. It is because he himself is honest that he finds Desdemona’s “infidelity” so odious, which prompts his expostulation of the intermingling of the pure and the impure: “. . . there where I have garnered up my heart / . . . to be discarded then / Or keep it as a cistern for foul toads / To knot and gender in” (IV.ii.56-61). The disgust that Othello expresses in this passage serves as notification to the sexual purity he demands of himself and his beloved.

Othello’s reaction to Desdemona’s alleged adultery also signals his innocence and the importance of chastity to him. If Othello were indeed sexually experienced, then Desdemona’s supposed infidelity would quite probably have been less traumatic to him, for his experience would have lessoned him about the “pranks” of men and women, thus softening the blow. As Iago declares, a “cuckold lives in bliss / Who, certain of his fate, loves not his wronger” (3.3.171-72). In other words, experienced men keep their peace of mind because they do not expect fidelity from women and tailor their affections accordingly. That Othello lacks this experience becomes apparent in his lamentation (III.iii.270-73), obsession with Desdemona’s sexuality, and erratic behavior—changes so profound that they prompt Desdemona to exclaim that her “lord is not himself” (III.iv.124-25). Othello’s transformation has at its core the issue of chastity. Believing that Desdemona has betrayed him and the values they share, Othello murders her. Although there is critical consensus that Othello kills Desdemona because of jealousy, it
is imperative to realize that he murders her because of his belief in her sexual betrayal (V.i.6)—the nullification of chastity.

Some critics see Othello as sexually repressed; others see him as sexually experienced, citing as proof his cry, “O curse of marriage! / That we can call these delicate creatures ours, / And not their appetites!” (III.iii.268-270). Despite Neill’s and Denton J. Snider’s hypotheses of illicit sexual contact between Othello and Emilia, there is no credible textual support or suggestion of any sexual union between Othello and any woman except Desdemona. Such hypotheses arise from Iago’s own admittedly dubious statement that Othello has cuckolded him and the possible intermingling of Othello’s and Emilia’s blood on the bed, resulting from Emilia’s request that her body be placed on the bed beside Desdemona’s. But Iago also suspects Cassio of wearing “my night cap” and the text is clear that Iago’s unsubstantiated pronouncements lack credibility. Also, Emilia’s request to be placed beside Desdemona is not necessarily a stage direction and might have been ignored, as Neill himself observes. Besides, reading an adulterous relation into the comingling of Othello’s and Emilia’s blood on the bed seems an overreach, since Desdemona is also on the bed and since the most efficient and readymade way to remove dead bodies from the stage is to pile them on a bed that will then be “hid” with curtains. Othello’s talk about women’s sexual insatiety does not necessarily mean that he himself is sexually experienced, as Allardyce Nicoll contends.

78. See, for example, Heilman, Magic in the Web: Action and Language in Othello 1(Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1979), 75; Leo Kirschebaum, “The Modern Othello,” English Literary History 11, No. 4 (December 1944): 290-91.
The wording of his cry, I want to suggest, is drawn from the common language of betrayed husbands.

The notion of women and their bodies as the property of men was a Renaissance commonplace. “The wife’s body,” according to Katherine Henderson and Barbara McManus, “was her husband’s; it was not legally hers to give to another.” As we saw in Act IV, scene i, Othello impatiently demands if Desdemona has the right to give her body to another. Henderson and McManus along with Valerie Wayne also show that Renaissance men’s complaint and slander of women drew on pre-existing language, language already in the public sphere, which described women “as lustful, deceitful, shrewish, domineering, extravagant, proud, vain, and selfish.” In Act II, scene i, Iago describes women as “. . . pictures out [a’doors], / Bells in your parlors, wildcats in your kitchens, / Saints in your injuries, devils being offended, / Players in your huswifery, and huswives in your beds” (109-15). The descriptions Henderson and McManus enumerate permeate Iago’s charges against women. Wayne points out that Iago’s slander of women relies on “stock phrases of standard misogynist fare.” According to Henderson and McManus, perhaps the most heavily stressed slander or complaint “is that of the seductress: the image of woman as . . . sexually insatiable and deceitful in the service of her lust.”

In Venice, as in London, certain expressions were also common in men’s complaints against and slander of women. In several case studies, men’s complaints almost exclusively centered on women’s sexuality, and expressions such as “insatiable

84. Wayne, 161. See, also, Henderson and McManus, 57.
85. Henderson and McManus, 47.
desires,” “dishonor,” and “shame” occurred repeatedly in husbands’ suits against wives. In one particular case, the defendant decided to break his promise of marriage by claiming that the plaintiff had an uncontrollable sexual appetite. Shakespeare knew of the ways Englishmen slandered women and would have known, heard, or read of the ways Venetian men published sexual complaints against women, complaints which he places in Othello’s mouth. Othello’s lamentation, “O curse of marriage! / That we can call these delicate creatures ours, / And not their appetites!” (III.iii.268-270), especially his use of the first person plural, draws on the common language that sexually aggrieved men used to slander women and publish sexual complaints against them. The clichéd expressions—“delicate creatures” and “their appetites”—identify Othello emotionally and linguistically with betrayed husbands while suggesting a language common to these men, as does his declaration that Desdemona will betray more men if she is not stopped from her (alleged) activity.

The hankerchief is the tangible expression of both the hero and the heroine’s chastity. As Charicleia’s ring and talisman, Pantarbe, is a visible sign of her chastity, so, too, is Desdemona’s handkerchief. As Othello’s first gift to Desdemona, the white handkerchief “spotted with strawberries” symbolizes the purity and passion of their love, which Othello, Michael C. Andrews argues, gives Desdemona to ensure “the continuance of his love for [her], not hers for him. . . . [and] . . . to render it perpetual.”

It is also, as Lynda Booce shows, “a visually recognizable reduction of Othello and Desdemona’s wedding sheets, the visual proof of their consummated marriage” and, so, of Desdemona’s chastity. The handkerchief, then, is a powerful sign in the play because it manifests the importance of chastity to both protagonists. Consequently, its loss fills Desdemona with perturbation because she understands its meanings; hence her observations that losing the handkerchief “were enough / To put” the noble-natured and pure-minded Othello “to ill thinking” (III.iv.25-29) and that “. . . I had rather have lost my purse / Full of crusadoes” than the “sacred” token (to use P.G. Mudford’s descriptive). Othello’s belligerent insistence on “the handkerchief!” is the need for reassurance that their vow of chastity is unbroken, as Winifred T. Nowottny also points out, and that their love for each other continues. Desdemona’s response, “It is not lost,” is that reassurance, despite her inability to produce the actual handkerchief. “Desdemona’s stammering insistence that ‘it is not lost’ may seem a troublesome deception in terms of literal fact,” Booce observes, “but it is perfectly true in terms of the handkerchief’s mythic identity”: the sexual gift that a wife and husband share is unique and can never be lost, which Wayne’s observation that the “handkerchief . . . remains a single and original piece of work” that “cannot be copied by Emilia [or] Bianca” reinforces. Desdemona’s response is also true literally: her chastity is unsullied.

To Othello, the symbolic and the actual meanings of the handkerchief must be in tandem: one does not exist without the other. Had Desdemona produced the handkerchief, that, in Othello’s mind, would have proven her purity and countered Iago’s
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slander. Because she does not, Othello feels compelled to purge sexual impurity from his world—a justification he draws from the symbolism of the lost handkerchief. According to Deuteronomy 22: 20-22, if a woman cannot disprove the charge of adultery by presenting her wedding sheets to the elders of the city/village, “they shall stone her . . . because she hath wrought folly in Israel.” As governor of Cyprus, Othello has judicial mandate to eradicate folly. Displaying the wedding sheets as a means to safeguard a woman’s life is an ancient Mediterranean, Asian, and African custom, still extant in some of these societies. Desdemona’s failure to produce her miniaturized wedding sheets (i.e., the handkerchief) results in her death, for Othello incorrectly believes she has transgressed the code of sexual ethics, which his explanation, heavy with the language of Deuteronomy, shows: “She turned to folly.” In countering Othello’s mischaracterization of her, Desdemona demands that he “send for [Cassio] hither [to] / Let him confess a truth” (V.i.39-70). Othello, who has mistakenly correlated the loss of the handkerchief to the loss of Desdemona’s chastity, does not comply, and tragedy ensues. Ironically, the wedding-sheets now splattered with Othello’s blood repeat his recognizance and pledge of love to Desdemona.

95. The Geneva Bible.
96. My reading of the handkerchief is greatly influenced by Lynda Boose’s essay.
97. The film Wedding in Galilee (1988), directed by Michel Khlefi, reveals the importance of the wedding sheets to a newly married couple, especially the bride. The elder of a small Palestinian village obtains permission from the Israeli military for his son’s wedding on condition that the military governor and his staff are guests at the wedding. As villagers gather outside the honeymoon suite to await proof of the bride’s virginity and consummation of the marriage, both sets of parents are anxious. The bridegroom’s psychological impotence prompts the bride to penetrate herself. The presentation of the blood-stained wedding sheets to the villagers as proof of consummation of the marriage and evidence of the bride’s chastity averts catastrophe
98. My italics.
III.

**Similarity Yet Difference in Desdemona and Othello’s Relationship to the Heliodoran Tradition.**

Because their deaths are predetermined in Shakespeare’s primary source, Cinthio, the disintegration of Othello and Desdemona’s relationship and their subsequent deaths signal the major differences between Othello and Desdemona’s relationship and the others in the Heliodoran tradition. The success of Charicleia and Theagenes’s relationship and the failure of Othello and Desdemona’s as well as the latter’s ultimate undoing are also rooted in the brides’ fathers’ and each society’s reaction to the marriage or impending marriage. As heroines in the Heliodoran mold, both Charicleia and Desdemona demonstrate their ability to choose their own mates. Despite Charicleia’s setting aside her father’s choice of a husband, Hydaspes and the Ethiopian people accept Theagenes as her prospective husband. Neither king nor country disparages Theagenes. To them, Theagenes’s different racial make-up is inconsequential. Instead, the king, as a sign of full acceptance of his son-in-law and of Theagenes’s imminent coronation as king of Ethiopia, removes “his own miter and Persinna’s, the symbol of the priesthood, and puts his on Theagenes and Persinna’s on Charicleia” (Bk. 10, 277). By contrast, Brabantio repudiates his daughter’s choice of a husband, labeling him a necromancer and taking measures to annul the marriage.

Desdemona’s choice of a husband brings serious consequences that also contribute to her death. Besides the inescapable fact that Desdemona’s death is already determined by Shakespeare’s primary source, Shakespeare complicates the matter by making Desdemona’s marriage without her father’s consent rob her of a support system that could have helped protect her from the scurrilous and deadly charges of Iago and
Othello. Notwithstanding, Desdemona makes her choice and marries without the consent of her father, thereby exercising autonomy. Brabantio’s “problem,” Martin Orkin argues, “is as much to come to an understanding of the fact of his daughter’s disobedience as it is to cope with his misgivings about his son-in-law’s color.” It is undeniable that parental right is at issue here and that the pain that consumes Brabantio owing to the loss of his only child increases our sympathy for him. Knowing that her father would disapprove of her marrying a man of a different color and origin, Desdemona had no choice but to elope to marry Othello. In addition, Shakespeare uses Brabantio’s loss to expose the magnifico’s color and other prejudices related to black Africans. Brabantio’s chastisement is not only directed at Desdemona, which would argue disobedience, but more so at Othello’s racial difference, which argues bigotry. Gratiano reminds us of Brabantio’s color prejudice against Othello: “Poor Desdemona! I am glad thy father’s dead. / Thy match was mortal to him, and pure grief / Shore his old thread in twain” (V.ii.204-6). To ensure that audiences and readers do not miss the connection between Brabantio’s death and Desdemona’s choice of husband, Shakespeare allows Gratiano to reiterate the connection for us. Risking overstatement, I would argue that it is Desdemona’s match, not her disobedience per se, that Brabantio finds unbearable and which precipitates his death.

Brabantio’s public disapproval of his daughter’s union helps give momentum to Iago’s systematic destruction of Othello and Desdemona themselves as well as to their relationship. Perhaps if Brabantio had been circumspect and controlled in the presence of Roderigo and Iago, then neither man would have been emboldened to attack

100. Except for saying, “She has deceived her father” (I.iii.293), Brabantio aims his objections at Othello.
Desdemona’s character. Roderigo’s “unlawful suit” might not have been sought or prolonged if Brabantio had not mentioned that he wished Roderigo, instead of Othello, had married Desdemona. Iago might not have conceived the notion of Desdemona’s “infidelity” if Brabantio had not, in the presence of Iago and others, flung in Othello’s ears the suggestion that Desdemona might deceive him. Brabantio’s loose tongue might have also signaled to Iago that attacking the Venetian general on racial grounds could be done with impunity. Interestingly, Iago also repeats the language Brabantio uses to deprecate Othello, echoing Brabantio’s claim of perverted love, reminding Othello of Brabantio’s charge of witchcraft against Othello himself, and of Brabantio’s sentiment about Desdemona’s deception (III.iii.206-11). Had Brabantio exercised more self-control, then he could not have been deemed complicit in the disintegration of Othello and Desdemona’s relationship.

The society in which both couples live also helps to determine their fate. Theagenes and Charicleia inhabit a nurturing environment which enables their love to thrive. Unlike Othello, who is plagued with whispers, innuendoes, insinuations, and consequent doubts about Desdemona’s faithfulness to him, Theagenes has no such poison poured into his ears. This is not to say that Theagenes does not endure his share of sexual intrigue. Frequently, he finds himself and Charicleia besieged sexually, with plots for their destruction. In Thessaly, women desire him; in Memphis, Arsace pursues him, plotting his and Charicleia’s death. However, none of these political or sexual intrigues takes place in his new country. Instead, they occur mainly in Persian Egypt, a place similar in its political and sexual intrigue to Venice.
Unlike Hydaspes and his fellow Ethiopians who accept Theagenes as Charicleia’s equal, Brabantio and the Venetian society reject Othello, viewing him as an inferior and different species from Desdemona. Iago and others’ polygenist view of Othello becomes apparent in their incessant belittling of him. This viewpoint is most obvious when Iago tells Brabantio that “Even now, now, very now, an old black ram / Is tupping your white ewe” (I.i. 88-89). At first glance, the difference that Iago posits is basically color: “black ram” and “white ewe.” However, a closer look reveals Iago’s extreme polygenesis position. As ventriloquist of his society, Iago articulates Othello’s difference from the Venetians by emphasizing that difference in racial terms as frequently as possible. His designation of Othello and Desdemona as ram and ewe is one instance of emphasizing that they are different species. From a biblical perspective, sheep and goats are different kinds of animals. For example, in Matthew 25:32-33, Jesus talks about the Final Judgment when “All the nations will be gathered before Him, and He will separate them one from another, as a shepherd divides his sheep from the goats. And He will set the sheep on His right hand, but the goats on the left.” The positions that these animals occupy, symbolically and literally, indicate their different natures. Sheep are gentle, docile, and easily led. Goats, however, are aggressive, frisky, roving, and wayward. The male goat or ram is especially wanton and sexually aggressive, mounting many animals that it encounters—from its own parents to siblings and others. Figuratively, Shakespeare prepares us for Roderigo’s and Iago’s designation of Othello as a goat in many ways: through the naked association of sexuality with “goats and monkeys,” as

---

101. It is difficult to say categorically if the duke rejects Othello or not. My sense is that he tolerates Othello because of political necessity. In Act I, scene iii, the duke assures a heartbroken Brabantio that he shall receive justice, “though our proper son / Stood in your action.” Upon learning that Othello is the culprit, the duke and the other senators proclaim their sorrow and shift their position because they need Othello’s military skills (II. 66-113).
well as “lascivious Moor,” “wheeling stranger,” “erring barbarian,” and “black ram.” Although the usage of “ram” as a male goat is largely relegated to the Caribbean, African, and certain parts of the United States, such as Oregon, it was a common usage during the sixteen and seventeenth centuries (and even nineteenth and twentieth centuries in England and Scotland\textsuperscript{102}--a usage Shakespeare would have known. Because the male sheep and goat are both rams, Iago’s polygenist categorization is almost imperceptible. “Polygenists,” according to John Stenhouse, “denied that all humans had descended from Adam and Eve, and emphasized racial differences rather than common humanity. The more extreme argued that racial differences ran so deep that the races constituted different species.”\textsuperscript{103} Iago’s categorization of Othello and Desdemona as ram and ewe betrays his view of Othello and Desdemona as different kinds of human beings because Iago and Roderigo associate all the characteristics that define a goat with Othello.

The deaths of Othello and Desdemona mark a radical departure from the relationships in the Heliodoran tradition. Othello is the only hero in this tradition to commit homicide and suicide. Despite Shakespeare’s retention of the deaths of his protagonists from his main source, Othello’s and Desdemona’s deaths are more vexed by Othello’s inculcation of and subscription to misogyny. Like all couples in the Heliodoran

\textsuperscript{102} In 1566 William Adlington translated “Apuleius \textit{XI. Bks. Golden Asse} xxvi. f. 70’, A great number beastes, amongst whiche there was bigge Ram goate, fatte, olde, and hearie.” In 1634 T. Herbert \textit{Relation Trav.} 8 noted that “In Angola . .[.] some adore the Deuill in forme of a bloudie Dragon . .[.] Others a Ram-goat.” To access these meanings in the \textit{OED}, type “ram and goat” in the search box and click on “browse.” See Appendix B; see, also, \textit{Webster’s Third New International Dictionary}. Recently, I spoke with a longtime resident of Oregon, Mr. Dan Clarke, Jr., who assured me that people in Oregon and surrounding areas call the male goat a ram. Then he explained the reasons male goats are called rams, confirming what I know. The association of sexuality with the male goat helps to explain the \textit{OED’s} citation of ram for sex, especially as that citation comes from \textit{Othello} (1.c.). Goats, not sheep, are known as wanton creatures. No one refers to a lecherous man as an “old sheep”—but, rather, as an “old goat.”

tradition, Othello and Desdemona love each other. However, like the other men in the play, Othello has latent fears about women’s sexuality, making him susceptible to Iago’s manipulations, not because there is something already corrupt in Othello himself, as Leo Kirschbaum and Robert Heilman claim,\textsuperscript{104} or because of Othello’s own feelings of racial inferiority, as Karen Newman believes. Newman’s assertion that “Iago’s manipulation of Othello depends on the Moor’s own prejudice against his own blackness and belief that the fair Desdemona would prefer the white Cassio”\textsuperscript{105} is myopic, lacking nuance and complexity. Othello’s belief that Desdemona is unchaste turns more on misogyny than on other prejudices.

Textually and culturally, misogyny runs deeper than racial prejudice. Each man in the play subscribes to sexual bias but not to racial bigotry. Cassio, for example, subscribes to gender bias but not to color prejudice. In Act IV, scene i, Cassio, seeking to regain his position, tells Bianca, “I do attend here on the general / And think it no addition . . . / To have him see me woman’d” (193-94). “Woman’d” recalls Iago’s catalogue of female vices: idleness, wantonness, and duplicity, among others (II.ii.109-15). Brabantio himself feels compelled to warn that damned, sooty-bosomed “thief,” Othello, against the treachery of woman, even if that woman is the magnifico’s own flesh and blood (I.ii.202-3). Iago is able to abuse Othello’s ear and manipulate him into destroying Desdemona and ultimately himself because both men share a common ideology—not, as Stephen Greenblatt argues, because of Othello’s adultery with his own wife Desdemona.\textsuperscript{106}

\textsuperscript{104} Kirschbaum, 283-96; Robert Heilman, 149.
\textsuperscript{105} Newman, 125.
Othello’s surrender to his masculine fears about female sexuality makes him complicit in the destruction of his relationship with Desdemona and directly responsible for her murder. By making Othello’s destruction of Desdemona and their relationship depend on the hero’s inculcation and internalization of societal biases and by Christianizing Othello and making him the equal of Desdemona in birth and virtue, Shakespeare points to a confluence of environmental, parental, and personal factors as significant elements in the disintegration of his protagonists’ relationship and their deaths. Conversely, these three factors enable Theagenes and Charicleia’s love and relationship to flourish. Othello and Desdemona’s crosscultural and transracial relationship along with Desdemona’s independent choice of a mate—all evince affinity to the Heliodoran tradition. But the decline of their relationship and their subsequent deaths mark a profound departure from this tradition. Although the deaths of Othello and Desdemona obtain from the play’s primary source, their undoing in the Heliodoran tradition can mean the need for parental blessing of a union. Among the reasons Theagenes and Charicleia elope from Athens to Ethiopia is that their union will receive parental blessing in Ethiopia, but will not in Athens. Paradoxically, Othello appears to vacillate between endorsement and disapproval of its protagonists’ defiance of parental consent in marriage.

There are gaps and moments in Cinthio that Shakespeare fills in and enriches, allowing us to see that Othello can be read as a part of the Heliodoran tradition and making us see the literary tradition associated with black Africans. Desdemona is intelligent, resourceful, honest, and as brave as her mighty general. Her opposition to society is no less courageous than Othello’s courage in facing an army on the battlefield.
While battlefield warfare is not waged on a daily basis for the duration of a soldier’s life, parental and societal battles frequently are. Though formidable on the battlefield, Othello is a political innocent who frequently accepts things as others present them to him. His honesty along with Desdemona’s innocence stand in deep contrast to the machinations of the Venetians. Consequently, his fall is not too difficult to comprehend. Although there are critics who condemn Othello’s ignomy, there are others who praise his nobility. As a black African on stage, Othello soars linguistically and representationally above the demeaning rhetoric and portrayal that often stigmatize black Africans on the English Renaissance stage, thus representing Blacks as more than subservient characters, sexual deviants, or procurers, which many early modern English dramatists portray them to be. Such portrayal by Shakespeare and other dramatists remind us of the dramatic heritage of Africans by letting us recall the *Aethiopica* and its influence on the English Renaissance stage.
Conclusion

From antiquity to the latter part of the sixteenth century, Africans have had favorable depiction in various literatures. In the first book of Wolfram von Eschenback’s medieval epic *Parzival*, for example, the black queen of Zazamarc, Belacane, and the white knight and prince of Anjou, Gahmuret, fall in love. Belacane and Gahmuret’s emotional reaction to each other recalls that of Charicleia and Theagenes, especially their love at first sight:

The black Mooress, that country’s queen, caused him to swoon again and again. He twisted and turned, time and again; like a bundle of willow twigs, his joints cracking... His heart resounded with blows for it swelled with chivalry, stretching both the warrior’s breasts, as the crossbow does the cord (14).

Like Gahmuret, Belacane feels the fire of love and desire: the lady “sighed time and again... she cast many bashful glances... at Gahmuret; then her eyes informed her heart that he was handsome” (14). Von Eschenback’s portrayal of Blacks, especially through the love and marriage of Belacane and Gahmuret, is reminiscent of Heliodorus’s. Their union, like that of Charicleia and Theagenes, reminds us of a tradition that depicts Blacks positively, but their separation because of difference in religious belief draws attention to the role of religion during the medieval and early modern period.

The story of Belacane and Gahmuret stresses the importance of religion as a tool that separated people during the late medieval and early modern period and that two important issues in this study warrant further investigation: first, that race as a designator
of color\textsuperscript{1} was not the dividing factor during Medieval and early to mid-sixteenth-century Renaissance Europe but became so from late sixteenth century onward and, second, that a literary tradition existed then which represented Africans positively.

With the reconquest of Spain, race gradually emerged as a tool of separation as Spaniards and Portuguese sought to establish the purity of their religious faith by distancing themselves from Moorish or Jewish ancestry and claiming that the purity of their faith could be seen in their blue blood beneath their pale skin.

The seminal event that contributed dramatically to the changing view of race as a tool of division, instead of religion, on the English stage was the Battle of Alcazar (1578) when hundreds of Europeans, including royalty, lost their lives on the battlefield in Morocco and Peele transcribed that historic moment into a dramatic one in his play \textit{The Battle of Alcazar} (1588/9), fusing the Vice figure from Medieval dramas with the black character of Muly Mahamet. Although black devils existed in Medieval plays, these devils were not actual Blacks but were allegorical figures or figurative representations of darkness and evil. The conflation of the actual and the representational, the Spanish blood laws, England’s contact with Mediterranean peoples, and its desire to reposition itself from a peripheral to a central power in global affairs, all converged to make race a tool of separation toward the close of the sixteenth century and contributed to the shift from a dramatic tradition that represented Blacks positively on the English Renaissance stage to one that depicted them negatively.

More than the contact itself, the English feared losing their identity and becoming the Other: Jews, Catholics, or Muslims. Besides England’s own attempts at inscribing

\textsuperscript{1} Sometimes nationality, religion, and gender were also categorized as race. The English thought of the Irish as a different race, and Jews were also seen as a separate race.
Spain as a sultanate, during the 1580s and 1590s certain pamphlets circulated throughout Europe, primarily in England, the Netherlands, and France, that conflated Spain with Moors, despite Spain’s own attempts to distance itself from its Moorish and Jewish past. ² Fearing the stigmatization of the racial European Other that Spain suffered because of its contact with Semitic people (Moors and Jews), the English invented ways to preserve and protect their identity by writing their religious experiences into Mediterranean plays while simultaneously dehumanizing Africans. While the Muslim world enjoyed religious tolerance and, to a great degree, peace, Renaissance England experienced religious turmoil and daily persecution. By superimposing their religious experiences onto the Muslim world, early modern English playwrights made the Mediterranean a site of religious contestation and persecution. Protestant England believed its religion to be true but Islam false, fostering the notion among many early modern English playwrights that any contact between England and any Islamic nation would inevitably result in conflict. England’s conviction that dark skin signified false religion and its nascent foray into the slave trade further resulted in the degradation of Africans on the English Renaissance stage.

The combination of dark skin and the wrong religion had distinct associations in the early modern English imagination: sexual depravity as well as dispossession and alienation from God, a technique English writers deployed to control Africans by dehumanizing them and to compensate for their own nation’s political marginality on the world stage. For example, George Best’s explanation of blackness and its consequent

inferiority, a justification for the slave trade and exploitation of Africans, provides ample illustration of this technique. According to Best, Noah’s “wicked sonne Cham disobeyed” his father—“being perswaded that the first childe borne after the flood . . . should inherite and possesse all the dominions of the earth, hee” consorted with his wife. As an example for contempt of Almightie God, and dis-obedience of parents, God would a sonne should be borne that it might remaine a spectacle of disobedience to all the worlde. And of this blacke and cursed Chus came all these blacke Moores which are in Africa.

Best’s mythmaking distorts and collapses the biblical account of Noah and Ham into that of Esau and Jacob as an explanation of dark skin,\(^3\) with specific aim to justify the slave trade and the exploitation of black Africans: in 1552 John Lok sold the first slaves whom he captured in Guinea, and ten years later, 1562, John Hawkins sold three hundred slaves whom he stole from Portuguese ships en route to the West Indies.\(^4\) Blackness as the spectacle of disobedience, the visible sign of sin, ignorance, and affinity with evil are part of Best’s mythology, which along with other negative narratives of black Africans, such as Peele’s *Battle of Alcazar*, became the dominant depiction of Africans during the late sixteenth-century and thereafter on the early modern English stage.

But the early modern English stage also associated blackness with positive images through the Heliodoran and other traditions. In the anonymous drama *A Pretie new Enterlude . . . of the Story of Kyng Daryus* (1565), the character Aethyopia is presented favorably on stage. There are two strikingly noteworthy observations about this text:

---

3. See Genesis 7-9 & 25: 20-34.
first, it is a morality play predating Peele’s *Battle of Alcazar*. Although Aethyopia’s part is small, it represents one of the earliest positive representations of Blacks on the early modern stage. Second, it is a play outside the Heliodoran tradition, indicating the possibility of a range of favorable portrayals of black Africans on the early modern English stage. *A Pretie new Enterlude* strengthens the two major concerns of this study: that race was not a tool of discrimination in early modern England until the close of the sixteenth century and, principally, that there were plays (and other performative literatures), especially those in the Helidoran tradition, that portrayed Africans positively.

The existence of this positive representation of Africans on the Renaissance stage from the 1560s to 1660s reveal the stretch of the tradition, especially of the tradition originating from the *Aethiopica*, and the major and minor early modern dramatists who participated in it: Heywood, Jonson, Shakespeare, and, as we have seen, Gogh, among others. The participation especially of three prominent early modern playwrights makes us realize the importance of Helidorous to the English Renaissance and its playwrights by bringing into sharper focus the patriarchal Renaissance norm and providing an alternate perspective to this prevailing norm. Heywood’s Bess Bridges and Shakespeare’s Desdemona, for example, are active, independent, brave, and yet chaste women whose behavior is a counterpoint to that of the ideally passive, dependent, and chaste Renaissance women. A successful entrepreneur, a courageous defender of her honor, a builder of community, and a leader, Bess Bridges, like Desdemona, reminds us of a frequently neglected or overlooked aspect of the English Renaissance, but which the Heliodoran tradition helps us to note: that females were more independent during the English Renaissance than is generally thought. Bess’s and Desdemona’s challenges to
the accepted standard of women’s behavior and role in the early modern period make us also see the difficulties involved in and the paradox of such challenges: liberation yet constraint. Ultimately Bess is recuperated into the role of domesticity through marriage, but a marriage that suggests equality.

Both Jonson’s and Shakespeare’s use of the Heliodoran lens also provides novel ways of seeing blackness and Othello. In satisfying “Her Majesty’s will” Jonson stages blackness because it would also satisfy his majesty’s will. Jonson’s dramatization of Queen Anne and her ladies as Ethiopian princesses offers insight afresh or, at least, one not frequently acknowledged: the role of blackness becomes associated with challenges and autonomy. The queen’s request to be a “blackamore” offers a tacit challenge to the Jacobean myth of male supremacy and imperial rule since African females, particularly African queens, Charicleia, Cleopatra, Sheba, and Candace, for example, “carried powerful connotations of female autonomy and ethnic diversity.” Finding herself increasingly alienated from the king and his court, Anne used blackness to assert her individuality and to challenge her husband’s power. The ladies themselves who participated in the masque were known to “resist patriarchal standards of female decorum”: Penelope Rich, was the mistress of Edward Blount and the mother of four illegitimate children; Lady Arbella Stuart was imprisoned for marrying the man of her choice, Lord Seymour, against the king’s wishes; Frances Howard, Lady Walsingham, murdered her husband in the “Overbury affair”; and Lady Mary Wroth had two illegitimate children with her first cousin, Lord Pembroke. One aristocratic female connected the behavior of the ladies of the court to “the performance of the masque,” noting that masque seem more like the “site of female misrule” than a peaceful

celebration of the king’s power.⁶ In a move that signals autonomy, the queen even established an alternate court to the king’s.

Jonson would also use blackness to assert King James’s authority over unruly subjects. As the king did with the sixteen Ethiopian princesses, he would do with his intransigent subjects: transform them from darkened Englishmen and Scotts to enlightened Britons. Viewed from this angle, Jonson is not just another early modern English playwright who apes the prevailing notions of blackness as anathema to beauty and light, but one who goes against the dominant idea of the time to celebrate the qualities associated with this color through his Ethiopian princesses.

Desdemona’s decision to make Othello her husband reverberates negatively throughout the society and speaks to a bravery that is as militant as any courage on the battlefield. Such courage gives us fresh perspective into her character, prompting us to revise traditional interpretations of her actions as compromising her virtue, for those very actions affirm her chastity because elopement and sexual purity are essential and integral aspects of heroines in the Heliodoran mode. Desdemona’s actions, measured against the Venetian society, against the intrinsic value of the play itself, and against the tradition of which she is a part, present a more layered Desdemona and allow a better understanding of her character.

Likewise, a greater depth attaches to Othello when the character is seen in the Heliodoran tradition. The difficulties that many scholars have in reconciling Othello’s blackness to his stature as a tragic hero easily disappear when the character is seen in this tradition, because of the tradition’s representation of black Africans as heroic and noble. Chaste and pious, Othello transcends the label of pagan convert or sensuous Moor, as

⁶ Hall, 137.
well as that of “erring barbarian.” Paradoxically, his displacement and lost identity are his identity because male dislocation is intrinsic to and characteristic of heroes in this tradition. It is no accident that Jonson and Shakespeare allow Niger, Othello, and Cleopatra to call for accurate portrayals of Africans and Africa, which challenge and disrupt Europe’s misrepresentations of Africa and its people. In recovering Helidorous, then, our understanding of the cultural practices of early modern English drama becomes more complex, more textured, and more nuanced.

Throughout this study, I have focused on the positive representation of Blacks in the Heliodoran tradition. In this pursuit, I have perused several dramatic works, arriving at the conclusion that though the number of positive dramatic representations of Africans is small, it can be increased significantly. When I began this study, I had not heard of the six continental plays that I uncovered and that became integral to this discussion. Other plays also in this tradition, such as The White Ethiopian, though less obscure, were considered lost. We know that the influence of the Aethiopica was widespread throughout Europe, influencing European humanists, including the Spanish dramatists Juan Pérez de Montalbán and Pedro Calderón de la Barca, who based their play Los hijos de fortuna, Teágenes y Cariclea (1664) on the Aethiopica.7 Places such as Holland, Hungary, Bulgaria, the former Yugoslavia, and Asia Minor where the Aethiopica was popular might yield more plays based on Heliodorus’s novel, which may be waiting to be discovered and, like Los hijos de fortuna, to be translated into English. The possibility also exists that plays independent of the Heliodoran tradition, as a Pretie new Enterlude

---

suggests, are also waiting to be excavated, all of which could expand our knowledge of the many positive roles that Africans played on the English Renaissance stage.

I am hopeful that more plays inside and outside the Helidoran tradition will be discovered, thereby increasing the number of dramatic works in the tradition of positive representation of Africans on the Renaissance stage, especially the early modern English stage, and showing us that the overall tradition of representing Africans positively on the early modern English stage is not as sparse as the current canon reflects.

By definition, the Mediterranean includes territories of Morocco, the Levant, and other places bounded by the Mediterranean sea and under the control of Moors and Turks. Yet as scholars we study the literature of this place through the viewpoint of England, a country with its own vested interests and far removed geographically and culturally from the Mediterranean. The current focus on race in Renaissance scholarship affords us an opportune time to research, recover, and discover dramatic literature perhaps written by people of the Mediterranean or by writers with Mediterranean sympathies about the contact between the peoples of England and the Mediterranean during the Renaissance. Such texts would provide invaluable perspectives on the interplay of the English and the Africans in the Mediterranean, thus giving scholars wider lens with which to view the Mediterranean relationship of these two nations. Perhaps, these kinds of texts could alter our perception by providing us with a more layered view of the relationship between the English, including other Europeans, and Africans. Such texts could also present a counterpoint to English portrayal of Africans by inverting the relationship in Mediterranean adventure plays between these two peoples to which we are accustomed.
Appendix A

**Detailed Summary of the Aethiopica**

**Book 1**

A group of pirates surveys the landscape from the mouth of the Nile and spies a heavily loaded merchant ship “moored by its hawsers.” Venturing aboard, the pirates see telltale signs of death and carnage and discover that everyone is dead, except two people of striking beauty: Charicleia and Theagenes. Awed by Charicleia’s beauty and thinking she is a goddess, the pirates keep their distance until her solicitations and affections for the seriously wounded Theagenes make them realize that she is mortal. Before they are able to capture the two young people and collect the booty, another set of pirates appears, prompting the first set to flee. This last group secures the booty, taking Charicleia and Theagenes captive and traveling until sunset before reaching their hideout, where the two captives are placed in the care of Cnemon, a fellow Greek and longtime captive of these pirates.

During the night, Cnemon recounts the reason for his exile and captivity: his stepmother, Demainete, importuned him with sexual advances, which he rebuffed. Piqued, she enlisted the help of her maid, Thisbe, to entrap him. Thisbe told Cnemon that Demainete had dishonored his father’s bed and asked if he would like to catch the adulterers in bed. Instead of finding an illicit lover in his stepmother’s embrace, Cnemon found his father, who pleaded for his life. Stunned, Cnemon let the sword fall from his hand. Recovering himself, Aristippus beat, bound, and charged Cnemon with attempted

---

1. The Cnemon story is based on the Phaedra myth. John Morgan suggests that Heliodorus might have been “using the first version of the Euripidean play” and that the “role of Phaidra is shared between Demainete and Arsake,” and the former “calls Cnemon a new Hippolytos.” See “Heliodorus,” 438.
patricide. Although divided in the type of punishment to mete out, the Areiopagos decided to banish Cnemon. Prior to his captivity, he learned of Demainete’s death, the confiscation of his father’s property (Demainete’s family charged Aristippus with her death), and Thisbe’s flight from Athens.

The next morning the leader of the brigands, Thyamis, assembles everyone and, recounting his vision that he interprets to mean Charicleia should be his wife, proposes to her; she pretends to accept his proposal by requesting appropriate time to put aside her priestly robes in accordance with her ancestral practices and by claiming that Theagenes is her brother. Thyamis agrees and prepares to march on Memphis.

Meanwhile, the first group of pirates finds Thyamis and his cohorts’ hideout, destroying and burning their possessions. Realizing the futility of victory and reinterpreting the dream to mean he must kill Charicleia, Thyamis steals away from the war and enters the cave where Cnemon had stowed Charicleia; following the voice of a woman who responds in Greek, “he seize[s] her . . . and plunge[s] his sword through her breast” and hurries back to the war.

Outnumbered and outmaneuvered, Thyamis’s remaining cohorts flee, leaving him to battle their enemies, who are the agents of his usurping brother, Petosiris. They capture, chain, and send Thyamis to the mainland. The attackers then turn their attention to recovering the spoils. Failing this, they set the island ablaze.

**Book 2**

Cnemon and Theagenes make their way back to the cave where Charicleia is hidden. Both men come across the body of a woman, which they eventually realize is
Thisbe’s. Along with Charicleia, they search the body and find a tablet around the neck. They discover that Thyamis’s squire, Thermouthis, has kidnapped her from an Egyptian merchant, with whom she had eloped, and has hidden her in the cave. They also learn of Cnemon’s father’s efforts to repeal his exile.

Finding a dead Thisbe, Thermouthis suspects Cnemon and Theagenes, both of whom come to believe that the cave is no longer safe because Thermouthis may seek to avenge Thisbe’s death. With Charicleia, both men decide that everyone should leave the cave but should travel in pairs: Charicleia and Theagenes, Thermouthis and Cnemon. Cnemon agrees to meet Charicleia and Theagenes at Chemmis as soon as he can give Thermouthis the slip.

On the way to Chemmis, Cnemon encounters an old man dressed as a Greek, who laments the loss of “his children.” As they travel together, Cnemon presses him to tell his story and learns that he is Calasiris, an Egyptian high priest and Thyamis’s father; that he is searching for Charicleia and Theagenes; that he is the guest of the merchant from whom Thermouthis steals Thisbe and where they are bound. Calasiris further confides that his exile is self-imposed because he fled from sexual temptation and the prediction of blood-strife between his two sons;² that during his sojourn at Delphi he and the Greek high priest Charicles became friends; that Charicles told Calasiris how he lost his wife and daughter and how he met an Ethiopian ambassador who offered him wealth to care for a beautiful girl. The ambassador explained that the girl’s mother had exposed her along with a ribbon and other pertinent paraphernalia that gave an account of the circumstances and the girl’s pedigree. Before Charicles could learn more about the girl,

---

² Calasiris’s flight recalls Oedipus’s, both of whom, John Morgan observes, act out a “story of a man’s inability to avoid or change the destiny written for him.” See “Helidorus,” 438.
the ambassador was ordered out of the country because his mission related to the disputed emerald mines. Cnemon also learns that Charicles sought Calasiris’s counsel about his daughter Charicleia and that as Theagenes sacrificed in the temple, the oracle foretold his and Charicleia’s adventure and marriage.

**Book 3**

*(Calasiris’s story continues)*

Each year, Thessalians offer praise and consecration to Neoptolemus in Athens. In the temple, Charicleia and Theagenes met for the first time and fell instantly in love. After the ceremony, both young people became ill, but only Calasiris realized the cause of their illness, and he managed to endear himself to Charicles and to gain his confidence by agreeing with him and praising Charicleia’s beauty independently. He led Charicles to believe that Charicleia’s illness resulted from some “Evil Eye.”

Later that day, Apollo and Artemis visited Calasiris and instructed him to care for Theagenes and Charicleia and to help them leave Delphi. Theagenes also visited Calasiris, confessed his love for Charicleia, and avowed his innocence. Playing the part of the magician that Theagenes assigned him, Calasiris promised to help him and also assured Charicles that he would cure Charicleia and make her amenable to love and marriage.
Book 4

(Calasiris’s story continues)

On the second day of the festival, Theagenes won the footrace, defeating the champion \(^3\) and, while accepting the prize from Charicleia, feigned exhaustion by falling into her embrace. Overcome with love, Charicleia took to her bed, and a worried Charicles sought Calasiris’s help once more. Pretending to “divine” and to “cure” Charicleia’s malady, Calasiris managed to obtain from Charicles the ribbon that inscribes Charicleia’s pedigree when her mother abandoned her as a baby and the other paraphernalia that attest to her ancestry. Calasiris told Charicleia of her lineage and encouraged her love for Theagenes, assuring her that it was reciprocated and promising to do all he could to help them. He also told Charicleia that her mother, Persinna, sought his help in finding her.

Charicles dreamed that an eagle swooped down and carried Charicleia away, which he interpreted to mean that Charicleia would be taken from him to a distant land. Although Calasiris knew that Charicles’s interpretation is accurate, he reassured his friend by reinterpreting the dream positively, telling Charicles that the eagle represented a husband, that the dream foreshadowed Charicleia’s marriage, \(^4\) and that he should be diligent in breaking down Charicleia’s resistance to marriage by showering her with presents from the prospective bridegroom, Alchemenes—Charicles’s nephew.

---

3. Besides being a descendant of Achilles, Theagenes also has other traits that identify him with Achilles: swift-footedness; throughout The Iliad, Achilles is called “swift of foot” as, for example, in Bk. 1 when fever plagues the Greeks for nine days because Agamemnon dishonored Chryseis’s father, Apollo’s priest. On the tenth day, Achilles, “swift of foot,” called a meeting and explained the reason for the pestilence. See The Iliad, Vol. I, trans. A. T. Murray, 7 (I. 41-67).
4. Technically, both interpretations are correct: Charicleia will be married, but in a distant land where she will be away from Charicles.
To implement the command of the gods, Calasiris, along with Theagenes, devised a plan to “kidnap” Charicleia using the young men from Theagenes’s entourage. Calasiris also secured passage for Theagenes, Charicleia, and himself aboard a Phoenician merchant ship. At the appointed hour, the Thessalian young men broke into Charicles’s house and with Charicleia’s assistance, “kidnapped” her, who, along with Theagenes, took refuge at Calasiris’s home, where she insisted that Theagenes vow not to violate her chastity, and Theagenes, protesting that such a vow impugned his own virtue, consented only at Calasiris’s urging. Calasiris then hurried to Charicles’s home, where he found the household in uproar, advised a swift pursuit of the kidnappers, and returned to his lodging.

Book 5

(Comasiris’s story continues)

Under the cover of darkness, Charicleia, Calasiris, and Theagenes boarded the ship and wintered in a Phoenician suburb at the home of a fisherman, who told him of the pirate Trachinus’s plot to attack the ship and make Charicleia his bride. Calasiris then prevailed upon the lovesick Tyrian merchant to sail immediately, promising him Charicleia in marriage.

At sea, pirates attacked the ship and forced the crew to surrender. Trachinus informed Calasiris that he had “betrothed” Charicleia “to be his wife and intended to celebrate the marriage today.” Calasiris alerted Theagenes and Charicleia to Trachinus’s design; playing along, Calasiris suggested that Trachinus forbade the other pirates to go onto the ship so that Charicleia could use it as a bridal chamber to prepare for the
wedding. Trachinus agreed and issued the order. Then Calasiris inveighled Trachinus’s deputy, Pelorus, to rebel against Trachinus by telling him that Charicleia loved him, not Trachinus. When Pelorus accused Trachinus of violating the pirates’ law of first choice and demanded Charicleia as his prize for being the first pirate to board the ship, Trachinus denied the demand and countered by asserting the law of a subordinate yielding to a superior—insisting that Pelorus could have his choice of any other prize. War erupted. Pelorus killed Trachinus, and Theagenes killed Pelorus. Amid the complete annihilation of crewmembers and pirates, Theagenes was seriously injured and taken to the ship, where another set of pirates appeared, taking the couple captive. From his perch on a hill, Calasiris tried to follow them but could not.

When Charicleia and Theagenes separate from Cnemon, they agree upon code words to help them locate each other should they, too, be separated. Theagenes chooses “Pythios” and “palm” and Charicleia selects “Pythias” and “lamp.” He shows her a scar on his knee, and she shows him an ancestral ring. As they are about to sail away, a troop of armed men captures them and takes them to Mitranes, the satrap’s lieutenant whom Nausicles (Calasiris’s host) pays to search the island for Thisbe. When Nausicles sees Charicleia in Mitranes’s custody, he is smitten and, pretending that she is Thisbe, tells her in Greek to play along, which she does. Although Mitranes releases Charicleia reluctantly, he sends Theagenes to Oroondates, exhorting the satrap to send the handsome Greek as a gift to the Persian king.

---

5. This is another identifier of Theagenes with the Greeks, in this case, Odysseus, and of Heliodorus’s intertextuality that helps situate the *Aethiopica* within the literature of ancient Greek tradition.
Nausicles returns home, claiming to have found a better Thisbe. During the night, Cnemon overhears a woman, who refers to herself as Thisbe, weeping. Terror seizes him. The woman turns out to be Charicleia, who reunites with Calasiris the next morning.

Book 6

Buoyed by finding Charicleia, Calasiris asks Nausicles to help him locate Theagenes. The next day they go in search of Theagenes. However, they learn that Theagenes never went to Memphis because Thyamis and his Bessean band have slaughtered Mitranes’s army and have captured Theagenes. At this news, the men return home, where Nausicles reveals his upcoming trip to Athens and offers his daughter to Cnemon. After much expostulation and felicitation about the betrothal, Charicleia and Calasiris decide to continue searching for Theagenes. Disguised as beggars, they encounter an old sorceress lamenting her dead son. Calasiris asks her for help, and she agrees but tells him to wait. Both he and Charicleia unwittingly witness her necromancy. The son predicts that Charicleia and Theagenes will live a brilliant and royal life in a remote country. He also predicts the peaceful resolution to the dispute of Calasiris’s sons’ and the death of the old woman, his mother.

Book 7

Because of Oroondate’s involvement with the disputed emerald mines, his wife, Arsace, is the interim ruler of Memphis. The sister of the Great King, Arsace is a

---

6. This episode recalls that in The Odyssey, in which the rites are similar. Odysseus digs a pit and pours a libation of milk, honey, sweet wine, water, sprinkled with white barley meal. He sacrifices sheep and conjures the dead, promising to do more sacrifices to the shades, especially to Teiresas’s, on his return to Ithaca if Teiresas unfolds the future to him. The Odyssey, trans. A. T. Murray, Bk.X, ll. 518-45 (p. 383), and Bk.XI, ll. 25-54 (p. 389). See, also, The Novel in the Ancient World, 436.
nymphomaniac. Because of her sexual overtures, Thyamis flees his homeland, for Oroondates, incensed by Petosiris’s lies about a dalliance between Thyamis and Arsace, hounds Thyamis out of Memphis and gives the priesthood to Petosiris. Now with his brigands, Thyamis wants to besiege the city, but Arsace checks his action by proposing that the brothers engage in single combat as a way of deciding the priesthood.\(^7\) Petosiris refuses to fight, throwing away his weapon, running, and seeking to re-enter the city but is prevented. With Theagenes following at a distance, Thyamis chases Petosiris around the city wall.\(^8\) Into this spectacle Calasiris enters, seeing his two sons feuding.\(^9\) When they do not respond to his call, Calasiris realizes that his beggarly attire makes him incognito. Shedding his rags and letting his hair down in a priestly fashion, he gains his sons’ attention and ends their feud. Shortly after, Charicleia runs into the arena, spies Theagenes, and embraces him. Not until she mentions the code words does he recognize her.\(^10\) Calasiris dies shortly thereafter, but he passes the priesthood on to Thyamis, enjoining him to protect Theagenes and Charicleia.

---

\(^7\) The allusion is to Hector’s challenge to the Greeks for a single combat to determine the outcome of the Trojan War and to Oedipus’s sons’ fight for the crown. See A. T. Murray’s translation of *The Iliad*, Bk. VII, ll.77-103 (p.309); Aeschylus, *Seven against Thebes*, The Loeb Classical Library, ed. & trans. Alan H. Sommerstein (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2008).

\(^8\) This entire book recalls the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the two major sources of Heliodorus. Petosiris’s flight recalls Hector’s when Achilles chases a fearful Hector around the city walls of Troy. The beggarly habiliments of Calasiris and Charicleia and the consequent failure by loved ones to them recall Odysseus’ homecoming. See *The Iliad*, trans. A.T. Murray, 465-73( XXII. 129-260); *The Odyssey*, trans. A.T. Murray, 177-187(XVII. 334-494).


\(^10\) Incognito as beggars, Calasiris and Chariclea are cast in the role of Odysseus, especially Calasiris who returns home to find his house in chaos. Throughout the novel, Calasiris and Charicleia have been repeatedly cast in this role. For example, Calasiris is the secondary narrator of the novel, and when in Book 2, Theagenes and Charicleia disguise themselves as beggars, Cnemon “(mis)quotes the *Odyssey* to make sure that no one misses the point.” See “Heliodours,” 436.
From the moment Arsace sees Theagenes, her desire for him consumes her.\textsuperscript{11} Finally, her procurer, Cybele, intervenes, and under the guise of hospitality lures Theagenes and Charicleia into the palace, where she gradually reveals Arsace’s design to Theagenes. Despite threats, beatings, and other punishments, Theagenes remains virtuous. However, when Arsace decides to marry Charicleia to Cybele’s son, Archaemenes, Theagenes pretends to be amenable to Arsace’s wishes and asks her not to marry Charicleia to another man. Arsace agrees. Embittered, Archaemenes steals away to alert Oroondates to Arsace’s voluptuousness; Oroondates dispatches soldiers to Arsace commanding her to send him the prisoners.

\textbf{Book 8}

The war between Persian Egypt and Ethiopia begins fortuitously for King Hydaspes, who outmaneuvers and outsmarts the Persians by pretending that Philae is not his objective. He takes the city and sends an ambassador to Oroondates, who is at Thebes mustering his army. Although preoccupied with war, the satrap is enchanted with Charicleia because of Archaemenes’s description of her beauty, demanding that his wife release her and Theagenes. Meanwhile, Arsace tosses Charicleia in the palace dungeon with Theagenes after attempting but failing to poison or burn her alive. As they commiserate with and encourage each other, Charicleia and Theagenes recall their dreams of Calasiris. Theagenes misinterprets his dream, believing that the dream’s reference to a maiden and a dark land signifies an imminent death. Charicleia explains that it portends his going to Ethiopia with her, thus fulfilling the oracle. She also comes

\textsuperscript{11} Morgan makes the point that Arsace also plays the role of Phaedra (436). It seems to me, however, that she is also cast in the mold of Calypso, keeping Theagenes against his will in order for him to become her lover. See \textit{The Odyssey}, trans. A. T. Murray, 171-81 (V. 7-162).
to realize that her dream had foretold that her ancestral ring, Pantarbe, would save her from the funeral pyre.

When the armed messengers of Oroondates arrive at the palace, they encounter no resistance and, freeing the couple, escort them to the satrap’s camp. They are, however, ambushed and captured en route by Ethiopian scouts who take the couple to King Hydaspes.

**Book 9**

Hydaspes reserves Charicleia and Theagenes as a sacrifice for victory in the war and turns his attention to capturing Syene by besieging it. From Syene to the Nile, he digs trenches that increase in width and incline; when all is done, Hydaspes opens the Nile into each trench, causing the water to rush downstream and flood Syene. In spite of themselves, the people of Syene surrender, and Oroondates, promising to return Philae and the emerald mines, lists his terms for surrender, which an amused Hydaspes grants.

During the night, Oroondates steals away to Elephantine, where he musters his army and leads an attack on Hydaspes. Despite routing the Persians and their allies, Hydaspes is careful not to engage in unnecessary slaughter and directs his men accordingly. To Oroondates, he is merciful, bestowing the best medical care on him, releasing him, and restoring all, except what belonged to Ethiopia by geographical right: the emerald mines and Philae. Likewise, he is magnanimous to his soldiers, rewarding

---

12. Morgan argues that the siege of Syene, which he uses to date the *Aethiopica*, occurred during 350 A.D. See “Heliodorus,” 417-20. The siege and overthrow of Syene by damming the Nile has Biblical resonance and a touch of irony. To overthrow Babylon, the Persian general, Cyrus, dammed the Euphrates, which ran underneath the city. The men entered the city by walking through the riverbed and finding the inner gates (of the city) open. See Isaiah 45: 1-6 and Jeremiah 50:36-38 (NKJV). Herodotus also recounts Cyrus’s overthrow of Babylon in his History. It is ironic that this strategy would be used against the Persians. See *The Histories in Four Volumes*, The Loeb Classical Library, trans. A. D. Godley, (London: William Heinemann. 1960), I, 229-41.
them according to their heroics and requests. In reviewing the prisoners, Hydaspes is struck by Charicleia’s resemblance to the daughter in his dream, but disregards his feelings. Speaking to them in Greek, he also inquires of her parentage and assigns a eunuch to guard her.

Book 10

Hydapes returns to Meroe among a jubilant and admiring public. When the preparations for immolations are made, the king orders the brazier to be brought forth to test the purity of the prospective sacrifices. Theagenes and Charicleia walk the brazier without being harmed, astounding the people with their beauty and chastity and, in Charicleia’s case, prompting the High Priest Sisimethres to caution Hydaspes about the gods’ displeasure with human sacrifice. As Sisimethres and the other priests are about to leave the celebration, Charicleia, to Hydaspes’s displeasure, asks the high priest to judge if she should be sacrificed. Claiming Ethiopian birth and lineage, Charicleia presents tokens to validate her claim. Both Persinna and Sisimethres confirm that Charicleia is the king’s daughter, whom the queen abandoned at birth. Perplexed and incredulous, Hydaspes inquires into the possibility of two full-blooded Ethiopians producing a “white” child. Persinna explains the role of the Andromeda painting; when messengers produce it, the similitude between it and Charicleia sweeps away the king’s reservations.

Despite this, the king wants the sacrificial rites to continue, but when the people demand that Charicleia and Theagenes not be sacrificed and the sacrificial system be abolished, all the others are saved. Theagenes performs two heroic feats: recapturing a

---

13. This book, according to Morgan, “plays on the two Iphigeneia plays of Euripides, with the threat of human sacrifice in a barbarian land and a father confronting the possibility of slaying his only daughter for the sake of the community he leads” (438).
runaway bull and using his wits to defeat a massive Ethiopian wrestler. As a part of the embassy from Oroondates, Charicles arrives in Meroe in search of his daughter Charicleia. He seizes and denounces Theagenes as a kidnapper, thief, and other things—all of which Theagenes admits to Hydaspes. Upon seeing Charicles, Charicleia prostrates herself at his feet and acknowledges his paternal benevolence. To the perplexed multitude, Sisimethres explains what has transpired. Hydaspes learns that Theagenes is Charicleia’s betrothed and makes their betrothal official. Both Theagenes and Charicleia are invested into the gymnosophist religion as priest and priestess of the sun and moon, prompting Charicles’s recollection of the Delphic oracle. The people rejoice at the king and queen’s fortune and prepare for the nuptials of Charicleia and Theagenes.
Appendix B

Definition Page from the *Oxford English Dictionary*

**ramgoat** n. now chiefly *Caribbean* (a) an adult male goat; (b) (also ramgoat bush) any of several, chiefly strong-smelling, Caribbean and tropical American plants; esp. *Zanthoxylum tragodes* (family Rutaceae) and *Turnera ulmifolia* (family Turneraceae) (obs.).

1566  W. Adlington tr. Apuleius *MT. Bks. Golden Asse* xxvi. f. 70". A great number of beastes, amongst whiche there was a bigge Ram goate, fatte, olde, and hearie.
1634  T. Herbert *Relation Trav.* 8 In Angola • • • some adore the Deuill in forme of a bloudie Dragon • • • Others a Ram-goat.
1668  F. Kirkman *Eng. Rogue* II. i. lxviii. 82 They have many Idols amongst them which they hold in great esteem, as a Ram-goat, a Bat, an Owl, a Snake, or Dog, to whom they ceremoniously bow or kneel.
1832  M. Scott in *Blackwood’s Edinb. Mag.* 32 474 They • • ran butt at each other like ram-goats.
1847  *Trinidad Spectator* 31 Mar. 2 Dar butt like a ram goat.
1882  in *Smithsonian Misc. Coll.* 23 No. 13. 38 Ramgoat-bush. • • The whole plant has a strong smell.
1958  J. Carew *Black Midas* i. 14 He was a lean white man with a ram-goat beard.
1996  E. Lovelace *Salt* iv. 44 The Shango palais where they kill unspotted ramgoats and wring the neck of white and red cockerels.
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