# Reframing Crusading Discourses in Seventeenth-Century English Drama

Aisha Hussain

For the fulfilment of Doctor of Philosophy in English Literature

University of Salford

School of Arts and Media

July 2022

Supervisors:

Dr. Lucia Nigri

Professor Ursula Hurley

**Acknowledgements**

First and foremost, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to my primary supervisor, Dr. Lucia Nigri and my secondary supervisor, Professor Ursula Hurley for their invaluable advice, and for their ongoing support and patience throughout my PhD. They, as a supervisory team, have seamlessly balanced being enthusiastic about my critical thinking and encouraging me to challenge myself as a researcher by furthering it. I feel truly privileged to have benefited from their exceptional knowledge and extensive experience.

I would like to thank the University of Salford for funding my research through the Pathways to Excellence Studentship. Having access to this funding has allowed me to engage with a diverse range of opportunities which have benefited my professional development and networking skills immensely, and I am very grateful to have been a recipient of it.

I extend my gratitude to my Viva Voce examiners, Dr. Mark Yates and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Murat Öğütcü for taking the time to engage with my research and for facilitating the fruitful discussion that formed my thesis defence. Their detailed and welcome feedback proved to be instrumental in assisting me with the refinement of the final version of my thesis.

In addition to this, my thanks goes to Medieval and Early Modern Orients (MEMOs) for affording me numerous professional opportunities which have enabled me to enrich my understanding of my chosen field of research in practical ways. I feel fortunate to have been able to work with their research and admin teams throughout most of my PhD.

And lastly, but most definitely not least, my appreciation also goes to my mother, Sonia Hussain, my father, Shahid Hussain, and my sister, Alya Hussain for their unwavering moral support throughout the duration of my PhD and always. I have deeply valued their personal encouragement, as it has been important in inspiring me to continue my studies to this level and to complete my doctorate.

**Table of Contents**

**Abstract**

Portrayals of Turks in early modern cultural discourses resisted historical accuracy: Turks are represented as violent, lustful, barbaric, and despotic despite the existence of numerous seventeenth-century Anglo-Ottoman correspondence documents, in which Turks are often associated with wealth, military strength, and political efficiency. The stereotyped cultural Turk figure also affected the way dramatists portrayed Turks on stage. This very popular dramatic type is violent, lustful, and, as a result, politically corrupt. By looking at how the theatrical type may have generally encouraged early modern resurgences of crusading rhetoric, I explore how Fulke Greville's (1554-1628), Thomas Goffe's (1591-1629), and Roger Boyle's (1621-1679) work may, instead, be read as a response to culturally influenced portrayals of Turks on early modern English commercial and university stages, thus prompting the emergence of an anti-crusading discourse. In order to fully appreciate the work of these three authors and the way they conceived their plays, and positioned their voices, in this particular historical period, this thesis also includes two chapters which focus on 'Turk' plays by Robert Greene (1558-1592) and by Aphra Behn (1640-1689). Their work, I argue, reframes the way in which Ottomans were physically assimilated into English society and, thus, English culture. This study meets a major need in the field of early modern English drama in identifying and exploring how the emergence of a new Turkish type on stage, which focused on more accurate portrayals of Turks whose violence is always 'justified' by Ottoman law, aligned with an anti-crusading agenda in the works of Greville, Goffe, and Boyle.

## Research Questions

Primary Research Question:

1. How does the emergence of a new Turkish type on stage in the works of Greville, Goffe, and Boyle reflect what can be identified as an anti-crusading rhetoric?

Secondary Research Questions:

1. How did the negative theatrical Turkish type encourage early modern resurgences of crusading rhetoric in the majority of early modern work?
2. How did portrayals of the Turk in cultural discourses affect the way dramatists portrayed Turkish characters on stage?

## Introduction: Literature Review

The Turk "was England's primary eastern object of fear and fantasy" in early modern world (Richmond Barbour, 2003, p. 15; see Daniel Vitkus, 2003). Depictions of Turks on the early modern stage are a testimony to the popularity of the cultural type and "achieved an articulacy and a variety that would perhaps be repeated, but would not be superseded" (Matthew Dimmock, 2005, p. 6). Thus, the Turk, as these Orientalist literary theorists highlight, became a social construct that contributed to the English desire to create a distinction between the virtuous English Christian Self and the demonised Turkish Muslim Other (see Barbour, 2003; Vitkus, 2003; Matthew Dimmock, 2005; Joel Slotkin, 2009). This Literature Review gives an overview of conceptions of the Christian-Muslim binary during the seventeenth century, how it was featuring and functioning in early modern English drama, as well as what agenda most English dramatists used to encourage it. This is explored through evaluating existing critical literature concerned with Orientalism, crusading discourse, Anglo-Ottoman trade, and gender studies. The key finding of the Literature Review is that there is a gap in the existing critical literature of instances where crusading rhetoric, as well as traditional examples of Orientalism, are reframed into what this project aims to identify as an anti-crusading discourse.

Most early modern plays portray Turks as being the antithesis of what English Christians should be and how they should behave, as S. Schmuck claims with regards to Turks who, from an English Christian perspective, were "ambiguous, inconsistent, and impulsive" (S. Schmuck, 2006, 5). Mediterranean and Islamic otherness included a wide variety of identities which "were defined by an overlapping set of identity categories, including race, religion, somatic difference, sexuality, and political affiliation" (Vitkus, 2003, p.8). Furthermore, "pejorative epithets associated with the Ottomans in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries included 'bloody', 'cruel', and 'barbarous'" (McJannet, 2006, p. 16).

Turks were likened to natural disasters, such as tsunamis and tornadoes, and wild animals, such as wolves, snakes, and hogs. The wildness of their behaviours was also reflected in theatrical depictions of Turkish rule, according to McJannet, which was often "described as 'tyranny' or a 'yoke'" (2006, p.16).

Edward Said's original theory of Orientalism (1978), when applied to early modern literature, creates a twofold prototype which does not fully account for non-military interactions between those from the Orient and the Occident during the early modern period. Despite the recognition of Ottoman military capacity, as testified by early modern English dramatists who did not usually attempt to fictionalise Christian victory in a crusade against the Muslims, Turks were still depicted as cruel, lustful tyrants. Such a negative depiction may have been the product of English anxieties about being forced to undergo Islamic conversion (see Vitkus, 2003). This thesis will attempt to demonstrate how any strict East-West binary is unattainable in the work of Goffe, Greville, and Boyle, who recognised that a number of historical Ottoman authoritarian figures actually possessed admirable qualities, which resulted in a selection of battlefield victories: qualities which early seventeenth-century England may have wished to emulate under increasingly shaky political circumstances.[1]

Vitkus (2003) and Dimmock (2005) both elaborate upon Nabil Matar's study of religious conflict between Muslims and Christians and, indeed, between Protestants and Catholics, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (1999). What is interesting is a distinction between the seemingly violent interactions between the Christian and the Turk portrayed in English drama in contrast to the lack of violence between these opposing groups historically. Drama of the period was used to create fictional terror by staging repeated Holy

[1] See page 29 of this thesis: These qualities included "unity, martial excellence, and strict justice" (Linda McJannet, 2006, p. 60).

Wars inspired by the medieval crusades. This fictional terror created on the early modern stage may have been constructed because of hopes held by English Christians that a resurgence of nationalism in England would be initiated in preparation for a possible war between themselves and Muslim Turks.

The Other is defined by historians and literary critics as the binary opposite to the English Christians who wrote and watched plays about Muslim Turks in the early modern theatre. The English may have created this binary as resistance against the threat posed by the Ottoman Empire to an unstable Christianity in the hopes it would create Christian unity and strength (see Stuart Hall, 1997). As far as literary representations are concerned, the Turk is most often examined within an Orientalist framework because the trope has been created via a "style of thought"[2] in which the Turk is seen as the Other, both consciously and subconsciously (Tiryakioglu, 2015, p. 104). "Imperial envy", according to Gerald MacLean (2004), is defined as the English vilifying and degrading of the Turk and their Islamic values, which stemmed from jealousy of the wealth and power of the Ottoman Empire and how it factored into English perceptions of the Ottoman Empire during the medieval and early modern periods. Imperial envy contained Turkish power, as well as English captivation and anxiety about the Turk, within early modern writing and performance (MacLean, 2004, p. 20).

It can be concluded that these negative portrayals of the Turk precede early modern writing because Orientalism is a "trans-historical discourse" (Said, 1978, p. 106-7). What is

---

[2] "A style of thought" meaning a construct or opinion "based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between 'the Orient' and 'the Occident'", according to Said (1978, p. 2).

now known as Orientalism gave English Christians during the early modern period the opportunity to build their own identity as being directly opposed to that of the identity of the cruel, barbarous Turk. Thus, the construct of the Turk as a theatrical type on the early modern stage fuelled the perception that the English should compete against the Ottomans to obtain more land and, as a result, to increase the global presence of both Christianity and English commerce.

One way that the English could have competed with the Ottomans was by waging a crusade against them. Manion outlines that a crusade could be defined as a widespread military cause or as a conflict in which an individual or small collection of individuals participated. These definitions of the crusading discourse in early modern drama, specifically 'Turk plays', are not simply conceived as having the sole focus of "conversion and racial identity", according to Manion (2014, p. 6), but as being predominantly based around the medieval crusading narrative. These medieval narratives advocate for "united Christian action against the Turks to the populace despite the conciliatory attitude of Elizabeth I's government or the anti-Catholic polemic of ardent Protestant reformers" (Manion, 2014, p. 6).

There also exists critical interest in the siege of Jerusalem at the end of the First Crusade, as well as how the literary representation of this holy city was altered (see Suzanne Yeager, 2004) by English writers to "promote personal devotion, claims to moral superiority, or national identity" (Manion, 2014, p. 5). In contrast, Suzanne Conklin Akbari (2004) examines how the Western conceptualisation of religious and geographical Otherness in medieval and early modern literature and culture contributed to Occidental perceptions of the Muslim Other. Akbari concludes that medieval and early modern Orientalism, which not only features in romance literature of both periods but also in dramatic works, attempted to create clear distinctions between the virtuous Christian and the villainous Muslim.

The reproduction of medieval crusading ideals in early modern literature and drama cannot simply be "dismissed as crude, second-rate narratives that unquestionably reproduce established ideologies" (Nicola McDonald, 2013, p. 5), given the renewed interest in Ottoman culture. McDonald's study, then, links to Manion's questioning of "crusading's narrative power and cultural influence in literary texts" (Manion, 2014, p. 5). It is very likely that the English interest in the Turk and their empire, their culture, and their Islamic customs increased alongside Anglo-Ottoman encounters (mainly in the context of trade) during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

Matar's *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen* (1999), *Britain and Barbary, 1589-1689* (2005), as well as his article entitled 'The Barbary corsairs, King Charles I and the civil war' (2001) are all key studies in understanding the effect that North African piracy had upon early modern England's economy. The now-influential Ottoman Empire was not one that "England could possess, but one it had to watch and guard against" (Matar, 1999, p. 82). The identity of the Muslim Other, as Englishmen discovered in their voyages between "London and Salee, or Plymouth and New England, or Bristol and Guinea", was complicated as they became all of the following to English merchants: "buyer and seller, partner and pirate, captive and captor" (Matar, 1999, p. 82).

Alongside piracy on the Barbary coast, the Levant trade was a prevalent factor in shaping the way in which early modern Englishmen conceptualised the Turk during the first half of the seventeenth century. According to Anders Ingram, the Levant trade "served as a facilitator to those travelling in or writing on the Levant, easing the movement of men and their observations, preconceptions and impressions along the trade routes" (Ingram, 2009, p. 45). It also functioned to some degree as a source of inspiration for early modern dramatists to write about inhabitants of the Levant.

It was during the final ten years of the sixteenth century that references to the Levant trade started to become evident in literary and dramatic works, given that it had been initiated in the year 1580 (see MacLean, 2004; Ingram, 2009). However, these references were not abundant and references, instead, to the Ottoman-Habsburg 'Long War' (1593-1606), according to Ingram, feature in twenty-two of fifty-four works recorded in the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London (1591-1610). It appears that the Ottoman-Habsburg conflict "highlighted a 'gap in the market' for works [written] in English on the Ottomans, which was exploited by authors, printers, and publishers" (Ingram, 2009, p. 369). Many of these publications were Austrian works which were later translated into English, one example being the *History of the Warres between the Turkes and the Persians* translated into English by Abraham Hartwell (1595). However, a call for original English accounts of the 'Long War' and the issues that the Ottomans posed to the Occident, such as the *Policy of the Turkish Empire* (1597) written and published by an anonymous author, all became prevalent at this time.

Whilst most of the works mentioned are heavily influenced by anti-Ottoman sentiment, it seems that in 1603, at the point when James I ascended to the throne, there was a decline in publications concerned, however negatively, with the Turk. The most likely cause of the decline in English publications on the Ottomans was "the peace of Zsitvatorok of 1606, which brought the Ottoman-Habsburg war of 1593 to 1606 to an end, [resulting in] a glut in the market brought about by the sudden proliferation of works on this topic" (Ingram, 2009, p. 96). This could possibly explain the large gap between Goffe's writing (1618-19) and publication (1631-32) of his Turk plays, which will be explored in more depth in the first chapter of the thesis.

The most widely known example of anti-Ottoman sentiment featured in many historical accounts concerned with Ottoman culture, though, was Richard Knolles' *The Generall*

*Historie of the Turks* (which was published in 1603 and dedicated to King James I). Despite being written during a period of declining interest in the Turks, Knolles' work was, according to Ingram (2009), highly influential. Although Knolles targets Turks as being violent, his work was one of the only accounts of its kind that made explicit the political successes of the Ottoman Empire rather than choosing to demonise its subjects.

Whilst accounts like Knolles', as well as seventeenth-century travelogues written by those such as Blount and Lithgow, provide accounts of Anglo-Ottoman encounters mainly between traders, and therefore mainly between male figures, critical interest in the representation of early modern female Turks or Christian women in contact with Turks is also worth exploring. To acknowledge these encounters as they were recorded by influential English, and Ottoman, female figures "corrects misrepresentations (of women Eastern and Western)" and misrepresentations of Anglo-Ottoman contact "culturally-inculcated by male-authored narratives" (Sidney L. Sondergard, 2008, p. 1390). The recognition of said encounters also "counters the tendency in postcolonial analysis to anticipate the development of England's imperialist enterprise", especially when examining the nature of the contact pre-eighteenth-century England had with the Mughal and Ottoman Empires (Sondergard, 2008, p.1391).

The masculine archetype of "turning Turk" refers to how a male could become an apostate through means of circumcision or castration and, in return, could achieve a higher position of authority (Bernadette Andrea, 2017, p. 7). However, as Andrea highlights, a female could not undergo this process. Her only way to ascend in status would be to become a concubine or wife through marriage to a Turk, without necessarily converting to Islam. She also examines the correspondence between Queen Elizabeth and Safiye, Murad III's most favored wife and how this relationship between the two Queens might have contributed towards a renewed interest in Turkish people and their culture. Instances like gift exchanges

between Elizabeth I and Turkish Valide Sultana Safiye after the establishment of the Levant Company provide the historical context in which Greene's more nuanced portrayal of Ottoman Muslims is conceived, which I explore further in Chapter Two.

The exchanges of gifts such as garments and cosmetic products (both typically associated with femininity) between the two female sovereigns assisted them in forming "'another' kind of commerce, among themselves" (Andrea, 2017, p. 13). This commerce created by the two women functioned as their sphere in which to partake in their alternative version of male negotiation.

This negotiation also occurs in early modern drama, where female characters in early modern Turk and Moor plays are either compared to Queen Elizabeth I, in a positive light, or in direct contrast to the English Queen as evil, scheming temptresses (see Lamiya Almas, 2009). Almas (2009) analyses dramatic portrayals of Roxolana, a woman kidnapped from the Ukraine by Crimean Tatars and sold into the Ottoman imperial harem as a concubine during the 1520s. Roxolana was said to have 'turned Turk' and quickly became Sultan Suleiman I's favourite concubine, and then his wife shortly after her apostasy.

According to Knolles, the factual Roxolana persuaded Suleiman to take her as his wife (Knolles, 1603, p. 760). This interest, then, may have been derived from the fact that Roxolana went against the traditional Ottoman hierarchy and rose from concubine to the position of Sultana. Greville, according to Almas, emphasises the evil nature of his Roxolana (spelt as the variant Rossa) because she plots to murder the Sultan's eldest son, Mustapha, (her stepson) so that his younger brother, Zanger (her son with the Sultan), could become heir to the throne. Her daughter, Camena, disagrees with her methods and so she kills her too. Her gender as ruler may have been, according to Greville, a "disruptive force" (Almas, 2009, p. 130) that created "unstable power relations between husbands and wives, parents and children" (Karen Raber, 2001, p. 137).

In contrast, Boyle's portrayal of Roxolana was much more sympathetic, even going as far as to say that his Sultana was "sophisticated, compassionate, and just" (Almas, 2009, p. 143). Since Boyle was writing, in the year 1665, at "a time of political recovery in England just five years since the restoration of Charles the II" (Almas, 2009, p. 144) and the Dutch war had recently begun, his Roxolana functioned as a comment upon the current political climate too. Boyle's depiction of Roxolana is that of "a prognosticator who plays an admirable and gracious political and maternal role in trying to save the Queen of Hungary and her infant son" (Almas, 2009, p. 145). She even warns Suleiman about the evil Rustan, who tries to sever the bond Mustapha and Suleiman have by telling the Sultan that his son has joined forces with the enemy's army. Boyle could be offering comment here on the political turmoil that the restoration brought about in England, given that the country was more stable in a religious and political sense under the rule of Elizabeth I.

Boyle's Roxolana may have been a reminder for his audience of the power and compassion that the female monarch can have. As far as Roxolana as the 'turned Turk' is concerned, both versions of *Mustapha* are suited to "represent explorations and experiences […such as] building alliances and carrying out negotiations between friend and foe" (Almas, 2009, p. 151). Ludmilla Kostova also analyses how Boyle uses the Roxolana figure to explore the ways religious apostasy and conversion were affected by an individual's gender (see Kostova, 2012). Boyle's Roxolana may not be inherently evil because she is not Turk-born, whereas Greville may have believed the very fact she turned Turk made her evil because she accepted what the English generally deemed evil morals and beliefs.

The "reformation of the state, conceived by the young princes [in *Mustapha*]" (Kostova, 2012, p. 25), was more pertinent than ever under the context in which Boyle was writing. In act five, scene eight, Roxolana wishes the Queen well before she goes back to Buda with her infant son:

[Roxolana]: Go, Madam, go, and hasten to your Throne!

Live to find Zanger's Friendship in your Son.

Be with much pow'r more happy then I prov'd,

Live to be fear'd, and yet continue lov'd.

(*Mustapha,* 1665, 5.8.118–122)

Here, the Queen of Buda is "privileged over Roxolana" (Kostova, 2012, p. 25), since Boyle's Suleiman reprimands her for her scheming to send the Queen back to her land without his permission. Roxolana's banishment can be read as "patriarchal fantasy" (Claire Jowitt, 2003, p. 69), in which Boyle may have deemed an excessive amount of female authority can be limited or controlled.

J.A. Hayden (2016) outlines the political framework within which the figure of Roxolana was situated. She analyses the characterisation of Roxolana in William Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes* (1663), Roger Boyle's *Mustapha* (1668), and Elkanah Settle's *Ibrahim the Illustrious Bassa* (1676). Of the three dramatists that each characterise Roxolana as devious, Boyle is the only dramatist that has his Suleiman divorce her and exile her from his court as punishment for her wrongdoings. Boyle's reason for doing so may be to illuminate how "women are not capable of moderating their passion [in this case not sexual passion but Roxolana's passion for her son, Zanger, to become Sultan], [and so] the monarch must assert his authority, even in love" (Hayden, 2016, p. 81). Boyle's solution to the "contemporary 'crisis' at court—that is, the mistresses—is forthright and clear" (Hayden, 2016, p. 81): to remove those women who attempt political intervention so that they, once again, become mere "Ornament[s] of Pow'r" (*Mustapha,* 1665, 5.9.795) by remaining devoted to their husbands and supporting the political agenda of the male.

To represent the early modern Eastern female, or the "Ornament of Pow'r" (*Mustapha,* 1665, 5.2.795), the face veil functioned as a prominent symbol used by English dramatists. It

evoked a number of outlooks, “including [of] curiosity, identification, condemnation, and envy” (McJannet, 2009, p. 186). Andrea (2017) explores the works of these playwrights by analysing early examples of feminist Orientalism. Such examples place the “source of patriarchal oppression onto an ‘Oriental’, ‘Mahometan’ society” (McJannet, 2009, p. 186) and, thus, contribute to the promotion of (what would later become known as) imperialism in early modern Britain. However, Andrea also recognises and praises those playwrights who avoided the inclusion of domineering patriarchal ideologies of seventeenth-century Britain in their writing. Doing so allowed playwrights to avoid the sentiment associated with proto-Orientalism and, also, to provide their audience with a counter-Orientalist critique of early modern patriarchal norms.

However, Hayden (2016) also points out that, although Roxolana was no longer recognised by the Ottomans as Sultana post-banishment, she was a figure represented continually on the early modern stage as both an influential and a threatening force of feminine appeal. In addition, early modern dramatists sometimes omit proto-Orientalist sentiment by denouncing the “double standard where women pay dearly for their gullibility or assertive sexuality, while men remain in or rise to positions of power” (McJannet, 2009, p. 167). Although Roxolana (in both Greville’s and Boyle’s plays) is punished for her “gullibility or assertive sexuality”, it can be concluded that she, as argued by some early modern commentators, “not only took over Suleiman’s heart, but also his Empire when she became his political advisor” (Almas, 2009, p. 117). She thus remained a “social and political paradigm” within literary and dramatic discourses (Hayden, 2016, p. 88).

In Greville’s play, McJannet argues that Roxolana is portrayed as the main instigator in Mustapha’s unjust death, since she persuaded her husband (falsely) that his son planned to usurp his throne via murder. Although, McJannet’s argument outlines that “the rhetorical and dramatic elements typically reserved from commentary (asides, soliloquys, and choruses) are

used to complicate moral issues and explore cultural differences, not to malign Muslims or the Turks in general" (McJannet, 2006, p. 167). In Boyle, however, the monarch's (Suleiman's) responsibility for the death of his son (Mustapha) is significantly increased in comparison to those same characters in the likes of Greville's *Mustapha.*

Boyle's *Mustapha* is a play in which Turks simply adhere to "their assigned roles in the [tragic] genre" (McJannet, 2006, p. 167). The Other in Boyle is merely viewed as a "version of the self" (McJannet, 2006, p. 167) rather than being perceived as barbaric. Greville, more so than Boyle, makes specific references to the variations between Christian and Ottoman political, social, and religious customs, rather than to the Other as a variation of the English Self. In some instances, he even favours the effectiveness of Turkish politics and military strategy over those of his homeland. As a result of doing so, Boyle seems to part from portraying his Turks by adhering to a traditional Orientalist framework—which encourages the creation of binaries between virtuous English Christians and villainous Ottoman Muslims—, which Chapter One will now proceed to expand upon.

## Chapter One ~ Historic and Fictionalised Anglo-Ottoman Encounters

### 1.0. Background to the Research

In the first half of the seventeenth century the resurgence of the Crusades (1095-1291) as a historical context in early modern English literature is testimony to a renewed interest in the Ottoman culture (Lee Manion, 2014), very likely determined by the anxieties emerging from contemporary Anglo-Ottoman trade arrangements (Ágoston, 2013; Erkoç, 2016). Turks were, indeed, as Tiryakioglu highlights, compared to "the rampaging Goths, Vandals, and Lombards who were blamed for the destruction of ancient Rome" (Tiryakioglu, 2015, p. 65). Through the crusading discourse, it is possible to trace the roots of early modern representations of Turks back to the religious and cultural history of medieval Europe, when the First Crusade was seen as a means to relieve the Orient from what Western Christians perceived as barbarism.

The resulting cultural anxiety situated within literature depicting crusades also took central stage in early modern plays, where writers like Spenser in his *Faerie Queene* (1590), Marlowe in his *Tamburlaine* (1590), and Shakespeare in his *Othello* (1603) offer interesting perspectives on the crusading narrative and the way it fashioned the start of the modern age (Manion, 2014), resulting in an expected neat opposition between the English audience and the Other, now perceived as the lustful Turk[3]. The derogatory representation of the Turks was even corroborated by the distorted narrative of Pope Urban II who claimed that Muslim Ottomans acted upon their lust against Christian males, females, and bishops in the form of sexual abuse: "They circumcise the Christians…What shall I say of the abominable rape of the women?" (Urban, 1095; see English translation in Munro, 1895). These stereotyped

[3] See page 11: The Other is defined as the binary opposite to the English Christians who wrote and watched plays about Muslim Turks in the early modern theatre.

features attached to the Turk in cultural discourses are also mirrored in the drama of the period.

A simple search on the Literature Online database demonstrates how theatre appropriates the stereotype of the lustful Turk in plays published before and after the Restoration. The adjective 'lustful' (in all its variants and spellings) is attributed to the 'Turk' in a selection of forty-three plays published during the years 1600-1670. What is interesting, however, is the texts' widespread combination of the Turk's sensuous appetite with political tyranny, as evidenced in plays such as *Lust's Dominion* (1600), *The Fair Maid of the West* (1602), and *The Renegado* (1630), to mention but a few of the most popular performed works. In these dramatic works, the traditional Orientalist stereotype of lustful Turks reappears in the characters of Eleazar, Mullisheg, and Asambeg, who successfully contribute to the downfall of Occidental monarchs by persuading them to embrace a lustful behavior, thus becoming unfit rulers in the eyes of their subjects (Lamiya Almas, 2009).

Critical interest in the representation of Turks within an Orientalist discourse focuses upon specific associations of Turkishness with indolence, barbarity, despotism, and lustfulness (see Edward Said, 1978; Ania Loomba, 2002; Nevsal Tiryakioglu, 2015; see Almas for a focus on gender). Against this background, scholars have started to investigate how specific religious undertones have played an important role on the early modern London stage (see Linda McJannet et. al., 2009; D. S. Yassin, 2012; see Seda Erkoç, 2016; Suzanne Keller, 2017).

Despite these important critical contributions to the debates around the crusading discourse, little has been said about equally significant early modern oppositions to that discourse and its rhetoric in drama. Even Bridget Orr's valuable study (2001), which explores the connections between English anxieties about Turkishness and seventeenth-century Anglo-Ottoman trade arrangements, fails to acknowledge the equally important contributions of

several early modern playwrights who succeeded in offering what can be considered an anti-crusading rhetoric on stage, which finds its best expression in Fulke Greville's *The Tragedy of Mustapha* (1609), Thomas Goffe's *The Raging Turk* (1618) and *The Courageous Turk* (1619), and Roger Boyle's *The Tragedy of Mustapha* (1665).

My research investigates Turkishness in the works of these three authors, who situate their voices within what I argue is an anti-crusading discourse. These dramatists revisited the crusading rhetoric by presenting Turkish characters who, despite their passions, are seen as successful politicians. These plays form the basis of chapters two, three, and four. These chapters focus upon how—in an interesting shift from their contemporaries—Greville, Goffe, Boyle, (and to an extent, Greene, and Behn) discuss characters who seem to part from the traditional Orientalist portrayal of Turks whose sexual incontinence parallels with political ambition and corruption. In the fifth chapter, I discuss representations of Turkish characters in Restoration drama through an exploration of more nuanced representations of Turkishness in Aphra Behn's *The False Count* (1681), followed by more negative discussions of Turkishness in Delariviere Manley's *The Royal Mischief* (1696). References will also be made to George Farquhar's *The Beaux Stratagem* (1707). The chronological order followed in this investigation will help demonstrate how the development of dramatists' engagement with anti-crusading rhetoric throughout the duration of the seventeenth century reflect specific interpretations of current political and social anxieties.

### 1.1 Crusading Discourses

To better understand the feud between the Germanic-Roman Habsburg Empire and the Ottomans, it is important to trace it back to the medieval period—or, what became known as the 'crusading period' (see Manion, 2014). The Habsburg Empire was divided into "two parts in late Antiquity: a Western and an Eastern. The decisive event in this respect took place on May 29th, 1453: the fall of the Eastern Roman—or Byzantine—Empire when Sultan

Mehmed II (1432-1481), the Conqueror, captured—or liberated—the capital, Constantinople" (Bent Holm, 2013, p. 12). From a Christian perspective, the city of Constantinople had been seized by the Antichrist. The disaster was explained as God's vengeance against those Christians who were practising a false religion and were therefore punished by God's scourge: the Turks (Andrew Wheatcroft, 1995, p. 25).

Richard Knolles' *The Generall Historie of the Turks* (1603) details the seizure of Constantinople at the hands of the Turks, outlining how the

> […] fury of the Barbarians, [resulted in the deaths of] many thousands of men, women, and children, without respect of age, sex, or condition. Many for safegard of their lives, fled into the Temple of Sophia, where they were all without pity slain, except some few reserved by the barbarous victors, to purposes more grievous than death itself. The rich and beautiful ornaments and jewels […] the magnificent Church of that most sumptuous and pluckt down and carried away by the Turks: and the Church itselfe built for God to be honoured in, for the present conuerted into a stable for their horses, or a place for the execution of their abhominable and unspeakeable filthinesse: the image of the crucifix was also by them taken downe, and a Turk cap upon the head […] and calling it the God of the Christians.
>
> (Knolles, 1603, p. 26)

The extract is evidence of a number of derogatory representations of the Turk in English travel narratives which, as aforementioned, corroborate discussions of Turkish male sexuality through the Orientalist discourse. This is also the case, for example, in seventeenth century travelogues. Sir Henry Blount describes Turks as exhibiting "sodomy, which in the Levant is not held a vice" (Blount, 1636, p. 143), and William Lithgow's English travelogue maligns Turks as being "generally addicted to, besides all their sensuall [sic] and incestuous lusts, unto Sodomy" (Lithgow, 1640, p. 102).

What, however, seems to be interesting is that these portrayals of Turks in English travelogues are somehow counterbalanced by a number of English publications on Turkish history which contained a much less prejudiced representation of Turks—and Turkish rulers. In these accounts, Turkish rulers are not barbaric, despotic, and lustful. These works, like the aforementioned *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (1603), highlighted the downfall of the Christians in Constantinople at the hands of the Turks, noting how Ottoman Sultan Mehmet II abolished Christian reign in Constantinople on May 29th, 1453, instead of glorifying the Christian rule of the city. The implications raised in these texts are crucial to understanding how historical narratives accounted for Turkish strength—and violence and lust—that, according to Samuel Chew, was "permitted […] to expand by God's will" (1937, p.1). Chew continues listing the other reasons for the downfall: "the uncertainty of worldly affairs, the lack of unity in Christendom, the Turks' ardent desire for sovereignty, and their unity and agreement among themselves, their courage, frugality, and temperance" (1937, p. 1).

The Ottoman regime, which developed shortly after the empire split in 1453, was organised around nearly constant wartime conditions and signalled a real divide between the West and the East. The Germanic-Roman Empire was, in the eyes of Turkish Muslims, considered a target for prospective Islamic and Turkish rulership (known informally as the "red apple" trope). This was because the Ottomans believed it was occupied by non-believers (Christians) and therefore declared that their half of the empire was the "domain of war" and was to be transformed, through defeat in battle, "into the domain of peace" (Holm, 2013, p.13). It is because of this chasm between medievally received responses of Turkish and the historically informed recognition of Oriental dominance (both politically and economically) that dramatists like Greville, Goffe, and Boyle could find a space where onstage representations of Turks could be altered to serve a less heavily stereotyped, and more truthful, version of the dramatic Turk.

## 1.2. The Historical and Cultural Turkish Types

During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the Ottoman Empire expanded in wealth due to newly established Anglo-Ottoman trade links, and especially grew in territorial gain under the reign of Sultan Suleyman (1495-1566), who led his troops to the "vicinity of Vienna across the Middle East to Iran and the Arabian Peninsula and took in most of North Africa" in 1683 (Holm, 2013, p. 13).The Barbary States of North Africa were the birthplace of early modern piracy that impacted three centuries worth of Western, especially Danish, contact with the Ottoman Empire. A definitive event for Ottoman relations with the Western hemisphere took place in the year 1683 when the Ottoman Empire "received [their] final blow" (Holm, 2013, p. 130) when they unsuccessfully invaded Vienna, the centre of the Habsburg Empire. This was a defining moment in Ottoman history because it was the first time the Ottomans were the instigators of a crusade against the West, thus starting a chain that ultimately led to the Empire's slow decline and eventual collapse.

The figurehead who held absolute authority over the now Ottoman Empire was the sultan, whose orders were often accepted in a sense of religious, more specifically Islamic, validation. The state that the sultan governed was, therefore, "a manifestation of divine order" (Holm, 2013, p. 12). If an Ottoman ruler was defeated, it was often believed by Muslims that he was so because he had been treacherous or deviant. The Janissaries, "an infantry unit and a standing army" used as "imperial bodyguards who aimed to protect the sovereign" (Gilles Veinstein, 2005, p. 116) by force from being attacked or overthrown. Interestingly, however, they were also capable of overthrowing an Emperor if they felt it was necessary for the continuation of what the Ottomans believed was a successful empire. Rather than being strictly legalised, Ottoman military coups became de facto events (which was mostly related to the lapse of military payment due to the Islamic calendar's lapse year). Rather than being

permitted to do so, the Janissaries simply used force (especially after Ahmet I's reign when fratricide was abandoned by his decree) to introduce new ways for many contesters present to overthrow the Sultan. The sultan's band of advisers most often included a grand vizier (someone the sultan would consult for political advice) and would also have access to the consultation of a Divan (an advisory board). Power was contained, physically, within the sultan's Topkapi palace, which was originally named the Yeni Sarayi or the 'New Palace' built under the rule (and orders) of Sultan Mehmed II. The "central state administration was named after the entrance to the domicile of the grand vizier: Bab-i Ali, Sublime Porte, High Porte, sometimes simply Porte, a term applied to the regiment as a whole" (Holm, 2013, p. 12). It is clear from the organised way in which the Ottoman Court was structured that the historical Turkish type is not presented as prioritising lust over political duty or being motivated solely by violent impulses. Instead, the historical Turkish type represents the Ottoman Court as being governed by a set of clearly established religious and cultural traditions dictated by Ottoman beauracracy; a system whose laws were considered even more official than that of the Sultan's own orders.

But, of course, the strength of seventeenth-century Ottoman rule may have come to represent political danger for the English monarchy. The anxieties caused by the threat of Ottoman domination may have encouraged the circulation of narratives of doom depicting English hopes of an imminent downfall of Turkish power in the West. These narratives increasingly adopted negative tropes of lascivious and violent Turks, which became deeply rooted in the early modern cultural discourses. When, for example, the knowledge of the Ottoman sultan's harem—with hundreds of women: wives or sultanas, concubines, and obliques guarded by Black Eunuchs and overseen by a Kislar Aga (Holm, 2013, p. 13)—reached England, it was immediately used to stigmatise all Turks as sexually incontinent, though intriguing. However, it is important to note that "Ottoman narrative sources are

virtually silent with regard to life within the harem" (L.P. Pierce, 1993, p. 33). Thus, we are provided with a reminder that the Ottoman harem—the formation of which was adopted from Byzantine pleasure palaces (see Alicia Walker, 2011)—was a private zone and that reliable information about what happened in this space was widely unavailable to Western writers. Occidental accounts, like those concerning Ottoman sultans who met Greek lovers in the harem (a particularly popular topic in the early modern period which found its source in Knolles' historical account) were based upon speculation.

Another example of simultaneous fascination with and horror of the Turks' lifestyle can be found in English acquaintance with Ottoman executioners, known as a bostangi (Turkish for 'gardener'), who fulfilled the dual role of keeping the harem presentable but were also often summoned to carry out political killings. Their preferred method of killing, as Goffe references when his Jacup is summoned to die, was strangulation and, more specifically, strangulation by a "silken cord" (Holm, 2013, p. 13). Rather than being an official legalised matter, the strangulation of throne contesters was Mehmet II's decree and became a precedent for successive fratricides. It was notably abandoned by Ahmet I through his changing of the succession regulations into the eldest sibling rule. (Although, 'illegal' fratricides still took place after this regulation was changed). This practice was reserved only for use upon members of the Ottoman royal family for the purpose of protecting imperial order and bloodlines. Upon the crowning of a new sultan, his younger brother(s) and/or male cousins would be sentenced to death by strangulation by that new successor, which was done in the hopes of preventing usurpation attempts by the younger sibling(s). This tradition was, at a later stage, removed in favour of the practice of imprisoning the sultan's younger male family members in secluded areas referred to as cages (or kafes) situated in remote areas of the palace.

These scenarios of violence, strength, and family murders fascinated Elizabethan and Jacobean audiences who continued to look at the Ottomans with fear and intrigue. Examining letters, for example those exchanged between James I and the Turkish Sultan Ahmet between 1603 and 1624, however, is crucial for us to understand the efforts made to maintain civil interactions, and to prevent (or at the least, to limit) the outbreak of conflict between English and Turkish merchants and travellers. In 1605, for example, a letter was sent by

> James, by the mercy of most gracious and almighty God, sole maker and ruler of the World, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland; most powerful and invincible defender of the true faith against all idolators falsely professing the name of Christ, to the most august and invincible Emperor, Sultan Ahmet, the most potent ruler of the kingdom of the Musulmans, and Monarch of the Eastern Empire, sole and supreme over all.
>
> (TNA/SP97/8/310, James I to the Turkish Sultan Ahmet, 1605)

The way in which James addresses Ahmet as a "most august and invincible Emperor" suggests either that the English King possesses great respect for Ahmet and his governance of the Ottoman Empire or, that his agenda is to establish peaceful relations with him through flattery. Another letter exchanged between the two monarchs was concerned with an impromptu attack on the island of Zea which was carried out by Thomas Sherley and his men in the February of 1602 (E. Denison Ross, 1934, p. 209). Consequently, Sherley was captured by Greek Turkish citizens of Zea and was detained on the island before being taken to Negropont—approximately one month later—and was further held captive from 20th March 1602 until 25th July 1605.

After being detained at Negropont, Sherley was relocated to Constantinople, where he was held captive under the orders of the Turkish Sultan Ahmet, prompting James I to write

the above letter requesting his release. James states that "[Sherley] is our subject, and on that account ought to be given up to us, unless he deserved this punishment for some shameful crime; we are moved by their prayers, to entreat you again on his behalf; and by these letters solicit Your Majesty for his liberty to be effected" (TNA/SP97/8/310, James I to the Turkish Sultan Ahmet, 1605; transcribed by E. Denison Ross, 1934). James' letters convinced Ahmet to release Thomas Sherley from prison on 6th December 1605. Ahmet's decision may have been testament to his willingness to preserve civil relations with England and possibly to prevent further unprovoked English attacks upon the Ottoman sphere in retaliation to his detainment of Sherley.

It appears that Sherley's actions were more aligned with the stereotypically violent way in which Turks were often regarded in cultural discourse. This piece of historical evidence of the blurring of the divide between seventeenth-century English expectations of Turkish versus English (mis)conduct seems to resonate with Goffe's rendering of the cultural stereotypes often attributed to portrayals of Turks and of Christians on stage as being somewhat ambiguous. This ambiguity becomes especially apparent, for example, in Goffe's portrayal of Sultan Amurath I, who unexpectedly shows mercy to Christian warrior, Cobelitz, by allowing him to live as they duel with one another in the final scene of *The Courageous Turk*. However, Cobelitz does not repay Amurath with the same merciful behaviour and, instead, treacherously murders him. Goffe's ambiguous portrayals of Turks and Christians in the wider context of both of his Turk plays will be the focus of the following chapter of this thesis.

## 1.3. The Dramatic Turkish Type in the Early Modern Period

According to Daniel Vitkus, "the Great [stage] Turk became a European bogey partly on the strength of a dynastic track record of executions, poisonings, strangulations, and general

familicide" (2000, p. 18). As briefly mentioned before, the London stage fabricated a significant number of narratives serving a specific political agenda focussing on the fall of the Ottoman Empire (which will eventually take place in 1683). During the first half of James I's rule, several pageants, such as *London's Love to the Royal Prince Henrie* (produced May 1610 by Henry, Prince of Wales, Alfred, W. Pollard, and G. R. Redgrave) and *Heaven's Blessings and Earth's Joy* (1613, directed by John Taylor), were staged to aid the celebration of royal affairs and contributed to filling the anti-Muslim agenda. As well as being designed to amuse the English public, these pageants also depicted a fictionalised Christian triumph over the Turk who, in reality, was yet to be conquered. The writers of these pageants, undoubtedly aware of the increase in early seventeenth-century Moroccan and Algerian seizure of thousands of English ships, offered narratives of heroic Christian conquests at the expense of dishonourable and weak Muslim opposers. Thus, the pageants voiced hopes, rather than realities, for the defeat of the Turk at the hands of a united Christendom.

*London's Love to the Royal Prince Henrie* highlighted the conflict between the Turks and the English through the inclusion of religious language. Such language highlighted that the conflict was between virtuous Christian traders and evil Muslim pirates. In a wider context, this type of religious conflict, although enacted by men, could have been interpreted as a conflict between faiths. The conflict staged in this pageant was a dispute over the lands of the Muslim (Ottoman Empire) and Christian (England) faiths respectively.

Staged on the Thames, a "water-fight" between a "Turkish pirate" ship and a "Worthie Fleete of her Citizens" on board "two merchant's shippes" was enacted (J.B. Nichols, 1828, p. 155). This fictitious episode emphasised the strength of the heroic English merchants who defeated the Turkish fleets. As J.B. Nichols remarks in a much later commentary on seventeenth-century pageantry entitled *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First* (1828) "the merchants and men of war, after a long and

well-fought skirmish, prooved too strong for the pirate, they spoyled bothe him and blew up the castle, ending the whole batterie with verie rare and admirable fire-workes, as also a worthie peale of chambers" (1828, p. 155).

Turks on stage appear, then, too weak to succeed in foreign politics and too lustful to succeed in internal politics, as evident in George Peele's *The Turkish Mahomet and Hyren the Fair Greek* (1594). This non-extant play, according to Farhana Wazir Khan (2011), is thought to have characterised, quite stereotypically, the Turk as being unable to control his lust upon meeting his Greek concubine. Peele, through the portrayal of his Mahomet, suggests that the Turk is unable to regulate his passions in order to participate in both the personal and the political; he is only able to become victorious in a crusade if he violently resists lustful distractions. Similarly, Knolles also refers to Mehmed II's relationship with Hirene as a set of "disordered affections, where reason ruleth not the reine" (Knolles, 1603, p. 350) and stereotypes his version of the Turkish Sultan as being the ineffective ruler overcome by lust for Hirene. This leads to Mahomet's facilitation of Hirene's murder, by which he appears unperturbed and, thus, Knolles' presentation of this Ottoman Sultan also corroborates violent stereotypes often attached to the Turk.

Knolles states that, historically, Mehmed II only succeeded in warfare because he concluded that "excess of passion, rather than the proper restraint of passion, provoked the execution of Hirene" (Knolles, 1603, p. 26). Farhana Wazir Khan argues that "this action of bloody determination at the end [of both Goffe's *The Courageous Turk* and Peele's Turk play] looks to work against the idea that Muslim men are incapable [of] control[ling] their sexual modes and perceptions, but only inasmuch as such deeds conflict with their duty as conquerors and holy fighters" (2011, p. 139). This highlights another central matter in the Christian perception of Islam as being a religion governed by unjust, violent principles.

The preoccupation with apostasy, conversion and 'turning' to Islam in pre-Restoration theatre is also of central concern in plays such as Robert Daborne's *A Christian Turned Turk* (1612) and Philip Massinger's *The Renegado* (1630). Each play is centrally concerned with the dangers and temptations posed by Islamic conversion. These threats are explored through the 'turning' Turk or apostasy of individual characters, as well as the irreversible nature of apostasy in Daborne, which leads to their subsequent downfall and the reversible nature of apostasy in Massinger, which allows them to be absolved. My research will explore how each play highlights the unstable authority of Christianity in Europe at the time of their publication and the Occidental fear of Islamic conversion that resulted from it. Both plays depict Islam as influential, affluent, and sensually appealing. As well as for erotic purposes, Islamic conversion in Daborne is presented as an inviting prospect for traders, whose 'turning' was a response to economic circumstance and a means of securing civil international relations. It is also presented by Daborne and Massinger as an attractive solution for pirates, whose apostasy was either convenient or saved their lives from captors. Both playwrights presented their audience with the challenge of identification with characters who were involved in a controversial combination of trade, renegadism, apostasy, and conversion.

In these plays, concerns about Western identity interconnect with anxieties related to sexuality. Indeed, the two discourses coalesce in scene seven of *A Christian Turned Turk* when Voada professes "Know then I love, / But not the man […] whose religion / Speaks me an infidel" (*A Christian Turned Turk*, VII.119-22), highlighting the religious conflict that may arise were Ward not to convert to Islam before marrying her. Her ultimatum is that before she can give him her hand in marriage, Ward must "Turn[s] Turk" (*ACTT,* VII.127) and adopt her religious customs to give him her hand in marriage. The following dumb show (*ACTT,* VIII) functions in a way that stages the unstageable in Daborne's play. Ward's apostasy is physically indicated in the scene both through his donning of Turkish

garments and how he ‘throws away the cup’ (8. stage directions) of wine, signifying his rejection of Christ’s sacrifice.

An implication made by Sares in scene nine—“I saw him Turk to the circumcision. / Marry, therein I heard he played Jew with ‘em, / Made ‘em come to the cutting of an ape’s tail” (*ACTT*, IX.2-4)—suggests Ward may also have been circumcised as part of his initiation offstage. Daborne may also have utilised the dumb show to prompt his audience to question the very nature of Ward’s conversion and how it could be perceived as being merely a physical, and not a spiritual, one. Ward does not remove his “Christian habit” (*ACTT,* VIII. stage directions) before putting on his Turkish garments and claiming, in scene thirteen, that he wishes to “betray this town, [and] blow up the castle” (*ACTT,* XIII.94), which reinforces the belief of Voada and a janissary that Ward is a “false runagate” (*ACTT*, XIII.104). Although he states that he is “a Turk, and [he] do[es] crave the law” (*ACTT,* XVI.241), this can be interpreted as what Joshua Mabie describes as “an example of legal posturing rather than an authentic declaration of identity” and sincere belief in Islamic values (2012, p. 1).

Ward justifies his apostasy because of the economic benefits he will reap from engaging with the Mediterranean economy in North Africa. He questions “What is one island / Compared to the Eastern monarchy?” (*ACTT,* VII.181-82), which reaffirms the inauthentic nature of his conversion. His identity as the overambitious Englishman would most likely have resonated with Daborne’s English audience and amplified their awareness of the economic attractions of the Ottoman empire. Ward’s superficial conversion is also a concept corroborated by the rejection he faces from the Governor regarding his appeal to stand as a Turk (*ACTT,* XVI.249). The janissary’s assessment of Ward is also a crucial element in our understanding of the reliability of Ward’s renegade status. The janissary also converted from

Christianity to Islam and, thus, possesses the agency to "judge the authenticity of converted loyalty" (Mabie, 1012, p. 1).

The conversions of Ward and of Benwash are the result of the prioritisation of 'libido over both faith and reason' as opposed to genuine spiritual transformation. Despite Alizia's attempt to prevent Ward from converting to Islam due to libido— "Sell not your soul for such a vanity" (*ACTT*, VII.206)—Ward is unable to ignore the allure of Voada. Benwash uses his wife to secure his financial benefits, since he has no daughter who he can utilise to charm Christian males. Thus, Occidental anxieties about religious conversion and the sexual discourses that coalesce into it are apparent in the Islamic conversion of Benwash and of Ward. Benwash's conversion differs from 'turning' Turk for the purposes of desire, as seen in Voada's seduction of Ward and his resulting conversion, because it is motivated by a fear of cuckoldry.

Although Benwash's identity as a Muslim convert has little stress placed upon it, his character can still be classified as a renegade because of his conversion to Islam to protect his wife from being wooed by a lustful Turk in Tunis. Subsequently, he is made a cuckold by Gallop and thus, the eroticism related to religious conversion is apparent in Daborne's writing because Benwash's Jewish identity is established by his conversion. In scene sixteen, he claims: "I sware as I was a Turk, and I will cut your throat as I am a Jew" (*ACTT*, XVI.75). The final words Benwash speaks before being killed by Dansiker are "Bear witness, though I lived a Turk, I die a Jew" (*ACTT*, XVI.213), and thus, he challenges the boundaries of his religious identity.

Crossing religious boundaries also allows Benwash to transgress the anti-Semitic trope of the Jewish vagrant. Benwash has developed the ability to form profitable associations that transgress borders dictated by religious identity. This is because he has formed mercantile relations with Jews, Christians, and Muslims. Such a development of Jewish identity may

be reminiscent of English Protestants in the seventeenth-century Mediterranean sphere. Although they were able to trade and build societies, they were unable to secure nationality or mutual religious belief in the district without 'turning' Turk (see Daniel Vitkus, 2003).

In addition to the murder of Benwash at the hands of Dansiker, Daborne presents the consequences of adopting a renegade status through a parallel between the suicides of Dansiker and Ward. It can be argued that both suicides are inspired by Shakespeare's writing of the death of Othello because both characters utilise their deaths to "make examples of themselves" (Vitkus, 2003, p. 157). The last lines of dialogue spoken by Dansiker, coupled with his suicide— "heaven is just: / Christians did fall by me, by slaves I must (*ACTT,* XVI.203-4)—are comparable to Othello's final words, which are as follows: "When you shall these unlucky deeds relate, / Speak of me as I am; nothing extenuate, / Nor set down aught in malice" (*Othello,* V.ii.391-93). Both "suggest divine retribution and damnation" (Vitkus, 2003, p. 157) for their wrongdoings, yet it is evident neither Ward nor Dansiker wish to have "All [the] tortures man e'er knew" (*ACTT*, XVI.288) inflicted on them.

Instead, Daborne frames suicide, which was frequent on early modern stages (see Shakespeare's *Othello*, 1603), as a dramatisation of a self-imposed reprimand and, more specifically for Ward, the murder of the malevolent Turk he has become. Both Ward and Dansiker take control of their deaths, which we could possibly be left feeling they deserve, unlike Othello. Thus, the moral offered by Daborne is a simpler one than that offered by Shakespeare, since the Christian perspective on damnation and divine punishment is affirmed, as opposed to unsettled.

However, Daborne presents Ward as a more impenitent and less merciful renegade than Dansiker, and so, it is important to recognise that he not only offers parallels between the two characters but also a contrast in the way their suicides are differently motivated. A letter included in *News from Sea* (1609) states that "Ward makes prey of all, and Dansiker has

compassion of some" (Anthony Nixon, 1609, p. 1). Here, Captain Dansiker of Argier is merciful to a degree, possibly harkening back to his release of an English ship, the *Charity*. Similarly, Daborne's Dansiker is associated with mercy. He is forgiven for his piracies (which are perceived as sinful by Christendom) upon renouncing his renegade status and returns to France to serve the country's Christian King, Henry IV. Daborne also stages Dansiker as "loyal to Christendom when he achieves his mission of atonement", kills Benwash, and "stabs himself" (*ACTT*, XVI. stage directions). He does so to avoid being sentenced to death at the hands of the Turks because of his refusal to obey the Mufti and 'turn Turk' (*ACTT*, XVI.231). In contrast, Ward is the hardened renegade whose suicide is more abhorrent and less noble than Dansiker's. Ward slays his lover and then commits suicide by stabbing himself, which guarantees and authorises the damnation he will endure for choosing not to renounce his apostasy.

Ward's final speech serves as a warning to his country. He addresses not only the Turks, but also the spectators who "live by theft and piracies" (*ACTT*, XVI.317) and may be tempted to partake in criminal acts, like himself, who are in danger of 'turning': "Let dying Ward tell you that heaven is just, / And that despair attends on blood and lust" (*ACTT*, 16.320-21). Nabil Matar discusses how "Daborne draped Ward in evil because he wanted to show the consequences of apostasy", allowing for no "redeeming quality" to be attributed to his renegade (1993, p. 494). It is understood Daborne fictionalised the death of John Ward because Matar notes that "Muslim Ward was thriving on the Barbary coast without undergoing divine or human punishment for his apostasy" (1993, p. 495). Daborne's decision to fictionalise the death of Ward suggests it was his aim to instil fear of the penalties that apostasy could bring about in his audience. Even if the audience of *A Christian Turned Turk* failed to see what Daborne depicted as Islamic barbarity they would, at least, recognise that divine retribution would afflict anyone who betrayed their Christian roots.

In *The Renegado*, Massinger may have drawn inspiration from Daborne's Ward in framing Grimaldi as the hardened renegade. His writing of this character also features similarities to Daborne's Dansiker since both renegades have the desire to repent and revert to serving Christianity once more. The spiritual conflict and guilt we see Grimaldi experience is reminiscent of a seventeenth-century understanding of the psychological process of religious conversion. This is because the result of Grimaldi's apostasy is his belief that he deserves to be damned.

The act of blasphemy Massinger has Grimaldi commit, through his interruption of mass at St. Mark's Church due to being overcome with "wanton irreligious madness" (*The Renegado*, IV.i.29), can be read as his appropriation of the suicide of Italian lawyer and apostate, Francis Spira. This was because Spira believed that the Christian God had abandoned him post-conversion from Catholicism to Lutheranism (see Jane MacDonald, 2014). Massinger has Francisco alleviate some of Grimaldi's guilt and reinstate him into Christian righteousness and Grimaldi's position becomes that of a "reformed renegade" (Vitkus, 2000, p. 43). This is a position which neither Ward nor Dansiker can adopt. This is because Daborne frames apostasy and renegadism as an irreversible process in the eyes of the Christian God, even if the renegade arrives at a state of remorsefulness. Whilst Daborne chose to depict the tragic deaths of his renegades, Massinger approached the dramatic representation of religious conversion within the framework of what Mustafa Sahiner describes as "Christianity's victory over Islam" (Mustafa Sahiner, 2007, p. 79).

It is possible the preoccupation and anxiety of 'turning' Turk in Massinger's play encouraged a return to "Catholic models", as well as set out the "cultural groundwork for the Church of England's gradual shift away from Calvinism" that Jane Hwang Degenhardt outlines in her study (2009, p. 65). Both Grimaldi's redemption and Donusa's conversion to Christianity amplify ceremonial forms of worship, such as reconciliation and baptism. The

danger ‘turning’ Turk posed transgressed beyond the sphere of belief in a spiritual framework and, in turn, required material solutions to enable its opposition and rescindment. The physical prominence of Islam and the palpable Christian corrective actions that could be used to resist its lure are emphasised in Massinger’s play, specifically through Paulina’s relic which she describes as a “miracle” that “preserve[s] [her] chastity” (*Renegado*, V.ii.69).

Massinger does not simply utilise the Christian resistance against ‘turning’ Turk to “replace Protestantism’s emphasis on spiritual inwardness with that of Catholic materiality” (Degenhardt, 2009, p. 63). Instead, he stages current conflicts amid the two divisions, which are facilitated through a gendered reading of the play. Spiritual courage is prominent enough to prevent Vitelli’s conversion to Islam. However, Paulina, the Christian sister of Vitelli, is dependent upon the material assistance of a relic worn around her neck. She wears the relic for protection of her virginity from the sexual predations of the lustful Asambeg. Vitelli’s lure into Donusa’s sexual allurement is rescindable through the maintenance of his Christian status in the face of temptation, whereas Paulina’s spiritual standing is inseparable from her physical form. If her chastity were to be destroyed by the Turkish viceroy, it would result in an irreversible destruction of her identity as a Christian too.

In this way, Massinger’s play facilitates the Christian victory over Islamic conversion and how it involves a multifaceted conciliation of materialism and spiritualism. This can also be understood in the context of the Protestant Reformation as the Protestant and Catholic representations of religious belief. As a result, this conflict between the spiritual and the material exposed how Islam posed both religious and physical challenges to early modern Christians. Francisco offers a priestly caution to Vitelli regarding the Muslim woman, Donusa, and her anticipated lustfulness, stating that “If lust once fire their blood from a fair object, / Will run a course the fiends themselves would shake at / To enjoy their wanton

ends" (*Renegado*, I.iii.11-13). Here, Vitelli's encounter with Donusa differs from the erotically motivated element of Ward's conversion. This is because Francisco's attempts to prevent Vitelli from undergoing an erotically induced conversion are successful.

Through Vitelli's repentance and regret for his sexual encounter, which results in him persuading Donusa to "spit at Mahomet" (*Renegado*, IV.iii.158) and convert to Christianity, Massinger responds to the relationship of Ward and Voada. In Daborne, the female Turk is outrightly presented as dangerously lustful and solely interested in converting Ward and marrying him for physical pleasure. This is evident when Voada persuades Ward to "be of one [a Turk] if you'll enjoy me" (*Renegado,* VII.ii.125). Massinger stages Donusa, despite the initial lustfulness she displays towards Vitelli, as a stock character inspired by customs of the romance genre. She is depicted as the righteous Saracen woman who becomes a Christian convert, or a "lovely Christian virgin" (Renegado*,* IV.ii.139), to escape from the captivity of her father, the sultan, and moreover to pursue a romantic relationship with a Christian.

An Islamic marital law explains that a Christian man is not permitted to marry a Muslim woman before converting to Islam himself, but that a Muslim man can marry a woman who retains her Christian identity (see Leo Africanus, 1550). This understanding of Islamic marital conduct is apparent in Massinger's writing because of the Ottoman sultan's order for the execution of his niece, Donusa, due to her partaking in sexual intercourse with a Christian man. Since Donusa's position as a Muslim woman does not guarantee her sexual privilege, like a Muslim man—"though Persian, Moor, / Idolatress, Turk, or Christian, [he is] privileged / and freely may enjoy her" (*Renegado*, IV.ii.135-7)—her only choice is to attempt to persuade Vitelli to turn Turk and to marry him.

Vitelli recognises, through his comparison of Donusa to "the Devil" (*Renegado,* II.iv.134), that their sexual encounter could lead to his Islamic conversion and damnation,

like Ward, unless he is to baptise her. His comparison of himself to "Ulysses" and Donusa to a "siren" (*Renegado*, III.v.21-2) suggests that one who maintains Western identity, specifically through Christian faith, is given the opportunity to assess his actions (of "follow[ing]" (*Renegado*, II.iv.135) her lust) and redeem himself. Homer's hero (see *Odyssey*, c. 725-675 BCE), like Vitelli, tackled sexual challenges presented to him by foreign women in foreign lands. He resisted these temptations (which Vitelli proves incapable of) and preserved his loyalty to his homeland by returning to Ithaca, as Vitelli does to Italy. Vitelli's question, "Can there be strength in that / Religion that suffers us to tremble / At that which every day—nay, hour—we haste to?" (*Renegado*, IV.iii.135-7), suggests Donusa's attempts to convert him to Islam are driven by her fear of execution, prompting her to doubt her own faith.

Vitelli's act of baptising Donusa can be read as Massinger's completion of Donusa's metamorphosis from, as Anna Mikyskova states, "an infidel princess…into a Christian martyr" (2015, p. 52). It is likely that an early modern audience would have interpreted her conversion to Christianity as the consecrate espousal of a pair of "martyr[s]" (Degenhardt, 2009, p. 66). Thus, *The Renegado* is a reversal of *A Christian Turned Turk* because it, instead, stages the opposite process and outcome: the 'turning' of a Turk to Christianity. Massinger facilitates this reversed outcome by confirming Christian authority to redeem both renegades and Muslims alike.

Renaissance playwrights, like Daborne and Massinger, tended to depict the danger of Islam as a risk of conversion brought about through sexual relations. This depiction is possibly a transmutation of the Islamic and mercantile dangers the Ottoman Empire posed to Europe into a racialised, private, and physical danger. The divisions of gender Massinger reinforces to enhance spiritual belief, through the need for material objects and corporeal activities, are susceptibility to Islamic conversion and Donusa's suitability to become a

Christian convert. Mary Janell Metzger discusses how the "intersecting logics of gender, religious difference, and whiteness help dictate the terms of conversion" (2009, p. 52). The fact Donusa is vulnerable to sexual contamination establishes an association of ethnic and patriarchal reason where the female body is vulnerable to racial re-engraving, unlike that of the male.

Massinger also highlights the preoccupation with religious conversion as an erotic attraction. He furthers the action by creating links between conversion and the common English renaissance association with Muslim sexual incontinence (see Lithgow, 1614). Massinger also stages the threat Islamic conversion posed to Western male sexuality, which was centred upon, as Judy A. Hayden's study suggests, "emasculation and domination through circumcision or castration" (2013, p. 350). His comic, Gazet, represents the density of Western anxieties about the erotic Ottoman lifestyle. The concept of circumcision, in the eyes of seventeenth-century English citizens, was often convoluted with castration. In turn, the religious 'turning' Turk became connected to becoming a eunuch (see Hayden, 2013) and suggested that having too much contact with the Turk posed a threat to Occidental notions of manhood. The notion that circumcision resulted in emasculation is represented both through the conversion of Ward and his implied circumcision and through Gazet's striving to become "an eunuch" (*Renegado*, III.iv.43) because it appeared to him that Ottoman erotic life was sensually appealing.

Massinger suggests that the Christian male can undo the contaminating consequences of intercourse with a Muslim woman through a means of spiritual resilience. For example, Gazet claims that because his codpiece was tied to his mistress's busk by a green ribbon, and it was supposed during the seventeenth century that only progenies of the Prophet Muhammad wore this colour, he escaped "a scouring" (*Renegado*, I.i.55). "Had it beene discovered", he explains, "I had been caponed" (*Renegado*, I.i.57–8). This ability differs,

however, from the notion that any type of contact with a Turk prefigured eternal 'turning' (see Lithgow, 1640). This suggestion is opposed in *A Christian Turned Turk* because of the success Voada, a Muslim woman, has in sexually persuading Ward to turn Turk. Her success infers that Daborne's linking of sexual persuasion and conversion resulted in a permanent religious alteration produced "through the body" (Lazaro Soranzo in Hayden, 2013, p. 350).

The concept of an irreversible 'turning' and a fated damnation in *A Christian Turned Turk* may align with Calvinist predestination, for which Massinger in *The Renegado* attempts to find a resolution. Massinger opposes the expectation that physical sins, notably in the sexual sense, must result in eternal perdition. Daborne's play exemplifies how intercourse between a Christian man and a Muslim woman leads first to Islamic conversion, then to self-destruction, and finally to damnation because it is what has been fated for Ward. In contrast, Massinger's play stages the sexual unification of a Christian man and a Muslim woman and how this can lead to a Christian conversion and wedding, and, subsequently, to exoneration. Ward's permanent conversion allows us to understand how Massinger's work differs from Daborne's because of its reliance upon material directories of belief with the intent of emphasising Christian exoneration.

Massinger also draws upon ceremonial aspects of Catholicism through the sanctified involvement of the priest and Grimaldi's act of defiling the bread and wine of the holy communion, Therefore, Massinger creates another set of links to materialism. Grimaldi's redemption also necessitates a ritualistic and optical accessory to make his Christian rebirth a plausible one. Like Daborne's renegades, Grimaldi believes his violation of the communion service and the abandonment of his identity as a Christian were so "fiend-like that repentance, / Though with my tears I taught the new sea tides, / Can never wash off" (*ACTT*, IV.i.75-77). The renegade characters in both plays seem to believe that rejection of Christianity will result in an unalterable damnation.

Massinger stages a ceremonial Catholic ritual through Francisco's order that Grimaldi can 'purchase' forgiveness for his sins through "zealous undertakings" (*Renegado*, I.i.87-8). Massinger may have staged Francisco as a Jesuit to emphasise that all Christian denominations (and not just Protestants and Catholics) needed to disintegrate their differences, at least to a certain extent. This disintegration was necessary to allow for unity and resistance against the sexual and national dangers Islamic conversion posed to fellow Christians. He draws upon the Catholic belief, which was criticised by Protestants and differed to the Calvinist belief that faith alone can result in predestined redemption, that performing good deeds was essential to achieve repentance. Thus, the play stresses that the carrying out of virtuous or noble physical deeds can reinforce a previously abandoned inner faith through the reversal of Grimaldi's apostasy. This cannot be the case for Ward because he is never provided with this advice.

Grimaldi can utilise his free will to perform good deeds and, so, is able to change the course of his fate. He is not subject to fate as a power acting upon him and being the determining factor in his predestined damnation, as Ward is. Daborne eventually strips Ward of his power-hungry nature by representing him, in his final speech, as regretful for his decision to turn Turk yet simultaneously accepting of his eternal damnation. When he states that "Who will soar high / First lesson that he learns must be to die" (*ACTT*, XVI.93-4), Ward understands it is God's plan for him to face "damnation" (*ACTT*, IV.i.4) and that his fate is irreversible.

Both Daborne's and Massinger's writings depict the alluring elements of Ottoman lifestyle, yet each playwright also encourages his audience to identify and understand why the temptations they present should be resisted. Both playwrights also explore how the "moral-nationalist scheme" (Gerald MacLean, 2007, p. 124) in their plays exemplify that one who is

born a Westerner will always inherently wish to maintain this identity, unless 'turning' to another culture or religion will bring them economic benefit or safety.

The ideologies of the two playwrights differ in their representation of irreversible and reversible renegade status, apostasy, and religious conversion. Daborne's play suggests that one who becomes Turkish, whether for authentic spiritual reasons or for economic gain, cannot denounce his Western nationality without consequence. Ward and Dansiker both arrive at a desire to return to Western identity. Ward (who is prevented from returning to England) and Dansiker (although he disengages from the Mediterranean economy in North Africa and is granted a return to France) both suffer death and damnation. Their renegade status is irreversible in the eyes of the Christian God.

In contrast, Grimaldi returns from North Africa to Italy and disengages from the Mediterranean economy. Vitelli returns to Italy and shows remorse for falling victim to Donusa's lust by baptising her. The remorseful returns of each renegade confirm their inherent desire to return to and maintain their Western national and religious identity. They can do so because Massinger provides an alternative of how "Islam's conception as both a religious and an embodied threat of conversion [could be used to] pressure[d] Protestant-Catholic differences to collapse" (Degenhardt, 2009, p. 85).

Each play highlights how the 'turning' Turk of seventeenth-century Western society was brought about through their embracing of new customs founded upon Mediterranean encounters. Whilst Daborne's play functions as a warning to his Jacobean audience that this type of 'turning' would result in an irreversible damnation, Massinger attempts to provide a solution to the problem of 'turning' Turk. He highlights how the early modern Occidental conception of Islamic threat produced more palpable forms of opposition against—and absolution of—apostasy, conversion, and 'turning' to advocate Christian unity.

Even in Shakespeare's Henriad – *Richard II* (1595), *Henry IV Part I* (1596), *Henry IV Part II* (1597), and *Henry V* (1599) – English Christian characters frequently employ similar negative Turkish tropes when criticizing each other's corrupt political agendas. However, these tropes differ from the more positive characterisations of the Ottomans found in English chronicles of Turkish history. By engaging with the intersections between crusading and anti-crusading discourses and Orientalism, we can see how the Shakespearean character of Henry Bolingbroke seeks to elevate himself and his political agenda by casting the Turks as a negative contrast. Early modern English playwrights, such as Shakespeare, combined medieval crusading rhetoric with a recognition of "Oriental" political and economic dominance with a view to commenting upon—and often to justifying—the waging of a 'Holy War' in the context of the drama. Much of the conflict referenced in the *Henriad* would not be what we would consider religiously motivated, because it was instead motivated by alternative issues, like financial concerns. However, Henry Bolingbroke, as he appears in *Richard II*, does begin to consider the holy city of Jerusalem and his own connection to God as a Christian and as a future king of England; this is when we see Henry's religiously motivated crusading ideals rear their head.

One example of this is when Henry declares that he and Thomas Mowbray (Duke of Norfolk)—who are, at this point in the play, about to engage in a duel—are "two men / That vow a long and weary pilgrimage" (*Richard II,* I.iii.48-49) and that Mowbray is a "a traitor foul and dangerous / To God of heaven, King Richard, and to me." (*Richard II,* I.iii.39-40). Here, it becomes evident through his comparison of pilgrimage to battle that Henry views warfare and religion as interconnected. He states that Mowbray's banishment—due to his violation of his future king and thus of the Christian God—is somewhat like an "enforced pilgrimage" (*Richard II,* I.iii.253). This makes it appear as though Henry believes that

religion is of higher importance than war, and that Holy War is a by-product of reinforcing what he believes is rightfully a Christian state.

The crusading action itself begins once Henry becomes King Henry IV and announces that he wishes to wage a crusade upon Jerusalem:

Those opposèd eyes,

Which, like the meteors of a troubled heaven,

All of one nature, of one substance bred,

Did lately meet in intestine shock

And furious close of civil butchery,

Shall now in mutual well-beseeming ranks,

March all one way and be no more opposed

Against acquaintance, kindred, and allies.

The edge of war, like an ill-sheathèd knife,

No more shall cut his master. Therefore, friends,

As far to the sepulcher of Christ—

Whose soldier now, under whose blessèd cross

We are impressèd and engaged to fight—

Forthwith a power of English shall we levy,

Whose arms were molded in their mothers' womb

To chase these pagans in those holy fields.

(*Henry IV, Part I,* I.i.9-24)

Here, it is evident that Henry believes—and by extension, his subjects also believe—that the purpose of his crusade is to alleviate the holy city of Jerusalem from the clutches of non-Christians and to restore what he anticipates will be order in his own state.

However, the possibility of violence linked to religious affairs seems to cause qualms in a personal capacity for Henry. This differs from most depictions of Ottoman Sultans in early modern English drama who wage warfare seemingly without psychological anguish or remorse. These Sultans, in accordance with Ottoman laws, kill their brothers without hesitation to assume the throne. Inevitably, language that invokes crusading ideals harkening back to the medieval period also appears in the Henriad, as is common whenever the possibility of a crusade appears in early modern drama. Such language existed to reinforce the strength and virtue of Western Christians and, by extension, to condemn the villainous Muslims occupying the holy city of Jerusalem.

In reference to his own court, and his own rule, Henry V states that "This is the English, not the Turkish court; / Not Amurath an Amurath succeeds," (*Henry IV*, *Part II*, V.ii.48-49), highlighting that his agenda when waging warfare is not the same as that of the Ottoman Sultan Murad III, who murdered five brothers to take the throne in 1574. Instead, Henry V justifies his warfare by claiming that he is not like the violent Turkish monarch, who believes himself to be supreme over his brothers and subjects. He sees himself as leading a band of men who "march all one way" and constitute a singular "soldier" who will wage a crusade for their own collective benefit, for the benefit of Jerusalem, and for the benefit of

Christ. Thus, Shakespeare poses questions to the English audiences of his Henriad regarding what qualities were required of a leader, be they English or Turkish, to become successful, resilient, and trustworthy, and to establish a politically stable environment.

## 1.4. Pre-Restoration Anglo-Ottoman Commercial Relations and Exchanges

Foreign policy between pre-Restoration England and the Ottoman Empire developed from a relationship that began as simple "commercial contacts dominated by the Levant Company" into "diplomatic relations controlled by the central government" (Blackwood, 2010, p. 4). This development in Anglo-Ottoman diplomatic encounters appears to be attributed to three possible features, which are England's domestic political affairs, a divergence from Levantine trade, and England's imperial ambitions (Blackwood, 2010, p. 4). It seems most plausible that the final of the three listed factors was the one which prompted the shift from a focus upon imperial ambitions to a focus upon Anglo-Ottoman diplomatic affairs, with what Gerald MacLean deems 'imperial envy' playing a large role in the alteration. "Imperial envy", according to MacLean (2004), is defined as the English vilifying and degrading of the Turk and their Islamic values, which stemmed from jealousy of the wealth and power of the Ottoman Empire and how it factored into English perceptions of the Ottoman Empire during the medieval and early modern periods. Imperial envy recognised Turkish power, as well as English captivation and anxiety about the Turk that accompanied it, within early modern writing and performance (MacLean, 2004, p. 20).

Levantine trade was a prevalent factor in shaping the way in which early modern Englishmen conceptualised the Turk during the first half of the seventeenth century. According to Anders Ingram, the Levant trade "served as a facilitator to those travelling in or

writing on the Levant, easing the movement of men and their observations, preconceptions and impressions along the trade routes" (Ingram, 2009, p. 45). It also functioned as a source of inspiration for early modern dramatists to write on inhabitants of the Levant.

What we now refer to as Orientalist conceptualisations contributed to the early modern English vilifying and degrading of the Turk and their Islamic values, which stemmed from jealousy of the wealth and power of the Ottoman Empire and how its vilification factored into English perceptions of the Ottoman Empire during the medieval and early modern periods. One such historical instance in which imperial envy seems to be at work is that of William Harborne's appointment to Istanbul and, subsequently, the initiation of English monarchical power over Anglo-Ottoman political and commercial relations.

At the end of the seventeenth century, English imperial envy was overtaken by England's colonisation of oriental subcontinents, made possible by the growth and domination of their naval forces. Following the English Restoration in 1660, England began to colonise several regions in the Indian Subcontinent as well as North Africa. The Restoration also resulted in, in addition to the English colonisation of these regions, the "chartering of the Royal African Company and the acquisition of Tangier and Bombay" (MacLean, 2007, p. 20). Thus, Britain was, at this point, seen as the most powerful Occidental colonial region. Imperial jealousy of the Ottomans, therefore, was no longer a prevalent factor in England's colonial ventures, as it was substituted by a sense of (albeit secondary) equality with their trading counterparts. In other terms, England viewed their once Muslim enemies as useful commercial allies in the "game of international intrigue and empire building" (MacLean, 2007, p. 191). Moreover, Anglo-Ottoman relations during this period were seen as political as opposed to commercial due to the Ottoman Empire's "consciousness [that their] government might hold valuable lessons for the ordering and administration of an empire" (MacLean, 2007, p. 191).

Following MacLean's analysis of imperial ambitions held by England during the seventeenth century as the main contributing factor to the development of Anglo-Ottoman trade and diplomacy, Alison Games points out how the English monarchy became the ruling authority, not just over England as a "centralised imperial state" but also over any diplomatic relations with the 'East' in which England engaged (Games, 2009, p. 298). The early relationship between England and the Ottoman Empire—and namely Turkey—was mostly a commercial one. Bruce McGowan adds that whilst England were the "undisputed leader in the Levantine trade" during the period spanning from 1620-1683, their trade relations "with the Americas and the East Indies" started to overtake their commercial priorities in the Mediterranean sphere by the early eighteenth century (McGowan, 1981, p. 21; p. 51).

However, during the latter part of the seventeenth century, the Levant Company were affected by the increasing demand to match the commercial activity of the East India Company in domestic trade, particularly related to raw silk, manufactured silk garments, and in the spice trade (Wood, 1964, p. 103). It is also interesting to note that the French who were under the instruction of Jean-Baptiste Colbert, by the 1660's, were also intentionally increasing their commercial exchanges with the Levant Company. This was most likely due to Colbert's recognition of the Levant Company's growing international influence and commercial activity, resulting in the French fabric industry's revival, as well as solidifying "administrative control over trade with Turkey" (Blackwood, 2010, p. 4).

In the early 1680's, Colbert's actions in increasing and improving the way in which France liaised with Turkey started to become beneficial, but this resulted in a decline in the financial stability of the Levant Company. English commercial "activity accounted for 39.8 percent of Ottoman exports in 1634 and 39 percent in 1686; by 1784, however, England's share had fallen to a mere 9.2 percent" (McGowan, 1981, p. 16). After the year 1700, as Alfred Wood states in his *A History of the Levant Company* (2013), the revival of the French

cloth industry (as well as competition from their more widely reputed competitor, the East India Company) resulted in the decrease of Anglo-Ottoman commerce, especially silk imported from the Levantine region (Wood, 2013, p. 103). And so, as Levantine trade declined, so did the international influence of the Levant Company itself which then led to a cultural change in the association between the Ottoman Empire and England more widely.

As well as the above imperial and financial instances and their consequences, domestic politics also had a prolific impact upon international diplomacy, for example, as Daniel Groffman points out, "England's internal political situation had ramifications for its nationals in the Levant" (Groffman, 1998, p.1). Thus, the 1640's was a decade consisting of several clashes between various English parties who frequented parts of the Ottoman Empire. Since the merchants of the Levant Company usually sided with the English Parliament, it was known that Charles I had ambitions to gain the trust of the Company in preparation to eventually limit their influence. This allowed the King to expand his own personal domination of English commerce within, and interactions with, the Levant.

Oliver Cromwell, who held the position of Lord Protector, also shared Charles' proposed aims to achieve a decline in Company power over Anglo-Levantine commercial and diplomatic relations. The Levant Company, as the above letters from the National Archives exemplify, appointed Thomas Bendish as Ambassador at Constantinople from 1647-1661. Prior to 1653, most correspondence between Ambassadors appointed by the Levant Company to posts within the Ottoman Empire were addressed not to one another, as may be expected but instead, to the Company's various Directors. Bendish, for example, mainly corresponded with Cromwell and with John Thurloe, Cromwell's secretary (Groffman, 1998, p. 190-191). At the start of the Restoration period, Charles II's aim was also to limit the Levant Company's power to an even greater extent, which he believed would increase the authority of the English monarchy. One of the key steps he took in his attempts

to do so was to recall Bendish and to appoint Henneage Finch, the Second Earl of Winchelsea in his place.

Finch was, according to Groffman, the first nobleman to assume the role of Ambassador, and he was also the first Ambassador who was given permission to address his correspondence directly to the English royal court. This may suggest that Finch was "very much the King's man rather than a representative of the Company, and his papers reflect the affairs of state rather than of commerce" (Groffman, 1998, p. 207). By this point, if the Levant Company did ever send collective correspondence to the Ambassador, it appeared to carry a more intreating tenor because the Company, when addressing Finch, were often criticising his expenditure, and pleading with him to reduce it. In 1663, a disagreement broke out between Finch and the Company because the latter did not agree to cover the ambassador's expenditure. The disagreement "probably accelerated the Company's forfeiture of control to the state, which picked up the purse and with it, absolute authority over its Ambassador" (Groffman, 1998, p. 208).

The Levant Company's downfall, due to the monarchy's influence over its ambassadorship, did not occur until the eighteenth century. Even though the East India Company ultimately took ownership of the Levant Company, the Levant Company was still in operation as a leading organisation in the trading of silk until the 1680's. At this point, English ambassadors stationing at Constantinople often commented, in stark contrast to the political stability of the 1640s when ambassadorial selection was far less troublesome, on "the rampant corruption present in the Ottoman administration and engaged in speculation on the Empire's imminent decline" (Blackwood, 2010, p. 5). Thus, the drastically changing status of English ambassadorship may suggest that it was necessary for England to be more attentive to the development of ambassadorial roles and how (in)effectively they were being fulfilled. The role of the ambassador was a dual one: one aspect of its focus was upon their

political duties and the other upon their function as a physical representation of English international commerce. The latter seemed to outweigh the former, as is evidenced from the letters concerning the reasoning behind Bendish's appointment to name one example. Instead of being secondary to political aspects of the ambassadorial role, Anglo-Ottoman trade itself was politicised and, thus, these two roles that the ambassador was expected to fulfil became conflated.

Several English Ambassadors based in Turkey held suspicions about whether bribery—and therefore, political tyranny—was one of the driving forces behind some of the generous objects and supplies gifted to the English by the Ottomans. The Ottoman Empire was renowned for its careful consideration of "the form and meaning of diplomatic gifts to be sent to foreign courts" (Michael Talbot, 2017, p. 106). As far as the British embassy who were in Istanbul were concerned, gift exchange with the Ottomans was as much a gesture of friendship as it was useful for British commercial—and thus, financial—benefit, seeing that the former, naturally, resulted in the latter. It was integral that Britain demonstrated the interest that their merchants travelling through and working in Istanbul possessed in the Ottoman Court to safeguard them from Turkish capture and legal sanctions. The first step to which England often resorted to achieve this level of protection for their naval workers was to engage in gift-giving exchanges with the Ottoman Court, seeing as the English quickly learned of the high regard in which the Ottomans held diplomatic gifting themselves. There exists an account of the Ottoman Capitulations, where the Sultana sent gifts as tribute, which then had to be accepted for formal relations to commence.

Henneage Finch, after he was appointed Ambassador at Constantinople to replace Thomas Bendish, stated that "a man may procure a friendship, and by corruptions create many confidents" (The National Archives, MS73/534 Earl of Winchelsea to Sir Edward Nicholas, 13th September 1661). According to the Earl of Winchelsea, Henry Paget, the

English could not "find money to give the ministers their usual presents […] we who have ever passed with an esteem superior to all other nations shall make ourselves the most contemptible." Furthermore, Paget states in another letter that "it is impossible to succeed with the Turks without money, especially when all other nations bribe them so high" (TNA/SC.PP/1/6 Baron Paget to the Consul and Gentlemen of the Factory at Smyrna, 14th October 1693; TNA/SP97/43 Earl of Kinnoull to the Duke of Newcastle, 12th October 1734). Henry Grenville also detailed that "money is the supreme mover of all measures in this corrupt, irregular, ill-conduced government; however, that might reflect upon a Christian state, it carries no infamy with it here" (TNA/SP97/42 Henry Grenville to the Earl of Egremont, 31st January 1763). Accounts like Paul Rycaut's *History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (1675) also seem to make statements about Ottoman gift-giving and how it represented their financial and commercial advantages, all of which corroborate the above examples.

Rycaut outlines how, for example, ambassadors from states bordering parts of the Ottoman Empire always received gifts from the Ottomans in return for their own offerings because, for the Ottomans, this process "represented the bonds of peace" (Talbot, 2017, p. 106). However, Rycaut continues to explain that these peaceful and amicable types of interaction and sentiment were not necessarily held by the Ottomans towards states further afield than those they considered their neighbours, which the below passage exemplifies:

> Ambassadors and representatives from other princes, whose principal design is esteemed for the promotion of trade and commerce, as the English, French, and Dutch, are always admitted with their presents, which the Turk by custom calls his right, and judges not himself obliged to return the like, esteeming his Capitulations and articles he makes with those princes, privileges and immunities granted their subjects.

(Rycaut, 1675, p. 150-151)

In the same vein, James Porter also wrote accounts which detailed his perception of the motivations behind English ambassadorial gift-giving to the Ottomans. He states that various ambassadors

> have gone so far as even to pretend, that the presents they carry, and which they are obliged to give at every audience, reflect honour on themselves as the givers, but not on the Turks as receivers. Whoever is acquainted with the Oriental practice, and knows the ostentation, pride, and haughtiness of Turkish government, must know that they look upon, and consider such presents as actual tributes.

(James Porter, *Observations on the Religion, Law, Government, and Manners, of the Turks,* 1768, 41-42)

However, there were some accounts about Anglo-Ottoman gift exchange and the motivations behind it that were less driven by Western bias against the Ottomans. It could be argued that the Ottoman Empire possessed a "world view based on a universal empire that, at least in official and ceremonial terms, viewed the rest of the world through a very particular prism" (Mehmet Sinan Birdal, 2011, p. 139). This can often be seen in Anglo-Ottoman royal correspondence, for example, as this type of communication was most often related to imperial matters which concerned both England and the Ottoman Empire.

British monarchs, for example, adopted the use of the following opening statement as standard when writing official correspondence: 'King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland'. Whereas, aside from a small number of examples included within the Capitulations, the Ottomans always referred to 'Great Britain' as 'Ingiltere' (England) in reference to the whole of Britain. This could be taken as testament to the concept that the Ottoman rhetoric towards

their international diplomatic relations was concerned with asserting their commercial authority, which was supplemented by the practice of gift exchange. The function of Anglo-Ottoman gift exchange, specifically within Ottoman diplomatic rhetoric, is effectively summarised in an English translation of a letter sent by Sultan Mehmed IV (reigned 1648-1687) to Charles II upon sir Daniel Harvey's arrival in Istanbul: "We received also your presents with satisfaction and [the ambassador's] requests and demands, whilst they are conform unto our noble laws and correspond to the friendship between us, shall be considered" (See Appendix 1, TNA/SP 97/19, Translation of Mehmed IV to Charles II, 1669). According to this letter, gifts functioned, for the Ottomans, as obligatory preliminary bases upon which diplomatic friendships were formed and maintained (which often necessitated further gifting between the two nations at later points). As Talbot states, it is not possible to discount the "economic role and value of gifts [without also discounting] their rhetorical and political role" (Talbot, 2017, p. 108).

British – and more widely, Western – attitudes towards gifting and receiving gifts to and from the Ottomans differed from that of Ottoman attitudes towards the same matter. This finds its best expression in a treaty between the Habsburgs and the Ottomans, signed at Zsitvatorok in 1606, which claimed that:

> 10. […] for our part an ambassador is to be sent with gifts to the Turkish Emperor and the great Murat Pasha Zerdar, and he is also to send his ambassador to our most esteemed Archduke Matthias, our most gracious lord, with gifts. And when our ambassador arrives at Constantinople in order to ratify our [city of] Prague, he will be with a greater number of gifts than has been the usual custom.
>
> 11. That now the ambassador of His Caesarean Majesty promises to bring to Constantinople a gift with the value of two-hundred thousand florins, once and for all.

> 12. That the peace will last for twenty years, calculated from the first of January to future years, and after three years both [parties] will reciprocally [send] ambassadors with gifts, without obligation, and nominate gifts of their own volition and choice.
>
> (*Treaties between Turkey and Foreign Powers,* 1606, 3-4)

In the above extract, it is evident that the importance of gift giving as well as the receiving of gifts for the 'European' Hapsburgs is being emphasised, as well as the fact that obligation to give or receive gifts from the Ottomans was not mandatory to encourage commercial trade.

However, if we examine modern English translations of Turkish correspondence from the same period, the emphasis upon reciprocity seems to come second to the fact that gift exchange is, in fact, viewed as mandatory by the Ottomans. This was because the Ottomans viewed gift exchange as a material demonstration of their financial superiority, exemplified within the following passage:

> And after sending tributary presents to our Lofty Porte, nothing further may be demanded for three years after the writing [of the treaty at] the River Žitava. Three years afterwards, tributary presents are to be dispatched corresponding to the requirements of friendship between the two [parties], with suitable presents to be sent together with a letter-bearing ambassador to our Exalted Footstool.
>
> (British Online Archives, A.DVN.DVE.d 57/, fol. 6, British Parliamentary History)

In this instance, tributary gifts were an integral part of the process of building and preserving amicable diplomatic relations (Talbot, 2017, p. 109). In addition to tributary gifts which were presented by one party to another during formal events (and which most often served the

above specific function), there also existed instances of Anglo-Ottoman "reciprocal gift exchange involving ceremonial robes (hil'at) […] and more informal gifts aimed at relationship-building (hibe)" (Talbot, 2017, p. 110). Traditions that inspired these practices of gift exchange within early modern Ottoman culture were of a diverse heritage; they situated themselves within Persian, Turkic, and Byzantine diplomatic practices, as well as in Islamic customs practised within Ottoman upper class culture.

Considering this diverse diplomatic heritage in Anglo-Ottoman commercial relations, the reasoning behind the exchange of gifts between the two nations becomes clearer. Gifts were, in short, a way in which each nation would convey a sense of political influence. In addition to this, they demonstrated material wealth, and also functioned as a necessary standard for initiating international alliance. As far as the British were concerned, this meant that they would have been aware of the various types of Ottoman gift exchange and the procedures that accompanied them. As well as this, the British would have also been aware that they, much like the Habsburgs had to partake in specific forms of gift exchange as stipulated by the Treaty of Zsitvatorok, had no choice but to conform to said procedures if they were to maintain beneficial commercial relations with the Ottomans.

In addition to examining the various strategies of gift exchange and its various purposes, it is also interesting to examine the various types of correspondence in the form of the letters themselves. For this purpose, I will once again draw upon the nature of correspondence linked to the Levant Company during the seventeenth century. According to Despina Vlami, the "company's international reach was served by an extended communication mechanism that transmitted information through institutional and private channels. Intra- and extra-company correspondence diffused information vertically and horizontally" (Vlami, 2015, p. 40).

"Vertically" refers to such letters containing everything from orders, to updates, and company guidelines. These documents were, under most circumstances, sent by those in high-ranking positions within the company (for example, governors, their deputies, and secretaries) to officers employed by the company stationed both domestically in London and internationally in various parts of the Levant (Vlami, 2015, p. 40). The London administration also corresponded with figures like politicians and those working for state authorities about the company's regular management of the factory assemblies. The company would also regularly contact agents, employees, merchants, and trading organisations about similar affairs. "Horizontally" refers, in contrast, to those letters that were exchanged between officers of the same level of authority within the company, and to letters that were exchanged between intra- and extra-company systems such as associates, partners, and relatives of those working for the company.

To keep the company well-informed about issues related to international relations and governmental guidelines, "extra-company correspondence [functioned as] a powerful source of official and sometimes confidential information provided by government and state official[s]". This type of communication produced and maintained the company's ties to the state and allowed the company to discuss their cases with the relevant agencies (Vlami, 2015, p. 40). The company, which was spoken for by an English ambassador, discussed their cases with the Ottoman authorities or, alternatively, liaised with the Ottoman authorities through dragomans (interpreters from non-Muslim Greek and Jewish communities) who used Italian and Latin as a lingua franca for purposes of translation (E. Natalie Rothman, 2021; Elżbieta Święcicka, 2020). The dragomans would then present Levant Company cases as they were put forward by English ambassadors to the Ottoman authorities.

On the other hand, intra-company correspondence established a system of communication in which those engaged within it were able to convey "knowledge, authority and trust" (Vlami, 2015, p. 41). Regular letters and circulars were firstly sent to the factories which were considered most significant by the Levant Company: those in Constantinople and Smyrna, followed by those in Larnaca, Salonica, Patras, and Aleppo. Occasionally this information was private, but it was always considered dependable due to its official status. The function of this type of correspondence was to reiterate the company's trading regulations and processes with these factories and vice versa, and to instruct one another on how to effectively implement these procedures in accordance with risk management strategies. This type of correspondence had less of an impact upon the growth of the Levant Company's commercial success than extra-company communication did, with most "prospects for geographical expansion and strategic options appear[ing] mostly in letters and reports sent by consuls and vice-consuls, factory assemblies and individual merchants to the administration in London" (Vlami, 2015, p. 41).

'Manifests' were also sent by the Levant Company's consuls to their London headquarters. Manifests were used as a means for the company to officially record the general activity of its freemen and to record the income that these freemen generated via a recording of "the arrivals and departures of English ships in Levantine ports". These documents also documented the names of consignors, their cargoes, and consignees, and the cost of duties paid to the English consulate on various commodities (Vlami, 2015, p. 9-11). The Levant headquarters in London often received news included within the manifests about Western communities and organisations trading within the Levant region, particularly about the French textile trade, as well as about Dutch, Greek, German, and Jewish trading activities. The central administration and the factories, according to Vlami, also exchanged news regarding the status of other issues connected to trade and diplomacy in the Levant, such as

"military events, natural calamities and epidemics, piracy and contraband activities, social life and Ottoman culture, customs and laws, etiquette issues, everyday practices and various incidents" (Vlami, 2015, p. 41).

Unofficial records most often took the format of letters exchanged between the company's freemen because they, much like autonomous merchants, enjoyed the freedom of exchanging written correspondence between other freemen, as well as independent firms and the company's acquaintances. Oftentimes, these independent exchanges would result in the rise of opportunities for freemen to trade outside of the realm of acceptable company policy. This was likely since these opportunities arose from emerging markets unaffiliated with the Levant Company or from "transport itineraries that bypassed the company's consulates and transport contracts that evaded general shipping" (Vlami, 2015, p. 42).

Thus, the information presented, and the opportunities posited to the Levant Company's freemen in external exchanges, were significant, as they encouraged them to evaluate the possibilities to trade and profit within (and outside of) the company, as well as the benefits and dangers of engaging with trade outside of the company. This is suggestive, as Ralph Davis points out, of the prominence of unofficial mercantile correspondence, as it tells us much about the state of "personal business strategy" (see Ralph Davis, 1967, p. 3). All outposts in the Levant would regularly receive correspondence which had been updated with the names of all new members of the company who had been granted permission to trade. All members' names were then recorded in the "chancelleries of the factories and each freeman and factor was acquainted with the entry of new members in the company's operational network" (Vlami, 2015, p. 42). Intra-company communication, not dissimilar to extra-company correspondence, served the purpose of presenting information, as well as its benefits and drawbacks, and allowing its recipient to achieve a sense of authority over the

decisions it encouraged. This time, however, information about the nature of personal business strategy was replaced by information on breaches of company policy, which enabled the administration to enforce sanctions. Thus, the exchange of letters in all their various forms functioned as a means of maintaining the Levant Company's commercial relationships safe.

## Chapter Two ~ Greene's *Alphonsus, King of Aragon* (1594) and *The History of Orlando Furioso* (1587)

### 2.0. Contextualising the Borders and Behaviours of the Eastern 'Other'

Edward Said states that the "Orientalism of the Elizabethan drama is [also] marked by the voice of the anti-Turkish passion continuing treatments that sometimes belong to traditions, which are based on the medieval treatments" (Said, 1978, 192). This anti-Turkish sentiment inspired many early modern English dramatists to focus upon conflicts between the Orient and the Occident in their writing, much like Greene does in his *Alphonsus, King of Aragon* (1587). Although this instance does not appear in his *The History of Orlando Furioso* (1594), what both of Greene's plays facilitate is a deeper investigation of personal religious and cultural affairs against the wider political agenda(s) followed by his contemporaries. This personal investigation takes the format of a union (via interreligious marriage) between the East and the West. Instead of favouring the commonplace period representation of English (or, by extension, Western) Christian victory over the Ottomans, Greene depicts two separate scenarios in which a Muslim or a pagan female and a Christian male are united through marriage. Through his employment of props such as the brass head in *Alphonsus* and his clever uses of costumes in *Orlando Furioso* as visual symbols of religious tolerance, Greene offers a more unconventionally sympathetic portrayal of the Ottomans. This portrayal seems to be more in line with historical Ottoman figures like Safiye Sultan (as opposed to the stereotypical early modern dramatic violent and 'lustful Turk'). It could be argued that the Turkish Sultana's alliance with Elizabeth I is echoed in the Anglo-Ottoman alliances in Greene's Turk plays because of the Anglo-Ottoman marital alliances in which they end.

In *Alphonsus* and *Orlando Furioso,* Greene revisits—and reframes—the crusading rhetoric by presenting his Ottoman characters as possessing positive qualities like humility, valour, and faithfulness, as well as by presenting his Western characters as being prone to

violent outbursts and lustfulness. This chapter will focus on a comparative analysis of physical conventions of the early modern commercial stage in each play, and how they are used to re-discuss representations of Eastern characters' identities through the peculiar use of costumes in *Orlando* and the use of props in *Alphonsus,* namely the brass head.

In *Alphonsus*, Greene's London stage becomes an embodiment of Ottoman territory. Instead of Ottoman imprisonment and torture at the hands of the Aragonese, the play fictionalises a civilised acceptance of defeat on the Ottoman's part and, subsequently, an Ottoman-Spanish alliance. This dramatic context is particularly interesting considering the friendship that was formed between the current English monarch Queen Elizabeth I and the Turkish Queen Mother, Safiye Sultan after the establishment of the Levant Company, as evidenced in the various letters exchanged between the two monarchs in 1599.[4] Against this historical background, I aim to explore how Greene could be commenting upon the political and religious stability established by Elizabeth I and what effect Anglo-Ottoman alliances, and indeed Ottoman-Spanish alliances given the Anglo-Spanish War, may have had upon it during the twilight of Elizabeth's reign. The visual symbol of the female body of Sultan Bajazet's daughter is further investigated as she is prompted by her father to give her hand to his conqueror, uniting the once-warring Empires on individual and national levels.

### 2.1. Christian Violence in *Orlando*

The unity between the Ottomans and the English in *Orlando* is less of a confirmation of civility under circumstances of conflict, and more a visual representation of the unexpected contrast between Orlando's madness and the calmer, level-headedness of the Soldan of

---

[4] See Montagu, L.M.W., *The Letters and Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu* (Philadelphia: Carey, Lea & Blanchard, 1837) for further evidence of these exchanges.

Egypt. Orlando's madness is best exemplified through his dishevelled costuming and unpredictable gestures, and the tranquil demeanour of the Soldan becomes most apparent when he refuses to wage war against Orlando's people because Orlando wishes to marry the Soldan's daughter, Angelica. Thus, Greene focuses on less demonised portrayals of the Eastern 'Other', allowing his audience to develop an awareness of alternative perceptions of allegiance and violence.

In the opening scene of the play, several potential suitors inhabit the stage alongside Angelica, each one competing to marry the Princess. Angelica chooses Orlando thus spurring anger in the other suitors who plot their revenge. Greene's villainous character, Sacripant, informs his servant that he longs to persuade Angelica to fall in love with him, and to subsequently marry her in the hope that he might fulfil his aspiration of becoming Soldan one day. To enact this vengeful plot, Sacripant attempts to invoke envy in Orlando by spreading rumours among local shepherds of Angelica's unfaithfulness to Orlando in favour of another suitor, Medor. Orlando discovers several roundelays left by Sacripant in a nearby tree he passes on his return to the castle. These roundelays also falsely signify that Angelica has been unfaithful to Orlando, favouring Medor. Orlando's decline into psychological turmoil translates into impulsive violence.

The unpredictability of Orlando's behaviour comes into fruition most noticeably in act two, scene one of the play when he, without any real warning, interchanges between "melancholy contemplation and habitual acts of violence, [which] is further emphasised through his association with the mythological figure of Hercules" (Jenny Sager, 2013, p. 13). At the beginning of this scene, Orlando is babbling with rage and invoking the Muses to have mercy upon him due to his psychological disturbance as he rambles through the forest. It is during this scene that he comes across the servant whom he impulsively "*draw[s] […] in by the leg*" and offstage, where "he rends him as one would tear a [l]ark" (*Orlando*, II.i.756).

Just as quickly as he facilitates this attack, Orlando returns to the stage with a prop which he likens to the wooden club that Hercules carries (the servant's amputated leg) and proclaims: "Villain, provide me straight a Lion's skin, / Thou seest I now am mighty Hercules: / Look where is my massy club upon my neck" (*Orlando,* II.i.759–61). Here, Greene orders his audience, through Orlando's proclamation, to "Look" at the severed leg, which is swung above his head, evidently exhibiting a lack of remorse for his violence.

Interestingly, the leg appears as if it were a popular prop that was frequently used on early modern English commercial stages. In the inventory of stage properties belonging to the Admiral's Men, Henslowe lists 'Kent's wooden leg', and there also exists the example of Faustus' leg being removed by a horse-course and then reattached by Mephistopheles in Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* (1592). Following this pattern, the reference that Orlando makes to the 'lion's skin', also attached to Hercules in mythology, is one that recurs on early modern London stages. It is not evident from the stage directions in *Orlando* whether the titular character wears lion skin or is simply referring to it, but the use of lion skin as a costuming device in other early modern plays often satirises unnecessary displays of bombast and rage. For example, Shakespeare's Bastard in *King John* (c. 1595-6) makes fun of Austria for donning "lion's skin", comparing this act to placing "Alcides' shoes upon an ass" (*King John*, II.i.144).

This portrayal of Orlando's behavior contrasts with the more favorable representation of the character in act one, scene one where he is compared to Hercules because of his "chivalry" (*Orlando,* I.i.127). As Kathleen Riley establishes in her *The Reception and Performance of Euripides' Herakles*, there are two schools of thought when discussing the figure of Hercules in early modern performance. One of these concentrates upon "heroic virtue, the other on his madness" (2008, p. 92). Each appear to align with Greene's Orlando's invoking of said Herculean traits, both positive and negative. When he drags the servant

away, mistaking him for a rival suitor of Angelica's, and amputates his leg, Orlando adopts what is known as "*Hercules furens,* the raving madman and murderer", yet he metamorphoses into "*morbus Herculanus,* who focuses on intellectual pursuits rather than on physical feats" later in the play as he "sits / [m]aking of verses for Angelica" (*Orlando,* IV.ii.1177-8; Sager, 2013, p. 115). Riley explained that the latter representation of Hercules—and, for our purposes, the latter representation of Orlando—affected by melancholy was regarded "as a model of Christian asceticism, his choice serving as a parable for the rejection of the body in favour of the spirit" (Riley, 2008, p. 92). By extension, both Herculean types function as a satire of the positive and negative nuances of human conduct within society, religion, and culture.

Kay Savage defines "battlefield directions" as "stage directions that belong to and adhere to the conventions of staging battles" (Savage, 2014, p. 16). In *Orlando*, Greene's use of these directions aligns the actions of Orlando and his impulsive Christian army with that of later historical figures like Thomas Sherley (previously discussed on page 27 of this thesis). Thus, Greene's representation of his Christian characters functions as a double-edged sword. On one hand, the stage direction "*Enter Orlando, the Duke of Aquitaine, the Count Rossilion with soldiers. Sound a parle and one comes upon the walls. Exeunt omnes*" *(Orlando,* I.ii) works to highlight negative qualities associated with Western Christian armies. Thus, the binaries (created by Orientalist ideals) between Eastern Muslims and Western Christians during the early modern period, in turn, allow Greene's audience to humanise their Eastern counterparts. On the other hand, it also may have inspired the re-emergence of a crusading rhetoric—and its resulting consequences—for those still watching Greene's plays during the early seventeenth century.

This particular stage direction from Greene is an example of what is known as "*sound a parle* […] which occurs when a city is under siege and either the attackers or defenders

*sound a parle/parley* as a signal to converse [with] the enemy" (Savage, 2014, p. 164). A stage direction of this nature was most often used in early modern English plays when an army was entering the stage into what would become a battle, when an army was entering the stage midway through a battle or leaving the stage to enter another battle (which would not be staged and, instead, would only have been spoken of verbally and left to the audience's imaginations). We know, at this point in the play, that Orlando would have been preparing to storm the royal grounds belonging to Rodamant (from the stage direction which reads "*Alarums. Rodamant and Brandemart fly*" (*Orlando,* I.iii). Although we do not see the outbreak of any real physical conflict during this scene, Orlando and his army—along with their *parle*—still represent the potential danger of conflict for Rodamant. We are, thus, left with questions regarding from which part of the stage the *parle* sounds and what instrument or whose voice is facilitating it.

According to Alan Dessen and Leslie Thompson, the borders of Rodamant's royal grounds are "strictly speaking a fictional designation for the level above the main platform [in the theatre], […] a technical term, usually used in the context of battle" (1999, p. 245). During this same scene, Greene's stage directions state that one single French soldier "*comes upon the walls"*; in other words, says C. Walter Hodges, the actor playing this soldier would have entered the stage—at the point this *parle* took place—from the gallery located above the main stage (1968, p. 62). As far as the method by which the sound was generated is concerned, the battle sound was most likely made via the use of a trumpet. The trumpet would probably have been played by one of the company's resident musicians positioned somewhere offstage, yet close enough to the action for the audience to hear their signal. The whole spectacle complete with this soundscape may have encouraged Greene's audience to associate the planning of a Western attack upon, and subsequent siege of, an Eastern city as a suspenseful and somewhat frightening concept. Therefore, this scene focuses upon building

the tense atmosphere which occurs before a Western army storms an Eastern city (as opposed to focusing upon the struggle and Western triumph itself during and after doing so). Thus, Greene facilitates a subtle movement away from the crusading rhetoric's encouragement of the resurgence of a Holy War at this point in his play.

### 2.2. Challenging the trope of the Eastern Seductress in *Orlando*

Following Orlando's display of madness-induced violence, the Soldan of Egypt hears false word of Angelica's unfaithfulness to Orlando and exiles her, before swearing that he will murder Medor for leading her astray. The physical appearance of the actor playing Orlando would have evolved throughout the play, much like the mind of the titular character they were portraying. After Orlando's exit from the stage clutching the severed leg of the servant whom he has just mutilated in act two, scene one, Orlando re-enters the stage "like a Poet" (*Orlando,* II.i.1168). Peter Stallybrass suggests that he may have been dressed in "a gown and laurel wreath, perhaps carrying papers", which would have been in stark visual contrast to the "blanket, staff, and horn of the Abraham man" that he left the stage wearing only a few moments prior (Stallybrass, 2006, p. 18).

In the next scene, Orlando awakes after being induced to sleep by the sorceress, Melissa, and questions his change of clothing. He asks her how he became "thus disguisde / Like mad Orestes quaintly thus disguisd?" (*Orlando,* II.ii.1304-5), after which Melissa sends him away "to the battell straight" (*Orlando*, II.ii.1339)—in which he will fight against Sacripant—with weapons in hand once again. It is not explicit what the actor playing Orlando would have done with the gown he wore when he was dressed like a "Poet". Presumably, he would have discarded it offstage, as it would most likely have caused a hindrance if worn during onstage combat. What we are sure of though, is that the actor playing Orlando would have been in disguise during his fight with—and subsequent killing of— Sacripant, as

Madricard describes the individual who killed Sacripant as "a simple swain; a mercenarie / Who bravely took the combat to him selfe […] with a scarfe before his face" (*Orlando,* II.ii. 1350-44). As Stallybrass points out, the "poet" costume (although it is unclear from the script of *Orlando*) may be explained theoretically "by the four 'madnesses' of Platonic philosophy, of which poetry was the first" (2006, p. 18). In a more practical sense, the "poet['s]" garments allowed the actor portraying Orlando to discard the gown during the approximately three hundred lines he was not required to be onstage, and then a further eleven-line exit after departing from Melissa's quarters would have allowed the actor time to don his battle disguise (the scarf). In addition to the above, the use of costumes, and more specifically costumes which convey disguise, is also a prevalent material staging device for Angelica.

Ottoman *female* characters in early modern drama, as opposed to male Ottomans, serve the purpose of tempting male Christian characters to convert to Islam and, in addition, to endorse and adopt Ottoman cultural values and traditions. Examples of this include the Italian merchant, Vitelli in Philip Massinger's *The Renegado* (1630), who is tempted by Turkish Muslim Donusa 'turn Turk'. On a surface level, then, it seems that the Muslim female is represented on the early modern stage as being nothing but a mere seductress who corrupts the English Christian male, as noted by critics such as McJannet (2009).

Another example of the Muslim female seductress stereotype in early modern English drama is Robert Daborne's Turkish female character, Voada in *A Christian Turned Turk* (1612). In this play, the significance of Turkish traditional garments worn by a former Christian male in the setting of the Ottoman harem is explored. Through this exploration, it becomes evident that concerns about Western identity interconnect with anxieties related to sexuality (as aforementioned in chapter one). Ward's apostasy is physically indicated in the scene through his donning of lavish Turkish garments, much like the ones Voada wears in the same scene.

However, Greene's portrayal of Angelica differs from the above examples because the pagan princess, in act three, scene two, enters the stage (the forest) dressed, as noted in the stage directions, "*like a poore woman*" (*Orlando,* III.ii.). When Rodamant and Brandimart come in search of Angelica with the intent of capturing and raping her, she attempts to persuade them that she is not, in fact, Angelica, but a "Daughter […] unto a bordering swaine, / That tend my flocks within these shady groves" before finally admitting when the men question her that she is "in disguisde [sic]" (*Orlando,* III.ii.872; 876). Thus, the Eastern woman is often portrayed as cunning, deceptive, and unfaithful (Rossa) or motivated by lustfulness. In the second instance, this type of Eastern female character is often, on the early modern stage, characterised physically by being clothed in expensive garments made of lavish fabrics like silk and velvet (Donusa).

Angelica (the Pagan female) is attached to neither of the above characterisations due to her faithfulness to Orlando, regardless of the fact that Orlando believed she was unfaithful. In comparison to figures like Greville's Rossa, Angelica's behaviour is suggestive of her values being more aligned with honesty, faithfulness, and virtue to Orlando. These are all qualities most often associated with Christian characters by sixteenth and seventeenth-century English dramatists. In contrast to Daborne's focus upon Voada's lavish garments as a representation for her values as an Eastern female, Greene chooses to place emphasis upon Angelica's disguise as a peasant. It is possible that Greene's comment was linked to the concept that English superstition about increased Anglo-Ottoman contact—fuelled by jealousy, much like the rumours against Angelica in *Orlando*—was somehow linked to costuming conventions in drama, whereby the Eastern female dons lavish robes and inhabits the harem setting whilst doing so. In doing the above, Greene's cultural cross-dressing scene becomes functional to a wider discussion on Ottoman versus English identity. Imperial envy refers to Turkish power, as well as English interest in and anxiety about Turkish people, within early modern writing

and performance (Gerald MacLean, 2004, p. 20). The very fact that Greene depicts his Eastern female character disguised as a peasant in rags may illuminate his specific political agenda, bearing in mind the historical context of the Anglo-Spanish war and thus the necessity for England to find an ally in their Ottoman counterparts.

In discussing the context of imperial envy with relation to costuming conventions of disguise, it is also fitting to refer to Bruce Smith's *The Key of Green: Passion and Perception in Renaissance Culture* where the term 'green' was also used during the early modern period, to refer to "passionate desire" (2009, p. 36). Greene's *Orlando* is not a play which prioritises material dramatic conventions over the thematic issues that they metaphorically convey, or vice versa. Instead, the two work simultaneously to illuminate that "passion" is "good and agreeable with reason" when his audience are able to "judgeth all things" through "green spectacles" (Smith, 2009, p. 36). In other terms, and in the context of Greene's materialisation of the East, when one does not harbour jealousy towards the wealth of another that they wish they possessed themselves, they are able to see past the 'Other's' lavish exterior and recognise their human qualities. It is evident that this analogy features in Greene through the virtuous Angelica's physical disguise as a peasant, which becomes evident when she states that she would rather "die by [Orlando whom] I love so deare, / Than live and see my Lord thus lunaticke" (*Orlando,* III.ii.919-20).

### 2.3. Islamic Idolatry and Christian Magic in *Alphonsus*

Greene's *Alphonsus, King of Aragon* is, similarly to his *Orlando*, a play which dramatizes contact between 'Europe' and the 'East' during the early modern period. This time, the action is centred in both Constantinople and various Occidental spaces. The play opens with the King of Naples returning from the land owned by the Spanish King Alphonsus in Turkey. Due to his vision that he will be usurped by Alphonsus, Amurack displays disdain towards

the Prophet Muhammad, accusing the Prophet of being responsible for the misfortunes that afflicts Ottoman sultans like himself due to his being too pompous a deity. This vision does indeed become a reality in the final act of the play, which is dominated by the plot point of Alphonsus successfully storming Constantinople and capturing Phigenia, the daughter of Amurack, with the intent of marrying her.

Perhaps even more aptly in *Alphonsus* than he does in *Orlando*, Greene blurs the divide between his English characters (and those who we would now refer to as 'European') and his Ottoman characters, with even more specific references to religious jargon and the use of physical idols on stage, which creates a conflation between Muslim and Christian values. Although Greene's English audience were most likely unfamiliar with the concept of the Prophet Muhammad as a "speaking idol" in favour of claims of the "untruthful divinity of Muhammad frequently stated in Marlowe's Tamburlaine", it is known that they did possess "strong faith in witches, ghosts, spirits, fiends, beasts, foresights, and visions" (F. M. T. Al-Olaqi, 2016, p. 447). As well as this, a number of early modern historical accounts depict the Prophet Muhammad as a pagan deity, such as Ralph Carr's *The Mahumetane or Turkish Historie* which talks of the "Originall and beginning of the Turkes, and of the foure Empires which are issued and proceeded out of the *superstitious* sect of Mahumet" (1600, p. 1).

The most prevalent example of this more sympathetic portrayal of a key Islamic figure in Greene's play situates itself in the use of staging to create 'The Temple of Mahomet'. The term 'temple' replaces 'mosque' due to the playwright's supposed understanding that it was a house of worship for Jews and pagans during the period in which he was writing, as 'mosque' had not yet been introduced into the English vocabulary. However, this may not be as unintentional a decision as is initially assumed, as Greene's representation of this space and its inhabitants—both human and idol—is arguably more critical of paganism than it is of Islam. Daniel Vitkus states that Greene's "temple of

Mahomet ... [is] as a shrine dedicated to the worship of the idol, Mahomet" (2016, p. 146). Greene's conceptualisation of the temple space and decisions as to how it should be staged may have been inspired by other fictional representations of this holy space, such as Christopher Marlowe's staging of 'Mecca's temple'. It could have also inspired later travel accounts like William Lithgow's (1636), where he discusses how the Turkish individuals whom he encountered allegedly explained that the Prophet Muhammad's tomb lay situated in the sky above the Kaaba.

In Greene's staging of the 'temple', he chooses to make its centrepiece a brass head. He describes the way in which 'flakes of fire [fall] from the mouth \ Of Mahomet, that god of peerless power" (*Alphonsus,* IV.ii.23-4), and adds details of the soundscape in the form of drumming noises sounding from inside of this brazen idol. This drumming is followed by the sound of a bell ringing, signalling the head to speak to a group of Turkish priests with the intent of persuading them to bring Amurack to the temple (*Alphonsus,* IV.ii). The brass head then begins to shake, which Richard Huygens argues is a reference to the medieval English belief that "Muhammad broke out into such madness that he dared to lie that he was a prophet" (1986, p. 21). Thus, if this interpretation is to be entertained, the Prophet does not physically or verbally appear in this scene, but the voice coming from the head (a pagan, as opposed to an Islamic, idol) is posing as such. This becomes clearer when the head exclaims that

> You cannot tell, nor will you seek to know:
> Oh perverse priest[s], how careless are you waxed,
> As when my foes approach unto my gates,
> You stand still talking of "I cannot tell".
> Go, pack you hence, and meet the Turkish kings

Which now are drawing to my temple ward;

Tell them from me, God Mahomet is disposed

To prophesy no more to Amurack,

Since that his tongue is waxen now so free,

As that it needs must chat and rail at me.

Kneel down both

(*Alphonsus,* IV.i.25-35)

In this scene, Greene frames the above claims of the brazen head as those belonging to "a necromancer", as opposed to those belonging to the Prophet Muhammad as the head attempts to convince the Turkish priests (Al-Olaqi, p. 448). Since the priests are not, in fact, convinced that the speech coming from inside the head is the word of their Prophet, the head reprimands them for their disobedience and orders them to kneel before it.

However, this seems an odd command from a figure who is supposedly claiming to be a Muslim religious leader, as Greene's audience know that the Christian enemies of the Turkish priests are preparing to invade the temple at this point. Had the speech of the necromancer really belonged to the Prophet, surely it would have prophesised this information about the Christians' plan to the Turkish priests and encouraged the latter to prepare to defend their religious grounds. Thus, through using the brazen head on stage, it can be argued that Greene moves away from the trope of representing the Prophet Muhammad as a sorcerer himself. It can also be argued that the talking brass head aids Greene's portrayal of the Turkish priests as possessing enough intelligence to ignore the commands of a prophet they, as Muslims, consider to be false.

With regards to the physical characteristics of the brazen head on stage in *Alphonsus,* little information exists. However, we are aware that Greene reused the brazen head as a central prop in this play from one of his earlier dramatic works entitled *Friar Bacon and*

*Friar Bungay* (1589). As Savage outlines, there is a convention led stage direction in *Bacon and Bungay* which reads as follows: "*Enter Friar Bacon with Friar Bungay to his cell*" (*Bacon and Bungay*, 1589, IV:iii; Savage, 2014, p. 18). We know that five of the scenes in Greene's earlier play take place in the study of *Friar Bacon* (those being I:ii, II:iii, IV:i, IV:iii, and V:ii). The scene in which the brazen head appears in *Bacon and Bungay* is act four, scene three, supposedly set in Bacon's study. The figurine of a head made of brass (which was most likely crafted to the scale of a real human head) was most likely to have been placed downstage. This is because the characters Serlsby and Lambert (who are presumably situated either centre stage or upstage in this scene) knock to enter the study and the only remaining space for the actors playing them to move into would have been downstage.

Dessen and Thompson confirm that this stage layout was where the study (and thus the brazen head) would have been situated. They draw upon the stage direction provided in this same scene "*goes in to [the study]*" (*Friar Bacon,* IV:iii). Were the study and the brazen head situated centre stage or upstage, the audience would perceive that these two characters were immediately entering the study the moment they stepped on to the stage. However, "*goes in to [the study]*" as in this case implies that the actor entered the stage and proceeded to make their way into the study from another setting.

As far as Christian perspectives are concerned, J. G. Harris' study reminds one that religious teachers, leaders of denominations, the anti-Christ, as well as necromancers and those who perform miraculous acts are all mentioned in Biblical books, such as Matthew XXIV (Harris, 2010, p. 80). It is interesting to consider concepts rooted in the religious and cultural prejudices that influenced the ideals of the "primitive church" (Conyers Middleton, 1752, p. 54). This is especially true when examining the dialectics of Saidian Orientalism applied to early modern English dramatic portrayals of 'Eastern' women, such as Greene's

Angelica in *Orlando*. This issue is also explored by David Moberly, who alludes to female converts as based on the historical figure of Irene, a Greek woman captured by Ottomans who fills Mehmed II with lust before he recognises the distraction she poses and murders her. He states that Irene "never speaks for herself when telling her story, unlike her male captive counterparts, many of whom wrote or dictated to others their experiences as slaves" (David C. Moberly, 2018, p. 139). In a similar way to seventeenth-century Occidental representations of the Orient, Irene functions as *"a topos,* a set of references, a congeries of characteristics, that seems to have [their] origin in a quotation, or fragment of a text, or a citation of someone else's work […], or some bit of previous imagining, or an amalgam of all these" (Moberly, 2018, p. 139).

Fighting between religious or racial counterparts (as the invasion of the temple in the brazen head scene illuminates) is not, however, the only way in which Greene draws upon the violence enacted by the Western Christian characters in his *Alphonsus.* This is outlined by a retrospective stage direction in act two, scene one, which states that

> *Albinius spies out Alphonsus and shows him Belinus.*
>
> *Belinus and Albinius go towards Alphonsus.*
>
> *Belinus say to Alphonsus.*
>
> *Shows Belinus Flaminius, who lies all this while dead at his feet. Alphonsus sit in the chair; Belinus takes the crown off Flaminius' head and puts it on that of Alphonsus.*
>
> *[Sound trumpets and drums within].*
>
> (*Alphonsus, King of Aragon*, II:i)

First of all, the phrase "spied out" is quite unusual to see, as opposed to a more generic term, such as 'sees'. 'Spies out' seems to imply that Belinus and Flaminius may not have noticed Alphonsus in the first instance but then Albinus realises he is there, and he immediately

informs Belinus of his whereabouts. In *Orlando,* a similar stage direction is used in act three, scene one ("*They spy Orlando*") and in act two, scene one ("*He spies the roundelays*").

Savage makes a key distinction between the two directions, as the term 'spy' is used differently in each scenario; in the first, it is used to refer to 'spying' an object, and in the second it is used to refer to 'spying' another character. She states that "the former is an instruction to the actor, the latter a convention of acting and staging" (Savage, 2014, p. 176). In the first example, the clowns enter the stage whilst conversing with one another, only to see Orlando already onstage. Although it is not clear whereabouts on the stage the actor playing Orlando would have been situated, we know that "the Elizabethan audience was familiar with the general concept of the dangerous observer" (Savage, 2014, p. 176). The stage direction in this scene may, indeed, indicate that the clowns were 'dangerous observers'. This is because one 'spies' Orlando by chance and points him out to the other, coupled with the fact that they continue to observe him from afar, which suggests that they should not be doing so.

According to Dessen and Thompson, '*shows him'* is a very common stage direction used within Elizabethan drama (1999, p. 245). However, and similarly to the example discussed from *Orlando*, it is strange that one individual in *Alphonsus* would "*show*" a character to another character on stage unless they were introducing the former character, or unless that character was in hiding or disguise. However, we also know that there would have been a number of other actors still onstage during act two, scene one of *Alphonsus*, as well as pillars which may have been obstructing Alphonsus from view from where the other two actors stood, and so it may have been difficult for Belinus to initially spot Alphonsus without having his presence pointed out by Albinus.

As far as the positioning of Flaminius' dead body itself is concerned, the fact that "*Belinus and Albinus go towards Alphonsus*" suggests that the actor playing Alphonsus may have been situated downstage left or right, assuming that the other two actors had entered from a door close to either centre or upstage (as it is unlikely this would have been downstage). The body of Flaminius would have been at Alphonsus' feet, which we know for certain from the stage direction: "*Show Belinus, Flaminius, who lies all while dead at his feet*". This stage direction would imply that the actor portraying Flaminius lie on the stage floor at the feet of the actor playing Alphonsus for at least eighty-six lines. This prompts the question of how this actor's body may have been moved by other members of the company on stage at this point, as he would not have been afforded the contemporary convenience of a lighting blackout during which to exit of his own accord. The members of the ensemble cast may have been tasked with moving the body of a dead character offstage in Elizabethan drama (unless it was explicitly stated in the stage directions that one of the named characters should move them). This slight inconvenience may also explain why Belinus and Albinus did not initially notice Alphonsus and the corpse at his feet; it would only be possible for them to notice this scenario at a point in the scene where it was feasible for the ensemble (presumably an actor playing an unnamed soldier here) to remove the actor playing Flaminius (Pauline Kiernan, 1999, p. 123).

Contextually, this scenario of the vanquished ruler at the feet of his slayer (from the same ethnic or religious group as the deceased)—and successor—is reminiscent of the final scene of Thomas Goffe's *The Raging Turk* (1618). In Goffe's tragedy, Bajazet, who is the eldest of Amurath's sons in *The Courageous Turk*, shows initial mercy to his younger brother Jacup by offering to share the throne and divide their monarchical responsibilities in order to let Jacup live. His tutor, Lala Schahin intervenes by arguing that Bajazet must respect "the

Turkish Lawes" (*The Courageous Turk,* V.iv.143), which state that the younger brothers of the succeeding sultan must die to avoid possible usurpation later.

However, consensus suggests that Greene's audience is left feeling less compassion for Alphonsus (the Western Christian who should according to most early modern plays possess qualities of virtue and mercy), as his qualms about committing murder to assume the throne are not nearly as evident as those of Bajazet. Historical instances like Elizabeth I's formation of military coalition with the Ottomans—in exchange of tin and ammunition—after the outbreak of war between England and Spain in 1585 may indeed have encouraged Greene to facilitate an agenda of humanising the Ottomans. Greene may have chosen to do this by reminding his audience of their support for England during past former political turmoil.

## Chapter Three ~ Fulke Greville's *The Tragedy of Mustapha* (1609)

### 3.0. Western Conception of the Laws of the Ottoman Empire: Machiavelli and Turkish Tragedy

In order to fully appreciate English perceptions of Ottoman law and custom it is crucial to consider the importance and influence that Niccolò Machiavelli's *The Prince* (1513) had on early modern conceptions of law. Machiavelli's writing was mainly concerned with the "authoritarian apparition of any ruler" (Çakırtaş 2017, p. 150) with *The Prince* being the most well-known of his works. Gerald Lee Ratcliff provides an outline of the main distinctions Machiavelli makes between different kinds of states. All principalities, says Ratcliff, "have been governed in one of two ways: either by one absolute prince, to whom all others are completely subordinate, [...], or else by a prince and hereditary nobles who hold their ranks not by the grace of the prince but by the antiquity of their lineage" (1986, pp. 32-3). According to Machiavelli, the most appropriate example of the principality governed by an absolute sovereign was represented by the Ottoman Empire, whose "monarchical bureaucratic system", as confirmed by Wang Hui in *Politics of Imagining Asia,* was considered "categorically different [from] European state systems" (2007, p. 71; see Machiavelli, 1513).

In particular, Machiavelli's text seems to single out some interesting aspects of Ottoman rule: the way in which the sultan's authority depends on his subjects' acknowledgment of the dictatorial nature of his mandate and the fact that democracy does not play any role in the way the empire is governed. In addition to Machaivelli's emphasis upon the importance of legitimacy in the line of succession to power, Donald Quataert also discusses how 'legitimate' Ottoman sons, unlike their English counterpart, do not necessarily need to be the sultan's eldest son:

> [...] all sons in this system possessed a theoretically equal claim to the throne. When the sultan died, a period between his death and the accession of the new monarch usually followed, when the sons jockeyed or manoeuvred. Scrambling for power, the first son to reach the capital and win recognition by the court and the imperial troops became the new ruler.
>
> (2005, p. 90)

However, with the dismissal of primogeniture privileges, Ottomans expected—and accepted as compliant with Ottoman law— civil wars brought forward by brothers keen to defend their legitimate right to power. It is this very consideration on Ottoman rule that prompts Machiavelli to state that "the prince who causes another to become powerful […] works his own ruin; for he has contributed to the power of the other either by his own ability or force, and both the one and the other will be mistrusted by him whom he has thus made powerful" (Machiavelli, 1513, p. 23).

As Harvey Mansfield points out, Machiavellian principle rationalises the catastrophic intra-familial killings for the benefit of the public, stating that "the essence of this politics is that 'you can get away with murder': that no divine sanction, or degradation of soul, or twinge of conscious will come to punish you" (1998, p. 7). Thus, the death of the physically weakest potential heir results in bettering the empire's chances of crowning a sultan who possessed the most martial prowess, which may have been reassuring for many Ottomans.

This type of Machiavellian politics, "where morals and principles have little account" was, according to Çakırtaş, "identified within the characteristic managing structure of the Ottoman Empire" (2017, p. 150). And thus, while Ottoman rulers become schemers and models of villainous mischief, Greville's Ottoman characters often offer a more complicated narrative where the actions of the rulers are not determined by the corrupted nature of games

of power—as advocated for in *The Prince*—but are instead invoked and endorsed by the law of their society.

### 3.1. Historical background to Greville's *Mustapha*

Fulke Greville was a student at the University of Cambridge and, in addition to being of service to Queen Elizabeth's court, he was also employed to carry out various roles for the state during the rule of both James I and Charles I. At the point Greville had finished writing his first version of *The Tragedy of Mustapha* (1594-6; final version written by 1609), he had already had first-hand understanding of sectarian power struggles, after experiencing their impact during his fulfilment of state positions under the reign of Elizabeth. With regards to his political involvement, Greville, along with the Sidneys, was also "associated with the militantly anti-Spanish faction, who lost power to the more cautious Cecils in the final decades of the sixteenth-century" (Seda Erkoc, 2016, p. 265). On the approach of the mid-1550s, Greville began to make public his association with Robert Devereaux, the Earl of Essex, who continued to back the "more aggressive policies against Spanish imperialism", with which the Cecils disagreed (Erkoc, 2016, p. 265). This political stance pushed him away from any future involvement with the English Court and its proceedings.

In his *The Life of Sydney* (1652), Greville (Sidney's biographer) writes on the way in which he edited his own tragic works, including *Mustapha,* and how his political agenda eventually, through the editing process(es), became embedded within the drama. The implications raised by such a remark are pivotal to our understanding of *Mustapha*. It is through the medium of the chorus' speeches, where the ambitions and vices of rulers in the play would be revealed, that Greville's political commentary becomes more evident. Greville elaborates that such additions were made to provide a "perspective on vice" and "the

unprosperities of it", arguably making his writing more "acceptable to every good Readers end" (1652, p. 35).

As mentioned above, Greville's initial version of *Mustapha* was written during a time of uncertainty regarding who would succeed Elizabeth, given her childless state. This uncertainty in the political life of England is also reflected in the precariousness of his own position. *Mustapha* embraces this political disquietude and thematises it within the narrative web of his Turkish tragedy. Ronald A. Rebholz states that the initial published version of Greville's play, which was thought to have been pirated and published in 1609 without Greville's permission (see Joan Rees, 2013), accentuates "the psychology of the individual person's moral choice" (1971, p. 3). In contrast, the latter version (1633; published in full after the dramtist's death) of Greville's play explores more than a mere personal disagreement at court, instead favouring the discussion of more pressing political issues, such as the question of legitimacy.

A case in point is the dramatist's conversation about the history of Anglo-Ottoman conflict and, specifically, the tension between Christians and Muslims in the early modern world. These issues are conveyed in Greville's *Mustapha* through his conception and assessment of the Ottoman Empire during the twilight of Sultan Suleiman's reign and the consequences of economic traffic between England and Turkey. Dramatising the story of the factual Suleiman and his son, Mustafa, allowed Greville to discuss a variety of issues related to England as it approached the 1600s. In addition, it also enabled him to cultivate his opinions on political matters, such as the outright reign of a king, so long as they were legitimate heir to a throne, be they politically efficient or tyrannical.

But the references to contemporary heated debates go beyond these internal references. As Greville alludes to in *Sydney,* his play was written with the intention of being dramatic exempla conveying his personal thoughts on English political affairs and obtaining the means

to do so by setting them in a foreign context. Greville's ambition in writing his Turk plays may not have been, as classical tragedies most often did, "to exemplify the disastrous miseries of men's lives" (Erkoc, 2016. p. 266). Placing sole concentration upon these "miseries" would suggest, according to Greville, that "Order, Lawes, Doctrine, and Authority" are all invalid means of preserving "innocency from the exorbitant wickednesse of power", thus implying an unwarranted objection to "Divine Providence" (1652, p. 133).

Greville's *Mustapha* is a closet drama (as opposed to a play written with the intention of public performance), which contains elements derived from the Senecan philosophical tradition. Brett Roscoe states that, although there has never been any definite confirmation regarding whether Seneca intended to produce closet dramas, "it is often assumed that Senecan tragedy was not intended for the stage" (2013, p. 78), much like Greville's 'Turk' play. James Ker and Jessica Wilson outline the way in which elements of Senecan tragedy became increasingly apparent in Elizabethan drama. Some of the main features discussed are stage conventions, such as the inclusion of the observant and philosophising chorus who were uninvolved with the characters or action on stage, asides spoken by characters entering the stage, and, often, the distinct five act structure favoured by Seneca.

Other features that appear to be inspired by Senecan drama in Elizabethan plays are more concerned with theme, such as "the relative absence of the gods and of the social world, with a tighter focus on underworld forces, moral psychology, the power of rhetoric, and fortune" (Ker and Wilson, 2012, p.12). Since Greville's *Mustapha* was written with the intention of being read, as opposed to performed or watched, the playwright was able to afford less attention to what was "appropriate for stage" (Roscoe, 2013, p. 763) and more to his concern with the individual and with his "poetics, which is informed by his theological and political thought, and the broader context of genre" (Roscoe, 2013, p. 762). The influence of Senecan philosophical tradition becomes apparent, then, in his inclusion of his Chorus

Secundus in the 1633 version of *Mustapha,* who are onlookers that philosophise about the actions of his protagonists. It is also apparent in scenes where his Turkish Sultana Roxolana invokes spiritual forces, and in his exploration into the moral psychology of his Solyman, his Mustapha, and specifically his Roxolana.

It is also worth noting that Greville did not wish, as a number of early modern English playwrights did, to use his plays to depict a God who always necessarily took revenge upon those who sinned against Him. Greville's characters, with specific reference to *Mustapha*, were written with the intention of "trac[ing] out the high waies of ambitious Governours, and to shew in the practice, that the more audacity, advantage, and good successe such Soveraignties have, the more they hasten to their owne desolation and ruine" (Greville, 1652, p. 133). Greville's aim, then, was to focus upon Christian strength over the Turk to further develop his exploration of the "power of the individual" in his tragedies (Erkoc, 2016, p. 266). To elaborate upon this analogy, Greville's *Mustapha* depicts how the maintenance of law and political order in an empire were often effective in sparing those who abided by it from "miseries" or misfortune. This was because it did not appear to be Greville's view that the divine intention of God was to abolish a sound system of organisation designed by his people, who upheld both religious and political order and justice.

Instead, Greville's Turkish tragedy exemplifies that the main factor which contributes to "desolation and ruine" was, in many cases, a ruler's aspirations to achieve something which would have distracted them from fulfilling their political duties. Ambition is therefore depicted negatively in his *Mustapha*, as demonstrated in the behaviour of Solyman's wife, Rossa (also known as Roxolana) and her son, Rosten, who display the stock 'stage Turk' traits of violence and political voracity. On several occasions, Mustapha, Camena, and Achmat, engage in conversations about Solyman's decision to kill his son, Mustapha, because of Rossa's persuasions.

This reframing of the Machiavellian code becomes apparent in Camena and Achmat's position in favour of Mustapha. This must be read through the filter of political, as well as moral, standpoints which, of course, contrast with the stereotypically violent, cold-blooded Turk. Greville's reconceptualisation of Machiavellian politics, in which the "rejection of naturalism" (Hyland Harris, 1948, p. 38) features in favour of actions of rulers endorsed by their societal laws, is highlighted through the Chorus of Tartars. The Chorus of Tartars criticise "religion, counsels recourse to nature, […] and accounts a true knowledge of reality as rising from the senses to the realm of reason" (Harris, 1948, p. 38). However, this is denied by the Mahometan Priests of Chorus Secundus, who determine that "if Nature is the source of all, she has not yet placed in accord the contenders, passion and reason; they are the cause of our strife, thus nature is evil" (Harris, 1948, p. 38). Thus, Greville once again emphasises the need of his Turkish characters to adhere to the strictures of Ottoman law when making political decisions so as to avoid being compromised by their nature. Even if their nature fills them with the desire to have mercy upon others (like Solyman inherently wishes to allow Mustapha to live), their concern that this will result in political ruin must override merciful instincts and lead a ruler to adhere to their laws, however harsh.

### 3.2. Cultural and Religious Boundary-blurring in Greville

Greville's *Mustapha* features characters who exhibit a certain degree of fluidity in their adherence to specific cultural values. This is particularly poignant in the additions and deletions appearing in the second edition of Greville's *Mustapha* in 1633. This later version explores, to a greater extent than the original version of the play, how the playwright uses Solyman's filicidal actions to provoke a discussion about the political, social, and cultural impact that trading with the Ottomans had upon England.

Thus, the 1633 version presents key differences in the lines spoken by the choruses, namely in its discussion of what impact the dispersion of English Christian culture had upon the subsequent weakening of Ottoman Muslim customs. An example of the above occurs between the end of act two, scene two and start of act two, scene one. In this scene, Chorus Secundus (referred to as Chorus Sacerdotum in the 1609 version), who are here defined as "Mahometan Priests", discuss the Ottoman Empire during Solyman's reign as a growing global force, and as an intercultural hub benefitting from the ever-increasing opportunities and interactions with England:

> [Chorus Secundus]: Europe in cheife our prophetes then withstood,
> With her three-mitred God of fleshe, and blood.
> Her lett' red Greece, that lottarie of artes,
> Since Mars forsooke her subtile, never wise;
> Prowde of her newe made Gods in fleshlie hartes,
> As she of olde was of her heathen lies;
> We undertooke with unitie of minde,
> And what their wittes dispute, our swords did binde.
> So that ere her crosse sectes could danger see,
> Their Thrones, Schooles, Miters, Idolles were resign'd
> To us, newe Trophies of our Monarchie.
>
> (*Mustapha*, 1633, lines 23-36)

Here, Greville praises Ottoman wealth and military strength, conveyed through the "Mahometan Priests" in Chorus Secundus. This type of praise results in a representation of Ottoman commercial activity aligned with historical accounts, which do not, like most theatrical and cultural accounts, seek to demonise the Turk and, so, sets the tone for Greville's humanisation of Turkish characters in his *Mustapha*.

Greville is particularly interested in challenging preconceived ideas attached to the binary representations of virtuous English Christian and the villainous Turkish Muslim. Solyman's Pasha, Achmat, is a case in point. Achmat is politically ambitious and succeeds in climbing social ranks to the "seconde slipperie place of honors steepe" and Greville alerts us that this promotion is determined by his abidance with Solyman's orders (*Mustapha,* 1609, 2.1.7). This is as opposed to his cunning which we would often expect from Turkish characters who ascend from lowly ranks to positions of power either through tyranny or through seduction (like Rossa).

Greville also discusses political rank and power in the Ottoman Court with relation to divine power. For example, Chorus Secundus states that the Ottoman Empire was ruled by "Mahometan priests" in the name of God before it evolved into what it claims is now a government ruled by tyrannical sultans during its appearance before the start of act two, scene one (*Mustapha,* 1633, lines 13-14; 37-38). The priests continue, during this same appearance, to argue that Anglo-Ottoman contact has led to the breakdown of their Ottoman traditions, which is the reason that their sultans have adopted tyrannical practices:

> [Chorus Secundus]: Yet by our traffique with this dreaminge Nation,
> Their Conquer'd vice hath stayn'd our Conqueringe State,
> And brought thinne Cobwebbes into reputation
> Of tender subtilitie, whose stepmother fate
> So inlayes courage with ill shaddowinge feare,
> As makes it much more hard to doe, then beare.
> […]
> So from our Prophets sawes when Sultans stray,
> In humane witte Power findes perplexed way.
> Hence, though we make no Idolles, yet we fashion

God, as if from Powers Throne he tooke his beinge;

Our Alchoran as warrant unto passion;

Monarches in all lawes but their owne will seeinge.

He whom God chooseth out of doubt doth well:

What they that choose their God doe; who can tell?

(*Mustapha,* 1633, lines 85-102)

The Mahometan priests continue to outline their belief that Christianity does not seem to affect secular English politics to as great an extent as Islam affects Ottoman law. They discuss how the newfound tyranny of sultans could result in the full appointment of a secular government. This appointment could, in turn, lead to political corruption because it may result in the abolishment of Turkish cultural and religious traditions.

Both historical source texts, Richard Knolles's *Generall Historie of the Turkes* (1603) and Bartolomej Georgijević's *The Ofspring of the House of Ottomano* (1566), include information about the extent of Ottoman tolerance, in a religious sense, that was exhibited towards the English Christians with whom they came into contact (Knolles, p. 645–655; Georgijević, p. 2-4). Greville also seems to support these statements made by Knolles and Georgijević in his play, evident in the claims of his Chorus Secundus. The Chorus outline how the "thinne Cobwebbes […] Of tender subtilitie" and "ill-shaddowinge feare" which surfaced because of increased Anglo-Ottoman contact or 'trafique' affected Solyman with "that f[e]are, / Which torrid zones of Tyrannie must beare" (*Mustapha,* 1633, III.iii.177–178), causing him to act tyrannically. Here, Greville moves from cobwebs to thrones and divine beings to allude to the concept that the reason Christian culture affected Turkish socio-political values to such an extent was due to their former seizure of Ottoman lands. It may also have been, as Katrin Roder suggests, because of the "exchange of ideas about practices of government" (2014, p. 564).

Chorus Secundus then explains further the discrepancies between Ottoman and Christian political strategies and contends that, whereas the Christians remunerate the "wealthy", Turks "grace the active" (*Mustapha,* 1633, III.iii.81-82). To elaborate upon this point, Turks are, as conceived in the western imagination, linked with "force" and the Ottoman Empire is described by Chorus Secundus as a "Conqueringue state" (*Mustapha,* 1633, III.iii.83-84). On the other hand, Christians are connected with the notion of "rest" and are described as having qualities such as "modesty", "lacke of power", and "Conquer'd vice" (*Mustapha,* 1633, III.iii.123 –168). Despite Knolles not actually employing the term "active" to refer to the Ottomans in his collection on Turkish history, in his 'Preface to the Reader', he does add the term "vigilancie" to their listed qualities and discusses how courageous Ottomans have been throughout history by referencing

> […] the wonderfull successe of their perpetuall fortune, their notable vigilancie in taking the advantage of every occasion for the enlarging of their Monarchie, […] their cheerefull and almost incredible obedience unto their Princes and Sultans; such, as in that point no nation in the world was to be worthily compared unto them […]. Whereunto may be added the two strongest sinews of every well governed commonweale, Reward propounded to the good, and Punishment threatened unto the offendor; where the prize is for vertue and valour set up, and the way laied open for every common person, be he never so meanely borne, to aspire unto the greatest honours and preferments both of the Court and of the field, yea even unto the nearest affinitie of the great Sultan himselfe […].
>
> (Knolles, 1603, p. 9)

Thus, what Greville is doing in his play, in addition to using this description of meritocracy to disturb the ruling classes in England who still believed in a hierarchy ordained by God, is making close references to Knolles' typecasting of Christians and Ottomans. He does so by

outlining their political differences and, thus, creating binary distinctions between Christians being 'passive' (or peaceful) and Ottomans being 'active' (or violent). He supports those distinctions through his portrayal of 'active' Solyman only to begin the process of dismantling them when he chooses to present Mustapha as being both sexually and politically 'passive', therefore blurring these differences.

The final scene (5.2) of Greville's Turkish tragedy consists of fifteen lines spoken by Zanger, who discusses his distress at Mustapha's death sentence. Achmat, another of Solyman's sons then enters the scene and notifies Zanger that the murder has now been carried out. As a result of Mustapha's murder, the dismantling of the Turkish system of succession to the sultanate—which has been prefigured a number of times by the 'Mahometan Priests' and the 'converts to Mahometanisme'—has finally come into fruition. Outraged by the act, Achmat adds that "nature is ruin'd; Humanitie fall'n a sunder: / Our Alocoran prophan'd; Empire defac'd; / Ruine is broken loose; / Truth dead; Hope banished" (*Mustapha,* 1609, V.ii.9-11). This is, according to Simon Tibbs (2003), one of the key disparities in Greville's retelling of the Mustapha tragedy as opposed to some of his contemporaries who have previously produced dramatic works inspired by the same historical instance: for example Nicolas de Moffan's Latin play entitled *Soltani Solymanni* (1555). Moffan, says Tibbs, frames Mustapha's murder as being "preceded by a vision of felicity and hope that is explicitly non-Christian in character" (2003, p. 134), as evidenced in the following lines: "sleeping about the twye light of daye, he semed to have seene Mahomet appareled with glistering robes, takynyng him by the hande, to bringe him unto a certaine place moste delectable" (Moffan, 1555; trans. by Henry Goughe, 1566, p. 135). In contrast to Moffan, Greville represents Mustapha as being a Christian martyr-like figure.

After Achmat's announcement of the death of Mustapha in Greville's concluding scene, he then continues to disclose to Zanger the way in which Rossa manipulated Solyman

into believing his son was a traitor who would attempt to usurp him. The Sultan's anxiety about this possible betrayal is conveyed in act five, scene two where he claims that he could see "the stormes of Rage, and Danger coming" (*Mustapha,* 1609, V.ii.32-3) and, thus, it becomes evident that Rossa's false persuasions have been effective. Achmat then recounts to Zanger the physical setting in which the murder took place: a space which has now been embellished with details associated with what is believed to be the Ottoman Topkapi Palace: "large, embroidered, sumptuous Pavillion" and a "Stately Throne of Tyrannie and Murther" (*Mustapha,* 1609, V.ii.45-6).

Achmat's speech then recounts how Mustapha came "to the Port" of the "Pavillion" (*Mustapha,* 1609, 5.2.49). He outlines how Mustapha was guided to the place at which his father was situated by "six slave Eunuchs" (*Mustapha,* 1609, V.ii.51) and that the Prince conducted himself with the stoicism that Senecan drama explores. This is because Mustapha was "Not fearing death […] [and] Not craving life" (*Mustapha,* 1609, V.ii.55-6); the position that the subjects of Senecan dramas struggle to attain. Here Achmat adds a further, significant detail: those present at the scene bow in front of Sultan Solyman, who acts with indifference and disregard both towards his subjects and towards the murder of his own son. The detail is crucial as Greville purposely portrays Solyman as a character who exhibits a lack of emotional drive (*Mustapha,* 1609, V.ii.61-65), thus endorsing the early modern trope of the unsympathetic and unemotional dramatic Turk.

The context in which Greville's work seeks to humanise his Turkish characters is apparent when the eunuchs show almost instant remorse for the murder the Sultan has just instructed them to execute. They attempt, albeit in vain, to assist Mustapha "in haste to be an Angell" (*Mustapha,* 1609, 5.2.81) as the dying Prince recites a prayer which explicitly includes a Christian addendum in the below extract:

> [Mustapha]: O Father! Now forgive me;

Forgive them too, that wrought my overthrow:

Let my grave never minister offences.

For, since my Father coveteth my death,

Behold, with joy, I offer him my breath.

(*Mustapha,* 1609, V.ii.84-8)

Of central concern is whether Mustapha's final words of integrity and apparent goal of "reformation in the Turkish state and church tend towards the quasi-Christian" (Tibbs, 2003, p. 136). It could, indeed, be argued that his words almost resonate with martyrdom, usually echoed in association with Christianity. Mustapha's invocation to the "Father!" can then be read as a supplication to both Solyman and God.

Albert H. Tricomi suggests that "rather than discard his filial obligations or his honour, the values upon which family and civilisation are based, he [Mustapha] knowingly obeys the paternal command that issues in death" (1989, p. 70). These 'values' refer to the issue of succession and the importance of the maintenance of the royal bloodline, most often associated with Christian English monarchies. Here, Greville blends cultural references because Mustapha becomes the martyr (with evident religious allusions) who bears respect for his father's decision to interrupt traditional Ottoman methods of competing for succession with Zanger.

Greville emphasises the after-effects of a passive Mustapha's death (with the prince's scorning to live also being a deeply Senecan trope) and the in-fighting between Turkish characters other than the play's main protagonist and antagonist. This becomes evident when Rosten repents for manipulating the Sultan and asks: "Achmat: Seditious Rosten, running from sedition?" (*Mustapha,* 1609, V.ii.5). Greville, here, presents a scenario in which Rosten recognises the danger of believing that democracy necessarily assuages tyranny: "And shall I helpe to stay the People's rage […] / No People, No. Question these Thrones of Tyrants"

(*Mustapha,* 1609, V.ii.92). Rosten—despite his questioning of how efficient the will of the people is—finally acknowledges that, in attempting to obtain "Power and Right" for themselves, the people will most likely cause the destruction of "Worth, [and] Freedome" (*Mustapha,* 1609, 5.2.107-8). His duty, as well as Achmat's, if he believes this conclusion to be true, is to "Save this high rais'd Soveraigntie" (*Mustapha,* 1609, V.i.113). This psychological framework is described by David Norbrook as the course that most of Greville's plays took: a course in which they "toyed with the idea of rebellion against tyrants even though they eventually rejected it" (2002, p. 150).

The aftermath of Mustapha's murder is explored further by Greville in act five, scene four, where the suicide of Zanger also takes place along with Rossa's expression of guilt for her contribution to both events. She describes the aftermath of both Princes' deaths as a course driven by "mischievous stepmothers malice" (*Mustapha,* 1609, V.ii.54). Zanger, before his own death, asks in reference to his mother's resolution: "Is there no Hell? Or do the Divels love fire? / If neither God, Heaven Hell, Or Divell be; / 'Tis plague enough that I am borne of thee" (*Mustapha,* 1609, V.ii.83-85) and she condemns all "humble hearts which unto Power give place" (*Mustapha,* 1609, V.ii.119). In Francis Bacon's *Of Empire* (1623), he refers to the "horrible acte" committed by Greville's Rossa, and the disruption to the order of Ottoman succession that it caused, that

> […] Roxolana, Solyman's wife was the destruction of that renowned Prince, Sultan Mustapha, and otherwise troubled his house and succession […]. The destruction of Mustapha […] was so fatal to Solyman's line, as the destruction of the Turks from Solyman until this day is suspected to be untrue, and of strange blood, for that Selymus the Second was thought to be suppositious.
>
> (1623, p.44-5)

Thus, Greville's play creates a depiction of Turkish authority that is influenced by existing anxieties surrounding the Ottoman Court in early modern England. The play becomes a space in which discussions around the authenticity of Turkish theocratic rule, the tyranny of its authoritarian figures, fighting between male sultans and princes, and the sometimes-overlooked deception that women in the court were capable of committing take place.

### 3.3. Historical and Cultural Representations of Roxolana

Roxolana, also often referred to as Hurrem Sultan, her Ottoman title, was born in approximately 1505. At some stage between the years 1515 and 1520, according to Galina Yermolenko (2010) in her discussion of Roxolana, she is thought to have been captured by Crimean Tartars from her birthplace in Ukraine. After this, she was sold into the slave market in the city of Caffa (also known as Kefe or Kaffa, and presently Feodosia) in the Black Sea region of the Crimean coastline. After her capture, she was most likely transported to another Mediterranean slave market. Post-Crimea, Roxolana arrived at the Avret Pazara, or the 'Women's Bazaar', in Istanbul: yet another slave trading market and, supposedly, was bought by a companion of the then Prince Suleiman, Ibrahim Pasha. Ibrahim took Roxolana back to Suleiman in the year 1520, after which Suleiman would house her in his Ottoman harem, where she became known for her happy disposition and sweet singing voice. This is from where the term *Hurrem* (meaning 'joyful' or 'laughing one'), eventually attached to her name, originated (Yermolenko, 2010, p. 2). Due to her recognisable personality traits and talents, Suleiman soon became attracted to the young woman and openly acknowledged that she was his favourite concubine, thus *de facto* substituting in his heart and power Suleiman's former concubine, Gulbahar or Gulfrem, the mother of Suleiman's eldest son, Mustafa.

The year 1520 marked Suleiman's ascent to the Ottoman throne and, the following year, Roxolana gave birth to her first child with the Sultan, Prince Mehmed. Yermolenko

notes that there was a rule in place within the Ottoman harem system which stated that to every "one concubine mother" there could be only "one son" with the current sultan in order to "prevent the mothers' influence over the sultans and [their] dynastic affairs" (2010, p. 3). There was an unusual exception to this rule made by Suleiman towards Roxolana, however, since after giving birth to Mehmed, Hurrem Sultan gave birth to five more children with Suleiman; one daughter (Mihrimah, born in 1522) and four sons (Abdullah, born in 1522; Selim, born in 1524; Bayazid, born in 1525, and finally Cihangir, born in 1531). This appeared to be an exception to the usual system as evidenced by both the Ottoman public and historical and travel narratives of the period.

Some of the most prominent of these sources include travelogues penned by Venetian Ambassadors to the Sublime Porte named Pietro Po (1526) and Bernardo Navagero (1553), the recordings of Luigi Bassano, an Italian who travelled through Turkey (1545), and *The Turkish Letters* (thought to have been written between 1555 and 1562 and published in 1589) of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, who held the position of Emissary to the Emperor Ferdinand of Rome from 1554-1562. In these accounts, Hurrem Sultan was always named Rossa or Roxolana because it was (wrongly) presumed by these writers that she was Russian. These sources speculate about the reasons and the methods by which Roxolana successfully established authority over the Ottoman Court, given that she climbed from the ranks of slave to sultana in a relatively short timeframe. The travel writings of the two Venetian Ambassadors also mention that Roxolana was not particularly beautiful—"young but not beautiful, but graceful and small" (Bragadino, 1526, p. 3)—but that, regardless, she carried herself with elegance and pride.

It is also noted, as aforementioned, that her joyfulness (often verging upon flirtatiousness) in combination with her porcelain skin and amber hair could potentially both have been behavioural and physical factors that allowed her to capture Suleiman's undivided

attention (Yermolenko, 2010, p. 4). Her influence over the Sultan is further corroborated by a poem that Suleiman included in one of his letters addressed to Hurrem Sultan, in which he says:

> My very own queen, my everything,
> my beloved, my bright moon;
> My intimate companion, my one and all,
> sovereign of all beauties, my sultan.
>
> My life, the gift I own, my be-all,
> my elixir of Paradise, my Eden,
> My spring, my joy, my glittering day,
> my exquisite one who smiles on and on.
> […]
> My Istanbul, my Karaman, and all the
> Anatolian lands that are mine;
> My Bedakhshan and my Kipchak territories,
> my Baghdad and my Khorasan [.]
>
> (trans. by Leslie Pierce, 1993, p. 58-63)

It is clear that Suleiman was besotted with Roxolana through his expression of devotion in this extract of the poem, coupled with the fact that the harem salary that she received was that of two-thousand aspers per day, as noted by Pierce (Pierce, 1993, p. 58), thus effectively exceeding the salary for the majority of other concubines in Suleiman's harem, who only received one-hundred-and-fifty to five-hundred aspers per day.

Suleiman's closeness to Roxolana was also largely accepted and celebrated by the public who, as Kevin Sharpe notes, was intrigued by Roxolana's involvement in political

administrative duties (2003, p.53). Hurrem Sultan, whenever Suleiman travelled abroad, maintained order within the Ottoman Court and used to report to Suleiman on a wide range of issues, such as their children's illnesses and necessary treatments, the outbreak of the plague in the city of Istanbul, and speculations about the behaviour of a number of courtiers (Sharpe, 2003, p. 53). In short, she played a crucial role in the Sultan's family and in his relationship with other members of the court, thus effectively positioning herself as a figure of authority within the harem and the court.

### 3.4. Roxolana and the Representation of Feminine Sexual Power in Early Modern Literary Discourses

Within early modern literary discourses, there is a strong connection between "sexual politics" and state affairs (Hayden, 2016, p. 78). This link is even stronger in those plays focusing upon Ottoman rulers. Ros Ballaster discusses the way in which the representation of feminine sexual power often extends to political influence in the Ottoman domain. Pat Gill states that "sexual obsessions undermine potent leadership", that the political evaluation of this new, "effeminate" type of governance "depends on misogynous rhetoric" and that the Roxolana figure in drama often portrays "boundless passion, whether in her ambition for political or sexual power" (2013, p. 64). Taking into account the promiscuous behaviour exhibited by Charles II, playwrights of the period often used Roxolana as an example of the destructive force attached to lustful relationships. The reference, evidently, worked as a warning to Charles, who seemed to ignore the implications and possible consequences of his personal life over political matters. It is for this reason that Roxolana ended up being represented on seventeenth-century stages as a model of "ambition, sexuality, revenge, [and] exoticism" (Gill, 2013, p. 206).

Hayden (2016) also outlines the political framework within which the Roxolana figure was situated in early modern literary discourses. She analyses the characterisation of Roxolana in William Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes* (1663), Roger Boyle's *Mustapha* (1668), and Elkanah Settle's *Ibrahim the Illustrious Bassa* (1677). In Davenant and in Settle, Roxolana is portrayed quite negatively in order to demonstrate the threat that the sexual influence of the female 'turn'd Turk' (a Christian who has converted to Islam) could potentially pose to the governance of the Ottoman Court. Settle's and Davenant's versions seem to corroborate Busbecq's negative historical representation of Roxolana, along with her son-in-law, Roostem [the historical Rüstem Paşa] in his *Letters,* which claim that the pair were "practicer[s] of witchcraft" (Busbecq, 1589, p. 114).

This connection of Roxolana to witchcraft also recurs in other literary accounts of the story, such as the English translation of Nicolas de Moffan's *Soltani Solymanni* (1555), and William Painter's novella inspired by Suleiman and his seizure of Buda (*The Palace of Pleasure*; 1566). In both texts, Roxolana invokes devils to help her temper her sexual and political power. What is interesting here is that, in Moffan and Painter, Roxolana's villainous qualities are always linked to the religious sphere. It is not surprising, for example, that she is also depicted as a hypocrite, feigning her religious beliefs as a Muslim convert by showing her religious devotion in public forums in an attempt to entice Suleiman. In these texts Roxolana is described as cruel and revengeful, as when she sends clothes soaked in a poisonous liquid to her stepson, Mustapha, with the intent of killing him so that her biological son, Zanger, could succeed Suleiman. Painter's fictionalised version of Roxolana as an overly power-hungry and murderous villain is, if possible, reinforced and bolstered in Goughe's translation and expansion of the Moffan novella where Roxolana appears as "craftye and deceitfull" (1566, p. 135).

In her study on representations of female figures in early modern 'Turk' plays and Anglo-Ottoman commerce between female monarchs, McJannet claims that Painter's novella "anticipates the tendency of later historians, such as Knolles, to narrativise their sources, setting events in a master narrative of East-West enmity and Ottoman decline" (McJannet, 2006, p. 73). In both Painter's *Palace of Pleasure* and in Goughe's translation of Moffan's *Soltani Solymanni*, it is Roxolana who is blamed for the instigation of Mustapha's tragic and unjust death sentence at the hands of his father (with Roostem merely being the one carrying out her orders). However, in Greville's and Boyle's playtexts Roxolana and Rustem are equally responsible for Mustapha's downfall.

Thus, it becomes evident that Roxolana, like the figure of the male Turk, was demonised in cultural discourses. This was a standpoint which heavily influenced dramatic representations of Hurrem Sultan on the early modern London stage and in Western literature. In contrast, once again as with the male Turks, historical representations of these Ottoman figures were overwhelmingly positive in comparison to their representation in cultural and dramatic discourses. It seems that Greville's (to an extent) and certainly Boyle's representations of Roxolana were inspired by some of the more positive—and historically accurate—representations of this Turkish Sultana.

### 3.5. Greville's Representation of Roxolana in *Mustapha*

Greville, in addition to exploring the relationship among male Turkish characters, also focuses upon the dichotomy of love/power in the character of Roxolana (spelled as the variant Rossa) and of Mustapha's half-sister, Camena. Rossa manipulates her husband, Solyman into falsely believing that Mustapha will attempt to usurp him. It initially seems that Greville frames this solely as a reflection of her evil nature, evident when she selfishly ponders, "My selfe! What is it but my desire?" (*Mustapha,* 1609, III.ii.24). Greville

exemplifies Rossa's noble justifications for committing acts of treachery and violence. In addition to this, Greville also illuminates the way in which Rossa's unfavourable actions are taken out of necessity to comply with the strictures of Ottoman law and do not necessarily align with her nature.

Greville emphasises Rossa's intention to have Mustapha executed to save her own son and thus her actions, however manipulative, are governed by loving maternal intentions. Rossa, upon her failure to manipulate Solyman on two separate occasions, realises that her attempts of imparting "Power to doubt" (*Mustapha,* 1609, III.i.112) will only result in her forming her expectations on "quick-sand" (*Mustapha,* 1609, III.i.54). Thus, as Peter Ure notes, instead of attempting and failing to convince Solyman to kill Mustapha verbally, Rossa "must commit some outward act of violence and cruelty whose pressure of proof and horror will arm the King with a resolution" (Ure, 2010, p. 320). The "outward action" that Rossa carries out is the murder of her own daughter, Camena. After murdering her, Rossa creates a textile which she uses as proof to display to her husband that Camena has been assisting Mustapha in his treachery. To kill her own daughter in order to substantiate the treachery that she claims Camena and Mustapha have together committed is Rossa's way of 'demonstrating' the truth of her accusations. However, Rossa and Solyman do not remember (as Greville's Rosten does in act three, scene one and as Chorus Secundus often suggest to the audience) that the Ottoman subjects— "an order in the State of which the tyrant's temperamental humours must take account" (Ure, 2010, p. 319)—support Mustapha. Due to this conflict of interest between head and body of the Ottoman Empire, fighting between Solyman and his people (who believe Mustapha is innocent of treachery against his father) occurs.

The physical conflict within the Ottoman State is not the only internal conflict that Greville draws upon, as he also refers to the internal war that the characters face with regards

to their passions and vices. For example, Rossa is always at war with her internal desire for power and Solyman faces an internal conflict between the maintenance of his power, his love for his son, and his lust for Rossa. By the final act of the play, Rossa is all-consumed by her own set of passions (both virtuous ones like love for Zanger and ones considered vicious, such as violent and murderous outbursts). Her passions are the only thing she is left with after the death of her children and after being banished by her husband (*Mustapha,* 1609, V.ii.116-24). At various points throughout Greville's play, Rossa's utterances suggest that she is overcome by these passions, or "Furies", by "choyce" (*Mustapha,* 1609, V.ii.48) and that she intentionally acts upon them to further her political aim of assisting Zanger in ascending the Ottoman throne. The nature of Rossa's passions are previously explored in Greville's play when she claims that she obtained them by summoning "ugly Angells of th'infernall Kingdomes" (*Mustapha,* 1609, III.ii.39-41), to "become a vessel charged with their power to harm" (Ure, 2010, p. 321).

Despite Rossa's "Furies", she is still capable of possessing genuine affection for both Zanger and Solyman. What is also worth noting here is that Greville does not position her religious or her cultural beliefs as the source of her villainous actions. These stem instead from the fact that she is trapped within a system of law that 'forces' her to order the murder of Mustapha to save Zanger's life. Greville, however, complicates this even further by depicting the necessary sacrifice that the mother should accomplish in order to save the life of her son: killing her daughter. Greville's portrayal of Rossa's violence is situated within the wider framework of the play in which he discusses in some depth the influence of the supernatural. Here, as Ure points out, the "dramaturgical problem is mixed with the theological" because, being a Calvinist, "Greville holds to the doctrine of predestination, but it is difficult to write a drama of the inward war in which the nature of the *personae* is already so irrevocably determined" (2010, p. 321). Greville uses spirituality to avoid creating a binary

between the ‘chosen’, virtuous Christian and irredeemable Turkish characters. In doing so, the characters do not appear as ‘predestined’ by the irremediability of their own actions.

In ‘A Letter Written to an Honourable Lady’ (circa 1595) Greville claims that the “extremities of good or evill will not easily be beleeved to reign in these middle natures of flesh and blood: in respect that God hath decreed the angels to heaven, the divels to hell; and left the Earth to man, as a meane creation between these two extremes. So that he must be a kind of divell himself, that can easily believe there should be divels raging within or amongst us” (1595, p. 78). Here, Greville outlines the discrepancies between the “Furies” or “divells” that Rossa speaks of invoking and the Calvinistic representation of angels and devils. Despite this, it is still possible for his Turk play to veer away from a conflation of the “objective evil spirits” (Ure, 2010, p. 322) themselves and an individual’s—in this case, Rossa’s—internal “Furies” or passions. Whilst Rossa employs evil spirits to charge her violent actions, her need to do so suggests that the ability to murder is not inherently natural to her and that the inner passion that drives her the most is maternal affection.

In order to further understand Greville’s seemingly misogynistic representation of Rossa and her ability to distinguish between the inner “Furies” and the supernatural “Furies”, it is useful to look at the dramatist’s own statement in *A Dedication* (1652) where he states that

> […] [he] presumed, or rather it escaped [him], to make [his] images beyond the ordinary stature of excess; wherein again that women are predominant is not for malice or ill intent to their sex, but as the poets figured the virtues to be women, and all nations call them by feminine names, so [he has] described malice, craft and such like vices in the person of shrews to show that many of them are of that nature, even as we are—[…] strong in weakness—and consequently, in these orbs of passion, the weaker sex commonly the most predominant.

(Greville, 1652, p. 133)

Through Rossa Greville wishes to present women as being "strong in weakness". He describes women as weaker than men in a physical capacity but as being more accomplished than men in their cunning wiles. As Matthew Hansen outlines, this is a notion which can be recognised through "the actions and language of the female characters [because it] frequently requires them to divorce themselves from their assigned gender identity in order to reach their fullest potential in depravity" (Hansen, 2001, p. 8). Hansen also touches briefly upon the way in which Greville's representation of his Rossa may have been inspired by the Medea figure because of the two women's mutual "exercise of political ambition, murdering her daughter in order to solidify her influence over her husband and eventually placing [or trying to place] her son on the throne" (2001, p. 14).

In the final scene of the play, Rossa discusses the way in which she has convincingly played the role of the dutiful Turkish woman when she

> [Rossa]: […] ventur'd; first to make the father feare,
> Then hate, then kill, his most beloved Childe.
> My daughter did discover him my way
> […]
> I kill'd her: for I thought her death would prove
> That truth, not Hate, made Mustapha suspected:
> The more it seem'd against a Mothers love
> The more it shew'd, I Solyman affected:
> Thus, underneath severe, and upright dealing,
> A mischievous Stepmothers malice stealing,
> It took effect: *For few meane ill in vaine.*

(*Mustapha,* 1609, V.ii.35-55)

Instead of the ceremonial "disengendering" (Hansen, 2001, p. 14) that Medea is often associated with, Greville's Rossa makes a highly effective attempt to appear to Solyman as if she is the supportive and dutiful Sultana, wife, and mother. It is important to remember, however, that Rossa does not necessarily wish to engage with the type of cunning that Greville speaks of in his *Declaration* because she is deviant by nature. Instead, it becomes clear in the above speech that she utilises her feminine ability to manipulate Solyman because of her "Mothers love" for Zanger. Her primary aim is to remain technically compliant with Ottoman law whilst still enabling her son to live.

Shortly after Rossa's explanation of her own cunning and concealment of it, which she confesses to Zanger, he tells her of the way he (because of his friendship with Mustapha) contests it:

> [Zanger]: Mother! Is this the way of Woman's heart?
>
> Have you no law, or God; but Will, to friend?
>
> Can neither Power, not Goodnesse scape your Art?
>
> […]
>
> 'Tus plague enough that I am borne of thee.
>
> Mother! O monstrous Name! shall it be said,
>
> That thou hast done this fact for Zangers sake?
>
> […]
>
> Yet Rossa! To be thine, in this I glorie;
>
> That being thine, gives power to make thee sorie.
>
> (*Mustapha,* 1609, V.ii.79-93)

In Zanger's speech, his blatant upset and feeling of betrayal at the death of Mustapha is apparent and Rossa is witness to his suicide as a result. Despite her shame at witnessing such

a visceral reaction from her son, Rossa still wishes to live even though she knows that death will relieve her of the guilt she now feels.

Instead, Rossa chooses to live and withstand the grief she now experiences due to her regret of engineering the prompt for her son's suicide, evidenced within the below extract:

[Rossa]: To think of God! Alas, so that I may:
Yet Power, and Goodnesse can but shewe me Feare:
Mercie I cannot crave, that cannot trust:
Nor die I will; for death concludeth paines:
Nor languish in conceipt; for then I must
Abhorre my soule, in which all Mischiefs raigne.
I will beare with me, in this Bodies dust,
What curse soever to the earth remains.

(*Mustapha,* 1609, V.ii.107-114)

At this point in Greville's play, it is clear that Rossa is damned to an existence of self-inflicted guilt, which yet again harkens back to the "Stoic endurance of [Greville's] brand of Calvinism [which] led him, at least at this stage of his life and career, to endorse" (Hansen, 2010, p. 139). At the end of the play, it is only possible for his Rossa to take vengeance upon herself by accepting culpability for the death, directly or indirectly, of all three of her (step)children and to endure the subsequent distress that this causes her. Even after the death of all of her children and her banishment from the Ottoman Court, she never fully accepts the stereotypical role of the Turkish woman. She, once again, manages to manipulate her assigned role of bereaved mother to facilitate her own agenda of playing the "suffering Stoic" (Pierce, 1993, p. 33).

## Chapter Four ~ Thomas Goffe's *The Raging Turk* (1618) and *The Courageous Turk* (1619)

### 4.0. Law and Lust in Thomas Goffe's *The Raging Turk* and *The Courageous Turk*

In *The Raging Turk* and *The Courageous Turk* (both of which are believed to have been written between the years 1618 and 1619), Goffe represents the Turk, and the violence that their laws allowed, as part of a culture where personal choices are made in favour of political ones. Through an analysis of Goffe's unconventional Turks, this chapter explores what constituted political success, corruption, and justice according to perceptions of English culture. It concludes that Goffe, in representing his Turks as law-abiding politicians (according to Ottoman expectation) who prioritise the religious-political unity of their nation over lascivious distractions, offered an insightful political commentary upon James I's homeland affairs.

Goffe originally wrote his first known tragedy, *The Raging Turk*, as a piece of university drama whilst he was a student at Christ Church, Oxford. It is a dramatisation of the events that occurred within the Ottoman Empire under the reign of Emperor Bajazet II (based upon Sultan Bayezid II, who reigned from 1481-1512). In the play, Bajazet struggles to maintain his monarchical authority because both his brother, Jacup, and his sons plot to usurp him. In the process of implementing the Emperor's attempted murder plot, another sixteen characters are killed. Bajazet's grandson, Solyman, then becomes his successor. It is often claimed that, because Bajazet himself, as well as his brother and sons, are portrayed as devious and violent individuals, "Goffe appears to be fascinated with the reputed evil of the Turks and their insatiable greed" (Fredson Bowers, 1987. p. 157).

However, Joel Slotkin highlights how "the savage violence of the stereotypical stage Turk is due less to volatile passions and more to the strictures of Turkish law and the imperative to emulate the idealized Turkish national type" (Slotkin, 2009, p. 2). Turk

characters in the works of Goffe may be products of this idealisation, since Bajazet II, as well as Amurath I, are violent, yet politically just. Bajazet kills his enemies, as well as several of his subjects, in accordance with Turkish law. According to Christian doctrine, murder is always punishable and, therefore, Bajazet must die as a result of his violence. However, according to Turkish law, the instances in which Bajazet commits murder are justified, given that he, first, emulates the Turkish national type and, secondly, only murders those who he believes are threatening the Muslim faith. Bajazet, for example, learns of his brother Zemes' capture at the hands of the Romans and of their successful attempt to convert him to Christianity. As a result of this instance, Zemes exclaims:

> [Zemes to Bishop]: My waxen wings are melted, I will soare,
> Against the sunn, through such thick clouds no more.
> The middle Region shall containe my flight,
> Your counsaile swayes my wishes, my late deedes
> Were full of sinne now let my brother know
> Zemes repents; (and that's the greatest woe).
>
> (*The Raging Turk*, II.viii.1143-48)

In act three, scene one Bajazet requests that his sons target and kill those Christians who are responsible for the capture of Zemes, or even worse, for his conversion: "Omnes [Bajazet's sons]: What meanes great Bajazet? / Bajazet: To murder you, unlesse you strangle them [Zemes' Christian captors]" (*The Raging Turk*, III.i.1362-3). This shows his understanding of, and his obedience to, medieval Turkish laws; the same laws which protected Muslims' religious reputation. When his sons, Thrizam and Mahomet, do not comply with his command, Bajazet takes the decision to strangle them and asks:

> [Bajazet]: Did I not send these to their Provinees
> To hinder Zemes flight? And did not they

Dejected bastards give him open way?

Mine anger hath beene just.

(*The Raging Turk*, III.i.1380-83)

Rather than presenting Bajazet as a despot, Goffe illuminates how the Turk would believe his actions were 'just'. Here, Bajazet believes he is defending the legacy of his religion against Thrizam and Mahomet, who make no effort to prevent Zemes from converting to Christianity.

Goffe explicitly refers to the degree of violence allowed by Turkish law. In act two, scene seven, Bajazet and Isaacke, one of the Bassaes, plot to kill the Greek Viceroy, Achmetes, who previously fought Zemes, who he "vanquish'd by a violent blow" (*The Raging Turk*, 2.5.768). Goffe illuminates, through Isaacke's reminder to Bajazet, that Turkish

[…] lawes allow a custome,

Not us'd of late, yet firme still in effect,

And thus it is; when there doth breath a man,

Direfully hated of the Emperour,

And he in strickt severitie of right

Cannot proceed against him, then he may

Overwhelme him in a robe of mourning blacke

[…]

You may intombe the traytor, and bewrappe

His pampered body in a vaile of death,

So let him dye, dreame not on the event,

Vice is rewarded in it's [sic] punishment.

(*The Raging Turk*, II.v.795-802; 815-18)

The tyranny of Goffe's Turks was portrayed, but did not result in them being unsuccessful rulers. Turk monarchs did not state, like early seventeenth-century English monarchs did, that they were agents of God, so they had the option to undertake violent actions without fear of being named hypocrites. They also possessed the freedom to usurp or dethrone someone if they believed their actions were going to result in political or religious disruption.

Indeed, disrupting the royal bloodline was, if not generally recommended, allowed by Ottoman law if it was for the good of the state. Ottoman law also stated (as Goffe points out) that a certain degree of violence can be lawful if it is carried out as an act of revenge against those who threaten the Muslim faith (see Farhana Wazir Khan, 2011; Astrid Stilma, 2016). Thus, Goffe's reference to Turkish law in his *The Raging Turk* allows for his audience to develop an awareness of alternative perceptions of acceptable violence; something they would certainly not have found to be a foreign concept. This is because revenge in early modern England was often legitimised in a similar framework based upon religious justice, as evidenced by the English Reformation which preceded Goffe's writing.

Similarly, Goffe's later Turk play *The Courageous Turk* also raises questions about violence as an alternative method of ruling. *The Courageous Turk* is a dramatization of the events that occurred within the Ottoman Empire under the reign of Emperor Amurath I (based upon Sultan Murad I, who reigned from 1319-1389). Goffe's Amurath shows an even more positive portrayal of Turkishness than his Bajazet. The plot sees Amurath infatuated with a captive woman from Greece—his concubine—named Eumorphe. His tutor, Lala Schahin, is convinced that Eumorphe will distract Amurath from his political duties (*The Courageous Turk,* I.ii) and suggests that he murders her to avoid succumbing to lust, and thus, to political failure. Amurath, after much deliberation and feelings of guilt, kills Eumorphe. Goffe appears to portray his Amurath as an effective ruler because he removes the temptation of lust before Amurath can engage in it. That is to say that Amurath prioritises

rulership over romance and is successful in waging war against, and conquering, the Christians in the first Battle of Kosovo. Goffe's discussion of Turkish sexual politics here—possibly ones that are shared by the English audience—is also interesting. His depiction of Eumorphe as a distraction to Amurath's political duties suggests that it is not for a man to control his urges but rather for the woman to be eliminated so she cannot, in her very living and breathing, pose an invitation to sin. This point is further evidenced by her passivity, objectification, and inability to act to save herself. Popular discourses on the evils of women would have resonated with this course of action (at least in the safe space of the stage).

In Goffe's account of the story, instead of adopting a blatant anti-Turkish agenda, his writing seems to align with "the anti-Greek polemicists who tried to portray the Turkish conquest of Constantinople as the revenge of the Trojans against the corrupt Greeks" (Al-Olaqi, 2017, p. 4). The scene of Eumorphe's murder at the hands of Amurath can inform our understanding of Goffe's stance on Turkish stereotypes. However, it could be argued that the scene should not be interpreted as "an occurrence of how eagerly Turks may be persuaded by lustful passions, but rather an illustration of Machiavellian political theatre" (Al-Olaqi, 2017, p.6), given that Goffe's portrayal of Amurath is heavily focused upon this character's evolution as he adopts the various roles his Empire expects of him: the lover, the father, and the Sultan. *The Courageous Turk* is a play in which Ottomans are, unusually, portrayed more positively because of the emphasis placed upon the multifaceted role of the Ottoman Sultan, and the intimacy felt by the audience because of Amurath's dilemma between nature and duty. If we are to believe that Eumorphe's murder represents the defeat of the Byzantine Empire and the role that Byzantium played in hastening their own downfall, then Goffe's take on representing Turkishness in both of his Turk plays can be likened to one of Trojan-inspired descent.

Goffe's Amurath makes a declaration, during the first scene of the play, in which he vows not to indulge in any activity driven by lust: "Jove Ile outbrave thee! melt thy selfe in Lust…Ile not envie thee" (*The Courageous Turk*, I.i.25-7). Here, a progression of the way English dramatists during the early modern period represented the Turk as a vilified trope becomes evident. From this point onwards, Amurath appears to be driven by the prospect of warfare as opposed to sexual passion, evidenced in the lines where he expresses (repeatedly) that his sole yearning is to slay, and to subsequently drink the blood of, his Christian opponents (*The Courageous Turk*, III.ii.44; 4.2.89). Although Goffe does not completely de-stereotype the Turk (given that his Turkish protagonist still exhibits violent behaviour), his play becomes one of the first of the period to abandon the trope of the lustful Turk who is not able to be successful in military ventures.

Amurath's concerns that his lusting for Eumorphe could result in fellow Ottomans viewing him, their leader, as "a Lusty, Lazy, wanton, Coward" (*The Courageous Turk*, II.iii.56) and rebelling against his political methods is a case in point. In Schahin's opinion, the relationship between Amurath and Eumorphe has merely been forged by "intemperate Lust" (*The Courageous Turk*, 2.4.4). Schahin further states that "Affections are good Servants: but if will / Make them once Master, theyle prove Tyrants still" (*The Courageous Turk*, I.ii.10). As in Knolles, the fact that Goffe's Amurath follows Schahin's advice (to kill Eumorphe and to focus on battle) is presented as having positive consequences for the Turks, who are now portrayed as successful in battle.

Whereas Bajazet, though just, is characterised as lustful and violent, Amurath is only characterised as violent once he has renounced his lust. Both Sultans are a political "model for admiration and imitation" (McJannet, 2006, p. 60) because they win each of the holy battles they wage respectively. It is in these battles that they exhibit, as Linda McJannet argues, qualities that were admired by early modern Turks and Christians alike: "unity,

martial excellence, and strict justice, qualities which they [Christians] sometimes felt were lacking in their own societies" (2006, p. 60).

The fact that Goffe's portrayal of Amurath does not align with typical early modern representations of the demonised Turk is also evident when he talks of rinsing his hands with the blood of the Christian enemies he will fight in battle. When Amurath states that "Our furie's patient! now will I be a Turke" (*The Courageous Turk*, III.ii.9), he appears to view the adopting of such violence as a necessity in order to maintain his Turkish identity. Violent scenes like this are therefore justified as 'necessary' and legitimate according to Turkish culture; a justification also evident when Amurath is debating whether to remain with Eumorphe or to kill her so that he can enter battle. Torn between the two choices, he fears that "The Christians now will scoffe at Mahomet; / Perchance they sent this wretch thus to inchant me!" (*The Courageous Turk*, II.iii.50-1). Here, Goffe illuminates the remarkably binary choice that Amurath faces; a choice which has no possibility of compromise which the dramatist could have chosen to include because of his aim for conflict to drive the drama. Moreover, though, what Goffe's illustration of Amurath's binary choice achieves is blurring the distinction between what is considered virtuous or vicious behaviour, and in the 'necessity' of the act, he reverses the stereotype.

Goffe's text offers a new framework to view the 'successful ruler' through the promotion of the establishment of peaceful English-Turkish relations. Fahd Mohammed Taleb Al-Olaqi argues that Goffe's representation of Turks functions as a "reinforcement to James I to instead alter his diplomacy into an enthusiastic association in European issues by admiring Ottoman tactics of war and reign" (2016, p. 175). In the case of both Bajazet and Amurath, Goffe opens new scenarios on what qualities were required of a leader, be they English or Turkish, to become successful, resilient, trustworthy, and to establish a politically stable environment.

## 4.1. Mercy and Justice in Goffe

*The Raging Turk*, a "narrative of countless murders, poisonings, and suicides, […] drives home the message that bloodshed is legitimised when it culminates, rather arbitrarily, in the emergence of the best candidate for the crown" (Wazir Kahn, 2010, p. 153). What is interesting in the context of our exploration of law is whether Goffe's critique of the Ottoman justice system is more concerned with the law itself or with the individual abiding by it, however successfully or unsuccessfully.

Bajazet kills his sons, Thrizam and Mohamet (*The Raging Turk,* III.i) because he perceives them as being traitors to their faith and to their people. One of Bajazet's grandsons', Solyman's, soliloquy also exemplifies the advantages of killing, with the main benefit being to secure the stability of the Ottoman Empire:

> [Solyman]: All this, and more than this I'le do, when peace
> Hath glutted our new greedy appetites,
> When it hath fill'd the veines of the Empire full.
> With vigour, then lest too much blood should cause
> Armies of vices, not of men to kill us,
> And strength breed weaknesse in our too great Empire,
> Then, then, and onely then we shall thinke goode,
> With warre to let the body politick blood.
>
> (*The Raging Turk*, V.X.3643-3650)

In addition to feeding English appetites for murder and disorder on English stages, Goffe refers to the Ottoman Empire as a body full of blood vessels ("fill'd the veines of the Empire") which need regulating in terms of their volume, which may speak to medical practices of the time. The playwright, in using this extended metaphor to refer to the empire,

may have been advocating for the “martial approach to empire building, best exemplified by the Ottomans, which seeks to overcome any Christian qualms” (Khan, 2011, p. 154).

Amurath, in *The Courageous Turk*, kills his lover, Eumorphe, whom he initially considers marrying and having her rise from the position of Greek concubine to Ottoman Sultana. After Amurath murders Eumorphe at the recommendation of Schahin, his attention does shift, as his tutor claims, from love to war evidenced through his attempts to invade lands held by members of his family. However, when he decides to invade Caramania, ruled by his son-in-law Aladin, Amurath is faced with Aladin’s wife, Hatan, issuing a plea to cease the attack: “The unnaturalst creatures not forget / Their love to those whom they do know their own! / My wife's his daughter; since we cannot stand / His fury longer, she shall swage his wrath” (*The Courageous Turk*, IV.iv.1350-53). Hatan’s plea is also encouraged by a nobleman who suggests to Aladin that he “take the Queene along, / And your two children; they may move his eyes; / For, desperate sores aske desperate remedies" (*The Courageous Turk*, IV.iv.1356-1359).

The plea, however, seems unsuccessful as Amurath maintains his position and declares his intention to murder his grandchildren, thus prompting further begging from Hatan:

> [Hatan]: (Deare father) let thy fury rush on me!
> Within these intrailes sheath thine unsatiate sword,
> And let this ominous, and too fruitfull wombe,
> Be tome in sunder? For from thence those Babes,
> Tooke all their crimes; error made them guilty,
> 'Twas Natures fault, not their; if affection
> Can worke then; now shew a true Fathers Love,
> If not, appease those murdering thoughts with me:
> For as Jocasta pleaded with her sonnes

For their deare Father, so to a Father I

For my deare Babes and husband; husband, father,

Which shall I first embrace?

[ ... ]

Look on thy child

With pardoning lookes, not with a Warriers eye.

(*The Courageous Turk*, V.i.1434-1449)

Here, the political power hierarchies of the state are translated into the domestic hierarchies of the family – an area in which women are necessarily involved. It is this second desperate imploration from Hatan that prompts Amurath's doubts about whether to follow his nation's wishes and laws or to preserve the filial relationship. He first states that, if he were to adhere to his nation's wishes and kill his grandchildren, he would eliminate the chance of them attempting to overthrow him: "We see a little Bullocke, 'mongst an heard / Growes on a sudden tall, and in the Fields, / Frolicks so much, he makes his Father yield" (*The Courageous Turk,* V.i.1487-1490). However, Amurath resorts to listening to Hatan's requests and shows mercy. Nowhere in the play does Aladin attempt to overthrow Amurath, signifying that his decision to deviate from Ottoman law has no dangerous consequences on Amurath's life and his rule.

Amurath claims that, in making this decision, he is using "mild Warriers pitty" (*The Courageous Turk*, 5.1.1520), which becomes apparent when he asks Aladin to do the following:

[Amurath]: Rise (my deere child) as Marble against raine,

So I at these obedient showers, melt!

Thus I doe raise thy husband: thus thy Babes:

Freely admitting you to former state.

But Aladin, wake not our wrath againe!

Patience growes fury that is ofter stirred;

When Conquerors waxe calme, and cease to hate,

The conquered should not dare to reiterate.

Be thou our sonne and friend.

(*The Courageous Turk*, V.i.1526-1534)

What is worth noting, though, is that the play is careful in signalling mercy as 'safe' only within the family circle. Ultimately, Amurath meets his death because he decides, once again, to show mercy to Cobelitz, a Christian warrior who is duelling with him on the battlefield. In doing so, it appears he wishes to carry out an additional ritualistic scene of forgiveness (as he did in front of his daughter and grandchildren) that makes him a merciful ruler. Amurath states that "by Mahomet and we are weary now: / Some Mercy shall lay Victory asleep. / It will a Lawreat prove to this great strife / 'Mongst all these murdered to give one his life, / So we'll discend" (*The Courageous Turk*, V.iv.1766-1770).

However, as mentioned above, this scene has different consequences from the one with Hatan: Cobelitz immediately seizes an opportunity to take advantage of Amurath's compassion and stabs him to death. Amurath's miscalculation lies in his misinterpretation of the implications raised by the expression "obtaining justice" (Joy Pasini, 2011, p. 116). Justice, in fact, can only be achieved—according to the Ottomans—with the complete defeat of Christians and the protection of Muslim people. Goffe seems, once again, to recuperate in the cultural discourses the precondition according to which Turks are unmerciful and violent. He then reverses that stereotype by showing Cobelitz as the unmerciful Christian.

Despite his death, the military triumphs of Amurath's army are never described as savage or barbaric ventures, but as "noble deeds" (*The Courageous Turk,* I.v.91) which are both threatening and admirable, with Emily Bartels stating that "while the demonization of

Oriental rulers provided a highly charged impetus for England's own attempts to dominate the East, their valorisation provided a model for admiration and imitation, shaming or schooling the English into supremacy, or providing an excuse for defeat" (1992, p. 5). This positive portrayal of Turks continues even after Amurath's death. Bajazet, who is the eldest of Amurath's sons in *The Courageous Turk*, also shows initial mercy to his younger brother Jacup by offering to share the throne and divide their monarchical responsibilities in order to let Jacup live. Schahin intervenes once again arguing that Bajazet must respect "the Turkish Lawes" (*The Courageous Turk,* V.iv.143). Even Turkish Captain, Eurenoses encourages the respect of laws as the only way to maintain control over his people: "Although we speake, yet thinke them not our words, / But what the Land speakes in us!" (*The Courageous Turk,* V.iv.177-8).

Bajazet, in *The Courageous Turk,* is then persuaded by his own advisors to strangle Jacup who, adhering to the code of honour, holds one side of the rope. Jacup's agreement to a ritualistic suicide raises once again the importance of adhering to law and political success in state matters, thus effectively explaining and justifying the violence offered on stage. In Knolles, Bajazet's compliance with the legal requirement of Jacup's strangulation marks "the beginning of the most unnatural and inhumane custome, ever since holden for a most wholesome good police amongst the Turkish kings and emperours" (Knolles, 1603, p. 3). Contrastingly, Goffe depicts Bajazet as a law-abiding ruler rather than a tyrant, which is an important departure from contemporary accounts of the same story and, in particular, from Knolles' text. This "ahistorical representation of Bajazet would mark" a real challenge "for English spectators [who cannot help but] feel involved in [his] struggle and identify with [him]" (Al-Olaqi, 2016, p. 66).

Goffe seems to problematise any straightforward definition and appreciation of mercy, including an example from *The Merchant of Venice* (1596). In Shakespeare's play, mercy is

seen as a necessary means to healthy power. Nancy Shields Kollman argues, for example, that the play "develops into an astute commentary on the virtue of employing mercy in judicial practice" (2006, p. 3) by drawing upon the following speech of Portia's in act four, scene one:

> [Portia]: The quality of mercy ... is twice blest;
> It blesseth him that gives and him that takes:
> 'Tis mightiest in the mightiest: it becomes
> The throned monarch better than his crown;
> His sceptre shows the force of temporal power,
> The attribute to awe and majesty,
> Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings;
> But mercy is above this sceptred sway;
> It is enthroned in the hearts of kings,
> It is an attribute to God himself [.]
>
> (*The Merchant of Venice,* IV.i.183-193)

Here, Portia's speech implies that mercy has mutual benefits for the individual granting it and for the individual receiving it. Mercy in Shakespeare is considered an instrument of authority as powerful as the "dread and fear" taught by God himself. Shakespeare thus applauds compassion—"the ruler most closely approaches God not when he wields his scepter, but when he 'seasons' justice with mercy" (Kollman, 2006, p.3).

In Goffe's plays, instead, merciful behaviours are further complicated by the clashing appreciation of mercy in two different cultural discourses, which are represented, in the dramatic internal frame, by Turkish characters and English characters respectively and, in the external frame, by the English audience. However, Goffe successfully represents Turkish perception of law and demonstrates that mercy is not always necessary and advisable. And

yet Goffe is also successful in showing how Bajazet's decision is only taken out of political and representational necessity (he must kill his brother to secure his power and to be seen as willing to do so). Even when faced with the decision to kill his sons, he explores the validity of the reasons behind the necessary deeds:

> [Baiazet]: Am I not Emperor? hee that breaths a no,
> Damnes in that negative fillable his soule,
> Durst any god gain-say it, he should feele
> The strength of fiercest Gyants in mine armes,
> Mine angers at the highest, and I could shake
> The firme foundation of the earthly Globe:
> Could I but graspe the Poles in these two handes,
> I'de plucke the world asunder; droppe thou bright Sunne,
> From thy transparant Spheare, thy course is done,
> Great Baiazet is wrong'd not shall thine eye
> Be witnesse to my hatefull misery.
> Madnesse and anger makes my tongue betray,
> The Chaos of my thoughts: vnder this brest,
> An heape of indigested cases are prest.
>
> (*The Raging Turk,* I.i.52-65)

The use of scale seems noteworthy in the above extract. This is because the cosmic rendering that Bajazet would do, fuelled by his anger (if only he could), seems to be a way of convincing himself of his own status and therefore the actions that his greatness requires. Thus, Bajazet is in fact a psychologically complex character who interrogates himself on the value of the violence he is being asked to carry out; the shift from "plucke[ing] the world asunder" to having indigestion serves to remind us of Bajazet's humanity.

*The Raging Turk* is Goffe's first exploration of more positively represented rulers. His rulers appear to believe in the legitimacy of violence and warfare in order to maintain the prosperity of an empire, and thus are now described as law-abiding, and therefore successful. Goffe's more positive portrayal of Turkish leaders, in the forms of Amurath and Bajazet, queries seventeenth-century English expectations of Turks and opens new scenarios on what qualities a leader, be they English or Turkish, should have in order to become successful, resilient, trustworthy, and to establish a politically stable environment. Orhan Burian discusses how Anglo-Ottoman political circumstances were friendly during the early seventeenth century (Burian, 1952, p. 209). However, this historical evidence, as stated, is fictionally overridden by the fact that Bajazet ultimately, even though he does not wish to be by nature or temperament, declares himself the "sworne enemie of the Christians, / and all that call upon Christ" (*The Raging Turk,* IV.iii.141-2).

Despite this, Goffe's Bajazet seems to leave his audience feeling "no compassion for the vanquished Sultan" (Jonathan Burton, 2005, p. 78). The Knolles chronicle, which does not demonise Bajazet (or Amurath), also facilitates a discussion of how Turks legitimise violence for political efficiency. However, Goffe still characterises Bajazet as violent. Therefore, he does not move towards fully representing a Sultan who sympathises with the Christian cause until his later representation of Amurath, who is not violent by choice and, ultimately, very easily forgiving towards his enemy in *the Courageous Turk.* Therefore, in response to the question of whether Goffe's critique of the Ottoman justice system is more concerned with its laws or the citizens who follow—or do not follow—them, it certainly seems to be the former. The Ottoman legitimisation of violence as a method through which to obtain political proficiency leaves no room for a credible Sultan or heir to choose not to employ it. This context has, as this chapter has established, historically been used by the English to demonise Ottomans as being unnecessarily barbaric. However, we can now

recognise that this is a misconception caused by seventeenth-century England's lack of understanding of the intricacies of the Ottoman legal system, as well as the expectations it placed upon those who operated within it.

## Chapter Five ~ Roger Boyle's *The Tragedy of Mustapha* (1665)

### 5.0. Historical background to Boyle's *Mustapha*

Roger Boyle was the First Earl of Orrery (1621 – 1679), a military director, and an involved politician in the court of Charles, being elected to the English Parliament in both the Commonwealth and Restoration eras. According to Kathleen Martha Lynch, Boyle kept a positive relationship with the government of Charles, with his family even going so far as to assist the King in resisting "the rebellious Scots during the first Bishops War of 1639" (1965, p. 21). This further provided Boyle with opportunities to develop friendly interactions with the monarch and the Stuart's court.

Regardless of the constructive relationship Boyle developed with Parliament and with Cromwell throughout the Commonwealth period, he also managed to ensure a positive relationship with the restored monarchy (Jenny Uglow, 2009, p. 70). The fact that Boyle proved to be of political assistance to Charles I coupled with his military understanding facilitated his relationship with Charles II. Uglow outlines how the most notable event that allowed Boyle to regain his close association with the English monarchy was his proposal to reinstate the banished monarch as recognised sovereign in Ireland (2009, p. 70). At first it seemed that Charles II was keen to implement this proposal but eventually chose not to do so and, instead, accepted an offer from General Monck to return to England in 1660. Boyle was still issued reward for his political service, as Charles II made him Earl of Orrery in September 1660, as well as Lord President of Munster and Lord Justice of Ireland (Lynch, 1965, p. 109). Restoration drama, remarks Sophie Tomlinson (2015), "provided a unique opportunity for a Restoration courtier playwright such as Boyle to examine some of the most pressing political issues of his day in the presence of the King" (2015, p. 560). Likewise, Nancy Maguire also states that several of Boyle's dramatic works attempted to affirm to his

Restoration audience that Charles' reign had prevailed over the Commonwealth pandemonium (1992, p. 94).

Even Boyle's *The Tragedy of Mustapha,* considering the political circumstances under which he was writing—and directly partaking in—deals with one of the most pressing political issues at the time: the issue of succession. Charles II had no heir after his childless marriage to Catherine of Braganza, so Boyle's Turkish tragedy is, essentially, an elaborate political allegory for this growing concern. The plot of Boyle's play is centrally concerned with Solyman's decision regarding who should become heir to the Ottoman throne after his wife (who is mother to their son, Zanger and stepmother to Solyman's eldest son, Mustapha) persuades him to kill his Mustapha. *Mustapha* is set in Buda (Central Europe), and life in the Ottoman Court is the main concern throughout the play. Boyle's choice to use Buda (now known as Budapest) as the setting for the action is not coincidental, as medieval Hungary fought off the threat posed by the Ottomans through establishing a Christian border in the city over the course of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. So, it seems that Habsburg's monarchy understood the significance of implementing a reliable and well-organised system by which they could attempt to secure the Habsburg Empire—which, it is worth noting, was backed by both Habsburg Spain and the Holy Roman Empire—and, more widely, the West against further threat of attack from the Ottomans. Indeed, as Geza Palffy notes, the first two decades of the sixteenth century saw "Hungarian border defence systems of fortresses [being] built to protect not only Hungarian territories but also the Austrian lands and the vast German Empire" (2000, p. 3).

According to Met'eb Ali Alnwairan (2018), 1526 marked the year that "the Ottoman Empire forces, led by Sultan Suleiman I, defeated the Hungarian armies under King Louis II at the Battle of Mohács near the southern borders of Hungary. The fallen King died shortly afterwards without a legitimate son; as a result, "the kingdom experienced a period of

political chaos" (2018, p. 87). This left two potential contenders for the throne: Janos Szapolyai, "one of the most influential political figures in the aftermath of the Battle of Mohács" (Alnwairan, 2018, p. 87), and Ferdinand Habsburg, who was the brother-in-law of Louis II. Civil war broke out in Hungary in 1527 which, although brief, caused considerable damage until the victory of Ferdinand (Benjamin Curtis, 2013, p. 68).

Further destruction then followed when Sultan Suleiman waged a mass-scale military attack upon Hungary in 1536, which resulted in the Ottoman conquest of expansive territories in Hungary, now ruled by King Ferdinand Habsburg. The year 1541 saw Suleiman capture Buda and incorporate areas in the heart of the Kingdom of Hungary into the Ottoman Empire under his rule, leaving only northern and western Hungary to be ruled by Ferdinand I. After one hundred and forty-five years, the Christians in Hungary were able to banish the Ottomans from Hungary in the Battle of Saint Gotthard (1664), which took place one year before Boyle wrote his *Mustapha.* In their defeat of the Ottomans in this battle, the Habsburgs coerced their enemy into settling upon conditions aligned with the Peace of Vasvar (Michael A. Cook and V. J. Parry, 1976, p. 170).

Although Boyle sets his play in a sphere that, arguably, may have been foreign to an English audience, this very audience learnt about Turks and the Ottoman Empire and its customs through the widely available historical accounts and travel narratives already mentioned in the previous chapters. It is also possible that Boyle may have drawn upon Henry Marsh's *New Survey of the Turkish Empire* (1663), which is more centred upon the religious discrepancies between English Christians and Turkish Muslims during the seventeenth century.

## 5.1. Analysis of Cultural and Religious Boundary-blurring in Boyle

The representation of Turkishness in Boyle's *Mustapha* is, like Greville's, an unconventional one. Through various characters that feature in his play who do not solidly adhere to negative Turkish tropes, Boyle defines the Ottoman Empire, its people, and its religious and legal practices in somewhat favourable terms. As previously mentioned, Boyle chooses to draw upon a crucial instance in Anglo-Turkish history when the Ottomans seized Hungary and surrounded its capital city, Buda. Boyle's Turks are not, as these characters often are on the early modern stage, presented as being unnecessarily violent and barbaric. In keeping with conventions of the heroic genre that he draws inspiration from where the barbaric Turkish Muslim is almost always defeated in a Holy War by the brave Christian knight, Boyle's Turks are explicitly associated with being honourable and virtuous. In addition to this, Boyle also discusses the concept of virtue in his *Mustapha* – specifically religiously motivated virtue.

An example of Turkish virtue and compassion can be found in a scene in which the Hungarians are discussing the most effective way to save Buda from the menacing Turks. The Cardinal suggests to Queen Isabella of Buda that she send her infant son as well as the crown jewels to Roxolana so that she may protect them. The Queen, after much deliberation, agrees to do so and she therefore is presented as someone who can entrust Roxolana, a Muslim convert. Not only does Roxolana take the child under her wing and protect him, but she also promptly returns the crown jewels to the Hungarians. Thus, Boyle represents the Turkish Muslims as being gracious and trustworthy. This is due to Roxolana's offer to assist her counterpart in her time of need, even though their people are in conflict with one another which also implies that he wishes to portray the two noblewomen as being more civilised than the warring men.

The references to Islam, the Prophet Muhammad, and the Holy Qur'an are all very positive in Boyle's play. For example, Rustan, the Turkish Vizier, adds to his discussion of Christian rulers that: "In lazy Peace let Christian Monarchs rust, / Who think no war, but what's defensive, just. / Our valiant Prophet did by Slaughter rise: Conquest a Part of our Religion is" (*Mustapha,* 1665, I.iii-4). Rustan seems to agree that Ottomans did engage in violence, not simply for barbarity's sake, but for the good that he asserts comes from honouring religious vows. Throughout the play, Islam and Christianity are presented more similarly than is commonly accepted in most early modern plays, and this is despite the references to the religious and political conflict between the two faiths. With regards to Roxolana's pact to safeguard the Queen of Buda's son, Solyman asks: "Is this the Thing that you would keep alive? / For whom the Cross does with the Crescent strive" (*Mustapha,* 1665, I.iv.429-430). Solyman praises Roxolana's noble effort, which he believes (as will be investigated in the next chapter) is attuned to her gender: "You, Roxolana, are the Conquerer. / What Storm is not allay'd by such a show'r? / I only try'd whether your / Virtue were Above my Anger, and your sex's Fear: / Since over both it does so nobly rise" (*Mustapha,*1665, I.iv.465-569).

The Hungarian Queen is also depicted by Boyle as a virtuous Christian monarch, since she exhibits loyalty towards the King of Buda during a scene where the Cardinal requests that she attempt to fool their Ottoman foes by romancing Solyman's sons, Mustapha and Zanger. Her refusal is powerful: "My Lord, take Heav'n a little in your Care. / How can I aught of love from Princes hear, / Who scorn those Altars, where I kneel with Fear?" (*Mustapha,*1665, III.iii.526-528). The Christian Isabella does not wish to manipulate the Sultan's sons and destroy the positive relationship she has built with them in the past because, although believing that Islam is a "false Religion", she has encountered Muslims with a "Virtue ever true" (*Mustapha,* 1665, III.iii.555-556).

Thus, she concludes that she will resist compliance with the Cardinal's plan and, therefore, put herself in the centre of the dangerous situation of not knowing what plans the Ottoman army have. However, in doing so, she realises that she is avoiding the acting out of a "moral sin" (Ludmilla Kostova, 2017, p. 25). It could also be argued that Roxolana is inspired by the Hungarian Queen to adopt virtuousness and human decency when she does everything in her power to keep the infant she has been entrusted to care for from harm. However, she does make the error of being taken advantage of by those who hold political positions in the Ottoman Court and is persuaded by these same characters to plot against the life of Solyman's legitimate son. She is coerced by Rustan into believing that Mustapha's death would secure, firstly, Zanger's succession of her husband. Secondly, he also coerces Roxolana to believe that Mustapha's murder would avoid any possibility of him killing his stepbrother in keeping with the Turkish customs previously outlined in the chapter.

Boyle's male Muslim Turks also do not fully adhere to the dramatic stereotypes of Ottomans who are solely consumed by vice. Instead, through Solyman's acceptance that Isabella and her son are able to return to Buda, Boyle represents Turkish individuals as virtuous. Even the friendship between Mustapha and Zanger becomes an example of virtuous behaviour, particularly when they both are infatuated with the Queen of Buda. They declare a promise to rival one another for her love, only if it can be attained whilst still being noble towards one another. When Solyman murders Mustapha, Zanger is distraught as opposed to happy, as Roxolana may have expected him to be since his chance of becoming sultan has increased significantly. Instead of accepting to succeed his stepfather, Zanger commits suicide to honour his brother and their friendship. Both Mustapha and Zanger, therefore, possess the heroic values of tragic heroes: "chivalric duty, nobility and honour" (Kostova, 2017, p. 25).

Solyman's portrayal, instead, is much more complex: he is seen as a valorous ruler and an affectionate lover but also as naïve and easily manipulated by the false viziers and Roxolana. Even in the final scene of the play, when he stands before his deceased sons, he only partially acknowledges his own miscalculations, blaming Roxolana whose life he ultimately spares: “Farewel for ever! and to Love farewel! / I'll lock my Bosom up, where Love did dwell; / I will to Beauty ever shut my Eyes, / And be no more a Captive by Surprise; / But, Oh! how little I esteem a Throne, / When Love, the Ornament of Pow'r, is gone!” (*Mustapha,* 1665, V.ii.790-795). However weakly he is represented during the play, Solyman’s final monologue is one, according to Kostova, of “love, honour and duty” (2017, p. 26). It is a monologue which exemplifies just what the result of more culturally sensitive portrayals of Ottomans in English drama could be. His monologue also poses questions about what possibilities Boyle could be opening in the minds of his audiences concerning their views on Anglo-Ottoman diplomacy.

Both Mustapha and Zanger in Boyle’s version of the play are relatively explicit examples of the way in which this playwright was making a conscious effort to humanise his Turks more than most of his contemporaries. As Laura Brown points out, “Orrerian drama operates through an aristocratic mode of honour” (1983, p. 6), which can be detected in *Mustapha* through Boyle’s emphasis of (both positive and negative) emotional responses exhibited by his male Turkish characters. This is both directly evident in the actions the male Turkish characters display towards one another and conveyed through their descriptions of their own emotional responses towards female characters.

Male Turkish emotionality towards women is evident, for example, in Zanger’s description of Isabella’s display of maternal affection: “When she her Royal Infant did embrace, / Her eyes such floods of Tears showr’d on her face, / That then, oh *Mustapha*! I did admire / How so much Water spring from so much Fire: / And, to increase the miracle, I

found / At the same time my heart both burnt and drown'd" (*Mustapha*, 1665, II.iv.378-383). At first, it could be deduced that Mustapha and Zanger do not play a part in this type of affection displayed by the Hungarian Queen. Nevertheless, Boyle transforms her affection towards her baby into an exchange that the male characters who are infatuated with her can take part in. He facilitates this through having Mustapha and Zanger discuss Isabella's maternal affection instead of depicting it on stage through her own actions.

According to Angelina Del Balzo, in the "love triangle between the Princes and Queen Isabella, male feeling is both doubled and evacuated" (2019, p. 75), which can be evidenced, once again, through Zanger's description of "Her Tears forbidding whom her Eyes invite, / Whilst she appears the joy and grief of fight; / Whilst empty hope does rise but to decline; / Then you will think your sorrows less than mine" *(Mustapha,* 1665, III.i.75-78). The fact that both Princes are infatuated with Isabella as well as the fact that their love is not returned by the Queen causes disappointment for both Zanger and Mustapha. In their disheartenment about Isabella's lack of affection for the brothers, any other feelings they are expected to have with regards to warfare, like bravery for example, seem subdued.

Earlier in the play, there is an instance where Mustapha witnesses a display of sentiment from Isabella and expresses his infatuation with her, which reads:

> [Mustapha]: She is as tyrannous as she is fair,
> Born to breed love, and to beget despair;
> I did lament her fortune, but I see
> One much more cruel is reserv'd for me.
> Can Zanger, for my love, my friendship blame,
> When the same fire does us alike inflame?
> My weakness cannot forfeit his esteem,
> Since I but yield to that which conquer'd him;

To love whom be first lov'd, can be no more

Then if I hate whom he did hate before.

(*Mustapha*, 1665, III.vi.529-537)

In this description of Mustapha's worries about the fact that his stepbrother is also in love with Isabella, his level of concern overrides her greater distress at having to entrust her son to Roxolana to protect him amid a conflict. Therefore, Boyle's writing of this scene allows for Mustapha's dialogue to refashion the struggle between the brothers' infatuation with Isabella and Isabella's prioritisation of maternal affection over romance. In refashioning these opposing forms of affection, Boyle makes his audience aware of two types of conflict. The first is that of political conflict, and which brother will be successor to the throne. The second is romantic conflict caused by the hypothetical dispute over which brother will win Isabella's heart. However, this never actually evolves into a conflict that the brothers become divided over because of the intense loyalty that each Prince possesses towards the other. Unlike previous portrayals of these Turkish Princes in early modern drama, Boyle's Mustapha and Zanger can control their own lust because they prioritise their friendship over their infatuation with Isabella.

Even though they live under a scheme whereby the right of succession to the throne belongs to the son who can prove the most political proficiency and battlefield prowess to their father, Mustapha and Zanger pride themselves on their brotherly affection. This affection they possess for one another, however, will likely pose issues when the son chosen as Solyman's successor will be instructed to comply with Ottoman law by assisting the unsuccessful son with their suicide. Thus, much of the conflict in the play is centred around the two Princes refusing to comply with violent laws regarding their assistance with the other's death. (This is as opposed to the conflict in *Mustapha* being primarily concerned with the feud between the Hungarian Christians and the Turkish Muslims as Boyle's audience

might expect). As previously discussed, until the start of the seventeenth century, Turkish law stated that when a new sultan ascended the throne, it was his obligation to murder his brothers (younger or older) to avoid the potential issue of usurpation. However, Mustapha promises Zanger that, when he ascends the throne as initially planned before the Solyman sentences him to death, he will abolish this law because of the kinship he possesses towards his stepbrother.

Thus, the positive relationship between the two Princes functions in a way which counteracts their political rivalry but does not go against the Ottoman justice system as it existed under Sultan Solyman's reign. This can be evidenced when Zanger tells Mustapha:

> [Zanger]: Our secret Sympathy your Fate secures:
> If bad, my Breast would feel't as soon as yours.
> And since you but bequeath a Legacy,
> Which cannot be possest before you dye,
> You safely give what I shall ne're receive
> Because I cannot *Mustapha* out-live"
>
> (*Mustapha*, 1665, IV.iii.496-501)

Here, Boyle creates a link between the political responsibilities Mustapha and Zanger share as Ottoman Princes and the kinship they share as brothers. This connection signifies that their affection towards one another is emotional as well as familial. According to both brothers, if they are connected in both senses of the term 'body', neither must die before the other because their perception is that this premature death would be unjust. We could imagine that, if Mustapha had succeeded Solyman and had his promise to Zanger come into fruition, both of Solyman's sons would have lived regardless of their elder brother's ascent to power. Had both Mustapha and Zanger lived, the newfound justice system Mustapha had planned to

implement would have sought to account for "private fraternal feeling" (Del Balzo, 2019, p. 66).

Solyman, in contrast to his son and stepson, displays a distinct lack of "paternal […] sentiment necessary for that transference" (Del Balzo, 2019, p. 67). Rather than secure his administration as Roxolana claims that Solyaman's abandonment of "paternal […] sentiment" will, it actually weakens it. Ottoman vizier, Rustan becomes angered to hear that Roxolana's persuasions have more influence upon Solyman's political decisions than the advice of his viziers. Driven by his anger, Rustan manipulates Roxolana by persuading her to turn him against Mustapha. Rustan initiates the concern in Solyman's mind that Mustapha will organise a public revolt against him, as well as attempt to usurp him, when he states: "Forgive me, *Sultan*, if I boldly sue / In Natures cause between your Son and you; / Those orders which to *Mustapha* you sent, / His filial kindness takes for Banishment" (*Mustapha,* 1665, III.ii.205-208).

When Solyman condemns Mustapha to death because of his belief in Rustan's and Roxolana's claims, the Sultan's actions lead the "anger" of the Ottoman army to "grow[n] loud" (*Mustapha,* 1665, IV.i.225). They then wage a "Mutiny" (*Mustapha*, 1665, IV.i.219) against Solyman because they believe Mustapha is innocent of treachery (*Mustapha,*1665, IV.i.219-230). Thus, the Ottoman Empire, as Boyle represents it, is only safe if those in positions of power mutually agree upon their course of action in political affairs by taking into consideration how one another is not only politically but also emotionally driven. It seems Solyman, in line with stereotypical representations of the Turk, is unable to possess this type of emotional sentimentality. Mustapha does possess this sentimentality, however, which aligns with Boyle's efforts to humanise the Turk and it is this humanisation that wins his Mustapha the support of the Ottoman subjects.

## 5.2. A Retrospective Comparison of Greville's and Boyle's *Mustapha*

Both Greville's and Boyle's *Mustapha* plays are dramatisations of the events that took place during the final years of Ottoman Sultan Solyman's reign, specifically with the murder of Solyman's eldest son and heir to the throne, Mustapha. Solyman ordered the death of Mustapha in 1553 after his wife, and mother of his stepson (Zanger), convinced him that Mustapha was treacherous. A number of historical sources claim that Rüstem Paşa manipulated Suleiman the Magnificent to strangle his son Mustafa because of some forged letters that claimed Mustafa had close relationship with the Safavids. Cihangir (Zanger in Greville's play) died of a combination of grief and of an opium overdose (which was used as painkiller during this period). As opposed to crowning the disabled Cihangir as next monarch, Hurrem Sultan wavered between supporting her sons Selim (later Selim II) and Bayezid against Mustafa. After Mustafa's death, Bayezid took over the role of Mustafa in gaining the support of some of the military (see Andre Clot, 2011). However, the reason she manipulated Solyman in Greville's tragedy was so that her own son could succeed the Sultan upon his death. Greville's Mustapha is not a successful politician: he appears disinterested in politics and his passiveness results in Solyman being persuaded by Roxolana to kill him. Greville's Solyman, however, is represented as violent and lustful (since he was initially acquainted with Roxolana in the setting of his harem) yet is also politically successful.

In Greville, Rossa facilitates her aim of persuading Solyman to kill Mustapha so that Zanger can succeed his stepfather by questioning Mustapha's legitimacy. In reference to Mustapha's mother, whom we know is dead, she states:

> [Rossa]: The knowledge who was Father
> To Mustapha made me—poore silly woman—
> Thinke worth in blood had naturall succession:
> But now I see Ambition mixtures may

The gold of Nature's elements ally.

His fame untimely borne:

Strength strangely gather'd

Honnor wonne with honoring,

Greatnesss with humbleness,

(a Monarchs heir in courses popular,)

Make me divine some strange aspiring minde;

Yet doubtfull; for it might be Art, or Kinde.

(*Mustapha,* 1609, I.ii.45-54)

In voicing her doubts about the chastity of Mustapha's mother, describing him as a "mix[ed]" "al[o]y" (or race), and noting the fact that he was born prematurely (therefore emphasising his unpredictability and hinting at the possibility that he may attempt to usurp his father before Solyman dies), Rossa instigates concern in Solyman's mind about whether Mustapha's respect for him is genuine. She persuades the Sultan that Mustapha's "kind" is not inherently fit to be ruler of the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, by casting this doubt in her husband's mind, also opens an opportunity for her own son to succeed Solyman instead.

In the final act of Greville's *Mustapha* (1609, V.ii), when the protagonist is sentenced to death by Solyman, he is obedient and presents himself as if he were guilty of that which Rossa has accused him. This is because Mustapha believes that his compliance with his sentence is a final act of respect towards his father, who has convinced himself that his filicidal actions are in accordance with Ottoman law and, also, with the expectations his people have of him not to allow an ineffective ruler to succeed him. Solyman emphasises earlier in the play, that it is "justice" that murders his son and not the fact that he wishes to commit such a violent act driven by "crueltie" (*Mustapha,* 1609, III.iv.103). In portraying the grief that the Sultan's decision causes him, Greville alters the way in which his Solyman

fulfils the violent Turkish stereotype. This scene appears more a criticism of the way in which Turkish law dictates the way a ruler should behave as opposed to a criticism of Solyman's nature.

Solyman's decision to have his son murdered is also dictated by his considerations on Mustapha's inefficient political management of the Turkish army, which would then result in Persian forces invading Turkish cities. According to Al-Olaqi, "Greville has figured out a mandate from the Islamic jurisdiction to approve the death sentence in reference to the Turkish law" (2017, p. 68). Solyman's reasoning functions as a justification to kill the passive Mustapha, since it concerns more than simply Solyman believing that he is unsafe but, in addition, that the lives of his subjects and legacy of Muslim Turkey are also endangered.

Boyle's retelling of the events that took place during the twilight of Solyman's reign functions as a warning against internal political instability and the rebellion that could ensue because of it. In act four, Rustan, as opposed to Rossa in Greville, adopts the role of instigating Solyman's anger at his son by tricking him into believing that Mustapha is capable of treachery. Solyman, due to this anger, then declares:

> [Solyman]: But if he [Mustapha] shines too fully in my face,
> I'le draw a Curtain and his lustre hide;
> His glory shall not make me turn aside.
> The shining Mustapha must change his Sphear;
> He threatens me worse than a Comet here.
>
> (*Mustapha,* 1665, III.ii.248-252)
>
> […]
>
> [Solyman]: For fearing *Mustapha,* I hate him too.
> And he, even in my Camp, my pow'r controuls;

I ruling but their Bodies, he their Souls.

(*Mustapha,* 1665, IV.ii.331-333)

It becomes evident, however, that Solyman has reservations about killing Mustapha because the "destruction of the succession" may result in "rebellion" in the Ottoman Empire (Alnwairan, 2018, p. 91), linking the theatrical action to the current political situation in Restoration England. Roxolana, in discussion with the viziers Rustan and Phyrrus about their collaborative plotting against Mustapha's life, states: "My favour to the Sultan you implore / Only for Governments your sought before. / You sue for Egypt, you for Babylon; / If I could these procure you would be gone**"** (*Mustapha,* 1665, IV.iv.562-565). According to Susan Owen, those who scheme to rebel against a political system are, in most cases, motivated by a desire to establish political power (1996, p. 134). Therefore, it becomes evident that, in contrast to Greville's Sultana, it is not only Boyle's Roxolana who rebels but also his Rustan and his Phyrrus.

Upon closely analysing Boyle's portrayal of Mustapha, it becomes evident that this character functions as a commentary upon life in Restoration England and the hardships brought about by the Civil War (Alnwairan, 2018, p. 91). Mustapha, again in Boyle, and despite Rustan's false persuasions encouraging Solyman to believe he is a threat, is depicted as submissive to his father's wishes upon being sentenced to death before he can commit treason. Boyle emphasises the probability of a new era of rebellion due to Mustapha's choice to passively submit to death and disrupt the line of succession to power, much like Greville's version of the firstborn Turkish Prince. This probably harkens back to the fact that Charles II had no legitimate heir to the throne. Thus, again, we see a portrayal of Mustapha as a Turk who departs from theatrical stereotypes because he "is moved by honour first and then by loyalty to his father" (Alnwairan, 2018, p. 91).

In addition, it could be argued that the murder of Mustapha, ordered by Solyman and carried out by the mutes, is not dissimilar to that of the regicide of Charles I. In a letter written by Boyle to an unknown recipient, the playwright speaks of the "barbarous murther of his late majesty, a sin which no honest man could avoid being sorry for", and "the bloody consequences of it" (Boyle in Maguire, 1992, p. 28). According to Alnwairan, Boyle's framing of Mustapha as 'martyr-like' may be construed as a "strategy to deconstruct the memories of the recent regicide of Charles I and the interruption with the succession line adding to royalty the innocence, nobility, and bravery of a martyr" (Alnwairan, 2018, p. 92).

It is evident that, in Boyle, the monarch's (Solyman's) responsibility for the death of his son (Mustapha) is significantly increased in comparison to Solyman in Greville's *Mustapha.* In Boyle, Solyman justifies his own decision to kill Mustapha by declaring that it is in keeping with Ottoman law. In Greville's work, Roxolana is portrayed as the main instigator in Mustapha's unjust death, since she persuaded her husband (falsely) that his son planned to usurp his throne via murder. However, as McJannet outlines, "the rhetorical and dramatic elements typically reserved for commentary (asides, soliloquys, and choruses) are used to complicate moral issues and explore cultural differences, not to malign Muslims or the Turks in general" (2006, p. 167).

Rather than presenting the Turk as merely barbaric, Boyle "assimilate[es] the other into the self" in order to make comment upon the "political polemics of the Restoration period" (Alnwairan, 2018, p. 93). What Greville's and Boyle's plays have in common is the fact that they both blur the distinction between the virtuous Christian and the villainous Muslim, evidenced through the unconventional portrayals of Mustapha and, to a certain extent, Solyman. Both plays depict Solyman's killing of Mustapha, not as being driven by violent impulse, but as being driven by the Sultan's fear that his throne—and therefore, the safety of his subjects—is at risk of being disrupted by Mustapha. Mustapha, like Solyman, is

humanised by both playwrights through this framework because his passiveness stems from his belief that, in submitting to his death sentence without retaliation is to fulfil his political duty to his father.

### 5.3. Boyle's Representation of Roxolana in *Mustapha*

Boyle's portrayal of Roxolana in his Turkish tragedy, much like the Turkish tragedies of Thomas Goffe, seems to draw inspiration from Richard Knolles' *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* in framing his Roxolana in a slightly more complex and sympathetic way to that of his contemporaries. Knolles' account outlines the factual events concerning Roxolana, the Hurrem Sultan, but it appears that Boyle's dramatization of her political involvement and meddling during Sultan Solyman's rule significantly deviates from historical events.

Boyle, in his *Mustapha,* makes a pointed effort to emphasise the fact that, by nature, his Roxolana was not meant to be regarded as an inherently evil character. This is because her plot to have Mustapha killed and, as a result, to instigate the succession of her own son to the Ottoman throne was spurred on by Boyle's malevolent counsellor character, Rustem Pasha. As previously seen in Goffe's *The Courageous Turk,* evil counsellors or teachers often featured in early modern drama as backseat instigators of Ottoman corruption. Interestingly, argues Yermolenko, this may have been a tool used by playwrights of the period to "point to the political chaos engendered by corrupt ministers" (2010, p. 76). More specifically, in Boyle's case, it may have pointed to the behaviours of "Edward Hyde, the First Earl of Clarendon, Charles II's Chancellor who, like Rustem Pasha, was viewed as corrupt and self-serving" (Yermolenko, 2010, p. 76).

Not dissimilar from Greville's divergent retelling of Roxolana's story, is the complex representation of Boyle's dramatised versions of the Turkish figures. This is especially apparent when it comes to his Roxolana, who possesses a heightened sense of her own level

of authority over both her husband and over Ottoman dynastic affairs. In act one, scene four (before Roxolana develops her deviant bond with Rustan), Rustan interrogates Roxolana because she has instructed Solyman's mutes to strangle him. Roxolana replies:

> [Roxolana]: I'le not dissemble as you Viziers do.
> A Viziers power is but subordinate,
> He's but the chief dissembler of the State;
> And oft for publick int'rests lies; but I
> The partner of Supreme Authority,
> Do ever mean the utmost that I say.
>
> (*Mustapha,* 1665, I.iv.347-52)

Here, it is apparent that Roxolana views herself as the "partner of Supreme Authority" or as possessing equal power to that of her husband's. After this, Achmat (Solyman's 'eunuch bassaw') discusses how he feels a sense of reprieve after hearing that Roxolana banished Rustan instead of sentencing him to death. Upon hearing this, Achmat is relieved and Roxolana asks: "Can you your safety doubt whilst you are mine?" (*Mustapha,* 1665, I.iv.373). Here, once again, she makes known her perceived ownership of those she takes on the role of governing.

Roxolana's methods of utilising her power are also explored when Rustan states that she is "faster conquer[ing Solyman], than he his foes" (*Mustapha,* 1665, II.i.2), reiterating that she has made her power play very clear. Despite Rustan viewing Roxolana's authority as being threatening to that of the Solyman's, he understands that, because of her influence over her husband, Rustan must re-establish his trusting relationship with her. The purpose of him doing so is to further his political relationship with Solyman and climb the ranks within the Ottoman Court. This instance, as Hayden points out, could be used by Boyle as a political comment upon what was happening in Restoration England regarding Henry Bennett, the

Earl of Arlington. Bennett was "anxious to dominate the mistress (Frances Stuart), in order that he might obtain control of her master" (Gramont in Hayden, 2010, p. 77). So, according to Hayden, Bennett invited Frances and her sister, Margaret Brooke to celebrations to flaunt them in front of the King, knowing that he would be in attendance (2010, p. 77).

In act three, scene three, it seems that Roxolana's attempts to "conquer" Solyman are not as effective as she would have hoped. Solyman informs Roxolana that she may be wrong about Mustapha's intentions because "'tis far above a Woman's art / To reach the height of an aspiring heart" (*Mustapha,* 1665, III.ii.213-4). Here, Roxolana's lack of ability to understand political affairs between the Sultan and his eldest son is referenced by Solyman and probably perceived as satirical by the audience.

Despite Roxolana's plotting, it could still be argued that Boyle does not wish to totally demonise his Sultana because, during this same scene, she comes to the internal realisation that it is necessary for her to make one of two decisions. She can either further her plot and continue to criticise the innocent Mustapha which will result in his death sentence, or she can let the innocent Mustapha live and succeed his father. However, the consequence if she chooses the latter option would be to watch her own son be sentenced to death upon his elder brother's ascent in keeping with Ottoman custom. She expresses both feelings of guilt and a recognition of the injustices brought about by this specific Ottoman law, since one innocent son will die no matter what she chooses as her next course of action. In addition, Roxolana understands that allowing Solyman to falsely believe Mustapha is treacherous would be for him to resist "Nature" (*Mustapha,* 1665, IV.v.661). However, she herself cannot ignore her duty to embrace that same nature in the form of loyalty to her own son (*Mustapha,* 1665, IV.v.652-65) and, thus, she chooses to fulfil what she believes is her personal bind with "Nature". Thus, Roxolana does not become involved in a plot against Mustapha's life because she is inherently evil but, instead, because Ottoman law dictates that Zanger must die

if Mustapha is to succeed Solyman. Boyle does not portray her as monstrous; instead, he portrays her as a mother who will take the necessary action to save her own son's life.

In keeping with the concept that Boyle did not wish to solely demonise his Roxolana, despite her fierce declaration of her authority and hunger for power, critics have nonetheless described Boyle's treatment of his Sultana as "sophisticated, compassionate, and just" (Almas, 2009, p. 143). An example of this type of Turkish virtue and compassion can be found in a scene in which the Hungarians are discussing the most effective way to save Buda from being besieged by the Turks. The Cardinal suggests to Isabella that she send her infant son as well as the crown jewels to Roxolana so that she may protect them. Once again, Boyle's retelling of the siege of Buda under Sultan Solyman's order draws upon the historical blockade of the city under the command of the historical Sultan Suleiman in 1541.

The historical Isabella of Hungary (the daughter of Sigismund, King of Poland) married the King of Hungary, John Zapolya in 1538. Yermolenko's study outlines the historical background of the seizure of Buda and recounts how Zapolya married Isabella after his ascent to the throne. Thus, he did not yet have a legitimate heir to succeed him at the point of his ascension. Due to this fact, Zapolya "signed a secret treaty with the Hapsburg Ferdinand I in 1538, which stated that upon Zapolya's death, Ferdinand would receive Hungary" (Yermolenko, 2010, p. 84). However, by the following year, Zapolya was married to Isabella and the pair had a son, John-Sigismund, which effectively made the treaty he had signed invalid. Zapolya died not long after John-Sigismund was born, and Ferdinand chose to ignore the fact that he was now the legitimate heir to the throne. Thus, Ferdinand's controversial taking of Buda was instigated. After Ferdinand occupied the city, Isabella contacted Suleiman in the hopes that he would assist in banishing Ferdinand. This then prompted Suleiman's attempt to seize Buda instead, with the Sultan giving the Hungarian Queen his word that he would allow John-Sigismund to assume power in Hungary once he had reached adulthood. In

the meantime, Isabella and her infant son were "sent to Transylvania where he was to rule as a vassal of the Porte" (Yermolenko, 2010, p. 85).

Boyle's recounting of this subplot, in contrast to that of the main plot revolving around the death of the two brothers, appears to follow historical accounts of the story more closely. However, Roxolana's involvement in the battle is Boyle's addition to the plot: his Sultana accompanies Solyman to set up the Ottoman army's camp in Buda. In addition, Boyle has his Solyman order that Queen Isabella hand over her son to the Ottomans so that the infant can be murdered. Instead of sending her son to the Sultan, the Cardinal recommends that Isabella befriend Roxolana by entrusting her with her baby. He explains to Isabella that "In gaining [Roxolana] you make the Sultan sure" (*Mustapha,* 1665, I.ii.123) so that the infant Prince of Buda may live.

Isabella, after much deliberation, agrees to do what the Cardinal has advised, and she therefore is presented by Boyle as someone who is able to entrust a Muslim convert (Roxolana)—who would under most circumstances be portrayed as her enemy—with her most precious possession. Roxolana, when this task is requested of her, agrees to take the child under her wing and protect him. Thus, Boyle represents Turkish Muslims as being gracious and trustworthy due to Roxolana's offer to assist her counterpart in her time of need, even though their people are in conflict with one another.

Whereas Roxolana's scheming is one of the main contributing factors leading to both Ottoman Princes' deaths, her interactions with Isabella prove to be quite the contrast to this as her compassion for the Hungarian Queen and her son are emphasised. Thus, much like the male Turkish characters in Boyle's play, his representation of Roxolana is also one that challenges the stereotype of the evil, lascivious, barbaric Turk. Roxolana's compassionate intentions in protecting Isabella's child, given the fact that she has previously proven unable to display this same level of compassion towards her own stepson, are debateable. After all,

Boyle markedly has his Sultana engage in plots against Mustapha's life, for example in act two, scene three when she requests that Rustan "by fresh intelligence / Charge Mustapha with some new offence" (*Mustapha,* 1665, II.iii.299-300). Following this, in the presence of her husband, she puts on an elaborate performance of outlining the (false) treacheries Mustapha may be planning to commit before persuading the Sultan to show leniency towards Mustapha and "injure him whose virtues you conceal" (*Mustapha,* 1665, III.ii.241).

Despite the untrustworthiness Roxolana exhibits in her interactions with the male characters, her interactions with Isabella allow Boyle to portray the sole Turkish female character of his play in a much more complex way with regards to deviance from cultural and dramatic stereotypes. Boyle may have taken inspiration from the alternative type of Anglo-Ottoman commerce shared by Elizabeth I and Valide Sultana Safiye in their exchanges of letters and gifts (aforementioned in the Literature Review section of the thesis) and applied it to his depiction of Roxolana's interactions with Isabella. Each Queen teaches the other about tactics which they, as female monarchs, were able to adopt to further develop their political (and familial) relationships.

Although both Mustapha and Zanger become infatuated with Isabella, it is clear that she is still grieving for the recently deceased Hungarian King and, therefore, she decides to leave Buda to escape from the prospect of becoming romantically involved with either of the Ottoman Princes. Isabella provides Roxolana with the advice that the Sultana should consider the close bond Mustapha shares with Zanger and, if not for her stepson's sake but for her own son's wellbeing, she should consider showing temperance to Mustapha. Roxolana seems, at the very least, to acknowledge Isabella's suggestion because she, in exchange, offers her own advice to the Hungarian Queen. She tells Isabella that she acts as though she feels affection towards Solyman, evidenced when she states that "The Great should in their Thrones mysterious be; / Dissembling is no worse than mystery" (*Mustapha,* 1665, 4.1.155-6). Here,

Roxolana is presented by Boyle as an individual who understands how to utilise her sexual prowess (adhering to the stereotype of the lascivious Turkish woman) to further her political agenda successfully. Through Roxolana's ability to utilise her sexual power to further her political influence, Boyle represents her as departing from the stereotype of the Turkish woman who is uninvolved in the political sphere. Instead, he represents his Roxolana not only as being involved in the political affairs of the Ottoman Court, but as possessing efficient political skills.

Isabella, in contrast, does not yet possess this skillset and is described, instead, as possessing "un-courtly, ill-bred innocence" (*Mustapha,* 1665, IV.i.175). Roxolana then advises Isabella that she can counter this by falsely "dissembl[ing her] love to Mustapha, / And mak[ing] him think what [she] often say[s], / that [she] for Love can mourn and languish too" (*Mustapha,* 1665, IV.i.177-9). Initially, Isabella seems uncomfortable with Roxolana's suggestion, but the Cardinal also corroborates that she should follow the Ottoman Sultana's advice because Isabella requires her friendship for the continued protection of her son (*Mustapha,* 1665, IV.i.267). Arguably, this is much the same as Roxolana's intentions to frame Mustapha as a traitor in the eyes of his father to save her own son from being executed. Both women's intentions, although each take different courses of action to try and facilitate their aims, are the same: to focus upon their maternal instincts and save their own sons from death. If this analysis is to be taken as key, then it is difficult to view Roxolana's scheming early in the play as fundamentally malevolent. In sum, Boyle adapts the historical siege of Buda and allows the two female monarchs to meet (albeit only in the realms of theatre) to provide commentary upon what an "ambitious woman might accomplish in satiating her greed for power" (Yermolenko, 2010, p. 83).

## Chapter Six ~ Aphra Behn's *The False Count* (1681)

### 6.0. Assimilating Ottomans into English society

In *The False Count* (1681), Aphra Behn draws inspiration from several comic staging and writing principles commonly found in Restoration plays, such as those by Rochester, Etheredge, and Wycherly. Most notably, she drew upon the topic of promiscuity and the way in which it corresponded with dominant patriarchal ideologies held within Restoration English society. Behn more specifically, as an English playwright, depicted her Turkish 'Other' via a means of utilising previously established "political, religious, and discursive conditions" to create for her audience a "common experience of an imaginative encounter with the Other" (Violetta Trofimova and Esin Akalin, 2007, p. 25). Through an exploration of how Behn physically incorporates the dramatic Turk figure into English culture, specifically through scenes in which English characters dress as Turks, chapter six illuminates how conversion is a matter of theatrical performance. This discussion is facilitated through an exploration of the ways in which characters from eastern and western geographies are similar in their socio-political conduct.

*The False Count* is a comedic play which is centrally concerned with the displeasing aspects of marriage, with the opening scene depicting the Governor of Cadiz, Carlos, mourning the breakdown of his relationship with Julia. Julia is, instead, to be wed to "an Old ridiculous Buffoon, past Pleasure, / Past Love" (*The False Count*, I.i.5–6). This "Buffoon" is also known as Francisco, who "was in his youth an *English* Cordwinder, that is to say, a Shoo-maker, / Which he improv'd in time to a Merchant, / and, the Devil and his Knavery helping him to a considerable Estate, / he set up for *Gentleman*" (*The False Count*, I.i.55–8). Behn then turns our attention towards Julia, who is depicted confiding in her servant about

the fact that she is now "married to a Thing, fit onely for his Tombe; a Brute, / who wanting sense to Value me, treats me more like a Prisoner than a Wife" (*The False Count*, I.ii.5–6). The servant prompts Julia to consider that, in being in a relationship with Francisco, she forgets previous pledges she made to Carlos, which will result in "lying with old *Francisco* [and committing] flat Adultery" (*The False Count*, I.ii.19). Thus, the servant's dialogue prompts Behn's audience to consider one of the main concerns dramatised within the play: the legitimacy of marriage. It is then brought to the audience's attention that it will be Julia's sister who is to be married to Carlos, even though she is infatuated with Antonio, a friend of Carlos'. However, Antonio's sights, we learn, are not set upon Julia's sister, but upon Isabella, who is Francisco's daughter from a previous marriage. Isabella, as Francisco describes her, may not seem humble in personality but is, in fact, from humble beginnings: "What a Mixture of Brother by the Fathers side, and Uncle by the Mothers side there will be; / Aunt by the Mothers side, and Sister by the fathers side; / a man may find as good kindred amongst a kenell of Beagles" (*The False Count*, I.ii.117–19). All these marriages in *The False Count* are somehow representative of a conflict or a compromise between political alignments and allegiances of individuals.

The second act of the play sees two disguise plots come into fruition. Isabella, by this point in the play, has already made explicit that she desires "a Cavalier at least, if not a Nobleman" (*The False Count*, I.ii.260) for a husband, and so, she employs Guiliom, a "Chimney-sweeper" (*The False Count*, II.i.93), to disguise himself as a Lord, the play's 'False Count'. The 'False Count' displays unusual and humorous conduct on various occasions, which makes Isabella's feigned attraction to him appear even more strange. He warns his love opponent that he will not hesitate to engage in a fake duel, in which he believes "the rustling Pole of [his] affection is too strong to be resisted" (*The False Count*, III.ii.162–3), which is followed by the stage direction stating that he "*rag[es] up and down*

*the Stage with his Sword in his hand*". The 'False Count' then states that "No Chimney ever burnt like me. / Fair Lady, suffer the Broom of my / Affection to sweep all other Lovers from your heart" (*The False Count*, III.ii.150–53), and suggests that he "*untuck his breeches*" in order to enable the women to see a battle wound he has suffered in his "back parts" (*The False Count*, III.ii.214). He also mocks the performative aspects of the behaviour and values of seventeenth-century high society when he brags of its "sawcy Rudeness, in a *Grandee*, is Freedom; [its] Impertinence, Wit; / [its] Sloven, Careless; and [its] Fool, good Natur'd" (*The False Count*, III.i.107–8). Behn's use of satire here implies that the aristocracy's morals are thwarted by a highly unfavourable set of characteristics.

According to Matthew Birchwood, a significant historical narrative also forms an important background to the prologue in *The False Count,* as well as to those individuals linked to the Popish Plot (Birchwood, 2020, p. 229). In 1681 (one year before Behn penned her comedy), a clergyman of the Church of England named Adam Elliot became entangled in various debates related to the Popish Plot. After hearing of the debates with which Elliot had become associated, Titus Oates, the Priest who chiefly instigated the plot, endeavoured to send Elliot into disrepute over Elliot's claim that he was a Jesuit who had been circumcised, and that he had previously been captured and sent to market as a slave by pirates who frequented the Barbary Coast. The Elliot versus Oates case is particularly interesting because Elliot, unlike several of Oates' counterparts, managed to disprove the allegations the latter made against him, stating that:

> he asserted, that I was a *Mahumetan*, and had been thereupon Circumcised; and that also I was a *Popish Priest* […]: by the former charge making me unworthy of credit or reputation, uncapable of the advantages of converse amongst Christians; and by the lat[t]er, the milder indeed of the two, aiming only at my life, which as being a *Popish*

> *Priest*, is forfeited to the Law. I must indeed confess of all kinds of Deaths I have the least fondness to be hanged, and I hate mortally that the butcherly Executioner should be rummaging amongst my Entrailes: neither can I apprehend any pleasure in being drawn up *Holborn hill* upon a Hurdle: therefore it was, that I had no mind to appear either a *Renegado*, or a *Popish Priest* [.]
>
> (Adam Elliot, 1682, p.1)

In the above extract, it is clear that Elliot's intention was to refute Oates' allegations. Elliot then proceeds to recount the instance in which he was incarcerated in Fez before he unlawfully escaped and managed to travel back to England. On numerous occasions, Elliot's account alludes to claims of apostasy that were made against him and how these allegations may, in fact, be more applicable to Oates since the latter often referred to any of his opponents or conspirators as a 'True-Protestant Turk'. According to Elliot's claims against Oates, then, the latter was a 'Turk' not due to his heritage but instead due to his despotism, as well as his "protean qualities" which make him seem "part Jesuit, part Ottoman" (Birchwood, 2020, p. 229).

In the epilogue of Behn's comedy, she claims that she penned her play about "ferocious Turks" and "fair slaves" in a matter of "just five days" (Behn, 1681, Epilogue of *The False Count*). *The False Count* was written and premiered before King Charles II in 1681 and is thought to have been inspired by Molière's *Précieuses Ridicules* (1659), which, according to Janet Todd (1993), was a satirical comedy centred upon the lives of "ridiculous" female characters. In a wider sense, it highlighted legal disputes within the realms of the deeply patriarchal sphere that was late seventeenth century France and, in turn, explored the gendered experiences of socio-political conflict that occurred within it (Todd, 1993, p. 17). It

can be argued that Behn's comedy follows a similar format regarding the way in which she utilises a similar satirical construction to that of Molière, and for related purposes.

With regards to Behn's dramatic portrayal of her Englishman disguised as an Ottoman sultan, it is evident that she drew upon previously established negative portrayals of the dramatic Turk, specifically evident within these examples of derogatory language used to refer to them in act four:

> *Francisco*: Oh Lord, *Turk, Turks*!
>
> *Guiliom*: *Turks*, oh, is that all?
>
> *Francisco*: All -why they'll make Eunuchs of us, my Lord, Eunuchs of us poor men, and lie with our wives.
>
> (*The False Count*, IV. i.33-5)
>
> [...]
>
> *Guiliom*: Why where be these *Turks*? Set me to 'em, I'll make 'em smoke, Dogs...
>
> *Isabella*: Oh, the Insolence of these *Turks*!
>
> [...]
>
> *Enter some* Turks *with the body of* Francisco *in chains and lay him down on a Bank.*
>
> *Fran*: The Great Turk, — the Great Devil, why, where am I, Friend?
>
> *I Turk*: Within the Territories of the Grand Seignior, and this is a Palace of Pleasure, where he recreates himself with his Mistresses.
>
> (*The False Count*, IV. ii.101-2; IV.ii.106-8)

Here, the trope of the common stage Turk is employed by Behn's attribution of lustfulness to those Turks who have many "mistresses" and "make Eunuch[s] of [Englishmen]". This is

done through her animalisation of those Turkish people whom she refers to as “Dogs”, and through her demonisation of the Turk as a “Devil”, as opposed to a human being. However, Behn sought to reframe these negative portrayals and give them nuance, but in a much subtler way than earlier playwrights writing on the Orient, such as Greville, Goffe, and Boyle, did. Said states in his *Orientalism* (1978) that

> It had been employed by Chaucer and Mandeville, by Shakespeare, Dryden, Pope and Byron. It designated Asia and the East, geographically, morally, and culturally. One could speak in Europe of an Oriental personality, an Oriental atmosphere, an Oriental tale, Oriental despotism or an Oriental mode of production, and be understood.
>
> (1978, p. 4)

By physically assimilating the dramatic Turk figure into English culture via a means of cultural crossdressing, Behn allows her English audience, as Said states, to understand their humanity.

It is interesting to note, with relation to Behn’s disguise plots, their origin which, according to Birchwood, is derived from the “stratagem of the feigned Turkish ship capturing the yacht”—which also links to Behn’s well-known Turkish galley scene—as well as “the idea of pretentious social climbers humiliated by the device of counterfeit nobility” (2020, p. 294). The latter concept also appears in Behn’s supposed source text, *Les Fourberies de Scapin* (1671) by Molière. Critics have also noted that it is possible Behn drew inspiration from Spanish novels, such as Castillo Solorzano’s *El celoso hasta la muerte* (1631), which translates to ‘Jealous to Death’, as this text also features an instance of Turkish captivity (Dolors Altaba-Artal and Naphtali Lau-Lavie, 1999, p. 108). In act three, scene one of Behn’s

comedy for example, trickster Guzman also discusses with Carlos the Turkish context in the form of an old Turkish Galley which the latter now possesses:

> there is a Galley also, in the Harbour, you lately took from the Turks; habits too were taken in her enough to furnish out some forty or fifty as convenient *Turks* […] Our Turkish Galley thus man'd, I'll put to Sea, and about a League from Land, with a sham-fight, set on that of old *Francisco*, take it, make 'em all slaves, clap the old Fellow under hatches, and then you may deal with the fair slave his Wife, as *Adam* did with *Eve*.
>
> (*The False Count*, III.i.36–43)

This planned instance of the capture and subsequent incarceration by false Turks offers a suitable background for Behn to comment upon the consummation of Carlos' love for Julia, as well as the driving force behind the punishment of cuckoldry that Francisco will attempt to issue to Carlos. All the above action outlined takes place in the conveniently situated pleasure garden, which is owned by Antonio.

## 6.1. Foreign and domestic spaces on the Early Modern English stage

It is very apparent that this pleasure garden in Behn is a dramatised adaptation of the Turkish Sultans's 'Seraglio', which traditionally serves the purpose of creating a similar "sexual-political fantasy" to that of Behn's Westernised version of this space (Birchwood, 2020, p. 295). In a strictly legal sense, the regulatory function of the harem, firstly, guarantees male offspring. Secondly, it also functions as a space which yields the prevention of cuckoldry and the creation of a bastardised line of succession, as well as an educational space for women (in sexual matters, but also in arts and theology which benefited the female inhabitants of the seraglio and their children with the Sultan). However, Birchwood also states that the

> […] seraglio is more than a setting or a scene; it is the supreme tragic site. Shutting out all strangers' eyes by definition, the exclusive realm of a single being, it is the paradise of pleasure only because prohibition surrounds it everywhere. Merely raising the curtain is already a transgression, therefore, and makes the spectator an accomplice, even before he becomes a witness to the inevitable drama.
>
> (2020, p. 295)

The creation of a "sexual-political fantasy" in the form of a seraglio and all the notions of both intrigue and anxiety with which it paralleled was, indeed, familiar for Behn's audience. This is due to the fact that earlier English plays also offered dramatisations of Ottoman seraglios and harems alike, such as Daborne's *A Christian Turned Turk* (1612) to name but one familiar example. The metadrama in *The False Count* subverts the general sexual-political fantasy by choosing to emphasise the conflated and ambiguous nature of rank, gender, and religious difference within Antonio's pleasure-garden, the dramatic space of the 'seraglio'. As a result of the above, this ambiguity moves away from stereotypes that are negatively associated with Turkishness

*The False Count*'s representations of the Turkish 'Other' seem to be based loosely upon Molière's masquerade scenario in *Le Bourgeoise Gentihomme* (1670). In this text, the French writer "had already displayed an imaginary encounter between the two opposing paradigms of culture and had ridiculed difference at a variety of levels from the perspective of [what he believed to be] a superior culture" (Trofimova and Akalin, 2007, p. 28). This is an attitude which Behn's writing appears to reiterate in places. Behn, in her seraglio scene, employs satire to create a foreign, yet familiar setting (in the realms of the early modern English stage), in which the racial and religious customs of the Ottoman 'Other' (as well as English prejudice against them) can be critiqued by its audience. This is done through the inclusion of language which suggests a stance of Occidental superiority and racial prejudice. For example,

Ottoman customs thought by the English to have been governed by patriarchal values were called into question by some of Behn's female characters. These women "ventur'd Life and Limbs, Liberty and [often became] Wife to the mercy of the Heathen Turks" **(***The False Count*, IV.ii.52).

Religious prejudice against Muslim Turks is also present in Behn's play, through the employment of derogatory phrases such as "Oh, damn'd circumcised *Turk*" and "Why, you're a *Mahometan* Bitch" (*The False Count*, IV.ii.16). These are slurs which extend to becoming comical when addressed to characters who display "abnormality or deviation" (Trofimova and Akalin, 2007, p. 28). It is the case, for example, of the satirical figure of the Turk who is addressed as "his Monstrousness" or "Barbarousness" (*The False Count*, IV.ii.1). Behn's disguised 'Turks' contribute to the satirical element of the play because they are the individuals who display confrontational behaviour towards all of the non-disguised Christian characters on board a ship early in act two, which reinforces the stage Turk as being a representation of barbarity and violent chaos.

Despite the evidence of racial and religious prejudice in Behn's play, the sexual politics in her seraglio scene appear to suggest a more nuanced approach to representing 'turned' Turkish women. Lisa Lowe states that "the concept of a masquerade, disguises afforded anonymity and, in doing so, permits sexual and social promiscuity. Masked ladies could take lovers, courtiers could pretend to be peasants" (Lowe, 1991, p. 46). Despite Guzman's aim to make Francisco a cuckold, it was instead Francisco's daughter, Isabella, who was excited by the prospect of engaging with Guzman in an intimate way, and subsequently becoming a 'turned' Turkish sultana. Isabella insists that "none should ravish [her] but the great Turk", and so she gifts a jewel to Guzman and bribes him to make her "first served up to the Grand Seignior" (The False Count*,* IV.ii.2). It could be argued that Behn's portrayal of Isabella and her unabashed eagerness to become sexually involved with Guzman opens new possibilities

regarding the representation of female virtue (in a bodily sense). Isabella dictates who her sexual partner will be, as well as when their relationship will become physical. Isabella's thoughts about Guzman, then, transgresses traditional representations of interracial romantic encounters in early modern drama, where the decision to 'take' a Western female is usually made by a Turkish male. Isabella functions then as a criticism of the "increasingly vulnerable and contingent position[s] of women" on the early modern stage and within seventeenth-century English (and/or Turkish) society **(**Trofimova and Akalin, 2007, p. 7).

Another example of where Behn dramatises a complex setting familiar to her audience to illuminate an Anglo-Ottoman encounter is the Spanish Garden. Here, Carlos discusses his apprehension about the consequences that may arise if the Turkish disguise plot fails. He states that the false pirates had sailed too close to land and that it was "doubtless [that] all beheld it from the Town" (*The False Count*, IV.ii.3). Carlos also claimed that most of the townspeople believed that "those two Galleys were purposely prepar'd to entertain the Count / and the Ladies with the representation of a Sea-fight; / lest the noise of the Guns should Alarm the Town […] / and so have ruin'd our designs" (*The False Count*, IV.ii.5–8). When the Turkish plot, and moreover its potential effect upon the townspeople, is introduced, a more obvious comment upon contemporary English political issues is offered on stage.

The Turkish disguise plot relies heavily upon the cultural inattentiveness of an English merchant, evidenced through the criticism of his knowledge: "Why, he never read in's life; / knows neither Longitude nor Latitude, / and *Constantinople* may be in the midst of *Spain* for any thing he knows" (*The False Count*, III.i.63–5). It seems that a recurring theme in Behn's play is that of geographical, and subsequently religious and cultural, unfamiliarity and the way in which it coalesces with sexual incontinence and political tyranny. What Behn does, however, is discuss, through theatrical disguise, previously corroborated cultural stereotypes around Ottomans as inherent to English culture. As John Miller states in *Popery and Politics*

*in England 1660–1688* (1973), Behn's characters' "elision of Constantinople with Cadiz and of the Ottoman Empire with Spain evokes potent associations with tyrannical and arbitrary modes of government all too familiar to Behn's audience" (Miller, 1973, p. 15). Exclusionists argue that Charles' royal advisers (and most probably the next monarch in line to the English throne) would necessitate the implementation of "Popery and Arbitrary Government" through means of surreptitious action (Andrew Marvell in Birchwood, 2020, p. 296). Therefore, Turkish Islam and Spanish Catholicism created a rather interesting political—as well as a religious—allegory for Behn's 1681 audience.

### 6.3. Differentiating social status and religious identity

Behn's Turkish seraglio blurs the borders—and therefore the conflicts—between social status and religious identity. Behn's charlatan character, Guzman, states that the false seraglio is where "in this hot part o'th year, he [the sultan] goes to Regale himself with his She *Slaves*" (*The False Count*, III.i.60-61). Guzman's dialogue here alludes to boundaries between genders and their respective roles, which function in a similar way to socio-religious ones. According to Birchwood, Guzman's description also "appears to be a reference to the famed concubines of the Grand Signior's palace, but with inevitable overtones of Charles II's libertinism", and also refers to the role of eunuchs in the Ottoman Court (Birchwood, 2020, p. 296). It is particularly interesting, when examining the overtones of Charles II's libertinism, to consider *English Liberties* (a popular tract first published in the year 1680). The first page of the tract harkens back to "liberties" associated with *Magna Carta* and *Habeas Corpus* by defending the laws that initiated them. This, therefore, poses similarities to the ways in which Behn discusses how the boundaries of law need not suppress liberty in the prologue of *The False Count.* This prefigures her stance on socio-religious boundaries during the first scene in which the audience witness her English equivalent of a 'seraglio'.

Henry Care, an English political journalist, and the author of the tract, adopted a very evidently anti-Catholic sentiment in his writing by rehashing the events of both English Civil Wars and their resulting consequences. This, in turn, allowed his reader's intrigue about what constituted justice within Turkish law to resurface. As earlier chapters of this thesis have established, justice within Turkish law was an Occidental fascination during the earlier half of the seventeenth century due to increased Anglo-Ottoman trade. Care maintains that the

> […] truth is, 'tis [the] *High Court* of Parliament, that only can hinder the *Subject* from being given up as a Prey to the *Arbitrary Pleasure* not only of the Prince if he should attempt it, but (which is Ten times worse) to the unreasonable passions and lusts of *Favourites*, cheif Ministers, and Women […] Or like the *Turkish* Empire under a *Weak Grand Seignior*, by the *Prevailing Concubine* of the *Seraglio*, who is perhaps her self *managed* by no higher dictates than that of her *chief Eunuch* or *She-Slave*.
>
> (Care, 1680, p. 1)

Care employs the term "She-*Slave"*, which is the very same phrase that Behn utilises in *The False Count* in reference to the eunuchs occupying the seraglio behind closed doors, as opposed to the seraglio's concubines, who took a more visually apparent role. Thus, the eunuchs, although "anatomically neutered" (Birchwood, 2020, p. 297), remained powerful political figures within this semi-borderless space in travel narratives and on stage.

As seventeenth-century traveller and diplomat, Paul Rycaut states in *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (first published 1666)*,* eunuchs inhabiting Turkish seraglios were thought to be "naturally cruel, whether it be out of envy to the Masculine Sex which is perfect and intire, or that they decline to the disposition of Women, which is many times more cruel and revengeful than that of men" (1666, p.5). Behn's version of the seraglio allows the dramatist to discuss and challenge the physical and symbolic boundaries between societal

gender norms hidden from public scrutiny. The seraglio becomes a theatrical space in which sexual politics can be controversially destabilised, as in act four, scene two.

In this scene, Carlos (disguised as the "Great Turk") warns that he will make a "revered Eunuch" of Francisco, who pleads "Oh! Mercy – Sir, that honour you may spare, / Age has done my business as well already" (*The False Count*, IV.ii.88-89), and the cuckold then becomes the eunuch. Even the coy Christian captive is substituted with the more resolute Isabella. Isabella sees Carlos—"the Great Turk"—as an attractive partner and believes he is a "man of quality" (*The False Count*, IV.ii.189-190). Therefore, rank takes precedence over religious or cultural difference, leading to Isabella wishing to become a "she Great Turk" (*The False Count*, IV.ii.316). When Francisco witnesses Carlos, the false 'Turk', becoming enamoured with his wife, he exclaims that the latter is a "damn'd *Mahometan Canibal*", a "Monster of a *Grand Seignior*!" (*The False Count*, IV.ii.200; IV.ii.203), and a "damn'd circumcised *Turk*" (*The False Count*, IV.2.218). He further questions her judgement by questioning if it is her "*Mahometan* Conscience, to take other mens Wives, as if there were not single Harlots enough in the world?", and proceeds to call her a "*Mahometan* Bitch" (*The False Count*, IV.ii.235–41). Interestingly, Francisco's violent outburst (unreciprocated by 'Turkish' Carlos) is behaviour that has traditionally been associated with the stereotyped dramatic Turk. Therefore, sexual and religious principles within English and Ottoman culture are not the only binaries that are blurred within Behn's 'seraglio'.

Ros Ballaster, in her *Fabulous Orients* (2006) explains that "French and English writers deploy Oriental settings and history as fables that address their own preoccupations about national identity and gendered agency. In so doing, they simultaneously open and close the gap between Eastern and Eastern cultures" (Ballaster, 2006, p. 142). Behn's *The False Count* has been given the subtitle "a New Way to play an Old Game", with the latter half ("Old Game") being used to refer to a dissatisfied wife outsmarting her domineering spouse. In

turn, this allows another romance—one which is "Cavalier in spirit" (Birchwood, 2020, p. 300) and aligns itself with both parties' romantic promises to the other—to come into fruition. On the other hand, the "New Way" is, instead, the theatrical depiction of the Turkish capture of English merchants, as well as the latter's religious conversion from Protestantism to Islam because of their incarceration; both were familiar dramatic depictions to Behn's audience.

Antonio's father sees, upon his return to the pleasure-garden, not Isabella and his son married but, instead, the Turkish meta-drama occurring. He demands that the drama end because he is displeased with it and, at the same time, what Birchwood deems "patriarchal reinstation" occurs. Thus, there is a link between two types of tyranny: Sultanic tyranny and that of the "libertine hero's" (Birchwood, 2020, p. 300). Behn likens Antonio's father to "the great Turk" when he is described as the "worst Great Turk of all" (*The False Count*, V.i.307). Thus, Ottoman stereotypes were not removed in this play. However, Behn does highlight the similarities between the English and the Ottomans, and, in turn, she also highlights Western Christian dominance as despotism and not as triumph. This scenario aligns with questions about conversion, which is also evident in earlier conversion narratives in drama, such as those of Greville's and Boyle's Roxolana. This leaves Behn's audience pondering two fundamental questions: firstly, to what extent is religious conversion performative, and to what extent is it genuine? Secondly, does religious conversion have the capacity to change an individual's entire moral code, or will there always be an ulterior motive (such as commercial benefit) that encourages an individual to undergo religious conversion?

These questions surrounding fluctuating loyalty with relation to religious conversion is alluded to within Behn's personal 'conversion' in the prologue to her comedy, which "read[s] more like the disillusionment of a seasoned political observer than the mere propaganda of a partisan playwright" (Birchwood, 2020, p. 300). By extension, the conceptualisation of

Behn's Anglo-Turkish relations is twofold. Even though the only Ottoman characters who appear in Behn's play are English characters disguised as Turks, the very fact that Turks are being imitated facilitates various incarceration and conversion accounts. These accounts, in turn, become associated with, and evoke curiosity about, England's encounters with the fictional—and, indeed, the factual—Orient. In *The False Count,* the familiar enticement of the seraglio is repeated as a common Turkish setting on the English stage. However, in this play, the violence of the stage Turk is satirised due to the only Turkish characters being Englishmen disguised as their Turkish counterparts in a comedic instance.

The difference between nuances applied by dramatists to their representations of Ottoman—and by extension 'Eastern'—characters in drama during the eighteenth century (as opposed to the seventeenth century) was believed to have been due to the prominence of scientific values rooted in principles of reason, instead of beliefs driven by blind faith and superstition. Therefore, advancements in scientific knowledge resulted in a shift in the "very paradigm of the representation of the Ottomans, and the Grand Turk was even shown [as] a benevolent ruler" (Trofimova and Akalin, 2007, p. 36). This was a concept also supported in period sources with specific relation to Behn's representation of the increase in Anglo-Moroccan interactions in her earlier play, *Abdelazer* (1676).

It is thought, for example, that at the time she was writing *Abdelazer*, Behn would have had sources such as Lancelot Addison's *West Barbary; or, A Short Narrative* (1671) at her disposal. Addison, who by 1671 was former chaplain at Tangier, writes in his work that

> […] it was chiefly to make the Justice and Religiousness of a People esteemed Barbarous, Rude, and Savage, to reflect upon their Enormities, who would be reckon'd for the only Illuminati of both. And to shew that this Unlick'd, Uncultivated People agree with the wisest Nations, in making the care of Religion and Justice to suppress Vice and encourage Virtue, as the only method to make a State happy. It was

> one of the Pedantick Vanities of the Grecians to repute all Barbarous but themselves; [...] yet those who acknowledge Humanity in all its Habits, may in perusing the Remarks made upon these Barbarians, meet with something that may civilize the Title, and induce them to think, that what is commonly call'd Barbarous, is but a different Mode of Civility.
>
> (Addison, 1671, p. 1)

Through the phrase "Humanity in all its Habits", Addison seems to encourage his reader to at least consider the differences between cultural values belonging to the Orient and the Occident alike. In the same sense, by staging the only Ottoman characters in her play as not actually being Ottoman at all, Behn highlights in the most physical sense possible how very similar English Christians and Ottoman Muslims can be. The only thing truly separating the two subgroups is the clothing they wear and the names that they bear.

## Conclusion

When examining the development of the way in which the dramatic Turk has featured in plays spanning the seventeenth century, it can be deduced that this figure has served as a physical indication of cultural and religious discrepancies between Islam and Christianity. This, as previously explained in the introduction to this thesis, very likely stemmed from negative religiously driven attitudes that English Christians developed towards their Ottoman Muslim counterparts during the medieval crusades. Similarly, their early modern descendants' similar negative attitudes were born out of imperial envy. The Ottoman Turk as they were represented on early modern English stages, then, allowed English Christians to create their own ideological set of attributes that constituted the binary between the 'English Self' and the 'Turkish Other', as well as to communicate this to the public via drama. If we are to take a sample comprised solely of Elizabethan plays (since this was the historical point at which the Turk became a popular figure on the English stage, most likely due to Elizabeth's known alliance with prominent Turkish figures, like Safiye Sultan), the Turk appears in as many as thirty-one of said plays. Wann states that it is for this reason that the English were thought to have expressed more interest than any other nation in the Ottomans. Ottoman Turks appeared to be the Eastern nationality by which the English were most intrigued as opposed to Persians or Egyptians, for example (Wann, 1915, p. 187). According to Esin Akalin, most of these Elizabethan plays "concentrated upon key characters who were predominantly Ottoman Sultans", and their chief concern was that of exploring "the motives and the consequences of the actions of these rulers. [This] ultimately created heroes or villains who fulfilled the needs of drama as much as the discipline of the historian" (Akalin, 2001, p. 365).

In addition to this, and as this thesis has discussed, the Turk also functions as a representation of the multifaceted nature of national identity. The Turk in early modern drama is both a racial and religious Other, as well as a socio-political antithesis to the English Christian in early seventeenth century drama. However, as this thesis explores in detail, these boundaries become progressively more blurred in drama over the course of the century. As key studies such as Said's theory of orientalism and MacLean's analysis of imperial envy illuminate, the Ottoman Empire and its inhabitants almost became colonised by Western literature in what can only be construed as a vengeful attempt to reclaim what was lost to them at the hands of the Ottomans during historical instances (like the medieval crusades). Althusser states of ideology that it is a "system (with its own logic and rigour) of representations (images, myths, ideas or concepts, depending on the case) endowed with a historical instance and role in society" (Althusser, 1969, p. 368). If we are to apply this definition to Western literature and is demonisation of the Turks, which was most likely driven by imperial envy, then it may have resulted in its audience adopting the belief that the Turk deserved to be conquered. This conquering of the Turk would have been viewed by the West as punishment for the former's previous siege of 'virtuous' Western nations; the inhabitants of which they believed belonged to the 'true faith'. Essentially, drama of the period became propaganda which, albeit subtly, advocated for another set of holy wars between the Orient and the Occident. This only grew in vigour once 1603 approached and James I ascended the English throne (as he was known to possess anti-Ottoman sentiments, unlike his predecessor).

Through invoking a sense of intrigue by staging exotic, splendorous settings of seventeenth-century Ottoman Turkey (such as the Topkapi Palace and the Sultan's harem), many English dramatists of the period also managed to evoke a sense of anxiety from their audiences, which was centred on the threat of a new set of crusades. Alongside these foreign

settings came cultural and religious behaviours and tendencies unfamiliar to most English Christians unless they had travelled through Turkey or neighbouring countries like Persia. These behaviours as they were depicted on stage were often vastly misunderstood by English dramatists as mindless Ottoman violence, as opposed to behaviours outlined and expected by Ottoman legal and judicial systems. As a result of maligning the stage Turk as violent, politically corrupt, and overcome by lustful passions, the English were able to communicate the message that this group of individuals were 'Other' to themselves in every possible way.

However, as has been outlined throughout the body of this thesis, we know that this was not the agenda favoured by all dramatists of the period. Instead of solely maligning the Turk as their contemporaries did, Greville, Goffe, and Boyle depicted the more realistic nuances (according to the absence of fabricated Anglo-Ottoman conflicts since the end of the crusading period) between common behaviours and values attributed to both Turks and Christians alike. By illuminating—and, as a result, partially dismantling—the misconception that the 'villainous Turkish Muslim' and 'virtuous English Christian' are polar opposites with regards to their beliefs and values, this group of dramatists, very interestingly, exposed the more realistic discrepancies between Eastern and Western schools of thought. If we are to consult existing studies, such as Akalin's analysis of demonised Turkish characters on the early modern English stage (2001), it becomes clear that the Ottoman Empire—and, by extension, its inhabitants—in the traditional Western imagination functioned both ideologically and historically

> […] as the paradigm and locale of the Other with its complex history and tradition of thought [.] [This paradigm] has a differentiating function through which European subjectivity has been defined since the Middle Ages. As the constructions of this subjectivity is built upon the dialectical interplay of Self and Other, subject and

> object, identity and difference, the Christian West constitutes itself on and against the defined Other
>
> (Akalin, 2001, p. 366)

That is to say that the stage Turk was a figure that prompted both fear (due to their violent outbursts) and fascination (due to the lavish costumes they donned and settings they inhabited) all at once for English audiences (within a dramatic context). All of these aspects allowed the English to capitalise upon defining their own identity in opposition to this Eastern figure. It was via this method of representation that the English public often learned about the political and social aims of their own nation, as they were encouraged to conceptualise the Ottomans as everything which they—and by extension, their society, government, and monarchy—were not.

This, as aforementioned, was not a historically accurate depiction of the polarity between English Christian culture and Ottoman culture during the seventeenth century, with several travelogues and letters, as well as etchings, woodcuts, and engravings providing testament to fruitful Anglo-Ottoman trading relations (Akalin, 2001, p. 366). The threat posed by the Ottoman military throughout the course of the seventeenth century was relatively low. The reason for this can be found in letters such as those exchanged between English and Turkish monarchs, as well as those penned by members of the Turkey Company stationed in Istanbul. The above sources discuss shared elements of trading (in addition to mutual Anglo-Ottoman aims of furthering their respective economies) and were prompted, seemingly, by goodwill in the form of gift exchanges between parties.

Playwrights like Greville and Boyle drew upon the historical setting of the Siege of Buda to depict their Turkish characters. However, it was known that both dramatists held

apparent political interests and agendas (especially Boyle, given his active political role preceding his publication of *Mustapha*). Therefore, they may have wished to bring to their writing their own understanding of the connections between individual behaviour and legal or political expectation. Thus, we see their Turkish monarchs—both male and female—grappling with issues connected to "tyranny, captivity, war and conquests, fratricide, dynastic loyalties/disloyalties, rebellions, pride and humiliation and passions dictated by licentiousness" (Akalin, 2001, p. 367). This is also a common theme exhibited within the dramatic works of Goffe, although his writing is less focused upon recreating a historical narrative to advocate for the agenda of peaceful Anglo-Ottoman trading relations than Boyle's writing is. Goffe's Turk plays in particular display a highly nuanced awareness of how the laws of the Ottoman Empire during the seventeenth century affected the way in which one viewed justice on a more individual level.

After providing an analysis of these Turkish tragedies by Greville, Goffe, and Boyle published during the early to mid-seventeenth century, this thesis then examined the way in which the English fascination with the Turks continued during the latter part of the century. However, and very interestingly, the fear that the English held, following the medieval crusades, of a prospective Ottoman invasion began to dissipate. Towards the end of the seventeenth century and, by extension, at the start of the eighteenth, Enlightenment thinkers in both England and the wider Occidental world sought to challenge traditional societal modes of thought, as well as to understand the concept that their civilisation could be further developed via means of logic. This, in turn, was reflected in literature and plays—including of those centred upon Ottomans—whereby the Turk was, instead, represented as being "noble, human, wise, generous, compassionate and magnanimous lovers" (Akalin, 2001, p. 367); much like they had been ever since the start of the seventeenth century in travelogues and official letters.

If this is to be taken as true of the period, then it can be deduced that Behn's play (a product of its time being that it was published during the late seventeenth century) does not necessarily embrace this Enlightenment-driven concept to its full extent. However, a movement towards humanising Ottomans becomes very evident. This is because Behn's Ottomans are actually non-threatening English characters (in the eyes of her English audience) and thus, by their very nature, have favourable and familiar qualities. In much the same way, Greene's *Orlando* is an even earlier example of the way in which unfamiliar appearances in the form of costumes and settings can vastly alter an audience's perception of who they identify as being the 'Self' and as being the 'Other', as well as what positive and negative qualities they attribute to (and identify with) in both.

So, what were the implications of the above representations and the way in which they progressed? And how did this pave the way for future publications on the Turks throughout the eighteenth century to the present day? Other than to examine the progression of Anglo-Ottoman commercial arrangements, there is not a concrete method through which to gain a true understanding of the exact way in which English publications affected their international relations (if they did so at all). With regards to the continuation of friendly Anglo-Ottoman commercial relations during the early eighteenth century, the Ottoman grand vizier, Hassan Pasha wrote in in undated letter addressed to the head of the British embassy (which was translated into English by Antonio Pisani in 1744) that the

> […] principal requisite [of existence]—which is that of providing in this life in order to attain afterwards the other—consists of being able to enjoy immunity and repose, as well as the necessary conveniences in their places of dwelling. Hence, it comes that mankind, to obtain that point [must] apply themselves in various sorts of traffic, and to the exercise of so many different arts. Yet the mass of the human body being

> composed of elements opposite to each other, there is moderation required in the manner of ruling the whole machine, to fit and to dispose the places of recourse according to the different factions.
>
> (TNA/SP97/32, Hassan Pasha to the Duke of Newcastle, undated, trans. by Antonio Pisani, 1744).

As we are more accustomed to examining British perceptions of Anglo-Ottoman trading relations, it is interesting to read of the alternative Ottoman perception and to understand the mutuality of the two. According to Hassan Pasha in this extract from his letter, it can be understood that by the early 1740s, the relations shared between nations and their inhabitants formed a structure which was governed by points of contention which required negotiations and settlements to be made. As Talbot highlights in his study on British-Ottoman relations spanning from the years 1661-1807, the very concept of commercial negotiation between nations with opposing cultural values (and, in contrast, shared financial ones) was "the very essence of the diplomatic framework that the British merchants supported through their finance" (Talbot, 2017, p. 212). This support took the form of continued amicable trading relations, specifically through adhering to the Ottoman convention of gift-giving (in both the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries). As well as this, it also manifested as British adherence to Ottoman "ceremonial, and petitioning" (Talbot, 2017, p. 212). This began in the early eighteenth century and further solidified British presentations of peaceful intention towards their Ottoman partners in trade.

These amicable early modern commercial relationships that were maintained between the English and the Ottomans continued well into the early nineteenth century until the outbreak of war in the year 1807. During this same year, when Yusuf Agah Pahsa returned to Turkey after being stationed in London with the Ottoman Embassy, soon-to-be King George III addressed a letter to him (which was translated into Turkish). This letter expressed

George's appreciation of his work with the Embassy as work which "strengthened and reinforced beyond all expression the full and complete concord of love and affection that has happily and blessedly endured and persisted of old between [his] Sublime State and the state of Britain" (George III to Yusuf Agah Pasha, 1807). The model concept of peace that is presented within this letter—especially through the employment of the phrase the "full and complete concord of love and affection"—is something that has been sustained throughout history, despite the adversity of new Ottoman wartime conditions. It harkens back to the British Capitulations and its description of the Ottoman Court functioning as a "refuge of asylum of the sultans of the earth, [and] the place of retreat of the sovereigns of the globe" (British Capitulations, c.1536). Essentially, these praises in the Capitulations aimed to set out an ideal of commercial relations between Britain and the Ottoman Empire, in which both parties could trade peacefully and amicably. These values were understood as essential by both nations for the maintenance of successful international trade.

However, the respect the British possessed for the Ottomans did not necessarily mean that there was no animosity due to historical instances of religious and cultural conflict, as well as English misunderstandings of the way in which Ottoman laws utilised violence as a means to obtain justice in many instances. Virginia Aksan outlines financial aspects of Ottoman international diplomatic relations, which were often misunderstood by the English. She states that the

> […] entire question of support of foreign representatives by the host governments is in need of a thorough analysis, along with diplomatic practices in general. One of the recurrent themes of the dispatches of the dispatches of European diplomats is the lack of cash, and the indebtedness which recurred as a result of 'gifts' to Ottoman officials, a problem equally common to the Ottoman permanent missions in Europe when they began in 1793.

(Virginia Aksan, 1991, p. 44)

It was known that the British, by the twilight of the seventeenth and the dawn of the eighteenth centuries, felt discouraged from highlighting many significant commercial disagreements with the Ottomans. This was likely because they knew that not adhering to crucial Ottoman diplomatic practices (such as gifting, partaking in ceremonial traditions, and employing a cordial tone in diplomatic letters) would have a lasting negative impact upon their own financial security. The above diplomatic practices (which were heavily influenced by Ottoman cultural traditions) in which the British were expected to partake, in fact, allowed the British to promote their own merchandise. This would have included objects ranging from watches to fabrics. During the latter half of the eighteenth century, however, the Turkey Company were left with a small budget with which to operate. This was due to their extensive expenditure on lavish gifts to exchange with the Ottomans, which resulted in a decline of Anglo-Ottoman trade. As a result, a decrease in popular interest in the Turk on stage for the first time since the years preceding Elizabeth I's reign also became evident.

These developing relationships between the English and the Ottomans in a commercial capacity were reflected and contextualised in drama from the close of the seventeenth century until the 1807 war, and the impact of this historical context also left a lasting impact upon even later English literature and drama. As Suraiya Faroqhi succinctly discusses in her study on the Ottoman Empire's historical engagements with the wider world, the first half of the eighteenth century saw

> […] the Ottomans and their European neighbours still inhabit[ing] a common world. Certainly, this was not the way in which people of the period would have seen themselves: in the thinking of the Muslim Ottomans, non-Muslim Ottoman subjects, and also the inhabitants of Christian states or empires, religious denomination was a central criterion by which people defined themselves, and were defined by others.

(Faroqhi, 2004, p. 211)

The above concept of the West navigating the changing nature of a shared world (at least within a commercial sense) and, as a result, redefining their conceptualisation of the Self and the Other in a cultural sense became evident in literature of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. However, plays about Turks were largely underperformed altogether by this point. Interest in promoting the waging of warfare against the already jeopardised Ottoman Empire (as was common during the early to mid-seventeenth century) became far less of a concern than enabling the "foreign observer [to] enter into new relations with a Western world [via the] motif of transformation and the idea of a new relation between East and West" (Hasan Baktir, 2007, p. 139).

This was, indeed, the case with novels such as Samuel Johnson's *Rasselas: The Prince of Abyssinia* (1759) and the anonymously published *The Lustful Turk* (1828). In earlier plays, the foreign titular character was branded as possessing similar individual qualities as those the West associate with their own notable heroes (as is the case in all the primary works examined throughout the main body of this thesis). However, in these novels, titular heroes were instead used to illuminate both shared and differing political, legal, and cultural practices, as well as ethical values. Despite this, religion was once again overlooked in many instances (which highlights a regression to the late sixteenth century conflation of Islamic versus Ottoman practices). Thus, novels about Ottomans during this era placed more of an emphasis upon international values and relations than they did upon qualities of the individual influenced by cultural or religious values. Novelists also appealed to the remnants of intrigue that their English readers possessed about the Orient. They did so by experimenting with register, which had not been evident in earlier seventeenth-century novels affected by Western bias. Where the narratorly voices in early eighteenth-century English novels were distinctly aligned with assuming Western personas, writers still managed to

highlight the Orient as possessing its own independent register and agenda through their Ottoman characters. The chief concern of these Ottoman characters was not to become specific tropes or personas stereotypically—and negatively—associated with the East throughout history. Instead, their purpose was to illuminate Ottoman practices as a neutral equivalent (in some cases) or alternative (in others) to Western social norms.

As Leila Ahmed notes, it was not

> […] only the Western world that developed historical constructs to serve vested political and ideological interests. Islamic civilisation developed a construct of history that labelled the pre-Islamic period as the Age of Ignornance (Jahilia) and projected Islam as the sole source of all that was civilised –and used that so effectively in rewriting history that the Middle East lost all knowledge of the past civilisations of the region.
>
> (Ahmed, 1986, p. 665)

Despite this, however, it is also interesting to note the way in which eighteenth-century novelists (as is the case in the two novels aforementioned) gave credence to the Christian past of the Islamic Ottoman Empire. This is corroborated by historians like James Sambrook, for example, who states that eighteenth-century writers obtained their knowledge of "the most ancient poetry, wisdom and religion […] from the near East" (Sambrook, 2016, p. 216). Here, the use of the phrase "near East" is very apt, as it suggests a period recognition of shared religious and cultural heritage. This positions itself in stark contrast to common literary perceptions made popular only half of a century prior to this point.

In sum, many eighteenth-century novelists—most likely considering the contemporary decline of its stability—sought to illuminate the former financial and military strength of the Ottoman Empire through reminding their readers of its lavish settings and commodities. Ironically, it was only at this point when the Ottoman Empire's long, gradual decline had

begun, that England would begin to appreciate (even if only to a developing extent) its rich and complex religious and cultural history. I argue that this evidence of more truthful, neutral, and less demonised representations of the Ottoman Empire as a nation is directly influenced by the seventeenth-century primary plays explored throughout this thesis, and how they implemented the trajectory of humanising the 'stage Turk'.

**Bibliography**


Primary Sources

Behn, A. (1681). *The False Count, or, A New Way to Play an Old Game.* In: *The Works of Aphra Behn: Volume Two*, ed. by Janet Todd. (1992). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boyle, R. (1665). *The Tragedy of Mustapha, the son of Solyman the Magnificent*. In: *The Dramatic Works of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery: Volume One,* ed. by William Smith Clark II. (1937). Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Greene, R., (2021). *Alphonsus, King of Aragon*. (1587). Glasgow: Good Press.

Greene, R., (2021). *The History of Orlando Furioso*. (1594). Glasgow: Good Press.

Greville, F. (1609). *The Tragedy of Mustapha.* In: *Selected Writings of Fulke Greville*, ed. by Joan Rees. (2014). London: A & C Black.

Goffe, T. (1631). *The Raging Turk.* In: *Couragious Turk and Raging Turk,* ed. by David Carnegie. (1974). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goffe, T. (1932). *The Courageous Turk*. In: *Couragious Turk and Raging Turk,* ed. by David Carnegie. (1974). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Secondary Sources

Addison, L. (1671). *West Barbary, or a short narrative of the revolutions of the kingdoms of Fex and Morocco.* London: Printed for Anon.

Ágoston, G. (2013). 'War-Winning Weapons? On the Decisiveness of Ottoman Firearms from the Siege of Constantinople (1453) to the Battle of Mohács (1526)'. *Journal of Turkish Studies,* 39 (1), pp.129-143.

Ahmed, L. (1986). 'Women and the Advent of Islam'. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 11(4), pp.665-91.

Akalin, E. (2001). *Discovering Self and Other, representations of Ottoman Turks in English drama (1656-1792)*. (Published Doctoral Dissertation, University of Toronto).

Akbari, S. (2004). *Seeing through the veil: optical theory and medieval allegory.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Aksan, V. (2001). 'The Question of Writing Premodern Biographies of the Middle East'. In: *Auto/Biography and the Construction of Identity and Community in the Middle East*, (pp. 191-200). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Almas, L. (2009). *The Women of the Early Modern Turk and Moor Plays*. Published Doctoral Dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Alnwairan, M. (2018). 'Roger Boyle's *The Tragedy of Mustapha* and English Restoration Politics'. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation,* 1(2), pp.85-94.

Al-Olaqi, F. M. T. (2016). 'The Courageous Ottoman in Goffe's Amurath I (1619)'. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(6).

Al-Olaqi, F.M., (2016). The "idol" of prophet Muhammad in Greene's Alphonsus. *Journal of English Language and Literature*, 6(2), pp.444-454.

Altaba-Artal, D. and Lau-Lavie, N. (1999). *Aphra Behn's English Feminism: Wit and Satire*. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press.

Althusser, L. (1969). 'Contradiction and overdetermination'. *For Marx*, 114(1), pp.15-35.

Althusser, L. (1969). 'Freud and Lacan'. *New Left Review*, 55(1), pp.48-68.

Andrea, B. (2017). *The Lives of Girls and Women from the Islamic World in Early Modern British Literature and Culture*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Anon. (1597). *The Policy of the Turkish Empire.* London: Printed by John Windet for William Stansby.

Bacon, F. (1623). *Of Empire.* (reprinted 2005). London: Penguin UK.

Baktır, H. (2007). Representation of the Ottoman Orient in Eighteenth-Century English Literature. London: Routledge.

Ballaster, R. (2006). 'Observing the letter: Ros Ballaster explores the role of the letter in Jane Austen's life and fiction'. *The English Review*, 17(2), pp.2-6.

Ballaster, R. (2008). *Fabulous Orients: Fictions of the East in England, 1662-1785.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barbour, R. (2003). *Before Orientalism: London's theatre of the East, 1576-1626*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bartels, E. (1992). 'Imperialist Beginnings: Richard Hakluyt and the Construction of Africa'. *Criticism,* 34 (4), pp.517-538.

Bassano, L. (1545). I costumi et i modi particolari de la vita de'turchi. Ristampa fotomeccanica dell'edizione originale. Rome: Printed by and for Luigi Bassano.

Behn, A. (1676). *Abdelazer.* In: *The Works of Aphra Behn: Volume Two*, ed. by Janet Todd. (1992). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Birchwood, M. (2020). '"Puritan Mahumetans": Reading Anglo-Muslim Contexts in Aphra Behn's *Abdelazer* and *The False Count'*. *Women's Writing*, 27(3), pp.294-309.

Birdal, M.S. (2011). *The Holy Roman Empire and the Ottomans: From Global Imperial Power to Absolutist States*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Blackwood, M. (2010). 'Politics, Trade, and Diplomacy: The Anglo-Ottoman Relationship, 1575–1699'. *History Matters*, 10(1), pp.1-34.

Blount, H. (1636). *A Voyage into the Levant***.** London: Andrew Cooke.

BOA/A.DVN.DVE.d 57/, fol. 6. (Undated). British Parliamentary History, 1102-1803.

Bowers, F. (ed). (2013). *Dictionary of Literary Biography, Volume 58: Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists.* (1987). Virginia: Gale.

Bragadino, P. (1526). *Untitled travel account.* Rome: Printed by and for Pietro Bragadino.

Brown, L. (1983). *English Dramatic Form, 1660-1760.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Burian, O. (1952). 'Interest of the English in Turkey as reflected in English Literature of the Renaissance'. *Oriens,* 5 (2), pp.209-229.

Burton, J. (2005). *Traffic and Turning: Islam and English Drama, 1579-1624.* Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Çakırtaş, Ö. (2017). *Mustapha and Greville: Constructing Anglo-Ottoman Diplomacy and Machiavellian Identities in Early Modern English Drama.* In: Ö. Çakırtaş (Eds.), *Ideological Messaging and the Role of Political Literature.* Hershey, PA: IGI Global. pp.145-158.

Camacho, Matthew. (2015). *Henry Bolingbroke's Desire for Crusading*. Available: https://shakespeareshenriad.weebly.com/henry-bolingbrokes-desire-for-crusading.html . Last accessed 8th May 2021.

Camacho, Matthew. (2015). *Henry IV: The Movement of Henry's Crusade*. Available: https://shakespeareshenriad.weebly.com/henry-iv-the-movement-of-henrys-crusade.html . Last accessed 8th May, 2021.

Care, H. (1680). *English Liberties; or, The Free-born Subject's Inheritance*. London: Printed for Benjamin Harris.

Carr, R., (1600). *The Mahumetane or Turkish Historie*. London: T. Este.

Chew, S.C. (1937). 'The Crescent and the Rose: Islam and England during the Renaissance'. *The American Historical Review*, 44 (3), pp.601-602.

Clot, A. (2012). *Suleiman the Magnificent*. London: Saqi.

Cook, C. and Paxton, J. (1978). 'The Making of Modern Europe'. *European Political Facts 1848-1918,* 1 (1), pp.1-15.

Curtis, B. (2013). *The Habsburgs: The History of a Dynasty.* London: A & C Black.

Daborne, R., (2000). *A Christian turned Turk*. In: *Three Turk plays from early modern England*, ed. by Daniel J. Vitkus. New York: Columbia University Press, pp.148-239.

Daniel, Norman. (1966). Islam, Europe and Empire. Edinburgh: U.P.

Davenant, W. (1663). *The Siege of Rhodes.* London: Printed for Henry Herringman.

Davis, R. (1967). 'A Commercial Revolution: English overseas trade in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries'. *Historical Association*. 64(1), pp. 2-25.

de Busbecq, O.G. (1968). *The Turkish Letters of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, Imperial Ambassador at Constantinople, 1554-1562*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

De Krey, G. (2007). *Restoration and revolution in Britain: A political history of the era of Charles II and the Glorious Revolution.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dekker, T. (1631). *Lust's Dominion,* ed. by J. G. Brereton (1931). Hornaing: Librairie universitaire, Uystpruyst.

Del Balzo, A. (2019). *"Furbish'd Remnants": Theatrical Adaptation and the Orient, 1660-1815*. Published Doctoral Dissertation, UCLA.

Denison Ross, E. (1934). *A letter from James I to the Sultan Ahmet.* London: Longmans, Green & Co.

Dimmock, M. (2017). *New Turkes: dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in early modern England*. London: Routledge.

Eldem, E. (2005). *Death in Istanbul: Death and its Rituals in Ottoman-Islamic Culture.* Istanbul: Ottoman Bank.

Elliot, A. (1682). *A Modest Vindication of Titus Oates the Salamanca-Doctor from Perjury*. London: Printed for Anon.

Erkoç, S. (2016). ‘Dealing with Tyranny: Fulke Greville's Mustapha in the Context of His Other Writings and of His View on Anglo-Ottoman Relations’. *The Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 47(1), pp.265-90.

Erkoç, S. (2016). ‘Dealing with Tyranny: Fulke Greville's Mustapha in the Context of His Other Writings and of His View on Anglo-Ottoman Relations’. *The Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 47(1), pp.265-90.

Faroqhi, S. (2004). *The Ottoman Empire and the world around it*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Games, A. (2009). *The Web of empire: English cosmopolitans in an age of expansion, 1560-1660*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gill, P. (2013). ‘“Across the Divide”: The Contemporary English Elegy’. *Symbolism: An International Annual of Critical Aesthetics,* 12(13), pp.367-379.

Goughe, H. (1566). *The Offspring of the House of Ottomano* […] all Englished by Hugh Goughe from Nicholas de Moffan’s *Soltani Solymanni*. London: Printed by and for T. Marshe in 1569.

Greville, F. (1609). *Alaham.* In: *Selected Writings of Fulke Greville*. London: A&C Black.

Greville, F. (1652). ‘A Dedication to Sir Philip Sidney’ in: *Sir Fulke Greville’s Life of Sir Philip Sidney; Etc.* (Vol. 3, reprinted 2019). Oxford: Creative Media Partners.

Greville, F. (1670). ‘A Treatise of Monarchy’. In: *The Works in Verse and Prose Complete of the Right Honourable Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke.* Blackburn: Printed for private circulation by C. Tiplady in 1870.

Greville, F. (ca. 1595). ‘Letter to an Honourable Lady’. In: *The Works in Verse and Prose Complete of the Right Honourable Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke.* Blackburn: Printed for private circulation by C. Tiplady in 1870.

Groffman, D. (2007). ‘Negotiating with the Renaissance state: The Ottoman Empire and the new diplomacy’. In: Aksan, V. and Groffman, G. *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp.61-74.

Hall, S. (1997). ‘The work of representation’. *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*, 2(1), pp.13-74.

Hansen, M. C. (2001). ‘Gender, Power and Play: Fulke Greville’s *Mustapha* and *Alaham*’. *Guelph*, 19 (1), pp.125-141.

Harris, J.G., (2010). ‘Mechanical turks, mammet tricks and messianic time’. *Postmedieval: a journal of medieval cultural studies*, 1(1), pp.80-87.

Harris, T. (2005). *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms*. London: Penguin Books.

Hartwell, A. (1595). *History of the Warres between the Turkes and the Persians: an English Translation.* London: Printed by and for A. Hartwell.

Hayden, J.A. (2010). ‘The Tragedy of Roxolana in the Court of Charles II’. In: *Roxolana in European Literature, History and Culture,* ed. by Galina Yermolenko. London: Routledge. pp. 87-104.

Heng, G. (2003). *Empire of magic: medieval romance and the politics of cultural fantasy*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Henslowe, P., (1908). *Henslowe's diary* (Vol. 2). London: A.H. Bullen.

Heywood, T. (1602). *The Fair Maid of the West,* ed. by R. K. Turner. (1967) Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Hillman, R., 1991. ‘“Not Amurath an Amurath Succeeds”: Playing Doubles in Shakespeare's Henriad’. *English Literary Renaissance*, 21(2), pp.161-189.

Holm, B., trans. by Kynoch, G. (2014). *The Taming of the Turk: Ottomans on the Danish Stage 1596-1896.* Vienna: Hollitzer.

Hui, W. and Hunters, T. (2011). *The Politics of Imagining Asia.* Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Huygens, R. B. C. (ed). (1986). Willelmi Tyrensis Archiepiscopi Chronicon. Brussels: Turnhout.

Hyland Harris, P. 'Within Machiavellianism'. *Italica,* 25(1), pp.28-41.

Ingram, A. (2009). *English literature on the Ottoman Turks in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*. Published Doctoral Dissertation, Durham University.

John, King of England. (1215). *Magna Carta,* ed. by Holt, J.C., Garnett, G. and Hudson, J. (2015). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, S. (1759). *Rasselas*. 2nd edn, ed. by Michael Irwin. (1999). Ware: Wordsworth Editions.

Jowitt, C. (2003). *Voyage drama and gender politics, 1589-1642: real and imagined worlds*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Keller, S. (2017). *Beyond the ruling class: strategic elites in modern society*. London: Routledge.

Keller, S. (2017). *Beyond the ruling class: strategic elites in modern society*. London: Routledge.

Ker, J. and Winston, J. (2012). *Elizabethan Seneca: Three Tragedies.* New York: Cornell University Press.

Khan, F. W. (2011). 'Mirrors of Governance: 'The Mighty Turkish Diadem' and English Drama (*Selimus.* Sc. Xxxvi. 2340)'. *Journal of European Studies*, 26-27 (2), pp.139-154.

King, A. (2001). '"Well grounded, finely framed, and strongly trussed up together" the 'medieval' structure of The Faerie Queene'. *The Review of English Studies*, 52 (205), pp.4-58.

Knolles, R.I., *The Generall Historie of the Turkes, from the First Beginning of that Nation to the Rising of the Othoman Familie with All the Notable Expeditions of the Christian Princes Against Them. Together with The Lives And Conquests of the Othoman, Kings and Emperours, Unto the Yeare 1610*. Islip: Printed for Anon.

Kollmann, N. S. (2006). 'The Quality of Mercy in Early Modern Legal Practice'. *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History,* 7(1), pp.5-22.

Kostova, L. (2017). 'Crossing the Divide between Christianity and Islam: Representations of Religious Conversion in three Seventeenth-Century English Plays'. *VTU Review: Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences,* 1(1), pp.18-28.

Kostova, L., Sarieva, I. and Irimia, M. (2012). *Comparisons and Interactions Within/Across Cultures*. Veliko Turnovo: St. Cyril and St. Methodius University Press.

Lithgow, W. (1640). *Totall Discourse Rare Adventures & Painful Peregrinations and Painfull Peregrinations of Long nineteente Years Travayles from Scotland to the Most kingdoms in Europe, Asia and Affrica.* London: Printed for Anon.

Loomba, A. (2002). *Shakespeare, Race and Colonialism.* New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Lowe, L. (1991). 'Heterogeneity, hybridity, multiplicity: marking Asian American differences'. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 1(1), pp.24-44.

Lynch, K. M. (1965). *The Social Mode of Restoration Comedy.* New York: Biblo and Tannen.

Machiavelli, N. (1513). *The Prince*, ed. by Brian Richardson and trans. by Leslie J. Walker. 2nd edn, (2013). London: Penguin Books.

MacLean, G. (2004). *The Rise of Oriental Travel: English Visitors to the Ottoman Empire, 1580-1720*. New York: Springer.

MacLean, G. (2004). *The Rise of Oriental Travel: English Visitors to the Ottoman Empire, 1580-1720*. New York: Springer.

Maguire, N. (1992). *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy, 1660-1671.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Malcolm, N. (2019). *Useful Enemies: Islam and the Ottoman Empire in Western Political Thought, 1450-1750.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Manion, L. (2014). *Narrating the Crusades: Loss and Recovery in Medieval and Early Modern English Literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mansfield, H. C. (1998). *Machiavelli's Virtue.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marsh, H. (1663). *A new survey of the Turkish Empire and government in a brief history deduced to this present time.* London: Printed by and for Henry Marsh.

Massinger, P. (1630). *The Renegado*. In: Vitkus, D. (2000). (ed). *Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England.* Columbia: Columbia University Press. pp.241-340.

Matar, N. (1999). Turks. *Moors, and Englishmen in the age of discovery.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Matar, N. (2001). 'English Accounts of Captivity in North Africa and the Middle East: 1577-1625'. *Renaissance Quarterly*, 54(2), pp.553-572.

Matar, N. (2005). *Britain and Barbary, 1589-1689.* Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

McDonald, N. (2013). *Pulp Fictions of Medieval England: Essays in Popular Romance*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

McGowan, B. and McGowan, B.W. (1981). *Economic life in Ottoman Europe: taxation, trade and the struggle for land, 1600-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McJannet, L. (2006). *The Sultan Speaks: Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks.* New York: Palgrave USA.

McJannet, L. (2009). ‘Early Modern English Drama and the Islamic World. Islam and English Drama: A Critical History’. *Early Theatre*, 12(2), pp.183-193.

Middleton, C. (1752). *The Miscellaneous Works of the Late Reverend and Learned Conyers Middleton: Containing All His Writings, Except the Life of Cicero: Many of which Were Never Before Published.* (Vol. 2). London: Published by and for R. Manby.

Miller, J. and Miller, J.L. (1973). *Popery and politics in England 1660-1688*. Cambridge: CUP Archive.

Moberly, D.C. (2018). ‘Mehmed II and His Woman: The Idea of Europe in Early Modern Representations of a Female Captive’. In *The Dialectics of Orientalism in Early Modern Europe* (pp. 137-153). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Moffan, N. (1555). *Soltani Solymanni.* London: Printed by and for Oporinus.

Molière, J. B. P. (1659). *Précieuses Ridicules*, ed. by D. Benjamin. (Reprinted 2011). Paris: Publications Pimido.

Montagu, L.M.W. (1837). *The Letters and Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu.* (Vol. 1). Philadelphia: Carey, Lea & Blanchard.

Munday, A. (1610). *London’s Love to the Royal Prince Henrie.* London: Printed by and for Anthony Munday.

Munro, D. C. (1895). Urban and the Crusaders. *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History*. 1(2), pp.5-8.

Munro, D.C. (1906). ‘The Speech of Pope Urban II. At Clermont, 1095’. *The American Historical Review*, 11(2), pp.231-242.

Navagero, B. (1553). *Relazione dell’Impero Ottomano del Clarissimo Bernardo Navagero, Stato Bailo a Costantinopoli Fatta in Pregadi nel Mese di Febbrajo del 1553. Relazioni degli Ambasciatori Veneti al Senato*. Rome: Printed by and for Bernardo Navagero.

Nichols, J. B. (1828). *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First.* London: Printed by and for J. B. Nichols.

Norbrook, D. (2002). *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oaks, D.H. (1962). 'The "Original" Writ of *Habeas Corpus* in the Supreme Court'. *The Supreme Court Review*, (19(1), pp.153-211.

Öktem, Ö. (2019). Re-Orienting Gender and Islamic Alterity in Early Modern English Drama. *English Studies*, 100(2), pp.133-148.

Orr, B. (2001). *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Owen, S. J. (1996). *Restoration Theatre and Crisis.* Oxford: OUP Oxford.

Painter, W. (1566). *The Palace of Pleasure: Beautified, Adorned and Well Furnished, With Pleasaunt Histories and Excellent Nouelles, Selected Out Of Diuers Good and Commendable Authors.* London: Printed by Henry Denham for Richard Tottell and William Jones.

Palffy, G. (2000). 'Scorched-earth tactics in Ottoman Hungary: On a controversy in military theory and practice on the Habsburg-Ottoman frontier'. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae,* 61(1), pp.181-200.

Parry, V. J. (2003). *Richard Knolles' History of the Turks.* Ankara: Economic and Social History Foundation of Turkey.

Parry, V. J. and Cook, M. (1976). *A history of the Ottoman Empire to 1730*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pasini, J. (2011). *Kin with Kin and Kind with Kind Confound: Pity, Justice, and Family Killing in Early Modern Dramas Depicting Islam.* Published Doctoral Dissertation, Rice University.

Peele, G. (1594). *The Turkish Mahomet and Hyren the Fair Greek.* (Not extant).

Pierce, L.P. (1993). *The imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Pierce, L.P. (trans., 1993). 'Untitled/undated poem written by Sultan Suleiman and addressed to Hurrem Sultan, Roxolana'. In: *The imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire.* New York: Oxford UP. pp.58-63.

Porter, J. (1768). *Observations on the religion, law, government and manners of the Turks* (Vol. 1). London: Printed by and for Nourse.

Quataert, D. (2005). *The Ottoman Empire 1700-1922*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Raber, K. (2001). *Dramatic Difference: Gender, Class, and Genre in the Early Modern Closet Drama*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Ratcliff, G. L. (1986). 'Introduction' in *Niccolo Machiavelli's The Prince.* New York: Barron's Educational Series, Incorporated.

Rebholz, R. A. (1971). *The Life of Fulke Greville First Lord Brooke.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Riley, K., (2008). *The reception and performance of Euripides' Herakles: reasoning madness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Robinson, B. (2007). *Islam and Early Modern English Literature: The Politics of Romance from Spenser to Milton*. New York: Springer.

Röder, K. (2014). 'Intercultural 'Trafique' in Fulke Greville's *Mustapha*'. *Literature Compass,* 11 (8), pp.560-572.

Roscoe, B. (2013). 'On Reading Renaissance Closet Drama: A Reconsideration of the Chorus in Fulke Greville's "Alaham" and "Mustapha"'. *Studies in Philology*, 110(4), pp.762-788.

Rothman, E.N. (2021). *The Dragoman Renaissance: Diplomatic Interpreters and the Routes of Orientalism*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Rycaut, P. (1666). 'The present state of the Ottoman empire. Textual tradition and lexical borrowings from Turkish', ed. by W. Schweickard. In: *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis*, 132(3), pp.187-196.

Sager, J. (2013). *The Aesthetics of Spectacle in Early Modern Drama and Modern Cinema: Robert Greene's Theatre of Attractions*. New York: Springer.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Sambrook, J. (2016). *William Cowper: The Task and Selected Other Poems*. London: Routledge.

Schmuck, S. (2005). 'The 'Turk' as Antichrist in John Foxe's Acts and Monuments (I570)'. *Reformation*, 10(1), pp.21-44.

Settle, E. (1676). *Ibrahim the Illustrious Bassa.* Charing Cross: Printed by and for Thomas Chapman in 1694.

Shakespeare, W. (1596). *King John.* In: *The Arden Shakespeare Complete Works*, ed. by Richard Proudfoot, Ann Thompson, and David Scott Katsan. (1988). London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. pp.603-63.

Shakespeare, W. (1596). *The Merchant of Venice*. In: *The Arden Shakespeare Complete Works*, ed. by Richard Proudfoot, Ann Thompson, and David Scott Katsan. (1988). London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. pp.831-858.

Shakespeare, W. (1603). *Othello.* In: *The Arden Shakespeare Complete Works*, ed. by Richard Proudfoot, Ann Thompson, and David Scott Katsan. (1988). London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. pp.941-977.

Shakespeare, W. (c. 1594). *Romeo and Juliet.* In: *The Arden Shakespeare Complete Works*, ed. by Richard Proudfoot, Ann Thompson, and David Scott Katsan. (1988). London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. pp.1007-1040.

Sharpe, K. and Zwicker, S. N. (2003). *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Slotkin, J.E. (2009). "Now will I be a Turke": Performing Ottoman Identity in Thomas Goffe's *The Courageous Turk'*. In: *Early Modern England and Islamic Worlds: Early Modern Cultural Studies*, ed. by Bernadette Andrea and Linda McJannet L. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Smith, B.R. (2010). *The Key of Green*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sondergard, S.L. (2008). 'Women and Islam in early modern English literature'. *Renaissance Quarterly*, 61 (4), pp.1390-1391.

Stilma, A. (2016). *A King Translated: The Writings of King James VI & I and their Interpretation in the Low Countries*, 1593-1603. London: Taylor and Francis Publishing Ltd.

Święcicka, E. (2020). *Dictionary of Italian-Turkish Language (1641) by Giovanni Molino: Transcripted, Reversed, and Annotated*. Boston: De Gruyter.

Talbot, M. (2017). *Vivaldi*. London: Routledge.

Taylor, J. (1613). *Heaven's Blessings and Earth's Joy.* London: Printed by and for John Taylor.

Tibbs, S. (2003). *Lineages of Turkish power in early modern writing in English.* Published Doctoral Dissertation, Newcastle University.

Tiryakioglu, N. O. (2015). *The Western image of Turks from the Middle Ages to the 21st century: the myth of 'terrible Turk' and 'lustful Turk'*. Published Doctoral Dissertation, Nottingham Trent University.

TNA/CP26/11/189. (1807). George III to Yusuf Agah Pasha.

TNA/MS73/534 (1661). Earl of Winchelsea to Sir Edward Nicholas.

TNA/SC.PP/1/6. (1693). Baron Paget to the Consul and Gentlemen of the Factory at Smyrna.

TNA/SP97/8/310. (1605). James I to the Turkish Sultan Ahmet.

TNA/SP97/32. (Undated). Hassan Pasha to the Duke of Newcastle, trans. by Antonio Pisani. (1744).

TNA/SP97/42. (1763). Henry Grenville to the Earl of Egremont.

TNA/SP97/43. (1734). Earl of Kinnoull to the Duke of Newcastle.

TNA/SP108/541/11-12. (1536). British Capitulations.

Todd, J. (1993). 'Anglo-American difference: some thoughts of an aging feminist'. *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*, 12(2), pp.241-245.

Tomlinson, S. (2015). 'The Actress and Baroque Aesthetic Effects in Renaissance Drama'. *Shakespeare Bulletin,* 33(1), pp.67-82.

*Treaties between Turkey and Foreign Powers*. (1535-1855). London: Printed for Anon.

Tricomi, A. H. (1989). 'Middleton's "Women Beware Women": as Anticourt Drama'. *Modern Language Studies,* 19 (2), pp.65-77.

Trofimova, V. and Akalin, E. (2007). 'The Representation of the Other in Aphra Behn's Works'. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses Año*, 54(1), pp.7-38.

Uglow, J. (2009). *A Gambling Man: Charles II and the Restoration.* London: Faber and Faber.

Ure, P. (2010). *William Shakespeare, the problem plays.* London: Longmans for the British Council.

Veinstein, G. (2005). 'On the Ottoman janissaries (fourteenth-nineteenth centuries)'. *Fighting for a Living. A Comparative History of Military Labour*, 10(1), pp.1500-2000.

Vitkus, D. (2016). *Turning Turk: English theater and the multicultural Mediterranean*. New York: Springer.

Vitkus, D. (2016). *Turning Turk: English theater and the multicultural Mediterranean*. New York: Springer.

Vlami, D. (2014). *Trading with the Ottomans: The Levant Company in the Middle East*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Walker, A. (2011). 'Middle Byzantine aesthetics of power and the incomparability of Islamic art: The architectural ekphraseis of Nikolaos Mesarites'. *Muqarnas*, 27(1), p. 79-101.

Wann, L. (1915). 'The Oriental in Elizabethan Drama'. *Modern Philology*, 12(1), pp.187-208.

Wheatcroft, A. (1995). *The Life and Times of Shaikh Salman Bin Hamad Al-Khalifa: Ruler of Bahrain, 1942-1961*. London: Kegan Paul International.

Wood, A.C. (2013). *A History of the Levant Company*. London: Routledge.

Wright, T., (1604). *The Passions of the Minde in generall*, ed. by Thomas O. Sloane. (1971). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Yassin, D.S. (2012). 'Representation of Muslims in Early Modern English Literature'. *Plaza: Dialogues in Language and Literature*, 2(2), pp.10-22.

Yeager, S.M. (2004). '"The Siege of Jerusalem" and Biblical Exegesis: Writing about Romans in Fourteenth-Century England'. *The Chaucer Review*, 39(1), pp.70-102.

Yermolenko, G. (2010). *Roxolana in European Literature, History and Culture.* Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

## Appendix 1: National Archives Letters

**SP 105/109/206 (Charles II to the turkey Company, recalling Sir Thomas Bendysh, Ambassador at Constantinople, and appointing Heneage Finch, Earl of Winchilsea, in his stead. Date and place: 25th June 1660, Whitehall)**

Transcription:

To our trusty and wellbeloved the Merchants of the Turky Company at London (1696).

Trusty and wellbeloved Wee greete you well. Whereas wee finds is expediens for the good of our affaires to recall Sr Thomas Bendish from his Employment at Constantinople, and to send in his roome a Person whose Quality, Affection to our service & his Country, and desire to improove and advance the Trade of those parts, may raise the reputation of that Employment and produce other great advantages both to us and you. Wee have thought fitt to recommend to you Our Right trusty & right welbeloved Cousin. Henneage Earle of Winchilsea as our Ambassador to reside in that Port: And as we do not doubt of your cheerfull receiving him in that Quality, so we are most confident that his worthy Deportment therein will give you occasion to thanke us for this our Recomendation of a Person of such Honor. And so we bid you heartily farewell. Given at Our Court at Whitehall this 25th day of June, in the twelfe yeare of Our Reigne.

**SP 97/17/11 (Charles I to the Sultan. Date and place: 21st January, 1647).**

Transcription:

1646

Charles to the High and Excellent Lord the _ Bashaw to his Grand Signior, Greeting.

High & Excellent Lord, having resolved to comand the _ of our Ambassador Sr Sackvile from now residing with the Grand Signior you, Lord and Master; And being _ by all

fit means to continue & maintain that _ league of mity and friendship which for many years hath been absent between our Imperiall Townes. We have sent this _ Sr Thomas Bendish _ and cannot to surround and _ our Ambassador in the port of the Grand Signior; And in our name to negotiate and doo all fitt offires, whom obey the amity betweene us may be confirmed and _, to the mutuall benefit and advantage of us our friends and Allies, and to the _ of _ and _ betweene each others subjects in freedom and security. And therefore knowing the eminent place and office you hold noone the Grand Signior, and the good affection you beare to us and oure _ of we understand our Merchants have lately had good _, in the great favour & justice they have obtained through your noble mediation. We have thought _ not only to acknowledge our manifold thanks for the same, But also to offer the continuance of our former Courtisies in the kind direction and acceptance of this our Ambassador Sir Thomas Bendishe, his believe what he shall deliver in our name, and assist him withyour authority and good efforts in all things he shall move our _ conduring to the ends of _ said: And likewise to discharge and dispend Sir Sackvile Crow away, to whom we have sent our Letter of Revocation to remand his returns to our persone, that we may review an account of the differences betweene him and our Merchants. And soe we comit you to the protection of God Almighty. Given at our Court this 21st January in the 22nd yeare of our Raigne Anno Domini 1646.

Charles by the award of the most high God, King of England Scotland _ and Ireland, Defender of the faith. _:

To the high and mighty Emperour Sultan Ebrahim Han Chiefe Lord and Commander of the Musulman Kingdom, solo & supreme Monarch of his Easterne Empire; _ and much happines.

Most high and mighty prince: having many and urgent _: sons induring us to _! Sackvile Crow Baronet from his employment as our Ambasador in ordinary residing at your

court; we hope it agreeable both to honor and to that _ of friendship which is esstablsihed betwixt us, in regard of the mutuall good of each others subjects, both to intimate so much onto you, and to appease our gratefull acknowledgement of the manifold favours and _ with all our subjects trading and now residing in your Dominions have from time to time (and your news especially of late, in their great differense) _ at your Royall hands, and at the hands of your principall Ministers. And _ we do well to review how _ it is for the supporting of our subjects will doo trade and remaine within your Dominions, to have that place supplied by some other personof quality and _, through whose interposition and industry our people might not only be relieved in their witt and reasonable orrations, but all those other things presented to your Royall hands with many fond to the maintenance and advancement of that mutuall _ and amity which hath been of long time _ and continued betwixt your predecessors and ours. We have made theirs of the bearer himself, our trusty and nobleloved subject & servant, Sir Thomas Bendyshe Knight and Baronet, to _ and remaine our Amb[assador]: & at your high port: desiring your Ma[jesties]: his not only gratiously and kindly to remaine & admit the said Sir Thomas Bendish to be our Ambassador, and also to afford him your princely _ and roundtenants in all such things with: from hime to hime he is to impart unto you in our behalf, or in the behalf of our Merchants; But likewise to himselfe our former Ambassador Sir Sackvile Crow, that he may returne to our perimitere and give us satisfaction in the late difference which happened betweene himself and our Merchants. And our further request is, that your highnes plesase to vouch safe and grant to our Merchants and subjects the continuance of those antient freedomes liberties & priviledges which hitherto they have reviewed and enjoyed; togther with such other additions of your favour as may be thought conveneient and advantageous for the _ of trade _ betweene each others subjects. And soe we wish your royall Ma[jestie] health and true felicity _ at our Court this 21st day of January in the 22nd yeare of our Raigne Anno Domini 1646.

**SP 84/173/37 (Sultan of Bantam to Charles II. Thanking him for arms shipments and asking for more to resist the 'imperious Hollanders. Date and place: 26th January, 1665).**

Transcription:

Bantam 26 Dec. 1664

Sultan Bantam to your Majestie of Great Brittone Charles 2nd: Sendish those Imploring the Divine Providence for your Majesties most prosperous and happy Reigne with _ of all worldly _ here and happinese hereafter.

Your Majesties Letter of the 28th February arrived to our reception as also the Great _ Muslims _: Accompanying it, for _ sender your Majestie ten thousand Acknowledgements accepting them with all testimony of thankfull _; and in confidence of your Majesties further _, wee doe intreat you out of your Princely Respect to supply us with _ word of the same _, and two more of the _ of the middle now sent, Wee also intreat your Majesties supply of gun Powder and Bullets as your Majestie can with _ _, and for your charge on cost of these _, wee shall pay to the Agent here Resident.

It will bee much to our Content that your Majestie could please to look towards _ parts once it is much to bee doubted the Imperious Hollanders will in a short time subdue all under their Obedience, and soe Consequently your Majesties subjects bee _ out of _ India. _, the Proffitt arriving by this _ or Commerce your Majestie may perceive by the Hollanders greatness, with his only supporters by their Jappan, China, _ and Amboyna Trade.

And now as A Testimony of my Sincere and Reall Respects to your Majestie: bee _ to Accept of foure Dyamonds put up in a small gold box accompanying those.

Bantam The 26th December 1664

(Note overleaf)

Prayes 7 more Great Guns of your size of these who now reed _ _. Last: & 2. More of your modell now sent: & by each ship some quantities of powder, & Bullet; for which he will pay _. Agent there: _ _. Hollanders grow mihty in those parts, & will migrate all trade; if not timely presented.

Prisents his Majesty with 4 diamonds, in a Boxe of Gold.

**SP 97/5/76**

Transcription:

As to high and mighty princes there is nothing more _ & glorious than if for the common safetie of men and maintenance of societie they for the good and profitte of theire subjects agree together. So is there nothing more available to effect at and preserve that agreement than if they may have first Ministers who as legates or Ambasciatores may impart the sense and meaning of the said princes distant notwithstanding by a large space of sea and land. In _ nature seinge that subject and servant of ours Henry Lillo hath bestowed no unprofitable paines both for the good [margin: hath now a long time taken] of your people & ours who executing that place in that moaste named Cittie of your Majesties Constnatinople, & by your Majesties highe favour hath had easie _ & into your glorious Court. And seing he hath greate occasion of businesses to returne some at this present we have thought fitt to send unto your Majestie another of our servants Thomas Glover, the bringer of this letters a gentleman of as highly esteemed [margin: deerly beloved squire of our body] of them that honourably attend about our person that he may be suitable in place the said Henry Lillo and execute alike your said office . Hither doe we about but yet in all businesses _ are or shall be committed to his trust he will so carry himself as yet he may give good satisfaction unto your Majestie & yet his honestie and diligence may be agreeable unto us. And _ so as we give many thanks unto your Majestie in yet one other servant Henry Lillo was by your Mjaesties so greate favour

and goodness entertained _ he truly with all thankfulness doth reporte and give out so do we command this other unto your Majestie be with of like goodnes and favoure entertained, & to him deling in our owne or subjects affaires we desire credit for given by your Majestie. To whom from the good and greate god king of all kings and of your universall world creator and guider we Earthlie wish all health and happiness.

(Total word count including bibliography and appendix: 57, 739)