T.C. İSTANBUL YENİ YÜZYIL UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

THE STEREOTYPICAL REPRESENTATION OF THE OTTOMAN TURKS IN ENGLISH RESTORATION DRAMA

Ph.D. Thesis

Işıl ŞAHİN GÜLTER

Thesis Supervisor

Prof. Dr. Cemile Günseli İŞÇİ

İstanbul-2018

T.C.

İSTANBUL YENİ YÜZYIL ÜNİVERSİTESİ

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

TEZ ONAY BELGESİ

İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bilim Dalı 161306016 numaralı doktora programı öğrencisi Işıl Şahin Gülter'in, "Stereotypical Representation of the Ottoman Turks in English Restoration Drama" adlı tez çalışması, Enstitümüz Yönetim Kurulunun 16/11/2018 tarih ve 2018/22 sayılı kararıyla oluşturulan jüri tarafından oy birliği /~~oy çokluğu~~ ile Doktora Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Tez Savunma Tarihi: 26/11/2018

Öğretim Üyesi Adı ve Soyadı			**İmzası**
1.	Tez Danışmanı	Prof. Dr. C. Günseli İşçi	
2.	Jüri Üyesi	Prof. Dr. Ayşe Dilek Erbora	
3.	Jüri Üyesi	Prof. Dr. Erendiz Özbayoğlu	
4.	Jüri Üyesi	Doç. Dr. Ferma Lekesizalın	
5.	Jüri Üyesi	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Javid Aliyev	

İSTANBUL YENİ YÜZYIL ÜNİVERSİTESİ

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

...Dişhekimliği Biyolojisi ve Genetiği.....

DOKTORA PROGRAMI

DOĞRULUK BEYANI

Doktora tezi olarak sunduğum, bu çalışmayı, bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yol ve yardıma başvurmaksızın yazdığımı, yararlandığım eserlerin kaynakçada gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu ve bu eserleri her kullanışımda alıntı yaparak yararlandığımı belirtir; bunu onurumla doğrularım.

Enstitü tarafından belli bir zamana bağlı olmaksızın, tezimle ilgili yaptığım bu beyana aykırı bir durumun saptanması durumunda, ortaya çıkacak tüm ahlaki ve hukuki sonuçlara katlanacağımı bildiririm.

26 / 11 / 2019

Adı-Soyadı

Işıl Şahin Güler

İmzası

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to begin by expressing my heartfelt thanks for my supervisor Prof. Dr. C. Günseli İşçi, always a source of advice and wisdom. In guiding this dissertation, she has been most perceptive, challenging, and a thorough reader. I am sincerely grateful for her careful and scholarly attention to my thesis and her patience in reading countless drafts. Her high standards coupled with her kind and approachable manner made this dissertation process a positive one and enabled me to see this thesis to successful completion.

I also extend my sincere thanks to my Thesis Committee, Prof. Dr. C. Günseli İşçi, Prof. Dr. Ayşe Dilek Erbora, and Dr. Javid Aliyev, for the invaluable support, assistance, guidance, and encouragement I received. I express my thanks and appreciation to each one of them, who gave efficiently of their time and energy and provided me excellent feedback.

I would also thank to Dr. Seçil Tümen Akyıldız who listened to me patiently whenever I feel tired and unmotivated. I express my gratitude for her valuable support and encouragement. I would also express my thanks to Prof. Dr. İhsan Dağtekin and Dr. Seda Arıkan for their guidance for my academic career.

I would also express my special thanks to the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBİTAK) for their financial support under the programme of TÜBİTAK BİDEB 2211-A – National Doctoral Research Scholarship to complete this thesis successfully.

Last but not least; I could not have written this thesis without the love, patience and tolerance of my family. My greatest debt, an incalculable one which I cannot repay, is to my husband and my best friend Erkan Gülter. Thank you Erkan, for unconditionally believing in me to make my dream come true.

ABSTRACT

THE STEREOTYPICAL REPRESENTATION OF THE OTTOMAN TURKS IN ENGLISH RESTORATION DRAMA

Şahin Gülter, Işıl

Ph.D., English Literature

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. C. Günseli İşçi

November 2018,

The aim of this thesis is to examine stereotypical representation of the Ottoman Turks in *heroic plays* of English Restoration drama. Drawing on medieval anti-Islamic polemic, crusading rhetoric and early modern texts regarding the Turks, William Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes* (1663), Roger Boyle's *The Tragedy of Mustapha* (1668), Henry Neville Payne's *The Siege of Constantinople* (1675), and Elkanah Settle's *Ibrahim the Illustrious Bassa* (1676) aimed to display so called religious and cultural *difference* between the Ottomans and the English. These dramatists employed stereotypical images of 'raging and expansionist Turk', 'cruel Turk', 'absolute Turk' and 'sensual Turk' deeply rooted in Western history and ideology through dramatization of themes including Ottoman expansionism and absolutism, Oriental despotism, familicide, polygamy and sensual weakness in their plays. Thus, on the one hand, Restoration *heroic plays* enabled the English to define themselves and assert their cultural and religious supremacy against the Ottomans reinforcing stereotypical images of 'the Turks.' On the other hand, these plays provided the dramatists with an outlet in which they could deal with the most pressing political issues of the period in the presence of the king. In other words, the dramatists made political commentary on turbulent political crisis of the second half of the seventeenth century including Revolution, Regicide, Restoration and Exclusion Crisis in disguise of Ottoman sultans and historical episodes on the Restoration stage. Therefore, Restoration playwrights aimed to warn the English politics of the seventeenth century in disguise of Ottoman sultans and historical episodes they reconstructed with their imagination. In that sense, this thesis argues that a comprehensive understanding of the representation of the Ottoman Turks in English Restoration drama requires a new perspective; thus investigates different aspects of the interaction between the Ottomans and the English in selected plays. The present theis has aimed to indicate that the notions of 'the Turk' took a central position in many aspects of English cultural life and the

stereotypical image of ‘the Turk’ had become a powerful medium through which a remarkable variety of cultural, religious, political anxieties and beliefs could be addressed in the second half of the seventeenth century.

Key Words: English Restoration Drama, Heroic Play, Ottoman Turks, Representation, Stereotype.

ÖZ

RESTORASYON DÖNEMİ İNGİLİZ TİYATROSUNDA OSMANLI TÜRKLERİ'NİN STEREOTİPİK TASVİRİ

Şahin Gülter, Işıl

Doktora, İngiliz Edebiyatı

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. C. Günseli İşçi

Kasım 2018,

Bu tezin amacı, İngiliz Restorasyon dönemi tiyatrosu *kahramanlık oyunlarında* Osmanlı Türklerinin stereotipik tasvirini incelemektir. Ortaçağ İslam karşıtı polemiği, Türklere ilişkin haçlı söylemi ve erken modern dönem yazınlarından etkilenen, William Davenant'ın *The Siege of Rhodes* (1663), Roger Boyle'nin *The Tragedy of Mustapha* (1668), Henry Neville Payne'nin *The Siege of Constantinople* (1675), and Elkanah Settle'ın *Ibrahim the Illustrious Bassa* (1676) oyunları Osmanlılar ve İngilizler arasındaki sözde dini ve kültürel farkı gözler önüne sermeyi amaçlamıştır. Bu oyun yazarları; oyunlarında Osmanlı yayılmacılığı ve mutlaklığı, Doğu despotizmi, aile fertlerinin katli, çok eşlilik ve şehvet düşkünlüğü gibi temaları sahneleyerek, Batı tarihi ve ideolojisine yerleşmiş olan 'kızgın yayılmacı Türk', 'zalim Türk', 'mutlak Türk' ve 'şehvetli Türk' stereotiplerini kullanmıştır. Böylece, Restorasyon dönemi *kahramanlık oyunları*, bir yandan, stereotip Türk imgesini vurgulayarak İngilizlerin kendilerini tanımlamalarına ve Osmanlılara karşı dini ve kültürel üstünlük iddia etmelerine olanak sağlamıştır. Öte yandan, bu oyunlar, oyun yazarlarına kralın varlığında en hassas politik olaylara değinmelerini sağlayacak bir ortam sunmuştur. Diğer bir deyişle; oyun yazarları, Devrim, Kral katli, Restorasyon ve Dışlama Krizi gibi on yedinci yüzyılın ikinci yarısına damga vurmuş politik krizleri, Restorasyon sahnesinde Osmanlı sultanları ve tarihi olayları altında gizleyerek, yorumlama fırsatı bulmuşlardır. Böylece, Restorasyon dönemi oyun yazarları, kendi hayal güçleriyle yeniden kurguladıkları Osmanlı sultanları ve tarihi olayları altında İngiliz politikasını eğitmeyi amaçlamıştır. Bu anlamda, bu tez Restorasyon dönemi İngiliz tiyatrosundaki stereotipik Osmanlı Türkleri tasvirinin daha kapsamlı incelenebilmesi için yeni bir bakış açısının gerekli olduğunu savunur; bu sebeple seçilen oyunlarda, Osmanlı-İngiliz ilişkilerinin farklı yönlerini ele alır. Bu tez, 'Türklük' kavramlarının İngiliz kültüründe önemli bir yer edindiği ve on yedinci yüzyılın ikinci yarısında stereotipik Türk

imgesinin birçok kültürel, dini, politik kaygı ve inanışa değinmek için kullanılan önemli bir araç olduğu sonucuna varmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İngiliz Restorasyon Dönemi Tiyatrosu, Kahramanlık Oyunları, Osmanlı Türkleri, Tasvir, Stereotip.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

"Our swords against proud Solyman we draw,

his cursed prophet, and his sensual law."

William Davenant, *The Siege of Rhodes, Part I*

When the curtain was raised on the first legitimate English stage following Restoration of monarchy in 1660, Davenant's chorus uttered a call to arms against "cursed prophet" of Islam and "sensual law" of Ottoman sultan invoking the conflict between Christendom and Islam beginning with *jihad* and crusade. *The Siege of Rhodes*, set amidst the imperial magnificence of the Ottoman Empire, managed to dazzle Restoration audience through display of Ottoman court, Sultan Solyman's *harem* and parade of Eastern costumes. Thomas Betterton, Solyman in Davenant's play, performed wearing a turban and 'Turkish vest,' while Mrs. Coleman played the part of Ianthe 'veiled.' The play's success in the mid seventeenth century showed that the notions of 'the Turk' and Islam took a central position in many aspects of English cultural life and 'the Turk' had become a powerful medium through which a remarkable variety of cultural anxieties and beliefs could be addressed. Thus, this thesis seeks to analyze the English cultural impressions, or images of 'the Turk' and Islam in the aftermath of Restoration of monarchy focusing on the dramatic representations of the period.

The history of the relationship between Christendom and Islam has been marked largely by mutual misunderstanding resulted from cultural images through which one viewed and judged the other.[1] Within the context of this conflict between the Christendom and Islam, Norman Daniel points out that "[b]y misapprehension and misrepresentation an idea of the beliefs and practices of one society can pass into the accepted myths of another society in a form so distorted that its relation to the original facts is sometimes barely discernible."[2] In other words, the European image of the Muslim world was based on misapprehension and misrepresentation exacerbated by cultural impressions. On the one hand, for the Muslim, "Christianity was an abrogated religion, which its followers absurdly insisted on retaining, instead of accepting God's final word."[3] On the other hand,

[1] A. Blake Denton, "The Medieval Canon and the Renaissance Image of the Turk: A Brief Historiography of Pre-Modern European Conceptions of the Muslim World," *Madison Historical Review*. Vol. 12, Article 5. (2015): 1.

[2] Norman Daniel, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1962), 2.

[3] Bernard Lewis, *Islam and the West* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 7.

Christendom regarded Islam as a deviant form of Christian faith, as a "heresy" or "a false doctrine."[4] This long and unfinished rivalry for the role of world religion between Christendom and Islam was expressed, confirmed or modified by the subsequent relationship between the two.

The religious aspect of this relationship between Western civilization and the Muslim world shaped the frameworks in which the European Christians expressed their animosity towards Muslims and united them as "Islam was reckoned the greatest enemy of the Christian Church."[5] Since Islamic conquest of Spain in 711 AD, the Christians led an intermittent war of conquest to recapture Christian lands which were under Islamic domination for about 800 years. With the advent of crusades against the Seljuk Turks in the eleventh century, much of the ideology of *Reconquista* was transmitted into the context of crusading.[6] Following Seljuk Turks' decline, a more powerful Islamic Empire appeared extending its territories from Eastern Europe to the Middle East and North Africa. The Ottomans created a world power extending over three continents, inhabited by very different races, and enjoyed a rich and diverse culture, vast lands and resources, and a flourishing economy.[7] The Ottoman conquests in southeastern Europe followed by a rapid Ottoman expansion into the heart of Europe affirmed Ottoman omnipresence in the world and led many European states to acknowledge Ottoman superiority. By 1600, Christian European states including Spain, France, Italy, Germany, were forced to accept Ottoman Empire as a military, commercial and a diplomatic force. Meanwhile, English relations with the Ottomans were established nearly a hundred years after the establishment of relations between the Turks and other Eurpean states. Although the English did not have any diplomatic relations with the Ottoman Empire in the aftermath of the conquest of Constantinople, the economic developments of the sixteenth century led the English to establish mercantile relationship with the Ottomans. Especially lucrative Mediterranean trade tempted the Englishmen who sought their fortune between English ports and Mediterranean destinations including Ottoman Porte. In this respect, this thesis asserts that

[4] Ibid., 7.
[5] Norman Daniel, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1962), 2.
[6] Öz Öktem, "The Representation of the Muslim Woman in Early Modern English Drama," (Ph.D., Diss. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2013), 10.
[7] Bernard Lewis, *Islam and the West* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 8.

superiority of Islamic power which was in possession of vast resources and extensive territories led the Europeans to establish friendly relations with the Ottomans.[8]

The intensified commercial and cultural contact with the Ottomans in the multicultural Mediterranean was accompanied by an explosion of all kinds of printed materials about the Ottoman Empire and the idea of 'the Turk.' Since 'the Turk' was not only 'the Other' or a commerce partner but also a threat penetrating into Europe day by day, the European interest showed a great increase. In the sixteenth century alone, more than three thousand texts dealing with 'the Turk' appeared in Europe; and this number was greater for the seventeenth century.[9] Most of these materials were official reports and records, historical accounts or travelogues written by merchants or the personal letters of the ambassadors and diplomats. According to Daniel, the production of the image of 'the Turk' by early modern texts widely derived from the conceptions of Islam held in medieval Europe that regarded Islam as an inherently violent religion and prophet Muhammed as a devious and sexually promiscuous religious leader.[10] These conceptions, well rooted in European consciousness, were forged during early modern period. Similarly, Robert Schwoebel notes that the early modern image of 'the Turk' was widely influenced by medieval conceptions of Islam and he maintains that "[e]ven under the pressure of momentous change [Europeans] clung tenaciously to established categories and adapted a large body of new information to the forms of thought and expression developed in the anti-Moslem and crusading literature of the Middle Ages."[11] That is, the early modern image of 'the Turk' included medieval images. Burton also argues that anti-Islamic polemic that reached back at least as far as the seventh century was projected forward onto the Ottomans constructing "the Turk as amoral barbarian, inhuman scourge, and even anti-Christ…"[12] Nancy Bisaha extends this argument innovatively adapting classical sources to the conflict between the Europeans and the Turks. Bisaha clearly acknowledges medieval influences on Renaissance humanist discourse; however, she further argues that the judgement of 'the Turk' was not solely based on religious difference, but on cultural and

[8] Öz Öktem, "The Representation of the Muslim Woman in Early Modern English Drama," (Ph.D. Diss., Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2013), 23.
[9] Jonathan Burton, *Traffic and Turning Islam and English Drama 1579-1624* (Cranbury: Rosemont Publishing, 2005), 22.
[10] Norman Daniel, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1962), 274-276.
[11] Robert Schwoebel, *The Shadow of the Crescent: The Renaissance Image of the Turk, 1453-1517* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1969), ix-x.
[12] Jonathan Burton, *Traffic and Turning Islam and English Drama 1579-1624* (Cranbury: Rosemont Publishing, 2005), 23.

political aspects as well adding the notion of "the new barbarian" to the early modern image of 'the Turk.'[13]

The early modern texts dealing with 'the Turk' including official reports, historical accounts and travelogues clearly drew on medieval European images. According to Amanda Wunder "sixteenth-century traveling antiquarians both built on and complicated – but ultimately fail to topple – the stereotypical rendering of the Turk as a barbaric warrior that was prevalent in Europe at the time."[14] In other words, these reports, accounts, and travelogues were expected to be based on actual encounters with the Turks; however they widely derived from common medieval European images of Islam. These official reports, historical accounts and travelogues proved to be a lasting source of fascination for early modern playwrights who produced dramatic representations of 'the Turk' drawing on conventional stereotypes recorded in these texts. At the center of these texts, "The 'Great Turk' as the Sultan was known was often figured as a ranting autocrat who slaughtered his siblings upon taking the throne only to luxuriate, in the decadent splendor of the seraglio."[15] In these figurations, the Turks were frequently associated with barbarity, oriental despotism and sensual weakness functioning as the counter identity for European Christians. In this respect, 'The Turk' was a popular theme that fascinated English dramatists who reproduced the image of 'the Turk' in their dramatic representations. Louis Wann draws attention to English fascination with 'the Turk' and states that forty seven plays staged Islamic themes and characters in the period between 1579 and 1642 and thirty one of these plays especially dealt with the Ottoman Turks and their history.[16] Wann's "The Orient in Elizabethan Drama" (1915) is regarded as the starting point for scholarly research on the representation of 'the Other'' in early modern English literature. Samuel Chew's *The Crescent and the Rose: Islam and Britain during the Renaissance* (1926) which came a decade later Wann's research deals especially with the Islamic Other focusing on the extent of the presence of Muslims in English literature and Western perception of Islam. Brandon Beck's *From the Rising of the Sun: English Images of the Ottoman Empire* (1987) and Kim Hall's *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and*

[13] Nancy Bisaha, *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 8-9, 43-44.
[14] Amanda Wunder, "Western Travelers, Eastern Antiquities, and the Image of the Turk in Early Modern Europe," *Journal of Early Modern History* 7, No. 1/2 (2003): 92-93.
[15] Jonathan Burton, *Traffic and Turning Islam and English Drama 1579-1624* (Cranbury: Rosemont Publishing, 2005), 23.
[16] Louis Wann, "The Orient in Elizabethan Drama" *Modern Philology* 12, No. 7 (1915): 439.

Gender in Early Modern England (1995) also focus on the Islamic Other on the English stage.[17]

Recently, in his *Islam and Britain, 1558-1685* (1998) and *Turks Moors and Englishmen in the Age of Disovery* (1999), Nabil Matar sheds light on the English representations of Islam and 'the Turk' challenging Edward Said's simple dichotomy of the West and the East. According to Said's *Orientalism* (1978), the West and the East has been contrasted and completed each other since antiquity and the distinction between the West and the East was based on "*positional* supeirority" of the West.[18] However, it can be misleading to apply Said's assertion of Western superiority to the East to the period before the eighteenth century, since the power relations in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were the opposite of the eighteenth century and onwards. In other words, until the eighteenth century the European powers were subordinated to Islamic power and the "relationship was one of anxiety and awe on the part of Europeans."[19] Thus, Matar concludes that it can be misleading to apply Orientalist point of view to the period before the eighteenth century since the English could not assert possession or dominaton in their relations with the Muslims.[20] Especially after 2000, Daniel Vitkus, Gerald Maclean, Jonathan Burton, Linda McJannet and Matthew Dimmock turn attention to the Islamic superiority before the eighteenth century analyzing all aspects of the representations of 'the Turk' in the period. These influential researches not only challenge Said's simple binarism of the superior West and inferior East, but also shift attention to the representation of the Turks in some less known early modern plays. Especially in his *Turning Turk, English Theatre and the Multicultural Mediterranean* (2003), Vitkus emphasizes Ottoman economic superiority in the Mediterranean trade and states that it can be misleading to apply Said's postcolonial theory to analyze the early modern English representation of Islam, since England was not "a conquering, colonizing power" until the Union in 1707.[21] Rather, as Gerald Maclean argues in his *Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800* (2007), the English were a relatively unimportant nation bent on competing with Spain for New World riches and the feeling that the English experienced in

[17] Seda Erkoç, "Repercussions of a Murder: The Death of Sehzade Mustafa on Early Modern English Stage," (Ph.D. Diss., Central European Society, 2008), 3-4.
[18] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 2, 7.
[19] Daniel J. Vitkus, "Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Europe," *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other.* Ed. David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), 209-210.
[20] Nabil Matar, *Islam in Britain, 1556-1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 11.
[21] Daniel J. Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 6.

their relations with the Ottomans was "imperial envy."[22] In other words, Ottoman superiority aroused complex and ambivalent attitudes of 'fear and desire' for early modern Englishmen. That is, they were fascinated with the power of Islamic Empire, while at the same time they were anxious of conversion to Islam or the phenomenon of "turning Turk.' According to Vitkus, early modern representations of Islam, as in later Western discourses, demonized Islamic people to produce "imaginary resolutions of real anxieties about Islamic wealth and might" in order to overshadow "Christian West's inferiority complex."[23] That is, dramatization of deformed Islamic image in early modern stage productions do not justify Western superiority but fear of militarily, economically, and culturally superior Islamic rival.

Following early moden scholarly activity on representation of 'the Other,' recent scholarly reevaluation of the Turks and Islam turns attention to Interregnum and Restoration England's perception of 'the Other.' Critics like Byron Smith, Bridget Orr, and Matthew Birchwood indicate that the relationship between Ottoman Turks and Restoration England was influenced primarily by the political dynamics of the period. *Islam in English Literature* (1939), Smith argues that English literature of Restoration period was free from the anxiety of Turkish aggressions over Europe. In parallel with this altered attitude towards the Ottomans, the dramatization of Muslim Turk characters was "decorative"[24] referring to the political anxieties of the period. In her *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (2001), Orr argues that the context of Restoration drama was shaped by English imperial ambitions and the theater "became an instrument of empire."[25] Orr maintains that between 1660 and 1714, at least forty plays set in Asia or the Levant appeared on the London stage. They were almost, all serious, heroic plays or tragedies that showed how the Eastern empires torn by civil strife, harem intrigues, oriental despotism besides conflict with European states.[26] Essentially, representation of the East on Restoration stage aimed to display *difference* of 'the Other' in order to contribute to the formation of imperial English identity. In his *Britain and Barbary, 1589-1689* (2005), Nabil Matar traces the relation between Restoration drama and Restoration England's imperial ambitions

[22] Gerald Maclean, *Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 20.
[23] Daniel J. Vitkus, "Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Europe," *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other.* Ed. David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), 210.
[24]Byron Porter Smith, *Islam in English Literature*, 2nd Ed. (New York: Caravan Books, 1939), 37.
[25] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 27.
[26] Ibid., 61.

following maritime victories in the second half of the seventeenth century.[27] In his *Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685* (2007), Matthew Birchwood argues that in the period under study "the Idea of lslam was a volatile mixture of longstanding anxieties centered upon the Ottoman Empire as a spiritual and military threat, combined with esteem for its cultural and imperial achievements."[28] Furthermore, Birchwood argues that the East was transfigured by "the lens of English politics" upon the "religious and political anxieties at home."[29] In other words, mid- seventeenth century drama was intentionally drawn to Islamic subjects and settings in order to reflect England's political and religious anxieties including Revolution, Regicide, Restoration and Exclusion Crisis. Susan J. Owen remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> These texts were closely and ferociously engaged with their times. Of course they are written within the dominant discourse of their times, which they in turn employ and embody, but the playwrights also, successfully or unsuccessfully, wrench these discourses to their purpose.[30]

According to Owen, the playwrights reflected the period's political and religious concerns in which they produced their plays. In that sense, this study aims to analyze representation of 'the Other' on Restoration stage focusing on the Ottoman Turks. It is certain that despite the efforts of recent scholars, many texts are awaiting to be read with a more critical eye on the representation of 'the Other.' Earlier critics ignored the rich variety of plays written in Restoration period focusing almost exclusively on 'Comedy of Manners' written by Dryden, Congreve, Wycherly, and Etherege. Deborah Payne Fisk asserts that although "the witty language of Restoration comedies was thought to be its jewel," it is important to realize the heterogeneity of Restoration theatre; its rich variety of dramatic forms and innovations as well as its complex representations of political and social events appealing to people from all walks of life.[31] Therefore, this thesis focuses non-canonical but innovative heroic plays of Restoration period that especially dramatized Ottoman Turks and history. Hence, this thesis tries to reach a deeper reading of these texts than the present literature offers analyzing Ottoman Turk stereotypes in less known Restoration heroic plays.

---

[27] Nabil Matar, *Britain and Barbary, 1589-1689* (Gainesville: Florida University Press, 2005), 133.
[28] Matthew Birchwood, *Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685* (Cambridge: DS Brewer, 2007), 184.
[29] Ibid.,5- 8.
[30] Susan J. Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 21.
[31] Deborah Payne Fisk, *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), xvi.

In order to achieve this end, this thesis will primarily conduct a discourse analysis to analyze representation of the Turks in Western writings scrutinizing medieval anti-Islamic polemic, crusading rhetoric and early modern texts regarding 'the Turks.' The aim of discourse analysis is to determine how the Western *stereotype* of the Turks was constructed and transmitted into subsequent texts. Therefore, the objective of this tesis is to determine the continuity and consistency of the stereotypical representation of the Turks tracing the influence of previous discourses on Restoration dramatic representations and to assert that selected plays sustained stereotypical image of 'the Turk'. In this context, William Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes* (1663), Roger Boyle's *The Tragedy of Mustapha* (1668), Henry Neville Payne's *The Siege of Constantinople* (1675), and Elkanah Settle's *Ibrahim the Illustrious Bassa* (1676) aim to evoke preconceived notions of Ottoman Turks embedded in Western consciousness. Andrew Wheatcroft remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> Soon mendacity, dissimulation and rapacity were also being presented as characteristically *Ottoman* vices. Add to these the all-too-easily imagined scarlet lusts and violent passions of the Harem, and the old stereotypes of the …the Ensanguined Turks were reinforced, not displaced by the contact with reality.[32]

It is obvious that Western discourse reproduced Ottoman Turk stereotypes turning attention to the harem pleasures, inherent tyranny in Ottoman practices, moral weakness and corruption in Turkish characters rather than displaying real contacts. Thus, the characteristics associated with the Ottomans were based on imagination rather than facts and experience. In other words, subsequent Western discourses concerning the Turks not only represented stereotypical Ottoman Turk image but also reinforced the old stereotypes established in previous discourses. Accordingly, the first chapter of this thesis aims to introduce the theoretical concepts that will be used in this thesis in order to examine representation of the Ottoman Turks in Western discourse. Therefore, multiple theoretical concepts will be clarified. First of all, the notion of *difference* in system of representation, Michel Foucault's premises on *discourse/knowledge/power* and Stuart Hall's statements on *representation* in cultural studies will be clarified. Then, Edward Said's *Orientalism* and the role of 'the Other' in European identity formation will be discussed. Even though Ottoman superiorty in the period before the eighteenth century disrupted order and stability

[32] Andrew Wheatcroft, *The Ottomans* (London: Viking, 1993), 210.

of Western binary oppositions of Self/Other, the West/the East, and Christian/Muslim, the Ottoman Turks were demonized in English cultural productions. In the production of these dramatic representations, as Nabil Matar notes, "simplification and stereotyping were the rules by which [the English] represented Muslims"[33] although the English were subordinated to Islamic power. In that sense, the concept of *stereotype* will be dealt with in cultural, psychoanalytical, and ideological sense. These theoretical concepts not only will be utilized in order to analyze stereotypical representation of the Ottoman Turks in Western discourse focusing on Restoration period, but also trace the role of the Ottoman Turks in Western identity formation process. In the second part of the first chapter, this thesis turns attention to the representation of the Turks in Western discourse scrutinizing the Western perception of Islam and the Turks in medieval anti-Islamic polemic, crusading rhetoric, and early modern texts.

The first part of the following chapter will elaborate on specifically Richard Knolles's image of 'the Turk' as "the Present Terrour of the World" and historical development of this image in English drama. Accordingly, this part focuses on early modern English discourse of the Turks and English anxiety of 'turning Turk' drawing attention to the Mediterranean trade and English encounter with 'the Other' in multicultural Mediterranean. That is, this part aims at analyzing stereotypical representation of the Turks and the phenomenon of 'turning Turk' in selected early modern English plays including Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine the Great Part I* (1586) and *Part II* (1587), Robert Greene's *Selimus, Emperour of the Turks* (1594), and William Shakespeare's *Othello* (1604). The second part of this chapter will deal with English-Ottoman relations following Restoration of 1660, Restoration anxiety of Ottoman style absolutism under the light of Paul Rycaut's *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (1668) and its influence on dramatic representations of the period. In this context, this part will trace emergence of 'heroic play' in the aftermath of Restoration of monarchy that played a crucial role in building a new monarchy and culture due to its propagandist nature promoting national greatness and national consensus.

In the last chapter of this work, selected non-canonical heroic plays that dealt with Ottoman history and sultans will be analyzed. In the aftermath of Restoration, many heroic plays, showing Ottoman Empire torn by domestic strife, harem intrigues, and moral

[33] Nabil Matar, *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 14.

corruption appeared on the London stage. In this respect, these dramatic representations allow Islam and Christanity to share the stage together for propagandistic purposes. In other words, these dramatic representations attempt "to put a representative [Other] in front of Europe, to *stage* the [Other] and Europe together in some coherent way, the idea being for Christians to make it clear to Muslims that Islam was just a misguided version of Christianity."[34] In other words, these dramatic representations aim to reinforce the *difference* between Self/Other, the West/the East, and Christianity/Islam staging turbulent episodes in Ottoman history. That is, political effects of sultanic tyranny, absolutism, inherent cruelty in Ottoman practices, polygamy, and sensual weakness of Ottoman sultans were staged in these heroic plays that played an important role in the construction of the emergent ideology of empire. In this context, William Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes* (1663) will be examined in terms of, first its genre as heroic play, and then, its attitude towards *stereotype* of 'raging and expansionist Turk.' The main discussion about the play will be centred on the representation of Ottoman quest for endless expansion, harem politics, and sensual despotism that stigmatized Ottoman Empire as a negative exemplar for the English monarchy. The second play to be analyzed is *The Tragedy of Mustapha* (1668) written by Roger Boyle. Following the tradition of William Davenant, Boyle turns attention to a widely reported Ottoman story in Western writings, the story of Sehzade Mustafa's death in 1553. The play's emphasis on inherent cruelty in Ottoman practices and the stereotype of 'cruel Turk' will be explored and scrutinized. The third play to be analyzed is Henry Neville Payne's *The Siege of Constantinople* (1675). Following the tradition of heroic play, Payne draws his plot on Sultan Mehmed II's reign. In this play, the main discussion will be centred around the Ottoman style absolutism and arbitrary governance system tracing the image of 'absolute Turk.' The last play to be anlayzed is Elkanah Settle's *Ibrahim the Illustrious Bassa* (1676). The play returns to the ever-popular reign of Suleiman the Magnificent and will be examined in terms of its attitude towards sensual weakness of Turkish sultan that jeopardized the State's stability.

Hence, this thesis aims to fill a gap in the literature on these plays through direct references to the historical accounts that recorded these episodes to see uniquely European additions in the process of reconstruction of Ottoman episodes. These plays that dealt with the conquest of Rhodes, Sehzade Mustapha's death, the siege of Constantinople, and the campaign against Persia primarily aim to reinforce the cultural and religious *difference*

[34] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 61.

between the Ottomans and the English staging episodes from Ottoman history. In that sense, this thesis attempts to show that these historical episodes were reconstructed in Restoration tradition of ‘heroic play’ in code of love and honor drawing on preconceived notions of Islam and ‘the Turk’ embedded in Western consciousness. This analysis of the plays will be helpful for a deeper understanding of the representations that one encounters in these plays.

CHAPTER 1

THEORETICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

1.1. System of Representation, Discourse and Identity Formation

System of Representation

The concept of representation has an important place in cultural studies. In this respect, this analysis aims to introduce the practices of representation that are frequently referred in cultural studies. Then what does representation mean? According to Stuart Hall, representation is an essential part of the meaning production. It produces meaning by the help of language, signs and images which stand for or represent things.[35] By the help of language, representation systematically produces the meaning of the concepts in our minds; that is correlation of the 'things' (objects, people, events) with the concepts enables a meaningful interpretation of the world within a "system." Hall argues that "the relation between 'things', concepts and signs lies at the heart of the production of meaning in language. The process which links these three elements together is what we call 'representation.'"[36] That is to say, the relation between 'things' in the world, concepts in our minds and signs (words, sounds, images) that produce meaning in language also produce representation.

Representation of meaning works through three approaches: the reflective, the intentional and the constructivist.[37] In the reflective approach, language intends to reflect the truth since true meaning is thought to lie in the real world. In the intentional approach, the speaker/author intends to impose his or her unique meaning on the world through language. That is to say, the meaning is intentional depending on the producer. In the constructivist approach, it is acknowledged that the meaning in language cannot be produced by mere 'things' or individual users but by concepts and signs. In other words, we construct meaning through concepts and signs; that is, meaning can not be conveyed

[35] Stuart Hall, *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. (London: Sage Publications, 1997b), 15-18.
[36] Ibid., 19.
[37] Ibid., 24.

through material world but through the language system we are using to represent our concepts.[38]

Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure's premises have greatly influenced the social constructionist view of language and representation. For the purposes of this analysis, rather than his great contribution to modern linguistics, Saussure's general view of representation in cultural fields has held a great importance. Jonathan Culler remarks on Saussure's premises on language and meaning and points out that "[l]anguage is a system of signs," so "the production of meaning depends on language."[39] According to Saussure, there is the *form* and the *concept:* the first element, the *signifier*, and the second element the *signified*. Put it simply, the 'thing' we hear or read or see is the *signifier*, it correlates with the *signified* and the *sign* is the union of them. Both *signifier* and *signified* are required for the production of meaning but the relation between them constructs representation. The first principle of Saussure's theory of language is that: "there is no natural or inevitable link between the signifier and the signified."[40] In other words, the relation between the *signifier* and the *signified* is arbitrary; then, that there is no universal fixed meaning. In short, the meaning is subject to change. This principle leads us to another important principle of Saussure's theory of language: "both signifier and signified are purely relational or differential entities."[41] Occasionally, what signifies is the *difference* between the signs rather than the essence of them, so *difference* plays a crucial role in the process of meaning production within language and the basic way that leads us to mark *difference* is the binary opposition. That is, the difference between the signs defined in relation to another's direct opposite as in night/day produces meaning of the words or concepts.[42] Moreover, these concepts are not autonomous entities but they operate with other concepts within a "system" and they are defined by their relations with each other.[43]

Discourse/Knowledge/Power

Nowadays, many societies aspire to become "Western" in terms of achieving Western standards of living. Turkey's journey, for instance, to be a "European" country started over four decades ago with Ankara Agreement (1963) struggling to make up the

[38] Ibid., 25.
[39] Jonathan D. Culler, *Saussure* (London: Fontana/Collins, 1976), 19.
[40] Ibid., 19.
[41] Ibid., 23
[42] Stuart Hall, *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (London: Sage Publications. 1997b), 31.
[43] Jonathan D. Culler, *Saussure* (London: Fontana/Collins, 1976), 24.

Copenhagen criteria. In one of his speeches in 2003, Romano Prodi, the President of the European Commission, puts forward that "We Europeans earnestly hope that these [European] values can be shared by all our neighbors and partners, however diverse their cultures and traditions."[44] Upon this quotation, the formation of the concepts 'West', 'Western', or 'Europe', 'European' will be clarified and the contribution of different cultures and traditions, non-Western cultures, to these concepts will be analyzed. In other words, this analysis will be based on how different cultures, non-Western cultures, contribute to the formation of 'West's identity. According to Stuart Hall, 'West' and 'Western' represent very complex ideas since these words not only refer to a geography or location but they also refer to a type of society, a level of development, values, and traditions. That is, "the West" is a *historical* construct, rather than a geographical one since to be "Western" is the outcome of a specific set of economic, political, social and cultural processes. Hall adds that "the West is therefore an idea, a concept."[45] The idea of "the West" enables us to qualify and classify societies as "Western" and "non-Western." This classification reduces different characteristics of different cultures and societies to a composite picture then *represents* these differences through a "system of representation." Based on *difference*, "the West" compares and evaluates "non-West," in other words "it functions as an ideology."[46] It enables people a certain structure and thought, it produces knowledge. In this context, I will argue that in the construction of "the West," Europe's contact and self-comparison with 'the Other,' non-Western societies, plays a vital role since the West measures its achievements against the *difference* of these non-Western cultures that provides a context in which the idea of 'the West' is shaped.[47]

According to French linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, as clarified above, rather than the essence of ideas/concepts, the *difference* enables them to carry a meaning. In the formation of Western identity the process of comparison and categorization based on a system of *difference* played a vital role. As Hall emphasizes that the national cultures acquired their sense of identity by comparison with other cultures and *difference* from them. He remarks this phenomenon as follows:

---

[44] Council of the European Union, "Copenhagen European Council, Presidency Conclusions" Retrieved from: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ ec/73842.pdf, 29 January 2003
[45]Stuart Hall, "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power," *Formations of Modernity*, Ed. Stuart Hall and Gieben Bram (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), 186.
[46] Ibid., 186.
[47] Ibid., 187.

> The West's sense of itself- its identity- was formed not only by the internal processes that gradually molded Western European countries into a distinct type of society, but also through Europe's sense of difference from other worlds how it came to represent itself in relation to these "others."[48]

According to Hall, construction of Western or non-Western not only derives from historical, political, social, and cultural processes, but also from a categorization and comparison process based on a system of *difference*. As a 'system of representation,' the discourse asserts this *difference* and divides the world into a simple dichotomy of the West/the East. This 'system of representation' reduces this dichotomy to a unified and homogenous structure posing the West as superior and the East as inferior within this structure. Simply put, representation of the world as divided according to the dichotomy of the West/the East is an outcome of Europe's representation of itself in relation to non-European cultures based on *difference*. In this process of representation, Europe's expansion and encounter with non-European cultures has held a vital role. Hall divides Europe's expansion into five main phases[49] and especially focuses on first two phases defined as the period of exploration (1430-1498) and the period of early contact, conquest, settlement, and colonization (1492-1502) when the idea of the East/West was formed.[50] These periods, dating back to the early Portuguese explorations of the African coast then Columbus's voyages to the New World, were regarded as vital to the formation of the idea of "the West" whose construction was enabled by the idea of "the East." John Roberts points out this phenomenon as follows:

> The conquest of the high seas was the first and greatest of all the triumphs over natural forces which were to lead to the domination by western civilization of the whole globe. Knowledge is power, and the knowledge

[48] Ibid., 188.
[49] Stuart Hall states that the process of expansion can be divided, broadly into five main phases:1. The period of exploration, when Europe "discovered" many of the "new worlds" for itself fort he first time (they all, of course, already existed. 2. The period of early contact, conquest, settlement, and colonization, when large parts of these "new worlds" were first annexed to Europe as possessions, or harnassed through trade. 3. The time during which the shape of permanent European settlement, colonization, or exploration was established. Capitalism now emerged as a global market. 4. The phase when the scramble for colonies, markets, and raw materials reached its climax. This was the "high noon of Imperialism," and led into World War I and the twentieth century. 5. The present, when much of the World is economically dependent on the West, even when formally independent and decolonized. Stuart Hall, "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power," *Formations of Modernity*, Ed. Stuart Hall and Gieben Bram (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), 190, 191.
[50] Ibid., 190.

> won by the first systematic explorers…had opened the way to the age of western world hegemony.[51]

As Roberts argues European conquests provided them knowledge that they would use to exert Western domination over rest of the world. These conquests also provided Western European countries with an idea of 'unique' civilization despite many internal differences. More importantly, in the construction of the collective idea of "the West," Islamic challenge played a remerkaby important role. As Roberts argues Christianity was central to the idea of "the West", since the concepts "Europe" and "Christendom" were virtually identical. According to him what makes European civilization distinct and unique in the eye of Westerner is essentially Christianity. The encounter with Muslim world during these two periods stated above, especially religious *difference* promoted a growing sense of superiority and internal cohesion that Roberts calls a "Eurocentric" view of the world.[52] The "Eurocentric" worldview or the idea of "the West" formed *discourses* in which Europe began to describe the *difference* between "Western" and "non-Western" societies during the course of Western expansion into the East.

A *discourse* simply means "a coherent or rational body of speech or writing; a speech or sermon" in language.[53] However, in identity formation context *discourse* "is a group of statements which provide a language for talking about- i.e. a way of representing- a particular kind of knowledge about a topic."[54] Foucault uses the word "representation" in a narrower sense, since the point that concerns him is the production of knowledge through *discourse* rather than just meaning through language. As Foucault puts it "relations of power, not relations of meaning" are his main concern:

> Here I believe one's point of reference should not be to the great model of language (langue) and signs, but to that of war and battle. The history which bears and determines us has the form of a war rather than that of a language: relations of power not relations of meaning.[55]

Foucault's approach is much more historically grounded than the semiotic approach. That is, Foucault shifts our attention from Sausserian signs to Foucaldian

---

[51] J. M. Roberts, *The Triumph of the West* (London: British Broadcasting Corporation, 1985), 194.
[52] Ibid., 202.
[53]Stuart Hall, "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power," *Formations of Modernity*, Ed. Stuart Hall and Gieben Bram (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), 201.
[54] Ibid., 201.
[55]Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972 - 1977*, Ed. C. Gordon, Trans. C. Gordon and Others (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), 114.

discursive statements related to each other. According to Foucault, a discourse consists of several statements intertwining with each other to form a "discursive formation." In Foucault's terms, "statements different in form, and dispersed in time, form a group if they refer to one and the same object."[56] The statements made within a particular discourse, mean something and are true within a specific historical context and historical period. That is, the knowledge produced by discourse differs from context to context and period to period with no necessary continuity between them.[57] To put it another way, the statements in a discourse provide a specific knowledge about a topic, more importantly a way of representing. Foucault's discussion of discourse/knowledge provides a context in which the relations between the West and the East will be clarified.

In the discourse of "the West and the Rest," it is easy to trace how the West behaves towards the Rest. As stated above, European explorations and the conquests contributed to the formation of the idea of "the West" whose construction was enabled by the idea of "the East." Furthermore, these explorations enabled systematic explorers with knowledge/power that would lead to the Western authority over rest of the world. Within this context, the discourse of "the West and the Rest" was produced by the Westerners who positioned themselves as the subjects of this discourse. Foucault remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> To describe a formulation *qua* statement does not consist in analyzing the relations between the author and what he says (or wanted to say, or said without wanting to); but in determining what position can and must be occupied by any individual if he is to be the subject of it.[58]

It can be inferred that a discourse constructs a position from which it makes sense and positions its performer as the subject of the discourse. Occasionally, in the discourse of "the West and the Rest," "the West" holds a superior position as the subject of the discourse. Furthermore, a *discourse* is not a closed system that means it incorporates elements of other discourses into its network of meaning. That is, "traces of past discourses

[56]Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, Trans. Alan Sheridan Smith (New York*:* Pantheon Books, 1972), 32.
[57]Stuart Hall, *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (London: Sage Publications, 1997b), 46.
[58]Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, Trans. Alan Sheridan Smith (New York*:* Pantheon Books, 1972), 95-96.

remain embedded in more recent discourses of 'the West'"[59] since Western discourse drew on the earlier discourse of 'Christendom.' Reading the discourse of "the West and the Rest" as an open system, as Hall argues, I argue that historical facts refer to early writings, speeches and chronicles and cite preceding academic research and texts that is called *intertextuality*. In other words, *intertextuality* means each text exist in reation to the other texts.[60] This term was coined by Julia Kristeva in order to indicate that history is inserted into a text and a text is inserted into history. Kristeva's concept of *intertextuality* is paraphrased by Fairclough as follows:

> By 'the insertion of history into a text', she means that the text absorbs in and is built out of texts from the past (texts being the major artifacts that constitute history). By 'the insertion of the text into history', she means that the text responds to, re-accentuates, and reworks past texts, and in so doing helps to make history and contributes to wider processes of change, as well as anticipating and trying to shape subsequent texts.[61]

Kristeva's concept of *intertextuality* is employed by Hall in his discussion of the discourse of "the West and the Rest." Keeping in mind Kristeva's assertion, the subsequent texts, regardless of genres, are also influenced and shaped by previous historical discourse. In this context, Foucault's notion of *discourse* and Kristeva's notion of *intertextuality* are interrelated with each other and present an invaluable path for the analysis of Western representations of the Turks. Based on Foucault's aforementioned statements, I assert that the Western discourse, in Hall's terms the discourse of "the West and the Rest," drawing on early writings, speeches and chronicles, sustains stereotypical representations of the Turks within this discourse. In other words, the early relationship between Christendom and Islam, the rise of the Ottoman Empire as a world power, and European anxiety of Turkish expansion into the heart of Europe resulted in negative representations of the Turks in Western discourse creating a "discursive practice" that constructed the stereotypical Turk image.[62] Hence, negative representations of of the Turks produced by Western discourse eventually became common knowledge. Then, how does discourse achieve this? According to Foucault, the knowledge produced by discourse constitutes a

[59]Stuart Hall, "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power," *Formations of Modernity*, Ed. Stuart Hall and Gieben Bram (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), 202.
[60] Nevsal Olcen Tiryakioğlu, "The Western Image of Turks from the Middle Ages to the 21st Cnetury: The Myth of 'Terrible Turk' and 'Lustful Turk,'" (Ph.D. Diss., Nottingham Trent University, 2015), 32.
[61]Norman Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change* (Cambridge: Polity Press. 1993/2009), 102.
[62] Nevsal Olcen Tiryakioğlu, "The Western Image of Turks from the Middle Ages to the 21st Cnetury: The Myth of 'Terrible Turk' and 'Lustful Turk,'" (Ph.D. Diss. Nottingham Trent University, 2015), 33.

kind of power; knowledge and power are directly related to each other as he defines this relation as "a power-relation."[63] Then, those who produce the discourse also have the power to enforce its validity. Hall draws our attention to the exercise of knowledge in practice and points out that "it was never a simple matter of the West just looking, seeing and describing the Rest" but a matter of describing and representing with its own cultural categories and preconceptions.[64] To put it differently, discourses produce meaningful knowledge and this knowledge influences social practices. Hall further remarks that discourses not only enable production of knowledge but also circulation of power; when discourses operate effectively in circulation of power, it is called a "regime of truth." Foucault remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> Truth isn't outside power, or lacking in power… Truth is a thing of this world; it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true, the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true.[65]

It can be asserted that, when power operates in order to enforce its truth, it also forms a set of statements, in Foucault's terms, a "regime of truth" in which these statements make sense. Since discourses operate in relation to power, power has the authority to enforce truth of these statements. However, the thing more concerns is whether a discourse organizes and regulates relations of power effectively rather than it is true or false.[66] When discourses operate effectively in circulation of power, it is called a "regime of truth:" since "'Truth' is to be understood as a system of … circulation and operation of statements."[67] As Foucault puts it 'Truth' is interrelated with circulation of power which produces and sustains it. Foucault's notion of "regime of truth," provided by Edward Said's study of *Orientalism,* will be used as one of the basis for this thesis. Inspired by

[63]Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972 - 1977*, Ed. C. Gordon, Trans. C. Gordon and Others (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), 201.
[64]Stuart Hall, "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power," *Formations of Modernity*, Ed. Stuart Hall and Gieben Bram (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), 204.
[65]Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972 - 1977*, Ed. C. Gordon, Trans. C. Gordon and Others (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), 131.
[66]Stuart Hall, "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power," *Formations of Modernity*, Ed. Stuart Hall and Gieben Bram (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), 205.
[67] Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972 - 1977*, Ed. C. Gordon, Trans. C. Gordon and Others (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), 133.

Foucault's aforementioned concepts of discourse/knowledge/power, Said examines the dichotomy of "the West" and "the East" produced by a "regime of truth" that he calls *Orientalism*.

Orientalism

In *Orientalism*, Edward Said analyzes Western construction of the "Orient" through various discourses and institutions. Said calls this discourse "Orientalism" and defines it as "anyone who teaches, writes about, or researches the Orient…either in its specific or its general aspects, is an Orientalist, and what he or she does is Orientalism."[68] Said draws attention to the construction of "the Orient" by "Orientalism" that needs to be examined as a discourse. According to him, Western discourse is a systematic discipline produced by European culture to reinforce the distinction between "the West" and "the East." Said examines this distinction by questioning the works of Orientalists and decrees that Orientalism invents a fictitious 'Orient' by fostering misperceptions about the East:

> The Orient was almost a European invention, and had been since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences…The Orient is not only adjacent to Europe it is also…one of its deepest and most recurring images of the Other.[69]

Said examines the Orient's special place in European Western experience and asserts that "the Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience."[70] That is, the Orient is not mere a product of European imagination, but it is a complementary part of European civilization. Orientalism that needs to be examined as a discourse produces knowledge about the Orient and positions it as the object of this knowledge within Orientalist discourse. Said remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> My contention is that, without examining Orientalism as a discourse, one cannot possibly understand the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage – and even produce – the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period.[71]

[68]Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 2.
[69] Ibid., 1.
[70] Ibid., 2.
[71] Ibid., 3.

According to Said, Orientalism, as a Western discourse, enables the Europeans to produce knowledge about the Orient. The European disciplines, institutions, doctrines, and theses contribute to the production and perpetuation of the Orient and its scientific status. Although Orientalism repudiates existence of the East and regards it as a "career" for Westerners, the East is real and present for the West through its history and tradition of thought. In other words, "'Orient' and 'Occident' are man-made;" however "the West" and "the East" are facts reflecting each other although Orientalism demonstrates comparatively greater strength of the Occident (British, French, American).[72] In other words, as a discourse Orientalism produces knowledge about the Orient through configurations of power as Said argues:

> The relationship between Occident and Orient is relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony…The Orient was Orientalized not only because it was discovered to be "Oriental" in all those ways considered common place by an average nineteenth-century European, but also because it *could be* – that is, submitted to being – made Oriental.[73]

Orientalism as a discourse enables Europeans to speak for and represent the Orient, according to Said, from the end of the eighteenth century to the present. What gives this discourse its durability and strength is *hegemony* as identified by Antonio Gramsci to which "consent" is fundamental. According to Gramsci, certain cultural forms are established by "consent":

> The "spontaneous" consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group; this consent is "historically" caused by the prestige (and consequent confidence) which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production.[74]

For Gramsci, the influence of ideas or of institutions operates within civil society by consent through affiliations like schools, families, or unions. Then, certain cultural forms predominate over others, just as certain ideas are more influential than others.[75]

---

[72] Ibid., 4.
[73] Ibid., 6.
[74] Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, Ed. and Trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (London: ElecBook, 1999), 145.
[75] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 7.

Gramsci remarks on the hegemony of Western culture over the whole world culture as follows:

> Even if one admits that other cultures have had an importance and a significance in the process of "hierarchical" unification of world civilisation (and this should certainly be admitted without question), they have had a universal value only in so far as they have become constituent elements of European culture, which is the only historically and concretely universal culture—in so far, that is, as they have contributed to the process of European thought and been assimilated by it.[76]

Gramsci draws attention to the Western hegemony over the whole world culture and states that non-Western cultures are regarded as constituent elements of European culture. Taking this premise into consideration, Said regards Gramsci's concept of *hegemony* as vital to Orientalism, as Orientalism is indispensable to the construction of European identity: "European culture gained its strength and identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self."[77] In other words, the misrepresentations and misconceptions of the Orient produced by a conviction of Western superiority contributed to Eurpean identity formation and culture. This discourse that fosters misrepresentations and misconceptions of the Orient not only compelements European identity but also provides a controlling and dominating mechanism over the Orient through authoritative and academic, yet imaginative and mythical knowledge produced by the scholarship of Oriental Studies of the Western academic institutions.[78] From the late eighteenth century, "Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient" makes statements about the Orient, authorizes views of it, and rules over it.[79] In short, Orientalism, as a *discursive formation*, enables the Westerner to describe and rule over non-Western cultures.

The subjective knowledge and distorted imagery of non-Western cultures in Orientalist discourse have been utilized as academic knowledge reinforcing preconceived distinction between the West and the East since antiquity. As "a style of thought"

---

[76] Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, Ed. and Trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (London: ElecBook, 1999), 765.
[77] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 3.
[78] Nevsal Olcen Tiryakioğlu, "The Western Image of Turks from the Middle Ages to the 21st Cnetury: The Myth of 'Terrible Turk' and 'Lustful Turk,'" (Ph.D. Diss., Nottingham Trent University, 2015), 35.
[79] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 3.

Orientalism incorporates not only academic texts, but also the writings of Western authors, novelists, travel writers, poets, economists, and philosophers as Said remarks as follows:

> Orientalism is a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between "the Orient" and (most of the time) "the Occident." Thus a very large of writers, among whom are poets, novelists, philosophers, political theorists, economists, and imperial administrators, have accepted the basic distinction between East and West as the starting point for elaborate theories, epics, novels, social description, and political accounts concerning the Orient, its people, customs, "mind," destiny and so on. This Orientalism can accommodate Aeschylus, and Victor Hugo, Dante and Karl Marx.[80]

Said argues that Western writers like Aeschylus, Dante, Ariosto, Marlowe, Shakespeare, Milton, Tasso, Cervantes, Hugo, Flaubert, and Nerval fostered the simplistic and distorted image of the East that have contributed to the Orient myths. In other words, the preconceived distinction between the West and the East fostered in these writers' poems, novels, social descriptions, political accounts and cultural representations have served to the creation of the Orient myths. In this context, it is obvious that Orientalism, as a discourse, embodies traces of previous Western discourses that sustain preconceived distinction between the West and the East. Said particularly criticizes the preconceived distinction between the West and the East that lead to distorted image of Muslims in Orientalist discourse. The distorted Christian imagery of Islam, intensified during the Middle Ages and early modern period, was produced by "a large variety of poetry, learned controversy, and popular superstition." In other words, "Christian concept of Islam was integral and self-sufficient" and bore little resemblance to Islam in itself.[81] In that sense, European Christians' perception of Muslims as 'the Other' produced by the Western discourse, including the Crusade rhetoric, chronicles, sermons, humanist discourse, and the literary texts of early modern period, has enabled the West to construct 'the East' as a cultural opposite and position itself as superior 'Self.' In that sense, the Western discourse has provided a prejudiced archival knowledge of Islam as discussed before through Foucault's notion of *discursive formation.* This biased archival knowledge to which Western writers keep referring to has promoted misrepresentations about Islamic

[80] Ibid., 3.
[81] Ibid., 60, 61.

cultures.[82] Said draws attention to the *intertextuality* of Western writings that constantly refer to each other and defines Orientalism as 'an archive of information':

> In a sense Orientalism was a library or archive of information commonly and, in some of its aspects, unanimously held. What bound the archive together was a family of ideas and unifying set of values proven in various ways to be effective. These ideas explained the behavior of Orientals; the supplied Orientals with mentality, a geneaology, an atmosphere; most important, they allowed Europeans to deal with and even to see Orientals as a phenomenon possessing regular characteristics.[83]

It is clear that Orientalist discourse is an "archive," in Foucault's terms "regime of truth" in which a set of statements circulate effectively drawing on other discourses. Stuart Hall argues that there are four main sources for Said's "archive" of other discourses that the discourse of "the West and the Rest" draws on: classical knowledge, religious and biblical forces, mythology, and traveller's tales.[84] These discourses provide the Westerners with a framework through which they see, describe and represent the East. Furthermore, these discourses not only bring fact and fantasy together, but also underline this conflation that constituted "knowledge." Said notes that "Orientalism is the discipline by which the Orient was (and is) approached systematically, as a topic of learning, discovery and practice." He maintains that Orientalism "designates that collection of dreams, images, and vocabularies available to anyone who has tried to talk about what lies east of the dividing line."[85] In other words, Orientalist discourse enables the West a cultural framework to represent non-Western cultures, or "the Rest" as Hall defines that reduces these non-Western cultures to fixed homogenous characteristics. The images and metaphors of the East are constructed by a powerful European fantasy in Orientalist discourse. According to Said "the essence of Orientalism is the ineradicable distinction between Oriental inferiority and Western superiority."[86] To put it differently, although the difference between the West and the East is not as 'radical' as it is suggested by the Orientalist point of view, the division between the Islamic cultures and the European Christendom has constructed

[82] Nevsal Olcen Tiryakioğlu, "The Western Image of Turks from the Middle Ages to the 21st Cnetury: The Myth of 'Terrible Turk' and 'Lustful Turk,'" (Ph.D. Diss., Nottingham Trent University, 2015), 38.
[83] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 42.
[84] Stuart Hall, "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power," *Formations of Modernity*, Ed. Stuart Hall and Gieben Bram (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), 206.
[85] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 73.
[86] Ibid., 42.

'strong West' vs. 'weak East' fostering hostility between them.[87] Said remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> Orientalism can also express the strength of the West and the Orient's weakness – as seen by the West. Such strength and such weakness are as intrinsic to Orientalism as they are to any view that divides the world into large general divisions, entities that coexist in a state of tension produced by what is believed to be a radical difference. For that is the main intellectual issue raised by Orientalism. Can one divide human reality, as indeed human reality seems to be genuinely divided, into clearly different cultures, histories, traditions, societies, even races, and survive the consequences humanly? By surviving the consequences humanly, I mean to ask whether there is any way of avoiding the hostility expressed by the division, say, of men onto "us" (Westerners) and "they" (Orientals).[88]

The constructed radical distinction between "us"/"they" and "the West/the East" divide the world into general divisions although distinction between the West and the East is not as 'radical' as it is suggested by the Orientalist point of view. Similar to Hall's definition of the West as an ideological construct rather than a geographical one, Said defines the East as an ideological construct based on the simple dichotomy of the West and the East. According to Said, the East within Orientalist discourse cannot be regarded as mere signification of a geographic territory in the Near or Far East generally denoted "the distant and exotic:" rather the East stands for the Islamic East or "'militant' Orient."[89] In other words, Orientalist discourse utilizes a collection of images and words to describe the Orient. By "'militant' Orient" said clearly refers to the "Ottoman peril" as he remarks as follows:

> Not for nothing did Islam come to symbolize terror, devastation, the demonic, hordes of hated barbarians. For Europe, Islam was lasting trauma. Until the end of the seventeenth century the "Ottoman peril" lurked alongside Europe to represent for the whole of Christian civilization a constant danger, and in time European civilization incorporated that peril

[87] Nevsal Olcen Tiryakioğlu, "The Western Image of Turks from the Middle Ages to the 21st Cnetury: The Myth of 'Terrible Turk' and 'Lustful Turk,'" (Ph.D. Diss. Nottingham Trent University, 2015), 39.
[88] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 45.
[89] Ibid., 75.

and its lore, its great events, figures, virtues, and vices, as something woven into the fabric of life.[90]

Said's reference to the "Ottoman peril" corresponds to the military dominance of the Ottoman Empire and a constant Islamic threat for the Europeans until the end of the seventeenth century. However, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the Ottoman Empire was not only the military power of the world but also was superior to Europe in terms of economic and political aspects. Extending its territories from Eastern Europe to the Middle East and North Africa, the Ottoman Empire was the biggest Islamic Empire. Thus, the Ottoman power and domination in the Middle East, Mediterranean, and the Balkans disrupt the dichotomy of Western superiority against the Eastern inferiority until the end of 17th century. Although Said leaves the reader with the perception that "Europe is powerful and articulate; Asia is defeated and distant,"[91] when examining the Western discourse of Ottoman Turks between the 15th and 17th centuries, it is not reasonable to apply the Eurocentric approach that is based on the Western superiority and Eastern inferiority. In discussing the West/the East relationship from a "general and hegemonic context," Said claims that Western political and intellectual domination over the East has defined the nature of the Orient potentially as weak and that of the Occident as strong. According to Homi Bhabha, Said's model of fixity in the ideological construction of otherness is a "historical and theoretical simplification."[92] To put it clearly, ahistorical and ageographical approach of Said's Orientalism disregards historical realities of the Ottoman Empire as a world power between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries. In that sense, if Orientalism is a "corporate institution for dealing with the Orient – dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views about it, describing it,"[93] it poses some historical and theoretical questions for the Ottoman case. Esin Akalın argues that although Said's main focus is on the post-Napoleonic period in which European powers began the process of imperialism and colonization of the East, his overgeneralization of the Orient is problematic and his general claims made through a rough historical overview are misleading.[94] Said simply argues that the "Orient" is what the "Occident" is not and claims that "the Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea,

[90] Ibid., 59- 60.
[91] Ibid., 57.
[92] Homi Bhabha, "The Other Question: The Stereotype and Colonial Discourse," *Screen* 24 (1983): 25
[93] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 3.
[94]Esin Akalın, "The Ottoman Phenomenon and Edward Said's Monolithic Discourse on the Orient," *Challenging the Boundaries* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007), 114.

personality, experience."[95] According to Said, the Europeans certainly ascribe many stereotypical characteristics to the East and the Eastern people. He remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> One of the important developments in nineteenth-century Orientalism was the distillation of essential ideas about the Orient – its sensuality, its tendency to despotism, its aberrant mentality, its habits of inaccuracy, its backwardness – into a separate and unchallenged coherence; thus for a writer to use the word Oriental was a reference for the reader sufficient to identify a specific body of information about the Orient.[96]

It is obvious that Said takes nineteenth century as the starting point for the Orientalist discourse that defines 'the Other' as sensual, despot, and backward; however he also confirms that Muslims were frequently defined as 'the Orient' or contrasting image of the European Christian in Western writings since the Middle Ages. Said's simple binarism of 'the Orient' and 'the Occident' and his oversimplified characterization of 'the Other' have been challenged by some contemporary critics. Daniel Vitkus prominently challenges Said's simple construction of Orientalist discourse and remarks that it includes "theoretical rigidity" and "historical limits."[97] Put it simply, it would be misleading to apply Said's simple binarism of superior West and inferior East to two thousand years of Western culture since before the eighteenth century the Western Christians were subordinated to Islamic power and wealth. Thus, Western Christian representations of Islam need to be more complex than Orientalism characteristically presents. Similarly, Nabil Matar argues that for the Europeans to have "knowledge" about Islam is not to maintain power over it, since Europe did not enjoy military or industrial power over Islamic countries during the period under study instead it was Ottoman Empire.[98] Matar explains this phenomenon as follows:

> It was not [Europe] but the Ottoman Empire of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that was pushing into Europe, conquering Rhodes and Crete, attacking Spanish, French, Dutch, English, and Scottish trading fleets, landing upon our coasts, impoverishing that part of the kingdom near the

[95] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 1.
[96] Ibid., 205.
[97] Daniel J. Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 11.
[98] Nevsal Olcen Tiryakioğlu, "The Western Image of Turks from the Middle Ages to the 21st Cnetury: The Myth of 'Terrible Turk' and 'Lustful Turk,'" (Ph.D. Diss., Nottingham Trent University, 2015), 102.

> Channel and enslaving thousands of men and women, many of whom converted to Islam. Muslims did not see themselves in a subservient position to Christendom...[99]

Matar maintains that Ottoman Empire holds a superior position to Europe that disrupts Said's monolithic discourse on the construction of 'the Orient,' so it would be misleading to apply Said's monolithic discourse to the period under study. However, Vitkus and Matar acknowledge that representation of the Turks in Western discourse in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was produced through simplification and stereotyping as applied as the theoretical basis of this thesis. As Nabil Matar confirms, "simplification and stereotyping were the rules by which [the Europeans] represented Muslims"[100] although Europeans were subordinated to Islamic power. Vitkus argues that enslavement or conversion 'fear' of the European Christians was the main reason of stereotyping of the Turks. According to Vitkus "demonizing representations of 'the Turk,'" were produced not as a result of European cultural domination but of the fear of conversion.[101] In other words, thousands of European Christians converted to Islam in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that increased stereotypical demonization of the Turks in Western writings. Ottoman Empire's might and glory during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries tempted the Christians who had poor social conditions in their lands and offered them employment and advancement in Muslim lands.[102] Put it briefly, Ottoman Empire's superiority to Europe and anxiety of Islamic expansion during these centuries were widely known reasons for stereotypical representations of the Muslim Turks.

The characterization of the Turks based on binary opposites draws upon and transforms other contemporary and historically prior texts fostering common Eastern stereotypes that are culturally inferior, backward, tyrant and sexually perverted. Said, referring to this preconceived distinction between the East and the West, argues that "such representations as *representations,* not as 'natural' depictions of the Orient."[103] In spite of Ottoman Empire's superior position in Ottoman/European binary opposite, the stereotypical representations of Muslim Turks in Western discourse are oversimplified and

[99] Nabil Matar, *Islam in Britain: 1558-1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 12.
[100] Nabil Matar, *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 14.
[101] Daniel J. Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 78.
[102] Nabil Matar, *Islam in Britain: 1558-1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 15.
[103] Ibid., 21.

homogenous reduced to certain negative characterization. In other words, as Said argues, Orientalists have systematically recorded distorted image of the East, which has infiltrated into "Western consciousness" and "general culture" since antiquity. Said remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> Orientalism, therefore, is not an airy European fantasy about the Orient, but a created body of theory and practice in which, for many generations, there has been a considerable material investment. Continued investment made Orientalism, as a system of knowledge about the Orient, an accepted grid for filtering through the Orient into Western consciousness, just as that same investment multiplies – indeed, made truly productive – the statements proliferating out from Orientalism into the general culture.[104]

Obviously, the ancient Western texts provide references for the Orientalist discourse after Napoleonic invasion of the Egypt that is regarded as the starting point of Orientalism. The representation of the Ottoman Turks in a broad selection of Western writings including dramas, novels, poems and many others are enriched by myths, imageries and fantasies about the Orient and deeply rooted in history and ideology. In other words, Orientalist discourse successfully reproduces the imageries and fantasies about the Orient by borrowing from and folding within earlier discourses as Said remarks as follows:

> In the depths of this Oriental stage stands a prodigious cultural repertoire whose individual items evoke a fabulously rich world: the Sphinx, Cleopatra, Eden, Troy, Sodom and Gomorrah, Astarte, Isis and Osiris, Sheba, Babylon, the Genii, the Magi, Nineveh, Prester John, Mahomet, and dozens more; settings, in some cases names only, half-imagined, half-known; monsters, devils, heroes; terrors, pleasures, desires. The European imagination was nourished extensively from this repertoire: between the Middle Ages and the 18th century such major authors as Aristo, Milton, Marlowe, Tasso, Shakespeare, Cervantes, and the authors of the *Chanson de Roland* and the *Poema del Cid* drew on the Orient's riches for their

[104] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 6.

productions, in ways that sharpened the outlines of imagery, ideas, and figures populating it.[105]

The distorted imagery of Islamic cultures in Orientalist writings originates from many individual items associated with Islam or the East that nourished European imagination from the Middle Ages to the eighteenth century. Therefore, Orientalism that draws upon and transforms other contemporary and historically prior texts has fostered common Eastern stereotypes that are culturally inferior, backward, cruel, and lustful. In other words the cultural stereotyping of the Orient has been influenced by the traditional repertoire of Western cultural concepts, myths and fantasies about the Orient. When this perspective is applied to the Ottoman phenomena, the 'Turk' as a cultural and ideological Other constructed through diverse representational literary or dramatic discourses has been stereotyped since antiquity. Now the concept of *stereotype* and how it functions in the representational practice will be analyzed.

Stereotype

The concept of *stereotype* which signifies religious, cultural and racial differentiation will be clarified in cultural, psychoanalytical and ideological sense. The etymology of the term *stereotype* derives from the Greek *stereos*, meaning "firm, solid" and *typos* meaning "impression." The term is widely used in the printing trade where a stereotype is a "solid plate of type-metal, cast from a papier-maché or plaster mould taken from the surface of a form of type."[106] A *stereotype* is originally a solid printing mould or plate which is difficult to change, but the word has been adapted for its present usage by Walter Lippmann in his book *Public Opinion.* In its cultural sense, according to Lippmann, stereotypes are the "pictures in our heads" that enable us to comprehend the world around us. In Lippmann's terms, stereotypes are the way we "define first and then see" 'the Other.'[107] According to him, we need stereotypes in order to make sense of the complicated modern world through a process of categorization. The rules of this categorization process are defined by our culture and transmitted from parent to child almost like "a biological fact."[108] Lippmann explains further as follows:

[105] Ibid., 63.
[106] *Oxford English Dictionary*. Retrieved from: www.oxforddictionaries.com.
[107] Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion*, (1922):3, 55. Retrieved from: https://wwnorton.com/college/history/america-essential-learning/docs/WLippmann-Public_Opinion-1922.pdf
[108] Ibid., 62.

> The subtlest and most pervasive of all influences are those which create and maintain the repertory of stereotypes. We are told about the world before we see it. We imagine most things before we experience them. And those preconceptions, unless education has made us acutely aware, govern deeply the whole process of perception.[109]

As Lippmann asserts how we perceive or evaluate the world around us is informed by preconceptions composed of inadequate and biased generalizations. These preconceptions rule over our process of perception which is lack of "individualized understanding." More importantly, the codes through which we stereotype constitute our philosophy of life. That is, when we use stereotypes, we assume that the world is codified according to the codes which we possess. According to Lippmann, we employ stereotypes innocently that gives this process its strength and endurance.[110] In psychoanalytical sense, definition of stereotypes is put forward by Sander L. Gilman. In his distinguished book he argues that stereotypes are "a crude set of mental representations of the world."[111] The individual has a sense of control over the objects he/she interacts with; however, when the sense of order undergoes stress, anxiety appears. In that sense, stereotypes sustain a necessary sense of difference between the 'self' and the 'object,' which becomes 'the Other.'[112] According to Gilman, the main reason for creating stereotypes is the anxiety individuals feel towards 'the Other.' The anxiety is projected upon the 'Other' externalizing our loss of control results in stereotyping investing 'the Other' "with all of the qualities of the "bad" or the "good"."[113] To put it simply, stereotyping is a control mechanism and provides the individual with a relief to cope with anxiety.

In ideological sense, Richard Dyer defines stereotypes by differentiating *typing* from *stereotyping*. He argues that *types* simplify process of perception of the world and lead us to produce meaning. Dyer states that we produce meaning by the help of wider categories such as *roles, membership,* or *personality type.* Our sense of world is underpinned by these different orders of typification. In other words, as Dyer defines "a type is any simple, vivid, memorable, easily grasped and widely recognized characterization in which a few traits are foregrounded and change or 'development' is

[109] Ibid., 60
[110] Ibid., 61.
[111] Sander L. Gilman, *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race, and Madness* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1985), 17.
[112] Ibid., 18.
[113] Ibid., 19-20.

kept to minimum."[114] *Stereotype*, then, reduces a person to "simple, vivid, memorable, easily grasped and widely recognized characterization" by exaggerating, simplifying, and fixing this characterization to eternity without development or change. In Dyer's terms, stereotyping simplifies, naturalizes, and fixes boundaries to enable exclusion of *difference*.[115] The boundaries, fixed by those who rule, are difficult to change so they are persistent that makes the process of exclusion necessary for the maintenance of social order. According to Dyer, stereotyping has an inclination to occur in the midst of inequalities of power where power is usually directed against the subordinated groups exposed to this exclusion process as Jacques Derrida also points: "we are not dealing with peaceful coexistence but rather a violent hierarchy. One of the two terms governs…the other or has the upper hand."[116] Dyer points out that stereotyping is an attempt to establish normalcy through the world view, value system, sensibility and ideology of the ruling groups that enable them to establish their hegemony.[117] Thus, stereotyping first establishes the norms of "normalcy," then reduces *difference* to 'essential' or 'natural' characterization limiting its change and development. It then excludes everything beyond normalcy to maintain social order. The symbolic order facilitated between the 'normal' and 'abnormal' is attributed with negative qualities and considered as dangerous or polluted. Moreover, this stereotyping process is exercised in an unequal power system in which power is directed to the excluded group. Stereotyping, then, becomes a tool of the ruling groups to impose their ideology unto subordinated or excluded groups. The role of stereotypes is essential to form unity as noted by Dyer "the effectiveness of stereotypes resides in the way they invoke a consensus."[118] Furthermore, the "consensus" derived from the stereotype itself has a direct relation with the disposition of power in society. In Dyer's terms, who proposes the stereotype also has the power to enforce it.[119] Simply, in ideological sense, the stereotype is directly related with power and the "consensus" invokes effectiveness and persistence of the stereotype that makes it an ideological construct. Keeping in mind Lippmann's cultural, Gilman's psychoanalytical, and Dyer's ideological considerations, the concept of *stereotype* will be used as a representational

[114] Richard Dyer, "Stereotyping," *Gays and Film*. Ed. Richard Dyer (London, UK: British Film Institute, 1977), 28.
[115] Ibid., 29.
[116] J. Derrida, *Positions* (Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press. 1981), 41.
[117] Richard Dyer, "Stereotyping," *Gays and Film* Ed. Richard Dyer (London, UK: British Film Institute, 1977), 30.
[118] Richard Dyer, *The Matter of Images: Essays on Representations* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 14.
[119] Ibid., 14.

practice henceforth. According to Hall, the stereotype corresponds to cultural and racial differentiation as he argues as follows:

> A stereotype is one-sided description which results from the collapsing of complex differences into a simple "cardboard cut-out." Different characteristics are run together or condensed into one. This exaggerated simplification is the attached to a subject or place. Its characteristics become the signs, the "evidence," by which the subject is known. They define its being, its *essence*.[120]

In Hall's words a stereotype is exclusion of difference and reduction of differences to "one-sided description." We can also call this process as a process of simplification. Then how does the stereotype operate in a discourse? Hall draws our attention to the operation of stereotype in Western discourse. Hall identifies some of discursive strategies as "idealization," "the projection of fantasies of desire and degradation," "the failure to recognize and respect difference," and "the tendency to impose European categories and norms, to see difference through the modes of perception and representation of the West."[121] In other words, the West disregards difference of non-Western cultures and defines these cultures through Western norms. In this respect, taking especially Dyer's ideological observations into consideration, Hall establishes a connection between difference, representation, and power. Stereotyping is essential to exercise of power through representational practices. Similar to Dyer's insights, Hall argues that "*stereotyping reduces, essentializes, naturalizes and fixes difference* (author's italics)."[122] Essentialization and naturalization of "difference" in stereotyping restrains subordinated or the excluded Other within permanent and fixed boundaries without change and development. As a result, marking the 'difference' with stereotypical representations enables 'the Other's *exclusion*. The stigmatization of religious 'difference' between Muslims and Christians produces stereotypical representations of Muslims as immoral, infidel, savage, barbarous, and brutal and allows the dismissal of Islam as a false religion that resulted in false representations. When 'the Other' is represented with stereotypical characteristics, then the exclusion becomes easier as Hall argues follows:

---

[120] Stuart Hall, "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power," *Formations of Modernity*, Ed. Stuart Hall and Gieben Bram (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), 215.
[121] Ibid., 215.
[122] Stuart Hall, *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (London: Sage Publications, 1997b), 258.

> Stereotyping deploys a strategy of 'splitting.' It divides the normal and the acceptable from the abnormal and the unacceptable…*So, another feature of stereotyping is its practice of 'closure' and exclusion. It symbolically fixes boundaries, and excludes everything which does not belong* (author's italics)."[123]

Hall's description of *exclusion* through *splitting* in stereotyping is based on deposition of binary oppositions. According to Hall, *splitting* enables cultures to form symbolic boundaries because it helps them "close ranks, shore up culture and to stigmatize and expel anything which is defined as impure, abnormal."[124] Therefore, all cultures compose such boundaries as they "keep the categories pure, giving cultures their unique meaning and identity."[125] When Hall's premises of stereotype are applied to the representation of the East and Islam in Orientalist discourse, it is clear that the encounter with a rival religion posed a threat to European Christians thus they established symbolic boundaries between the Islamic culture and their own. Especially in the face of Ottoman military advance into Europe, stereotyping of the Muslim Turks as the members of the rival religion and attributing them with negative qualities can be regarded as European endeavors to create the pure Christian image. In other words, representation of Muslims in binary terms not only enables the Christians to create an ideal Christian image but also a collective identity against Muslims. By attributing judicious and negative qualities such as "ferocious," "warlike" "hostile," "truculent and vindictive," reduce the Muslims to one simplified figure that represent the essence beyond question.[126] According to Hall, Orientalist discourse, being unified and monolithic, utilize stereotyping to divide world "into good-bad, us-them, attractive-disgusting, civilized-uncivilized, the West-the Rest…By this strategy, the Rest becomes defined as everything that the West is not- its mirror image."[127] In other words, a stereotype is a counter-identity; its function is to help to the definition of our own identity by juxtaposing it to the stereotypical other. In this context, it can be argued that Orientalist discourse based on the notion that the West has power to produce knowledge about the East has constructed 'the Other' through stereotypical representation of the Orient, and thus, created Western 'Self.'

---

[123] Ibid., 258.
[124] Ibid., 237.
[125] Ibid., 236.
[126] Peter Hulme, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492-1797* (London: Methuen ,1986), 49, 50.
[127] Stuart Hall, "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power," *Formations of Modernity*, Ed. Stuart Hall and Gieben Bram (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), 216.

1.2. The Representation of 'the Turk' in Western Discourse

A general background on medieval attitudes toward Islamic society will provide a useful beginning to discussion. Richard William Southern examines Western perception of Islam dividing Western attitudes toward Islam into three stages. During the first period, "the age of ignorance" (c. 700-1100), Western writers "knew virtually nothing of Islam as a religion."[128] Southern refers to eighth and ninth century thinkers inspired by bible such as Venerable Bede, Eulogius, and Alvarus who interpreted the rule of Islam as preparation for the appearance of *Antichrist*.[129] John V. Tolan argues that Christian authors portrayed Muslims "as a divinely sent punishment, as pagan idolaters, as Christian heretics, as followers of Satan, or as devotees of Antichrist."[130] When referring to Muslims, medieval Christians often used ethnic terms such as "Arab," Saracen," or "Ishmaelite" however they did not use "Muslim" or "Islam." It is clear that the perception of Saracen as "idolatrous pagan" or "polytheist" had its origins from the early Middle Ages. As Tolan points out "pagans" and "Saracens" were used interchangeably.[131] He remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> Earlier writers described Muslims as pagans, at times basing their descriptions on biblical or Roman descriptions of pre-Muslim Arabs. Only at the turn of the twelfth century, however, is this supposed "paganism" described in vivid detail, its fictive contours clearly delineated. The epic descriptions of battles against the Saracens demanded a vivid and colorful enemy, one against whom war was justified and victory was glorious. Fighting against pagans, crusaders could claim to be wreaking vengeance for the pagans' crucifixion of Christ and their usurpation of His city; when they fell in battle, they could claim the mantle of martyrdom. The fight against paganism had a long history, one in which Christianity was sure to emerge victorious.[132]

---

[128]Richard William Southern, *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), 14.
[129] Ibid., 16, 17.
[130]John V Tolan, *Saracens: Islam in the Medieval European Imagination* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 4.
[131] Ibid., 128.
[132] John V. Tolan, "Muslims as Pagan Idolaters in Chronicles of the First Crusade," *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other*. Ed. David R. Blanks & M. Frasetto (New York: St. Martin's Press. 1999), 98.

According to Tolan, earlier writers contributed to the construction of binaries between Western Self and Muslim Other and motivated Christians to fight against the strongest enemy of Christendom who aimed to destroy Christianity. By fostering a contrasting image of Muslims and also demeaning Islam, Europeans helped to create their own Self image as a perceived ideal Christian society as Norman Daniel argues: "Christian misconception of Islam was fitted into the main body of knowledge and opinion in which European society found expression."[133] Western Christians often depicted Muslims in binary opposites to construct their own 'Self' as a superior society by stigmatizing the Muslims as the 'Other.' While their battle against Muslims was considered as a great piety, Islam was depicted as a religion of violence and lust. Edward Peter argues that, as a consequence of the juxtaposition between Christendom and Islam, Western Christians united in the Crusade Idea which uniquely suited to express European sense of oneness but also sharpened a sense of Christian unity.[134] The First Crusade propaganda was perhaps the most important product of this early period. In the eleventh century, the military attacks of Seljuk Turks on Western Christendom prompted the military campaign for the First Crusade. In 1071, Seljuk Turks defeated Byzantine forces at the Battle of Manzikert and conquered provinces of Anatolia, Persia, Syria, Palestine and Jerusalem. Byzantine Empire regarded Turkish conquest of Anatolia as loss of its great wealth, especially Muslim conquest of Jerusalem was a great loss for Christendom. Turks' inhibiting the Christian pilgrimage to the Holy Land prompted Byzantine Emperor Alexius Comnenus to ask for help from Pope Urban II in the early 1090s. On November 27th of 1095 Pope Urban II gave a speech to initiate the first Crusade against the Turks.[135] According to Bisaha, this speech was considered as the cornerstone of crusade preaching and propaganda. In one account of the sermon Urban was reported to have said:

> From the confines of Jerusalem and the city of Constantinople a horrible tale has gone forth and very frequently has been brought to our ears, namely, that a race from the kingdom of the Persians, an accursed race, a race utterly alienated from God, a generation forsooth which has not directed its heart and has not entrusted its spirit to God, has invaded the lands of those

[133] Norman Daniel, "Crusade Propaganda," *A History of the Crusades: The Impact of the Crusades on Europe, Volume 6*. Ed. Harry W. Hazard & Norman P. Zacour (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press. 1989), 54.
[134] Edward Peters, *Christian Society and the Crusades 1198-1229* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971), xii.
[135] Robert Payne, *The Dream and the Tomb: A History of the Crusades* (New York: Dorset Press. 1990), 33.

> Christians and has depopulated them by the sword, pillage and fire; it has led away a part of the captives into its own country, and a part it has destroyed by cruel tortures; it has either entirely destroyed the churches of God or appropriated them for the rites of its own religion.[136]

Turks were defined as "an accursed race" who expanded into Christian territories "by the sword, pillage and fire." Urban's speech presented the crusader's image of the Turks before they ever saw them. In crusade discourse, Turks were clearly characterized as brutal Godless murderers who had tendency to violence. From the perspective of crusading propaganda, Turks were also characterized as followers of a religion who destroyed churches and transfomed them into Islamic religious places. Crusade discourse aimed to fill the crusaders with Muslim antagonism so it presented killing Muslim "for the faith" as an act of great piety and self-sacrifice; while killing a Christian was considered a mortal sin. Ultimately, the crusaders were motivated to destroy Muslims and crush their empire.[137] In other words, European Christians were motivated to expand their religion, territory and influence; Islam was simply an obstacle to such European ambitions. In order to annihilate this obstacle, the crusades were symptomatic of a growing sense of cultural and religious unity in the West. In short, the crusade discourse prompted ideological, religious and cultural unity against Islam.[138] In that sense, it can be asserted that the crusade perception of 'the Turk' and Islam was much more related to emerging ideology concerning Christian religious and cultural unity than a reaction to any real contact with Muslims themselves. This religious and cultural unity was accomplished through crusade discourse that reinforced European Christian superiority. Bisaha draws attention to the Urban's speech's urge to take up cross by making clear cultural distinctions between Christendom and Islam:

> Oh race of Franks, race from across the mountains, race chosen and beloved by God — as shines forth in very many of your works — set apart from all nations by the situation of your country, as well as by your catholic faith and the honor of the holy church!... Let the deeds of your ancestors move you and incite your minds to manly achievements.[139]

---

[136] Qtd in Nancy Bisaha, *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 15.
[137] Nancy Bisaha, "Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks" (Ph.d. Diss., Cornell University, 1997), 165.
[138] Maxime Rodinson, *Europe and the Mystique of Islam* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1987), 7.
[139] Qtd in Nancy Bisaha, "Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks" (Phd. Diss., Cornell University, 1997), 166.

It can be inferred that Pope Urban's speech clearly differentiated European race from non-Europeans asserting their religious superiority that invoked binary of Christendom/Islam. The Europeans were convinced by sermons and speeches of prominent Christian leaders that theirs was the chosen and true faith and the crusaders were doing God's work or achieving martyrdom in the attempt of fighting against Muslims. Riley-Smith draws attention to Western Christians' perceptions of crusaders as "braver or more skillful warriors" and of Turks as "servants of the Devil":

> If only the Turks had adhered to the Christian faith, it would not have been possible to find stronger or braver or more skillful warriors. But this was exceptional. The norm was invective. The Muslims were said to be barbarians depraved in their morals and deficient in their faith. . . . They were enemies of God, Christ and Christianity; so they were servants of the Devil and their places of worship were devilish.[140]

Contrary to the image of Turks as the servants of the 'Devil', Christians viewed themselves as "servants or warriors of God or Christ."[141] They seemed clearly convinced that theirs was the chosen and true faith and the crusaders were doing God's work or achieving martyrdom in their attempt. This crusading mindset was distinctively included in the adaptation of romances and epics. For example, the *Song of Roland*, the most popular of the surviving *chansons de geste* from the Middle Ages, includes crusading rhetoric and concepts.[142] In this work, the Saracens of Spain were repeatedly referred to as pagans and idolaters with connection to devil. The Saracen foil, King Marsile was introduced as "King Marsile who did not love God. He served Mohammed and called upon Apollo."[143] From the time of the first crusade when the *Song of Roland* was written down as we know it today, Charlemagne and his knights were perceived not just as warriors, but as Christian warriors, courageously defending their faith against the Muslim rulers of Spain. According to Bisaha, Charlemagne romance prompted another trend which gained popularity around the time of the crusades, that of viewing the Muslims as impious idolaters.[144]

---

[140] Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading* (London: Continuum Books, 2001), 111.
[141] Ibid., 111.
[142] Richard William Southern, *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), 28.
[143] *The Song of Roland,* Ed. and Tr. Glyn Burgess (London: Penguin Books, ,1990), 29.
[144] Nancy Bisaha, "Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks" (Phd. Diss., Cornell University, 1997), 168.

Southern's second stage of Western attitudes toward Islam, "the century of reason and hope" (c. 1140 to 1290), was marked increasingly by study of Qur'an and increased contact with Muslim areas. According to Southern, during this period Islam was regarded as a Christian heresy that could be righted without excessive difficulty.[145] In other words, as well as protecting Christian interests in the Holy Land, crusades were regarded as a step toward facilitating the process of Muslim conversion. In order to achieve conversion of the Muslims, learning the languages and beliefs of the Muslims also peaceful preaching was underpinned.[146] As Bernard Lewis asserts during this period, in the monasteries of Western Europe, Muslim texts including Qur'an were studied and translated not only to prevent Christian conversion to Islam but to convert Muslims to Christianity.[147] During this period positive cultural image of Islam was extended by accounts from travellers and residents in the East and Muslim Spain. For instance, Marco Polo admired the splendor and high culture of Muslim cities such as Baghdad. Polo also presented each ethnic and cultural group of Muslims he met as a separate entity disregarding reduction of Muslim entities to monolithic societies without important distinctions.[148]

Southern's third stage was from the late thirteenth century to the mid-fifteenth century when Western stereotypes about Islam gained greater frequency.[149] Southern refers to Sir John Mandevilles's travels and states that Mandeville's accounts only succeeded in making the East seem more fantastical and wondrous but also made the East a stuff of fantasy in the eye of Westerner.[150] However, with the rise of Ottoman Empire, the image of 'Turk' and Islam deteriorated since Ottoman rise menaced Christian sovereignty. Southern's third stage may be clarified by addressing to the rise of the Ottoman Turks and their advance into Europe.

The Rise of Ottoman Empire and the Image of 'Turk'

Muslims, in crusading discourse during the Middle Ages, were characterized in biblical terms such as 'Antichrist,' 'enemy of Christianity,' 'infidel,' 'servants of Devil' as stated above. However, Western world began to use new terms in order to define Muslims

[145] Richard William Southern, *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), 39.
[146] Ibid., 56, 57.
[147] Bernard Lewis, *Islam and the West* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 13.
[148] Nancy Bisaha, "Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks" (Phd. Diss., Cornell University, 1997), 175.
[149] Richard William Southern, *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), 67, 70.
[150] Ibid., 72-74.

following Ottoman Empire's rise as a world power. With a distinguished military power, the Ottomans conquered a good portion of Anatolia, Gallipoli in 1354 pressing on to the shores of the Bosphorus, and ensured their presence in the Balkans in the Battle of Kosovo in 1389.[151] However, this battle was regarded as a blow to Ottoman forces since Sultan Murad I was killed during this battle and Murad's son Bayezid I (1389-1403) was soon forced to leave Balkans in order to deal with problems in Anatolia aroused as a result of his father's death.[152] Sultan Murad I's death was considered as "a moment of hope" by Coluccio Salutati, the chancellor of Florence. He identified Sultan Murad I with a crusading rhetoric and his reaction to the Battle of Kosovo showed great resemblance to the medieval images of the Turks incorporated into fourteenth centry discourse of the Turks. He congratulated Tvrtko on his glorious victory over the "arrogantly mad and madly arrogant Mohammed-worshipper, Amurad [Murad], who had taken the empire of the Phrygians or Turks by force and planned to destroy Christianity and the name of our dear Savior from the face of the earth, and-if he could-to erase it from the book of the living."[153] Salutati's depiction of Sultan Murad I reflected intensified European fear and resentment as a result of Ottoman expansion into European territories reinforcing European antagonism towards Muslims. The Western perception of the Ottoman Turks in the fourteenth century was remarkably consistent with previous discourses of Muslims. That is, the Christians preferred to portray Ottoman Turks with anti-Islamic polemic and crusading rhetoric. The Ottoman Turks were portrayed as an absolute enemy of Christendom since lack of interest in learning about Ottoman Turks and frequent use of preconceived notions of Islam prevented them from developing an objective point of view.

Rapid expansion of the Ottoman Turks into European territories led them to unite against the common enemy. Especially Sultan Murad's son Bayezid's omnipresence in the Balkans posed a serious threat to Hungary and alarmed Christian Europe. Madden remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> The rise of the Ottoman Turks and their successful campaigns to the West drastically changed the stakes in the crusading movement. It was no longer faraway Palestine that was in danger but Western Europe itself. Crusaders had always seen themselves as fighting a defensive war, defending the

[151] Thomas F. Madden, *The New Concise History of the Crusades* (Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2014), 208.
[152] Nancy Bisaha, *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 22.
[153] Qtd in Ibid., 22.

> Christians in the East, Jerusalem, or the faith. Now they were called on to defend themselves. Henceforth, crusades were no longer wars to expand Christendom but desperate attempts to slow the advance of Islam. Crusading had become a matter of simple survival.[154]

According to Madden, the Ottoman threat and expansionist policy shifted primary motive of crusades from expansion of the Christendom to slow down the advance of Islam. For the crusaders capturing Holy Land was the primary motive of crusades; however Ottoman threat led their efforts to stop Islamic penetration into Christian territories.[155] Upon Ottoman threat on the borders of Hungary, in 1396 a crusading force comprised primarily of Burgundian and French troops, joined by recruits from England, Germany and Italy, headed east to Nicopolis, an Ottoman fortress on the Bulgarian side of the Danube. The crusading army and thousands of knights were severely defeated by Sultan Bayezid's forces. This stunning Ottoman victory against the Crusade of Nicopolis would have two important results. For the Balkans, the failure at Nicopolis ensured Ottoman control over Serbia, Bosnia, and Albania in the following century. For the Western Europeans, Ottoman Turks' victory against the Crusade of Nicopolis represented a severe psychological blow to the crusade ideal.[156] The defeat of Christian knights at Nicopolis alarmed Christianity and spread the circulation of prophecies that all of Europe would be conquered by this "extremely ferocious race" who devoted its effort to swallow Christian world.[157] Following destruction of the Crusade of Nicopolis, a new crusade against the Ottoman Turks, called by Pope Eugenius also ended in a humiliating defeat in 1444.[158] According to Bisaha, after Ottoman victory against crusaders in 1444 at Varna, humanists began to use the term 'barbarian' when they referred to the Turks. The term 'barbarian' was used to motivate Crusades against the Turks who were conquering European territories one by one. Bisaha notes that although 'barbarian' was used to refer to the Turks in the aftermath of Crusade of Varna, the use of this term reached the level of "discourse" on the Turks after the conquest of Constantinople with a stronger and more unified rhetoric and set of images.[159]

---

[154] Thomas F. Madden, *The New Concise History of the Crusades* (Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2014), 209.
[155] Ibid., 9.
[156] Nancy Bisaha, *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 55.
[157] Ibid., 56.
[158] Thomas F. Madden, *The New Concise History of the Crusades* (Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2014): 211-214.
[159] Nancy Bisaha, *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 60.

The Turks as 'Barbarian Enemies of Civilization': 1453 and Beyond

On May 29, 1453, Ottoman Turks captured Constantinople after a two months siege. Sultan Mehmed II conquered the Constantinople that made the Turks appear virtually unstoppable to Westerners and excited more horror and concern than any Ottoman conquest preceding or following it for some time to come. The conquest of Constantinople greatly increased and focused the discourse of Turks. Why was 1453 so special? According to Bisaha, one reason was that the siege of Constantinople extended the judgment of Turks by Europeans to broader cultural and political considerations. In the aftermath of the conquest of Constantinople, the Turks as the "new barbarians" were "enemies of civilization as well as the faith."[160] Bisaha maintains that the association between "Turks" and "barbarians" had been so naturalized by the second half of the fifteenth century that "apparently the audience knew well enough what this signifier had come to mean…The Turks had become Europe's new barbarians…"[161] The association between the Turks and barbarity was underpinned by the slaughter stories of the city and noncombatant people. In one of the chronicles that documented the siege of the city, Nicolo Barbaro[162] portrays Turkish siege as follows:

> The wretched people in the city felt themselves to have been taken already, and decided to sound the tocsin through the whole city, and sounded it at all the posts on the walls, all crying at the top of their voices, "Mercy! Mercy! God send help from Heaven to this Empire of Constantine, so that a pagan people may not rule over the Empire!" All through the city all the women were on their knees, and all the men too, praying most earnestly and devotedly to our omnipotent God and His Mother Madonna Saint Mary, with all the sainted men and women of the celestial hierarchy, to grant us victory over this pagan race, these wicked Turks, enemies of the Christian faith.[163]

The chronicler depicts the Turks as "pagan race," "wicked Turks" and "enemies of Christian faith." It can be asserted that the fifteenth century image of 'the Turk' shows

[160] Ibid., 63.
[161] Ibid., 72.
[162] Nicolò Barbaro, a physician on a Venetian galley, kept a journal of the events of the siege. It is the most reliable account of any observer of the siege, though it contains a few inaccuracies.
[163] Nicolo Barbaro, *Diary of the Siege of Constantinople 1453*, Tr. John Melville-Jones (New York: Exposition Press,1969) Retrived from: http://media.bloomsbury.com/rep/files/Primary%20Source%204.6%20-%20Barbar%C3%B2.pdf

resemblance to crusade chronicles in which the Turks were also depicted as 'Antichrist,' 'enemy of Christianity,' 'infidel,' 'servants of Devil.' Furthermore, in many accounts, the leader of the Turks, Sultan Mehmed II was portrayed as "the cruel enemy of God, a new Mohammed, violator of the Cross and the church, despiser of God's law, and prince of the army of Satan."[164] Allegations of the Turks' cruelty focused not only on slaughter, but also on sexual violence as Bisaha quotes from one of Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini's letters[165]:

> What utter slaughter in the imperial city would I relate, virgins having been prostituted, boys made to submit as women, nuns raped, and all sort of monks and women treated wickedly? … Those who were present say that the foul leader of the Turks, or to speak more aptly, that most repulsive beast, raped on the high altar of Hagia Sophia, before everyone's eyes, the most noble, royal maiden, and her young brother, and then ordered them killed.[166]

Bisaha states that the accounts of the fall of Constantinople in 1453 were modeled on the accounts of the fall of Rome in 410 to Germanic barbarians drawing attention to the resemblance between the myth of Sultan Mehmed's rape of the royal maiden and the rape of King Priam's daughter in tales of Troy. According to Bisaha, incorporation of classical or medieval examples into the accounts does not necessarily mean that all the events described were invented, but it raises some doubts as to whether they were exaggerated to correspond to these models.[167] After the conquest of Constantinople, these stories that associated sexual aggression with Sultan Mehmed extended this image on other Ottoman Sultans too. In general, the tales of unrestrained slaughter, enslavement, and rape of the population of Constantinople structured the Turks as cruel and sexually aggressive barbarians in European imagination. The association between barbarity and the Turks not only derived from the stories of unrestrained enslavement, rape and slaughter but also from the descriptions of demolishment of churches, cathedrals, altars, and statues. The Europeans lamented the great losses to Western security and culture after Ottoman conquest of Constantinople. In the eye of Westerner, Constantinople possessed a rich heritage of famous monuments, churches, and libraries, made the city seem a living piece

[164] Qtd. in Robert Schwoebel, *The Shadow of the Crescent: The Renaisssance Image of the Turk, 1453-1517* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1969), 12.
[165] N. Bisaha states that they were printed at least 10 different times before 1500.
[166] Qtd in Nancy Bisaha, *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 63.
[167] Ibid., 64.

of ancient history to Western scholars. Descriptions of how the soldiers vandalized altars and statues, especially Sultan Mehmed II's conversion of the great cathedral of Hagia Sophia into a mosque shattered the vision of this illustrious city for the Westerners. Thus, Europeans began to view the Turks as a threat to European culture as well as to European security.[168] In other words, typical depictions of cruelty and sexual violence often committed by "barbarian leader" himself and demolishment of holy places were depicted in Western discourse. More importantly, Greek refugees from the Ottoman military advance brought their collection of anti-Turkish images. Upon the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks, one of the most influential Byzantine humanists Cardinal Bessarion, makes a similar appeal to Piccolomini's lament that is quoted above:

> The refuge of all good things has been captured, despoiled, ravaged, and completely sacked by the most inhuman barbarians and the most savage enemies of the Christian faith, by the fiercest of wild beasts. … Men have been butchered like cattle, women abducted, virgins ravished, and children snatched from the arms of their parents. If any survived so great a slaughter, they have been enslaved in chains so that they might be ransomed or a price, or subjected to every kind of torture, or reduced to the most humiliating servitude.[169]

Here, it is obvious that the Turks were depicted as cruel, barbarian and sexually aggressive and more importantly as "enemies of the Christian faith." This new image of the new barbarians was a combination of classical and Christian influences that presented "the Turks as the bloodthirsty foe of Christ and Plato" as Schwoebel notes.[170] Venetian humanist Lauro Quirini aims to draw attention to the devastation of Greek culture during Turkish siege of the "noble and rich city, once the capital of Roman Empire" as follows:

> Thus in our miserable time an ancient, noble and rich city, once the capital of the Roman Empire, mistress of all the Orient, has been captured by most savage barbarians, sacked for three days, and has come into wretched servitude, the worst of all evils. . . . Add to this the fact that all these wicked deeds were done by most savage barbarians, for not only has a royal city been captured, temples devastated and holy places polluted, but an entire

[168] Ibid., 65.
[169] Qtd. in Ibid., 2.
[170] Robert Schwoebel, *The Shadow of the Crescent: The Renaisssance Image of the Turk, 1453-1517* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1969), 166.

> race has been overcome the name of Greece is blotted out. Over a hundred and twenty thousand volumes were destroyed, as I learn from Cardinal Isidore of Kiev. Thus both the language and literature of the Greeks discovered, increased and perfected with so much time, labor and effort, has perished, alas! . . . That literature has perished which illuminated all the globe, which gave us the laws of salvation, holy philosophy and the other good arts by which human life is embellished. . . . A rude and barbarous race, living according to no fixed laws or customs, but unfettered, nomadic, willful this race, filled with treachery and fraud, shamefully and ignominiously tramples underfoot a Christian people.[171]

As this long quotation reveals Quirini obviously laments devastation of Greek culture, language and literature by "a rude and barbarous race" which was also regarded as uncivilized. In other words, Turkish conquest of Constantinople was regarded as devastation of ancient culture reducing the Turks to an inferior uncivilized race. Above quoted accounts show great resemblance to each other in defining the Turks as strongest enemy of Christendom and European culture. In that sense, it can be asserted that the accounts narrating the conquest of Constantinople drew many elements on anti-Islamic polemic and crusade accounts and they strongly united in depicting the Ottoman Turks in negative stereotypes. In Crowley's terms:

> The fall of Constantinople had awakened in Islam and Europe deep memories of the Crusades. The Ottoman peril was seen as the continuation of the perceived assault of Islam on the Christian world; the word *Turk* replaced the word *Saracen* as the generic term for a Muslim – and with it came all the connotations of a cruel and implacable opponent.[172]

As discussed previously, Ottoman Turks were characterized negatively and demonized as the enemy of the Christian faith in crusade rhetoric, as earlier Saracens were exposed to similar demonization. The 'Saracen' was based on religious identity. Nevertheless, after the conquest of Constantinople, Turks, the 'new barbarians', began to represent Muslims in general as the strongest enemy of Christian faith as well as European culture. As Housley asserts that in earlier crusading texts, the term 'barbarian' was used to

[171] Qtd. in James Hankins, "Renaissance Crusaders: Humanist Crusade Literature in the Age of Mehmed II," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 49,* Symposium on Byzantium and the Italians, 13th –15th Centuries, (1995): 122.
[172] Roger Crowley, "The Present Terror of the World 1453-1683," *1453: The Holy War for Constantinople and the Clash of Islam and the West*. Epub Version (New York: Hyperion, 2005), part 16, para 13.

signify 'racial difference' rather than hostility toward civilization or culture. However, this new Turkish 'barbarian' image combined racial and religious identity and demonized Turks different from the Saracens.[173] Housley points out that "the Turk was an enemy of faith, but he was also a barbarian; this quality was perceived as genetic, its roots residing in the Turks' origins as steppe dwellers, the Scythians."[174] Definition of the Turks as Sycthian descendants directly associated them with uncivilized and inhuman characteristics. In his *Cosmographia,* Aeneas Silvius drew on the writings of Aethicus and described Scythian and Turkic people as "fierce and ignominious people, fornicators engaging in all kinds of sexual perversions and frequenters of brothels, who ate detestable thinks: the flesh of mares, wolves, vultures…"[175] Aeneas's descriptions of the Scythians as savage and immoral were utilized to describe the Turks. First of all, description of the Turks as a ferocious, warlike and barbarian race or descendants of Scythians adapted well into notions of Western society to reinforce the *difference* between the West/the East, Christendom/Islam, Self/Other. Secondly, the stigmatization of religious and racial *difference* between the West and the East automatically produced immoral, uncivilized and barbarian stereotype of Muslim Turk. The construction of Muslim Turk *stereotype* eventually resulted in dismissal of Islam as a false religion and the Turks as barbarian race and followers of this false religion. Overall, repetition of these stereotypes in Western discourse evolved into a myth drawing on elements in previous discourses and influencing subsequent discourses on the Turks.

The accounts quoted above narrate the actual events in the form of story; according to Barthes, narration of past events may include imaginary events that put objective historiography in a problematic position.[176] Barthes remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> Does the narration of past events, which, in our culture from the time of the Greeks onwards, has generally been subject to the sanction of historical "science", bound to the unbending standard of the "real", and justified by principles of "rational" exposition – does this form of narration really differ,

[173] Norman Housley, "The Crusades and Islam," *Medieval Encounters, 13,* (2007): 205.
[174] Ibid., 206.
[175] Qtd in Nancy Bisaha. *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 76.
[175] Ibid., 64.
[176] Roland Barthes, "The Discourse of History," *Comparative Criticism,* 3 (1967): 7.

> in some specific trait, in some indubitably distinctive feature, from imaginary narration, as we find it in the epic, the novel, and the drama?[177]

In fact, Barthes clearly questions objectivity of traditional historiography using the words "science", "real" and "rational" within quotation marks. Thus, he tries to reveal paradoxical transformation of the fictional narrative structure into reality. In other words, according to Barthes, "narrative structure which was originally developed within cauldron of fiction (in myths and the first epics) becomes at once the sign and proof of reality."[178] In other words, these accounts that narrated the actual events in the form of story also included many inaccuracies and exaggerations. However, they constructed the image of 'the Turk' through a discursive practice fostering stereotype of the Turk that became common knowledge.[179] The sources that I have reviewed so far show that representation of the Ottoman Turks in Western discourse shows uniformity underlining cruelty, barbarity and sexual aggression of the Turks. Especially rise of the Ottoman Turks in the sixteenth century intensified negative characterization and demonization of the Turks in Western discourse defining them as the strongest enemy of Christian faith as well as European culture. In other words, the "new barbarians", the Turks, combined racial and religious *difference* for European Christians. Although the Turks were no longer perceived as the 'common enemy' that unified Christian Europe during the crusades in the aftermath of Protestant Reformation, Catholics and Protestants interchangeably used the Turk as the standard of their religious hatred.

[177] Ibid., 7.
[178] Ibid., 18.
[179] Nevsal Olcen Tiryakioğlu, "The Western Image of Turks from the Middle Ages to the 21st Cnetury: The Myth of 'Terrible Turk' and 'Lustful Turk,'" (Ph.D. Diss., Nottingham Trent University, 2015), 34.

CHAPTER 2

THE REPRESENTATION OF THE OTTOMAN TURKS IN SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ENGLISH DRAMA

2.1. The Representation of Stereotypical Turkish Sultan and 'Turning Turk' Anxiety in Early Modern English Drama

Richard Knolles and Image of 'the Turk' as "the Present Terrour of the World"

Ottoman Empire as a rising power in the world intermittently threatened central and Eastern Europe as well as Western Europe in the Mediterranean and even in the open seas in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In Chew's terms "In the fourteenth century a cloud arose in the East and from the fifteenth till far into the seventeenth the Ottoman peril hung over Europe."[180] Expanding its borders into the heart of Europe conquering strategic European holds, the Ottoman forces affirmed omnipresence of 'the Turk' in the region. By 1600, Christian European states including Spain, France, Italy, Germany, were forced to accept Ottoman Empire as a military, commercial and a diplomatic force. Towards the end of the sixteenth century there was an increasing European interest and curiosity about Ottoman administration, military organization, culture and history.[181] Put it simply, a series of Ottoman victories and conquests in European lands not only created interest in Ottoman issues but also caused real anxieties about Islamic wealth and might. As a result of this constant interest, curiosity and anxiety the Europeans experienced in their relations with the Ottomans, the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries witnessed numerous writings about the Ottoman Turks.[182] Especially, Ottoman military organization generated a great concern

[180] Samuel Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose*: *Islam and Britain during the Renaissance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937), 100.

[181] Nevsal Olcen Tiryakioğlu, "The Western Image of Turks from the Middle Ages to the 21st Cnetury: The Myth of 'Terrible Turk' and 'Lustful Turk,'" (Ph.D. Diss., Nottingham Trent University, 2015), 77.

[182] Detailed information about the image of the Ottoman Turks in Italy can be found in Mustafa Soykut, *Image of the "Turk" in Italy: A History of the "other" in Early Modern Europe, 1453-1683* (Berlin: K. Schmarz, 2001), Also, Clarence Dana Rouillard, *The Turk in French History, Thought, and Literature (1520-1660)* (Paris: Ancienne Librairie Furne Boivin & Cie, Editeurs 1940) contain information about their representation in French history and thought, while Carl Göllner, *Turcica. Die Türkenfrage in der öffentlichen Meinung Europas im 16. Jahrhundert*, (Bucereşti: Editura Acedemiei, 1978) presents their portrayal in Germany. Sıla Şenlen, "Richard Knolles' *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* as a Reflection of Christian Historiography," *Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi OTAM* 18.18 (2005): 382.

for the Europeans as Chew asserts "it is not surprising that this formidable fighting-machine is again and again pointed to by Christian publicists as a principal cause of Turkish success."[183] Chew also draws attention to "incorruptible military discipline" as well as "thrift, patience, and endurance" of the Ottoman soldiers.[184] Ottoman military organization and administration was contrasted to European division in Christendom and regarded as the sole reason for the Ottoman victory over the Europeans as Dutch humanist Erasmus asserted in his short treatise entitled *De bello Turcico*.[185] Erasmus constantly favored unity among the Europeans and demonstration of Christian morality against the Turks. According to Dimmock, Erasmus's "philosophia Christi" did not primarily aim to display the Ottomans as a military threat, but rather aimed to display the "religious decay" and divison in Christendom and motivate unity among the European Christians.[186] As a result of the divison in Christendom, 'the Turk' was interchangeably used by Catholics and Protestants to assert their own religious hatred for the other. As far away as Iceland the Lutheran[187] prayer book included a prayer beseeching God to "save us from the evil designs of the Pope and the terror of the Turk."[188] Luther's private letter to fellow clergyman reveals a lasting concern with the Turkish threat:

> We have been so led astray lately by reports of the Turks' approach, that we scarcely know what to believe. And in case God's wrath should be nearer than we think, and we should be surprised by the Turk, when, like the wolf, we have become so accustomed to the outcry that we feel secure, let us arm ourselves through prayer, pleading with God to keep the house and prevent such a visitation, and forgive our great and manifold sins, to the glory of His holy name.[189]

This quotation clearly illustrates Luther's concern of Turkish military threat whose insights and understanding of Islam was affected by his geographical proximity to Turkish

[183] Samuel Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose*: *Islam and Britain during the Renaissance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937), 106.
[184] Ibid., 110.
[185] Nevsal Olcen Tiryakioğlu, "The Western Image of Turks from the Middle Ages to the 21st Cnetury: The Myth of 'Terrible Turk' and 'Lustful Turk,'" (Ph.D. Diss., Nottingham Trent University, 2015), 83.
[186] Matthew Dimmock, *New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England* (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005), 21.
[187] Martin Luther (1483-1546) lived and wrote during the height of Ottoman power in Europe and he was acutley aware of the threat posed by the repeated Hungarian Campaigns of Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent.
[188] Bernard Lewis, *Islam and the West* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1993), 74.
[189] Qtd. in Paul T. Levin, "From "Saracen Scourge" to "Terrible Turk": Medieval, Renaissance, and Enlightment Images of the "Other" in the Narrative Construction of "Europe"" (Ph.D. Diss., University of Southern California, 2007), 212.

Hungary. He regarded Turkish victory as "God's wrath" and punishment over Christians because of their sins. The following passage is from his 1542 preface to Riccoldo's *Confutatio*:

> For hundreds of years the Saracens and Turks have enjoyed victory and prosperity (albeit frivolous and empty) over against the Christians. We, on the other hand, have experienced much adversity under their control. … However, this does not mean that Muhammad's faith is right and our faith is wrong, as the blind Muslims boast. … God permits us to be punished and suppressed on account of our sins, as we read in Psalm 79:8,9.[190]

It can be inferred that Luther's writings in the sixteenth century regarded the Turks as the strongest enemies of Christian faith. According to Luther, the Turks were the followers of a false religion and their victory over Christians was considered as "the Scourge of God's fury" that reproduced medieval and crusade stereotypes of the Turks in the sixteenth century Western discourse. Luther also underpinned the adversaries in Christendom associating the Turks with Catholics in his writings. Luther points out that "Antichrist is at the same time the Pope and the Turk. A living creature consists of body and soul. The spirit of Antichrist is the Pope, his flesh the Turk. One attacks the Church physically, the other spiritually."[191] Obvioulsy, Luther associated the Turks with "papists" as the enemies of Christian faith depicting the Turks as the Antichrist. Furthermore, Luther reproduced sexually perverted and barbarian Turk stereotype in his writings referring to Prophet Mahomet and Quran's position on sex as engaged with "fleshly concerns"[192] and Prophet Mahomet's teachings of sword. He quotes Riccoldo da Montecroce as follows:

> [Muhammad] acquired for himself a right proper work tool, a sword, the killing piece. He placed in his Koran the command that all who opposed his statutes and refused to believe should be killed! He speaks this way throughout his entire book, not just in one chapter. Kill! Kill![193]

---

[190] Qtd. in Ibid., 220.
[191] Qtd. in Daniel J. Vitkus, "Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Europe," *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other*. Ed. David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), 212.
[192] Qtd. in Paul T. Levin, "From "Saracen Scourge" to "Terrible Turk": Medieval, Renaissance, and Enlightment Images of the "Other" in the Narrative Construction of "Europe"" (PhD. Diss. University of Southern California, 2007), 232.
[193] Qtd. in Ibid., 234.

It is obvious that Ottoman cruelty and sensuality were associated with the teachings of Prophet Mahomet. This particular image of Prophet Mahomet widely derived from the conceptions of Islam held in medieval Europe that regarded Islam as an inherently violent religion and prophet Mahomet as a devious and sexually promiscuous religious leader.[194] These conceptions, well rooted in European consciousness, were forged during early modern period and aimed to humiliate the Turks. Obviously, Luther combined his religious insights with medieval European perception of Islam in order to deal with Turkish threat in the sixteenth century. This particular image of Prophet Mahomet Luther created in his writings proved to be a stable and highly influential source of fascination for Western writers who reproduced Muslim Turk stereotype in their writings.

English interest of Ottoman Empire increased over a hundred years after the establishment of relations between the Turks and the rest of Europe. According to Burian, the most obvious reason of this delay was geographical since England was outside the periphery of the Turkish peril.[195] Although the English postponed diplomatic relations with the Ottomans until 1580s,[196] English interest in Ottoman history, customs, manners, administration and military organization generated numerous writings about the Ottoman Turks. In 1603, *The Generalle Historie of the Turkes,* an immense volume of more than six hundred leaves, was published to present general history of the Ottoman Empire in London which was regarded as the greatest of English works produced in early modern period

[194] Norman Daniel, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1962), 274-276.

[195] Orhan Burian, "Interest of the English in Turkey as Reflected in English Literature of the Renaissance," *Oriens* Vol.5. No. 2 (1952): 209.

[196] In his seminal book, Halil İnalcık states that English trade with the Levant goes back to as early as 1446 when English exported woolen cloth to Turkey and imported Levantine goods such as currants and wine. Obviously, by the mid-sixteenth century, when mercantilism began to dominate the economy of the national monarchies of the West, the English desired to strengthen their place and increase share in the East-West trade. Between 1560 and 1580 English imported Levantine goods such as dyes, silk, alum and cotton in French and Venetian ships. However, the Ottoman-Venetian war in 1570-1573, disaster of Lepanto in 1571, and the fall of Antwerp in 1572 were turning points for the history of relations between the Ottoman Empire and England. According to İnalcık, Venetian-Spanish coalition posed a threat to the Ottoman interest in approaching the West so this threat motivated Ottomans to establish direct relations with the English. On the one hand, in order to reach English tin, steel and lead also to give a fatal blow to the Venetian economy, Ottomans aimed excluding Venetians from this export process by establishing direct mercantile relations with the English. On the other hand, the Ottomans were aware that England was under the threat of Spanish invasion and sought ways of alliance with the Turks. Thus, "this situation created a *de facto* cooperation between Ottomans and northerners." In May 1580 Sultan Murad III issued full capitulatory privileges to English, which had been granted to French in 1569, so "with a reduced customs duty of 3 percent instead of 5 percent paid by other nations, the English became the most favored nation in the empire." In 1581 the Levant Company was established to conduct direct trade with Ottomans and the merchant William Harborne was sent to the Ottoman Porte as England's first ambassador. Halil İnalcık, Donald Quataert, "Northerners in the Mediterranean," *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1600* (Cambridge University Press, 1994), 364-368.

dealing with the Ottomans. Its author, Richard Knolles did not know a word of Turkish nor had he ever been to Turkey. However, as an educated Renaissance Englishman, he was able to make use of earlier Latin writings drawing extensively on the literature of travel, mission, diplomacy, and scholarship that reflected perceptions and concerns of Christian Europe as regards the Turks.[197] *The Generalle Historie of the Turkes* was the first text written in the medium of English instead of Latin that made it accessible not only to the sophisticated reader but also for the general reading public.[198] In general, Knolles's text provided information about the history of the Turks, lives and conquests of the Ottoman sultans, and the aspects that contributed to the Empire's success.[199] More importantly, Knolles indicated constant Ottoman threat for the European Christians and defined Ottoman Empire as "THE glorious Empire of the Turkes, the present terrour of the world" referring to the imperial ambition of the Turks who "triumpheth over the best part of the world."[200] In his "To the Reader" he remarks as follows:

> So that at his present if you consider the beginning, the progresse, and perpetuall felicitie of this the Ottoman Empire, there is in this world nothing more admirable or strange; if the greatnesse and lustre thereof, nothing more magnificent or glorious; if the power and strength thereof, nothing more dreadfull or dangerous: which wondering at nothing but at the beautie of it selfe, and drunke with the pleasant wine of perpetuall felicitie, holdeth all the rest of the world in scorne, thundering out nothing but still bloud and warre, with a full persuasion in time to rule over all, presining unto it selfe no other limits than the uttermost bounds of the earth, from the rising of the Sunne unto the going downe of the same.[201]

It is obvious that Knolles' depiction of the Turks reflected not only European fear and anxiety in the face of Ottoman expansion but also a certain antipathy felt towards the Turks. This certain antipathy towards the Turks incrased following the conquest of Constantinople, once the capital of Roman Empire, and the Ottomans were began to be

[197] Bernard Lewis, *Islam and the West* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 72.
[198] Sıla Şenlen, "Richard Knolles' *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* as a Reflection of Christian Historiography," *Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi OTAM* 18.18 (2005): 383.
[199] Ibid., 384.
[200] Richard Knolles, *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (London: Islip, 1603), 1. Retrieved from: https://books.google.com.tr/books?hl=tr&lr=&id=BudbAAAAcAAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=richard+knolles&ots=yu95Uxmxwv&sig=92MGNP5YF64p4MO2WF4kKxivmGw&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=richard%20knolles&f=false
[201] Knolles, "To the Reader."

considered as a threat to Christendom. As Kemal Karpat points out "the fall of Constantinople in 1453, and the ensuing fear that the Turks would attack the West and destroy Christianity, was the most powerful stimulus conditioning the formation of the Western image about Turks."[202] In his formation of the image of the Turk, Knolles heavily included medieval anti-Islamic polemic and crusading rhetoric regarding the Turks:

> Whereof the first and greatest, is the just and secret judgement of the Almighty, who in justice delivereth into the hands of these mercilesse miscreates [Ottomans], nation after nation, and Kingdome upon Kingdom, as unto the most terrible executioner of his dreadfull wrath, to be punished for their sin.[203]

Knolles, drawing on previous discourses, considered the Turks as a punishment of God for Christians' sin. That is, God sent the "mercilesse" Ottomans in order to punish wicked acts of the Christians. In his Introduction to "Christian Reader," Knolles repeatedly defined the Ottomans as "infidels," "heretics," "princes of darkness" and more importantly "common enemy of Christianity" also followers of a 'false' religion based on 'supersition.'[204] Knolles also referred to previous chronicles in which the Turks were stereotyped as barbarians. Here is his detailed description of the conquest of Constantinople:

> In this furie of the Barbarians, perished 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 pittie slain, except some few reserved by the barbarous victors, to purposes more grivous than death it selfe. The rich and beautifull ornaments and jewels of that most sumptuous and magnificent Church…pluckt down and carried away by the Turkes: and the Church it selfe 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 Turks cap upon the head […] and calling it the God of the Christians. Which I note not

[202] Kemal H. Karpat, "Introduction," *The Ottoman State and Its Place in World History*, Ed. Kemal H. Karpat (Belgium: E. J.Brill, 1974), 3.
[203] Knolles, Dedication to King James in Historie of the Turkes.
[204] Knolles, "To the Christian Reader unto the Historie of the Turkes following."

> so much done in contempt of the image, as in the despise of Christ and the Christian religion.[205]

Knolles clearly incorporated 'barbarian' Turk image constructed following the conquest of Constantinople into his depiction. He reproduced the image of stereotypical Turk who killed the Christians indiscriminately and vandalized Christian churches. As he asserted at the end of this quotation, Knolles regarded these villainous acts as a humiliation of Christianity underlining the preconceived notion that the Turks would attack the West and destroy Christendom. As asserted above, Knolles's depiction of the siege of Constantinople shows resemblance to the chroniclers' depiction and aims to evoke cruel, barbarian and sexullay aggressive Turk image in the seventeenth century Western discourse. Here is his depiction of Turkish siege of Vienne:

> The poore people not knowing where to hide themselves from the furie of their enemies, nor of whom to crave helpe, fled as men and women dismaied, carrying with them their beloved children, the unfortunat pledges of their love, and what else they could, as things saved out of the middest of the fire. For whatsoever fell into the enemies hand, was lost without recure: the old men were slaine, the young men led away into captivitie, women ravished before their husbands faces, and afterwards slaine with their children, young infants were ript out of their mothers wombs, and others taken from their breasts were cut in pieces, or else thrust upon sharpe stakes, yeelding up againe that breath which they had but a little before received; with many other incredible cruelties, which were then by the mercilesse enemie committed.[206]

In this context, it can be asserted that Knolles's seminal book *The Generalle Historie of the Turkes* draws on previous discourses about the Turks adapting them into seventeenth century context in order to depict the Ottomans and ultimately models subsequent texts about the Turks. However, it is important to note that Knolles's chronicle was initially composed for propaganda purposes to unite Christians against Turkish military advance so this chronicle cannot be trated as true representation of the Ottoman Turks.[207] This particular image of the Turk Knolles created in his writings proved to be a

[205] Ibid., 347.
[206] Ibid., 610.
[207] Sıla Şenlen, "Richard Knolles' *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* as a Reflection of Christian Historiography," *Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi OTAM* 18.18 (2005): 392.

stable and highly influential source of fascination for Western writers who reproduced Muslim Turk stereotype in their writings.

Early Modern English Anxiety of Islam: "Turning Turk"

Knolles's *The Generalle Historie of the Turkes* provided an extensive source of knowledge about Ottoman sultans, administration and military organization of the Empire as well as customs and manners of the Turks. Hence, the English were widely aware of the Turks at the beginning of the seventeenth century. However, the English had begun to trade with the Ottomans in the last decades of the sixteenth century and the commercial relations, sponsored by Queen Elizabeth, flourished in the seventeenth century. As a result of extensive diplomatic and commercial relationship in the multicultural Mediterranean, the English people interacted extensively with the Turks during these centuries. In Matar's terms: "the Turks…were men and women [the English] had known, not in fantasy and fiction, but with whom they had worked and lived, sometimes hating them yet sometimes accepting and admiring them."[208] The English experienced anxiety and reluctant admiration in their relations with Ottoman Empire since the English were subordinated to Ottoman power because "the Ottoman Empire was an institution to be feared and appeased."[209] English merchants rarely would use force against Ottoman sultanate and fleet, because "the outcome was usually defeat, ruin, enslavement, or death."[210] Especially confronting with Ottoman Turks' diplomatic and economic power in the Mediterranean generated a state of anxiety and fear for the English. In their discourse about the Muslim Empire, the English never used "words such as *colony*, *plantation*, and *settlement*"; they were only "'factors' to Islam."[211] In that sense, it can be asserted that the economic and diplomatic rules of the Mediterranean were determined by the powerful Ottomans to which the English were subordinated.

During these centuries the English also interacted extensively with Muslims of the kingdom of Morocco. The Turks and the Moors were the "chief Others" for the English because of the general anxiety that Islamic expansion generated among the English. English anxiety of Islam produced numerous writings about Muslims. In these writings,

[208] Nabil Matar, *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 6.
[209] Daniel J. Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 30.
[210] Ibid., 31.
[211] Nabil Matar, *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 11.

Muslims were precisely demonized and stereotyped. Matar draws attention to the "alterity" created within literary and theological contexts and points out that "government documents, prisoners' depositions, and commercial exchanges show little racial, sexual, or moral stereotyping of the Muslims" contrary to the early modern literary texts including plays, masques, pageants, and other similar sources.[212] Matar further points out that the English interest in the Turks and Moors was so intense that between 1580s and 1630s there were many plays about them; while during these years the English engagement with the New World was also intense; however there was not a single play about the American Indians. In general, the Turkish and Moorish characters embodied fear, anxiety and hatred towards Muslims in most early modern English plays reflecting European stereotype of 'evil Muslim.' Matar sheds light on how English writers sustained Western stereotype of 'barbarian', 'infidel', and 'sexually overdirven' Muslim and constructed the early modern image of Muslim 'Other':

> They established in their popular and widely read works the stereotype of the Muslim – a stereotype that was presented and re-presented in numerous plays and pageants, and that gained wider appeal and permanence . . . The 'Turk' was cruel and tyrannical, deviant and deceiving; the 'Moor' was sexually overdriven and emotionally uncontrollable, vengeful, and religiously superstitious. The Muslim was all that an Englishman and a Christian was not: he was the Other with whom there could only be holy war.[213]

As discussed in previous chapter, the national cultures acquire their sense of identity by comparison with other cultures reinforcing *difference*. The stereotype of Muslim established in popular English works attracted attention and provided a counter-identity. In that sense, the English shaped their identity in relation to 'the Other' through attribution of the opposite characteristics to 'the Other.' Taking Gilman's psychoanalytical definition of stereotype[214] into consideration, it can be asserted that the encounter with Muslims in multicultural Mediterranean created feelings of fear and anxiety that resulted in stereotyping of Muslims as a control mechanism. Thus, the Muslims were depicted

[212] Ibid., 13.
[213] Ibid., 13.
[214] In *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race, and Madness*. (New York: Cornell University Press. 1985), Gilman argues that the main reason for creating stereotypes is the anxiety individuals feel towards the world around them, which generates the need for the 'Self' to control the 'Other.'

"barbaric" as occupying a place beneath the civilized European/Christian. Matar insists that this construction of "barbaric" Muslim image as non-European and non-Christian in the early modern period was not dependent on facts and experience rather on imagination. He points out ascribing "barbaric" images to the Muslims reflected English desire of colonizing and dominating them. In other words, according to the English, the "barbaric" image of the Indians justified English dominaton over them; the barbarity of the Muslims also deserved to be dominated by the English.[215] Thus, it can be asserted that English representations of the Muslims extensively derived from their actual encounter with the American Indians. Put it differently, in order to label Muslims as 'the Other,' or 'barbaric', the English borrowed the constructions of *difference* from their real encounter with the American Indians. In America, the Englishmen encountered a culture to which they felt superior and they could defeat with the "invisible bullets" as Thomas Harriot[216] describes in his *A briefe and true report* (1590):

> Those that were immediately to come after us they imagined to be in the air, yet invisible & without bodies, & that they by our entreaty & for the love of us did make the people to die in that sort as they did by shooting invisible bullets into them…To confirm this opinion their physicians to excuse their ignorance in curing the disease, would not be ashamed to say, but earnestly make the simple people believe, that the strings of blood that they sucked out of the sick bodies, were the strings wherewithal the invisible bullets were tied and cast.[217]

However, the Englishmen possessed no invisible bullets when they encountered with militarily, politically and commercially powerful Muslims who were dictating their own rules of economic exchanges in the Mediterranean. As Matar points out the English who conquered Virginia humbled in North Africa and the Levant.[218] The Englishmen alleged national superiority by associating Englishness with Christianity and imposing the

---

[215] Nabil Matar, *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 15.

[216] In his *Invisible Bullets* (1988), Stephen Greenblatt introduces Thomas Harriot as "the most profound Eizabethan mathematician, an expert in cartography, optics, and navigational science, an adherent of atomism, the first Englishman to make a telescope and turn it on the heavens, the author of the first original book about the first English colony in America, and the professor throughout his career of a dangerous reputation for atheism."

[217] Thomas Harriot, *A brief and true report of the new found land of Virginia* (London: 1590), 6 Retrieved fromhttps://nationalhumanitiescenter.org/pds/amerbegin/exploration/text4/Harriot_Brief_and_True_Report_1590.pdf

[218] Nabil Matar, *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 15.

"image of Englishmen as God's own." They called the colonies in America "sodomites" who deserved divine punishment for being non-Christian and the violation of their lands was regarded as a "just" war. Within the same context, the Muslims, as non-Christians, were defined as "sodomites" who deserved to be punished and the war against Muslims be a "Holy War."[219] According to Matar, "English writers dramatized and described a holy war against the Muslims as their compatriots' waged war against the Indians, but the anti-Muslim holy war remained a pageant or 'paper war.'"[220] Since the English didn't seize a single inch of Muslim land in the Age of Discovery unlike Spaniards and the Portuguese who had seized territories in Muslim North Africa, they felt frustration and anxiety as reflected in early modern representations of Islam. Hereby, the more English confronted with failure in the Muslim lands, the more they imposed their success in the conquest of America on Islam, since the lands of Islam under control of Ottoman Empire remained beyond domination and colonization. English failure in seizing new territories in Muslim lands and their dependency on Muslim power in the multicultural Mediterranean generated a state of anxiety and fear for the English. The intercultural exchanges and relations with Muslims threatened English identity by converting English subjects to Islam or 'turning Turk':

> The heterogeneity and instability of identity that characterize the Mediterranean region made the English presence there a source of anxiety and contradiction: on the one hand, the English felt their difference as Protestant outsiders acutely, almost as alienation; on the other hand, they felt drawn into exchanges and relations that threatened to 'convert' them to a foreign condition or, at least, contaminate them.[221]

The phenomenon of 'turning Turk,' or converting to Islam intensified English frustration and anxiety since it was more common for Christians to 'turn Turk' who chose to become renegades in North Africa and the Middle East. Vitkus refers to the economic motif as one factor behind the conversion of many English citizens to Islam since in England experienced repeated episodes of famine, plague, and economic depression between 1570 and 1630.[222] Furthermore, the openness and freedom of Islamic culture allowed to the religious converts attracted English Protestants so they willingly converted

[219] Ibid., 16.
[220] Ibid., 17.
[221] Daniel J. Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 43.
[222] Ibid., 110.

to Islam. As Matar illustrates Europeans who settled or found opportunities in Oriental lands held high positions although this situation changed "from cruel enslavement to well-paying employment and from professional labor to ambassadorial opportunity."[223] In other words, the Oriental lands eventually became the desired destination for Christians who sacrificed their loyalty to their country and religion in favor of materialistic gains in the Oriental lands. In Matar's terms: "Islam projected an allure that promised a common [English] social and political power…it was the allure of an empire that changed an Englishman's hat into a turban—with all the symbolism of strength associated with the Islamic headdress."[224] Matar refers to the role of British dramatists and theologians in challenging the jeopardy of the phenomenon of the renegade and conversion to Islam:

> Aware that the attraction of the Ottoman Empire sometimes proved irresistible to their compatriots, [the English] tried to undermine this attraction in three areas of writing and activity: theological polemic, drama and evangelism. In the area of evangelism, great momentum was generated in England toward the conversion of Muslims to Protestantism; in the dramatic arts, Robert Daborne, Philip Massinger and others wrote to show the horrible punishment that God had in store for the Christian convert to Islam; in apocalyptic commentary, English and Scottish theologians showed that the Saracen who refused to convert to Christianity would be destroyed at the eschaton.[225]

The English were well aware of the Ottoman social and economic power that tempted Protestant English 'to turn Turk' and become renegade pirates or join in the Ottoman army. The English aimed to handle this Islamic source of fear in many ways. Especially, dramatization of cultural and religious renegades and their damnation on the stage was very common during early modern period. These dramatic representations that displayed punishment of the Christians who converted to Islam appealed to the English audience's taste when Europe was haunted by rapid military advance of the Ottomans. In that sense, it can be asserted that English dramatic representations of the Ottoman Turks in early modern period reflected real anxiety the Christian Europeans felt in the face of Ottoman advance rather than mere fictional images and fantasies. The English interest in

[223]Nabil Matar, "Introduction: England and Mediterranean Captivity, 1577-1704," *Piracy, Slavery, and Redemption: Barbary Captivity Narratives From Early Modern England*. Ed. Daniel J. Vitkus, and Nabil Matar (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 19.
[224] Ibid., 15.
[225] Nabil Matar, *Islam in Britain, 1558-1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 19.

Islam was so intense that forty seven plays staged Islamic themes and characters in the period between 1579 and 1642 and thirty one of these plays especially dealt with the Ottoman Turks and their history.[226] In Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine Part One and Part Two* (1587-88), George Peele's *Turkish Mahumet and Hiren the Fair Greek* (1588) and *The Battle of Alcazar* (1589), Thomas Kyd's *The Tragedye of Soliman and Perseda* (1592), Fulke Greville's *Mustapha* (1594), Robert Greene's *Selimus* (1594), Thomas Heywood's *The Fair Maid of the West*, or *A Girl Worth Gold, Part I* (1602) and *Part II* (1630), William Shakespeare's *Othello* (1604), Robert Daborne's *A Christian Turned Turk* (1610), and Philip Massinger's *The Renegado* (1624), English playwrights dealt with Ottoman sultans reproducing conventional set of characteristics for describing Islamic power; at the center of each play stood an Islamic tyrant sultan who conformed to the preconceived notions of stereotypical Turkish image. Vitkus remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> Before these plays were written, a conventional set of characteristics for describing Islamic power had already been established: first, there is a sultan who exercises all the power, while all others merely obey. This sultan, in order to feed his passions, is bent on possession and domination. He desires to increase his physical boundaries of his realm and also to obtain women for his harem and capture souls for his religion. Those who resist are killed, enslaved, or converted. Christians are forced or tempted to turn Turk. Because he has absolute power, he rules everyone but himself: his own passions are uncontrollable. This archetypal sultan is depicted as fickle and given to extreme, unstable desires, whims, and sudden fits of irrational anger. He perverts justice, enforcing Islamic law and all codes of honor to suit his whims and lusts.[227]

Vitkus's depiction of stereotypical Muslim sultan image reproduced previous discourses regarding Turks reinforcing their cruelty, barbarity and sexual aggression. In general, the Muslim sultan represented "absolute power" that enabled him to act according to his uncontrollable passions, unstable desires and sudden anger. He even perverted justice and religion for the sake of his desire and lust. This antagonistic depiction reflected a certain antipathy felt towards the Turkish sultans' unstoppable westward expansion that

[226] Louis Wann, "The Orient in Elizabethan Drama" *Modern Philology* 12, No. 7 (1915): 439. 423-447.
[227] Daniel J. Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 115.

caused a great anxiety among the English. Occasionally, it "is not common, […] to imbue one's mortal enemy with praiseworthy attributes"[228]; however this antagonistic depiction can be regarded as a certain reflection of English anxiety of conversion to Islam and fear of Turkish advance into the heart of Christendom. In this respect, early modern plays held great importance to provide a relief for the English theatergoers depicting humiliation of the Ottoman sultans and damnation of English subjects who converted to Islam on the stage.

The Representation of Stereotypical Turkish Sultan in *Tamburlaine* and *Selimus*

Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine the Great Part I* (1586) and *Part II* (1587) is the first play that an English audience witnessed for the first time an Ottoman Sultan being portrayed on the public stage. Joseph Q. Adams argues that Marlowe's *Tamburlaine,* "the swarthy-faced Mohammedan with his turban and crooked falchion haunted the stage. As a villain he was represented as the incarnation of ambition, cruelty, sensuality, and treachery."[229] In the play, Turkish Sultan Bajazeth embodies image of 'the raging Turk' who can be regarded as the "ardent confirmation of Europe's anti-Turkish, anti-Islamic fears and stereotypes."[230] According to Matar, Marlowe's play is partly responsible for the creation of "Muslim Otherness" in English culture as a whole since it is the first dramatization of a Turkish sultan on English stage.[231] And more importantly, "Bajazeth is at best a one-dimensional stereotype of rage, or worse a buffoon, and that this image of the Ottoman sultans was transmitted to and reproduced by later playwrights."[232] With his first speech Bajezeth confirmes audience's fear of the Turk through his boast of Ottoman power and expansionist policy:

> You know our army is invincible:
>
> As many circumcised Turks we have,
>
> And warlike bands of Christians renied,

[228] Robert Schwoebel, *The Shadow of the Crescent: The Renaisssance Image of the Turk, 1453-1517* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1969), 13.
[229] Qtd. in Linda McJannet, *The Sultan Speaks: Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 63.
[230] Jonathan Burton, "Anglo-Ottoman Relations and the Image of the Turk in *Tamburlaine," Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 30 (1), (2000):141.
[231] Nabil Matar, *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 13.
[232] Linda McJannet, *The Sultan Speaks: Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 65.

As hath the ocean or the Terrene sea

Small drops of water, when the moon begins

To join in one her semi-circled horns (*Tamburlaine I*, I:iii.7-12).

Sultan Bajazeth is the first Ottoman sultan who appeared on English stage and his opening words uttered are confirmation of Ottoman military power and expansionist policy. Bajazeth's address to the English audience and his boast of Ottoman military power evoke English anxiety and fear of the Turk. However, in the course of the play, Tamburlaine's victory over Ottoman Empire referring to the Sultan Bajazeth's defeat in Battle of Ankara (1402) and humiliation of Sultan Bajazeth on the stage exhibit a projection of European aspiration of that time. Tamburlaine is depicted as the savior of Christendom who defeated the "scourge and wrath of the God":

I that am termed the scourge and wrath of God,

The only fear and terror of the world,

Will first subdue the Turk and then enlarge

Those Christian captives which you keep as slaves (*Tamburlaine I*, I:iii.46-58).

It is obvious that Marlowe draws on crusading rhetoric regarding the Turks and Knolles's chronicle incorporating the image of the Turks as "the scourge and wrath of God," and "terror of the world" into his play. In the play, Sultan Bajazeth is captured and kept in a cage by Tamburlaine, and at the end of the play the audience witness Bajazeth's suicide by hitting his head on the metal bars of the cage. Thomas and Tydeman depict in detail the Sultan's sufferings in captivity:

> In this great shame that he was undergoing, Bayazed was pierced through by rage, seized by grief, and overwhelmed with insult; he begged for death, and, when in his right mind, made an inexorably determined vow to take his own life. By repeated blows against the iron bars of his cage he smashed his head... and so brought about his unhappy, mournful fate. [233]

Sultan Bajazeth's humiliation in a cage and suicide do not reflect historical reality; on the contrary it reflects the Christian West's inferiority complex that was renewed and

[233] Thomas Vivien and William Tydeman, *Christopher Marlowe: The Plays and Their Sources* (London: Routledge, 1994), 109.

reinforced in the face of Ottoman omnipresence in Europe. As Vitkus puts it "many of the images of [Ottomans] that were produced by European culture in the early modern period are imaginary resolutions of real anxieties about Islamic wealth and might."[234] In other words, Ottoman expansion into Europe was compensated on the stage through 'paper-war' and provided a relief for the English audience who were distressed by Turks' victories in Europe. Bajazeth's affirmation of his overthrown means Islamic defeat for the audience and fulfills a longstanding Christian European fantasy:

> Ah, fair Zabina, we have lost the field,
>
> And never had the Turkish Emperor
>
> So great a foil by any foreign foe.
>
> Now will the Christian miscreants be glad,
>
> Ringing with joy their superstitious bells
>
> And making bonfires for my overthrow (*Tamburlaine I* 3.iii.233-38).

While giving a boastful speech of Ottoman power at his first speech, in the course of play Sultan Bajazeth reaffirms his defeat and Christian victory. Referring to Bajazeth's defeat at the Battle of Ankara shortly after his victory over the Christians at Nicopolis (1396), Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* was an imaginary victory over the Ottomans that appealed to the taste of early modern audience. In that sense, it can be asserted that representation of Ottoman sultans on early modern stage clearly helped the English dramatists to underpin the image of 'cruel Turk' reproducing anti-Islamic polemic of previous Western discourses. Furthermore, English dramatists frequently displayed Ottoman stories referring to Ottoman history in their plays. For instance, the imperial fratricide, initiated by Sultan Bajazeth, became a permanent practice in the history of Ottoman dynasty and repeatedly reconstructed on the English stage.[235] Robert Greene's *Selimus, Emperor of the Turks* (1594) displays Sultan Selim I as an extremely cruel Turkish image, executing his family members to access to the Ottoman throne. Greene's depiction refers to the practice of imperial fratricide, portraying Ottoman sultan and his court as cruel and murderous. Vitkus argues that:

---

[234] Daniel J. Vitkus, "Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Europe," *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other.* Ed. David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), 210.

[235] Nevsal Olcen Tiryakioğlu, "The Western Image of Turks from the Middle Ages to the 21st Cnetury: The Myth of 'Terrible Turk' and 'Lustful Turk,'" (Ph.D. Diss., Nottingham Trent University, 2015), 94.

> The actions of the Turkish royal family gave the anti-Islamic polemicists of Western Europe plenty of material to confirm their preconceived notions of oriental despotism. The Great Turk became a European bogey partly on the strength of a dynastic track record of executions, poisonings, strangulations, and general familicide.[236]

It is obvious that the image of dysfunctional Ottoman royal family was reproduced on early modern stage in order to reinforce preconceived notions of oriental despotism. In *Selimus,* Greene's depiction of Sultan Selim's fratricide, as Vitkus asserts above, promoted the image of 'cruel Turk' and confirmed preconceived notions of oriental despotism associated with Ottoman sultans. In this respect, depiction of Ottoman imperial practices on the stage not only reaffirmed stereotypical Turkish cruelty and barbarity, also reinforceed binary opposites that contributed to construction of Self/Other. *Selimus* starts with a soliloquy by the Ottoman Sultan Bajazeth similar to Sultan's first speech in *Tamburlaine,* boasting of Ottoman power and conquests: "Aye, though on all the world we make extent/ From the south pole unto the northern bears, And stretch our reign from East to Western shore" (*Selimus* I.13-16). With his speech, Selim reminds English audience Ottoman expansion into Europe and the menace they posed to the Christendom. Similar to Marlowe's depiction of Ottoman sultan in a cage, the audience witness Greene trying to awaken the feeling of Christian victory over the Turks: "My strongest garrisons they have supplanted/ And overwhelmed me in sad mischance/ And my decrease so long wrought their increase/ Till I was forced conclude a friendly peace" (*Selimus* I.64-71). In fact the play aims to deal with internal succession conflict in the Ottoman Empire and external losses for that time in order to provide a relief for the early modern audience. During his speech he reinforces the "war-like" and "cruel" qualities of Selim, and suggests that if Selim succeeds the Ottoman Empire would continue its expansion into Europe. In his *The Generalle Historie of the Turkes,* Knolles had depicted Sultan Selim I as the "most mercilesse man":

> [Baiazet, Acomates, Corcutus] perished through the unnaturall and execrable crueltie of this most mercilesse man. So that men generally did both feare him and hate him. For as much as he without all feare of God or regard of worldly shame, accounted no practise wicked or devise detestable,

[236]Daniel J. Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), 21.

> that might serve for the better establishing of his kingdome; and had set downe in his mind, (long before corrupted with ambition and tyrannie. That it was farre better for the assurance of his estate, to be feared of all than beloved of many; and therefore spared no man's life, of whom he had but the least suspicion.[237]

It can be inferred that Knolles's depiction of Sultan Selim shows resemblance to Greene's dramatization of the sultan who killed his family members in order to reign without fear and suspicion. In this context, both *Tamburlaine* and *Selimus* reaffirmed Vitkus's depiction of stereotypical despotic sultan who had been established in Western writings. The representation of despotic Sultan in these plays, ascribed with a set of conventional characteristics, described Ottoman royal house as a dysfunctional family whose members were power hungry and unnaturally murderous referring to the imperial fratricide. The representation of the Ottoman sultans in early modern drama was closely related to the image of 'cruel and barbarous Turk' of previous discourses regarding Islam and the Turks.[238] Thus, these plays both strengthened stereotypical Turk image and relived the English who were distressed by 'Ottoman peril' haunted Europe in the early modern period.

The Representation of "Turning Turk" Anxiety in *Othello*

The representation of 'cruel and barbarous Turk' on the stage helped the English to set centrality of 'Christian Self' in opposition to 'Muslim Otherness.' Especially religious and cultural *difference* was reproduced on early modern stage as a compensation of English subordination to Ottoman power. In this respect, English playwrights repeatedly peopled their plays with renegades who converted to Islam. In the face of Islamic expansion in Europe and Roman Catholic threat, the Protestant England experienced a collective anxiety about religious conversion. English Protestant ideology defined the Devil, the pope, and the Turk as religious enemies who aimed to convert good Protestant souls to a state of damnation. Hence, English texts associated internal and external enemies with "the pope and the Ottoman sultan; Satan or the Anti-Christ."[239] According to Vitkus, "conversion to Islam (or to Roman Catholicism) was considered a kind of sexual transgression or spiritual whoredom, and Protestantism proclaimed the same judgment –

[237] Richard Knolles, *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (London: Islip, 1603), 556.
[238] Daniel J. Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 121.
[239] Ibid., 77.

eternal damnation – for all those who were seduced by either the pope or the Prophet."[240] In other words, overpowering of the Ottomans besides Roman Catholic threat and apostasy of Englishmen increased anxiety of losing English identity, since conversion to Islam was not only regarded as a threat to Christianity but also to English masculinity posing it uncertain and vulnerable.[241] The expression 'to turn Turk' or 'turning Turk' that reflected anxiety of Islam was very common during early modern period, so the intolerance of cultural and religious renegades who 'turned Turk' was repeatedly dramatized on early modern stage. Damnation of these renegades on the stage appealed to the English audience's taste when Europe was haunted by rapid military advance of the Ottomans. Upon the roots of the meaning of 'the Turk' in European context, in *The English Parnassus* (1654), Joshua Poole assembled the following list of suitable synonyms and epithets from a comprehensive survey of 'the best authors'' works: "Unbelieving, misbelieving, thrifty, abstemious, cruel, unpitying, mercilesse, unrelenting, inexorable, warlick, circumcized, superstitious, bloody, wine-forbearing, turban'd, avaritious, covetous, erring."[242] Poole especially excluded any special reference to Islam in that list, since Muslims were always associated with 'the Turks' regardless of national origin. Indeed, 'the Turk' could be applied to the English if they behaved in an inappropriate way.

William Shakespeare's *Othello* (1604) reflected early modern English anxiety of "turning Turk" among English Protestants since conversion to Islam caused deep fear and anxiety for them. Although England felt safe from direct Ottoman menace because of geographical distance, the immediacy and proximity of the Ottoman advance were widely referred in early modern texts as Thomas Newton stated in his dedication to *Sarracenicae Historiae:* "They [the Saracens and Turks] were…at the very first very far from our Clyme & Region, and therefore the less to be feared, but now they are even at our doors and ready to come into our houses…"[243] In that sense, *Othello* embodied English anxiety of Islamic expansion rooted in a history of crusades, Islamic conquests and Christian *Reconquista.* Shakespeare aimed to relieve English audience through display of devastation of Ottoman

[240] Ibid., 78.
[241] Jonathan Burton, "English Anxiety and the Muslim Power of Conversion: Five Perspectives on 'Turning Turk' in Early Modern Texts*," Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, Vol.2 No. 1. (2002): 40.
[242] Qtd in Gerald Maclean, *Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 7.
[243] Qtd in Daniel J. Vitkus, "Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Europe," *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other.* Ed. David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), 211.

navy by the crusading fleet that attacked the Ottomans in Lepanto on 7 October 1571 under the command of Don John of Austria. Halil İnalcık remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> In the great naval battle which followed, the Ottoman fleet was destroyed. Four hundred and thirty-eight warships took part in the battle, of which 230 were Turkish. Only thirty Turkish ships managed to escape. The casualties given by both sides amounted to 59,000 dead and wounded. Under a triennial treaty of alliance the Christian states were to fit out every year 200 galleys carrying 50,000 troops. When, however, the Christian allies set out for Cyprus the following year, they were surprised to find facing them a new Turkish fleet, and hesitated to renew the assault. In the third year Venice preferred to make peace (7 March 1573). Under the peace-treaty, Venice renounced all its rights in Cyprus and agreed to pay heavy compensation.[244]

The naval power of the Christian league damaged Turkish navy in the Battle of Lepanto in 1571 as it was dramatized in *Othello*: "Our wars are done:/ The desperate tempest hath so bang'd the Turks/ That their designment halts" (*Othello*, II. i. 190-93). Othello confirmed as follows: "Our wars are done / The Turks are drown'd" (*Othello*, II. i. 202). It can be asserted that Shakespeare drew on Knolles's depiction of the Battle of Lepanto as he detailed as follows:

> It was a right horrible spectacle to see, how in this battell the sea stained with bloud, and covered with dead bodies, weapons, and the fragments of the broken gallies besides the great number of them that were slaine, and beaten into the sea; many of the Turks blinded with feare, casting away their weapons, to escape the furie of the enemie threw themselves headlong into the sea: but finding no hope to recover the land, labored againe to come to the gallies; or elsefainting by the way, were miseraly drowned…The number of the Turks lost in this most famous battell, could hardly be known, by reason that many of them were drowned.[245]

Although crusading fleet defeated Ottoman forces in Lepanto, they couldn't stop penetration of the Turks into Europe. As Andrew Wheatcroft observes the Turks never lamented the damage in Lepanto because "it was not the Ottoman tradition to make a

[244]Halil Inalcik, "The Heyday and Decline of the Ottoman Empire," *The Cambridge History of Islam Volume 1A: The Central Islamic Lands from Pre-Islamic Times to the First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 337.
[245] Richard Knolles, *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (London: Islip, 1603), 883.

lasting memorial out of victory or to chasten themselves with the remembrance of defeat. Triumph or catastrophe were in the hands of God."[246] In other words, Lepanto defeat was heavily underestimated by Ottoman Empire and regarded as a temporal success for the Europeans because the battle never diminished Ottoman power rather motivated them as the Turkish Grand Vizier Sokullu stated: "In wresting Cyprus from you, we have deprived you of an arm; in defeating our fleet, you have only shaved our beard. An arm when cut off cannot grow again; but a shorn beard will grow all the better for the razor."[247] Obviously, the naval battle of Lepanto was a critical setback for the Turks; however two years after Lepanto, the Turks conquered Cyprus. İnalcık points out that the conquest of Cyprus represented the highest point reached by Ottoman military power and mastery.[248]

The Turks conquered Cyprus in 1573; however neither the conquest nor any Ottoman attempt to conquer the Island was mentioned in the course of the play. The audience was presented a feast held to celebrate devastation of Ottoman navy in Act II, scene ii. Günseli İşçi associates this unspoken part of the play with "Ottoman obsession" as Lewis asserts in his *Islam and the West.*[249] According to İşçi, the deep and ever present fear of Turkish intrusion into Europe and Islamic threat for Christendom in the seventeenth century lies at the heart of this unspoken part of *Othello*.[250] Although, in the minds of early modern audience, as a hybrid creation Othello, the noble Moor of Venice, was never identified with a specific racial category, he could be associated with many religious and ethnic alterities – "Moor," "Turk," "Ottomite," "Saracen," "Mahommedan," – all constructed in opposition to Christian identity. Othello was a religious, national and moral contradiction; he also embodied a threat to the European/English notions of selfhood and nationhood due to his disrupted and inconstant identity. That is, Othello both contradicted and constituted European identity as Maclean argues:

> In the same way that European identities often imagined themselves into being by constructing and incorporating an imagined 'Turkish' (or some other exotic) other, another that is specially constituted by a series of

[246] Andrew Wheatcroft, *Infidels: A History of the Conflict between Christendom and Islam* (Newyork: Random House, 2005), 31
[247] Qtd in Ibid., 31.
[248] Halil Inalcik, "The Heyday and Decline of the Ottoman Empire," *The Cambridge History of Islam Volume 1A: The Central Islamic Lands from Pre-Islamic Times to the First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 337.
[249] Günseli S. İşçi, "Othello'da Türklere Yönelik Söylenenler ve Söylenmeyenler," *Tarih ve Toplum Dergisi*, Vol. 31 May, (1999): 52.
[250] Ibid., 52.

> contradictions, so the action of Shakespeare's play achieves tragic closure by following through how the very contradictions assigned to the other, once they have been incorporated, destroy the incorporating body. What destroys Othello is this 'Turk' within.[251]

In the course of the play, Othello, the "Moor of Venice," transformed into an enraged murderer from a Christian soldier and virtuous lover; he asserts his transformation as follows: "[M]y bloody thoughts with violent pace / Shall ne'er look back, ne'er ebb to humble love" (*Othello* 3.iii.460-461). Iago depicts Othello as a sexually-overdriven fool that makes him vulnerable to conversion:

> To win the Moor, were't to renounce his baptism,
>
> All seals and symbols of redeemed sin,
>
> His soul is so enfettered to her love,
>
> That she may make, unmake, do what she list,
>
> Even as her appetite shall play the god
>
> With his weak function. (2.iii.316.-22)

In Western discourse, sexual excess and aggression were always associated with Muslims. As Vitkus also asserts "to turn Turk" also refers to the association between Islam and promiscuity: "conversion to Islam [to turn Turk] was considered a kind of sexual transgression or spiritual whoredom."[252] In that sense, it is possible to observe highly negative images of Islam in the militant fury and frustrated lust of Othello since Islam was always defined as a religion of violence and lust. The Muslims of Ottoman Empire and the kingdom of Morocco were the 'chief Others' for the English and the words "Moor" and "Turk" were used interchangeably; the Moors of Barbary were often called Turks and signified a generalized Islamic identity.[253] English confusion of various Eastern ethnicities and their reduction of all these highly negative images to 'the Turk' caused many Othello-like characters on early modern stage. According to G.K. Hunter in the eye of English the Moors were "black-skinned outsider":

---

[251] Gerald Maclean, *Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 127.
[252] Daniel J. Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 78.
[253] Ibid., 96.

> The word 'Moor' had no clear racial status" to begin with; "its first meaning in the O.E.D is 'Mahmoden,' which itself meant merely "infidel," "non-Christian," "barbarian." Moors, as foreign infidels, virtually equivalent to Turks: 'the word "Moor" was very vague ethnographically, and very often seems to have meant little more than 'black-skinned outsider,' but it was not vague in its antithetical relationship to the European norm of the civilized white Christian.[254]

The Moors were defined as treacherous, aggressive and unstable people as Iago tells Roderigo, "These Moors are changeable in their wills" (*Othello* 1.iii.339-40) and he depicts Othello as an "erring barbarian" (*Othello* 1.iii.346-47). More importantly, the Muslim Moor was the counter- identity for civilized white Christian. Vitkus points out that in *Othello* the Moor was whitened and Christianized through baptism and he acquired epithet of "noble Moor" after he converted to Christianity. However, his purification was a borderline case even after his conversion to Christianity. In fact Othello's situation reflected religious intolerance regarding the Moors who were assumed to engage in covert Islamic practices that made them liable to suspicion and distrust for Christians. Associating this suspicion and hatred for the converted Moors with Othello's situation after his conversion, Othello's identity was relatedly put into question for the English.[255]

In fact, in *Othello* Shakespeare aimed to dramatize the threat posed by peaceful and good relations between the Venetians and the Ottoman sultanate that resulted in relinquishment of Cyprus to the Ottoman Turks in 1573 through Othello's lack of leadership. According to Vitkus, Othello's lack of leadership and frustrated male violence was directed at Desdemona, "forming a link between military aggression and sexual transgression."[256] Eventually, "the murder of Desdemona is the pagan sacrifice of a pure virgin, the action of the stereotypically cruel Moor or Turk."[257] By his conversion to oriental despotism, Othello fulfilled the stereotype of 'bloody Turk' or 'cruel Moor' reproduced by Western discourse. Othello's transformation into a violent and merciless Islamic tyrant also confirmed his relinquishment of Christianity and embrace of Islamic cruelty. Thus, Othello, who 'turned Turk at the end of the play, deserved "double"

[254] G. K. Hunter, "Elizabethans and Foreigners." *Shakespeare Survey* 17 (1964): 51.
[255] Daniel J. Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 94, 95.
[256] Ibid., 96.
[257] Ibid., 98.

condemnation by the audience; one for his black color and the other for his reconversion to Islam. Vitkus explains this phenomenon as follows:

> A baptized Moor turned Turk, Othello is 'double-damned' . . . for backsliding. Sent out to lead a crusade against Islamic imperialism, he turns Turk and becomes the enemy within. He has 'traduced' the state of Venice and converted to a black, Muslim identity, an embodiment of the Europeans' phobic fantasy. Othello has become the ugly stereotype.[258]

Othello who was adopted by the Venetian state in exchange for his service betrayed through his reconversion to Islam or "turning Turk" and transformation into a violent and merciless Islamic tyrant at the end of the play. Even in his last speech he boasts of killing a Turk for the service of Venetian State:

> And say besides that in Aleppo once,
>
> Where malignant, and a turban'd Turk/
>
> Beat a Venetian, and traduc'd the State,
>
> I took by th'throat the circumcised dog,/
>
> And smote him, thus. [He stabs himself]" (*Othello* V. ii 152-156).

According to İşçi, Othello's last speech can be analyzed in two different ways. On the one hand, Othello's last speech may refer to his hybrid creation and ideological paradox since he needs to affirm his loyalty and service to Venetian state within which he was an alien and 'the Other.' Although he acted like a "barbarian" by murdering a Turk, his murder of 'the Other' or 'the Turk' would alleviate his murderous act. On the other hand, Othello's committing suicide at the end of the play reinforcing the negative stereotypical characteristics that were attributed to the Turks may be associated with "Ottoman obsession" of his age as analyzed above.[259] Othello's death ends those anxieties and relieves this "obsession" to some extent; Othello is dead and Cyprus reverts to Cassio's control, so conversion is contained.[260] Shakespeare's dramatization of the "malignant and turbaned Turk" (*Othello,* V.ii.362) in *Othello* brings the relationship between Islam and Christendom into sharper focus. In other words, *Othello* is structured

[258] Ibid., 106.
[259] Günseli S. İşçi, "Othello'da Türklere Yönelik Söylenenler ve Söylenmeyenler," *Tarih ve Toplum Dergisi*, Vol. 31 May, (1999): 54.
[260] Matthew Dimmock, *New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England* (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005), 206.

around a providential Christian victory over the Turks while it is set against Christian defeat and destruction in Cyprus.[261] To put it simply, Shakespeare's *Othello* draws attention to English anxiety of "turning Turk" that is relieved by Othello's damnation at the end of the play. In that sense, Othello's damnation is a dramatic attempt to reverse Christian inferiority complex deconstructing fascination with Islamic wealth and might. Tu put it another way, Shakespeare, drawing on medieval anti-Islamic polemic and crusading rhetoric regarding the Turks, reproduced anxiety of Islamic expansion and stereotypical Turk image in early modern period. Clearly, early modern discourse of the Turks shows a remarkable consistency with the previous discourses upon which the early modern playwrights heavily drew.

2.2. The Restoration England and Representation of the Ottoman Turks in Restoration Drama

The Restoration England and English Anxiety of Ottoman Style Absolutism

As discussed in the previous part, the early modern discourse of the Turks was obsessed with the phenomenon of 'turning Turk,' since "the Turk was England's primary eastern object of fear and fantasy."[262] As Louis Wann also underlines in the period between 1579 and 1624 forty seven plays staged Islamic themes and characters and thirty one of these plays especially dealt with the Ottoman Turks and their history.[263] In that sense, the early modern playwrights repeatedly dramatized English anxiety of "turning Turk" displaying damnation of Islamic conversion on the stage. Those playwrights drawing on the elements of previous discourses of the Turks and binding them into early modern network of meaning not only reproduced stereotypical Turk image but also led perpetuation of that image for subsequent texts. The image of Turk was structured as a "powerful ideological construct"[264] referring to a set of specific characteristics rather than an ethnic identity. Linda McJannet remarks certain stereotypical characteristics associated with the Turks as follows:

> Pejorative epithets associated with the Ottomans in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries included "bloody," "cruel," and "barbarous." Turks

[261] Ibid., 205.
[262] Richmond Barbour, *Before Orientalism: London's Theatre of the East 1576-1626* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. 2003), 15.
[263] Louis Wann, "The Orient in Elizabethan Drama" *Modern Philology* 12, No. 7 (1915): 439. 423-447.
[264] Stephan Schmuck, "From Sermon to Play: Literary Representations of 'Turks' in Renaissance England 1550-1625," *Literature Compass*, 2, (2006): 5.

> were compared to forces of nature (whirlwinds or floods) or beasts (wolves, vipers, boars) and depicted in bestial terms such as "unbridled" or "swarming." Their rule was described as "tyranny" or a "yoke."[265]

It can be inferred that in spite of Ottoman positional superiority in Anglo-Ottoman relations during early modern period, representation of the Turks was based on stereotyping and simplification as previously noted by Vitkus and Matar.[266] Essentially, early modern English literature reinforced setereotypical image of the Turk well established in Western consciousness through anti-Islamic polemic of medieval times and crusading rhetoric regarding the Turks. In the first half of the seventeenth century, the English were both fascinated with Ottoman wealth and might and afraid of being conquered and converted by the Ottoman power. Maclean argues that including primarily the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 all desirable objects such as "oil portraits, magnificent and powerful horse, costly 'Turkey' carpets, embroidered silk tapestries and other household furnishings"[267] represented a lack that was structured as awe and desire by the English and turned into "imperial envy":

> During the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, at least, English writers . . . never forgot that they were dealing with an empire that controlled a great deal of Eastern Europe and a third of the known world, not a backward, vulnerable and somehow 'orientalized' space waiting to be conquered and controlled. Where imperial discourses might be expected to produce empowered imperial subjects constituting themselves at the expense of colonized subalterns, the situation proves to be more complex in the case of English views of the Ottomans. Instead of any simple desire for domination, we will find instead a restructuring of desire, knowledge and power: imperial envy.[268]

As Maclean argues the English were well aware of Ottoman Empire's power and strength who controlled a third of the world even they were demonized in popular English writings. Obviously, as a wealthy polity that stretched across three continents, Ottoman

---

[265] Linda McJannet, *The Sultan Speaks: Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 16.
[266] Nabil Matar, *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 14., Daniel J. Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 78.
[267] Gerald Maclean, *Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 44.
[268] Ibid., 20.

Empire was beyond colonization and domination rather that it was a source of awe and fascination that Maclean terms as "imperial envy" for the English who were a relatively unimportant nation bent on competing with Spain for New World riches. Maclean adds that the "imperial envy" the English experienced in their relations with the Ottomans played a role in inspiring their own imperial ambitions and was part of the impetus that transformed them into an imperial nation.[269] English imperial ambition was essential for the making of the English identity as Matar argues as follows:

> The making of the English (and later British) identity has been associated with two forces: Protestantism and colonization. The English, both men and women, it has been argued, gradually articulated their sense of self in light of their adherence to Protestant theology (with explicit opposition to Catholicism) and their colonial thrusts into Ireland and North America-thrusts that later transformed into imperial realization.[270]

It can be asserted that Ottoman Empire played an undeniable role in transformation of England into an imperial nation. Through imperial attempts in North Africa, the Indian subcontinent along with chartering of the Royal African Company and acquisition of Tangier and Bombay, the English began to establish colonies and strenghthen power of English navy. English colonial expansion and acquisition of new lands were regarded as "sensational events [that] confirmed England's new status as a leading power in all continents and as would-be mistress of the seas."[271] In Maclean's terms, "imperial envy started to give way to an emergent imperiousness," and the Ottomans were began to be regarded "less as distant and barbaric partners in trade and increasingly as potential allies in the great game of international intrigue and empire building."[272] Even though Ottoman Empire was still pushing towards neighboring Christian countries like the Island of Crete, which was surrendered to Turks in 1669 after a long siege, the Turkish military power was no longer a serious threat for the Europeans as Lord Kinross notes "the continuing Ottoman campaign against Crete made it clearer than ever that the Turks no longer had command of the sea."[273] In other words, In contrast to the development of European navies and economies, Ottoman Empire had to accept the military degeneration in 1681 with "a

[269] Ibid., 20.
[270] Nabil Matar, *Britain and Barbary, 1589-1689* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2005), 1.
[271] Gerald Maclean, *Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 189.
[272] Ibid., 21, 189.
[273] Lord Kinross, *The Ottoman Centuries*: *The Rise and Fall of the Turkish Empire (*New York: Morrow Quill Paperbacks, 1977), 331.

treaty of peace [which] was signed with the Russians, by which the Turks renounced all claim to the Ukraine and withdrew their troops from the area."[274] In other words, by the late seventeenth century the balance of power had begun to shift away from the Ottoman Empire towards the West, in spite of many territorial acquisitions including Crete in 1664 and part of Poland in 1676. Turkish failure in Vienna in 1683 concluded the Turkish gradual military deterioration; they began a slow retreat that culminated in the loss of the Ukraine to Poland, Hungary and Transylvania to Austria, and Morea to Venice in the 1699 Treaty of Karlowitz.[275] In the second half of the seventeenth century Ottoman Empire ceased to be a serious military threat, although it still held a strategic position in commercial alliances with European countries and "remained an important factor in the European balance of power."[276] Thus, accounts of Ottoman political and religious aspects came into prominence. As important as Knolles's *The Generalle Historie of the Turkes*, Paul Rycaut's[277] *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (1668) provided detailed information on the Ottoman political, military, and religious organization in the second half of the seventeenth century. However, according to Darling, Rycaut reproduced the stereotype of Turk established in Knolles's *Historie* in Restoration political context.[278] In other words, Rycaut presented his political commentary about the Civil War, Commonwealth, and Restoration in Turkish guise. In "The Epistle Dedicatory", he states that "I may confidently draw a rude Scheme before your Lordship, of the *Turkish* Government, Polices, and Customs;"[279] he maintains as follows:

> This Present, which I thus humbly consecrate to your Lordship, may be termed barbarous, as all things are differenced from us by diversity of Manners and Custome, and are not dressed in the mode and fashion of our Times and Countries; for we contract prejudice from ignorance and want of familiarity. But your Lordship, who exactly ponderates the weight of

[274] Ibid., 342.
[275] Roderic H. Davison, *Turkey: A Short History*. 3rd Ed. (Huntingdon, England: The Eothen Press, 1998), 74,75.
[276] Bernard Lewis, *Islam and the West* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 19.
[277] In 1660, after the Restoration, he was granted an appointment as private secretary to King Charles's new ambassador to the Ottoman sultan in Istanbul and Levant Company's secretary in Istanbul. Linda T. Darling, "Ottoman Politics through British Eyes: Paul Rycaut's *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire*," *Journal of World History*, Vol.5, No.1 (Spring, 1994): 72.
[278] Linda T. Darling, "Ottoman Politics through British Eyes: Paul Rycaut's *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire*," *Journal of World History*, Vol.5, No.1 (Spring, 1994): 74.
[279] Paul Rycaut, *The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (London: Charles Brom, 1686), A4. Retrieved from: https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=KKMuTmW98DEC&printsec=frontcover&dq=paul+rycaut&hl=tr&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi_lZy7iqrfAhUvtYsKHfA6BzgQ6AEILzAB#v=onepage&q=paul%20rycaut&f=false

> Humane Actions, acknowledges reason in all its habits, and draws not the measures of Oeconomy or Policy from external appearances or effects, but from the Fundamental and original Constitutions; so that your Lordship will conclude, that a People, as the *Turks* are, Men of the same composition with us, cannot be so Savage and Rude as they are generally described; for ignorance and grossness is the effect of Poverty, not incident to happy Men, whose spirits are elevated with Spoils and Trophies of so many Nations.[280]

Rycaut states that his account was generally based on official Ottoman records, registers, and eyewitness accounts rather than on the basis of hearsay and asserts that his account would provide more familiarty with the Ottomans. In general, his account was about political and religious matters[281] rather than military strength of the Ottomans referring to the lessening Ottoman military effectivenesss in the region. More importantly, Rycaut's special interest in political and religious matters reflected his concern for the most critical issues of England by the second half of the seventeenth century. Rycaut argues that:

> But indeed when I have considered seriously the contexture of the *Turkish* government, the absoluteness of an Emperour without Reason, without Vertue, whose Speeches may be irrational, and yet must be Laws; whose Actions irregular, and yet Examples; whose Sentence and Judgement, if in matters of the Imperial concernment, are most commonly corrupt, and yet decrees irresistible:…as Slaves for their great Patron and Master, what will inevitably effect their ruine and destruction, though they have all arguments of faithfulness, virtue and moral honesty (which are rare in a *Turk*) to be their advocates, and plead for them.[282]

Rycaut draws attention to the absolute authority of Ottoman sultan and his irresistible power over his subjects and regards this absolute authority as the sole prerequisite for the continuity of the Ottoman Empire since Ottoman absolutism was undoubtedly effective in case of war. Here, Rycaut implicitly refers to English monarchical

[280] Paul Rycaut, "The Epistle Dedicatory."

[281] Rycaut's political refelctions are concentrated in the first four chapters of his sixty-chapter work. The first and longest "Book" (twenty-two chapters), on the governmental structure and practices of the Ottomans, is entitled "The Maxims of the Turkish Politie." The second "Book" (twenty-six chapters) is entitled "Of the Turkish Religion"; the third (twelve chapters) is "Of the Turkish Militia". Linda T. Darling, "Ottoman Politics through British Eyes: Paul Rycaut's *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire*," *Journal of World History*, Vol.5, No.1 (Spring, 1994): 75.

[282] Paul Rycaut, *The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (London: Charles Brom, 1686), 2- 3.

Restoration of 1660 that was intended by some as a step toward French-style absolutism.[283] French monarchy was regarded as ultimate in tyranny suppressed only by tyranny of the Turks. In that sense, Rycaut's detailed political commentary of Turkish governmental organization in which tyranny, absolutism, and unquestionable sultanic rule was associated with the absolutist tendencies of the Stuart monarchy.[284] Rycaut remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> In this Government, severity, violence and cruelty are natural to it, and it were as great an errour to begin to loose the reins, and ease the people of that oppression to which they and their fore-fathers have since their first original been accustomed, as it would be in a Nation free-born, and used to live under the protection of good Laws, and the Clemency of a virtuous and Christian Prince, to exercise a Tyrannical power over their Estates and Lives, and change their Liberty into servitude and slavery.[285]

Rycaut's account of Ottoman political organization not only rendered his political commentary on European monarchies but also reinforced the image of oriental despotism that hanged over the Turks since antiquity. In that sense it can be asserted that Paul Rycaut's account of the Turks provided detailed information about the political organization of the Empire and propagated Turkish stereotypes focusing on the notions of oriental despotism or absolute and arbitrary nature of the Ottoman Empire. In other words, Rycaut's work, a veiled advice to the English monarch, led perpetuation of Turkish stereotypes in Restoration England. Rycaut depicted Ottoman rule as a negative ideal awakening a new consciousness that the Ottoman government would hold valuable lessons for the ordering and administration of new monarchy. In the political context of the Restoration England, it can be argued that English anxiety of "turning Turk" was replaced by anxiety of Ottoman style of absolutism, arbitrariness and oriental despotism.

Restoration of the Monarchy and the Stage: The Representation of the Turks in Heroic Plays

Rycaut's account of Turkish political organization moulded by political crisis of the second half of the seventeenth century including Revolution, Regicide, and Restoration inspired English playwrights to dramatize English politics in disguise of 'the Other'. The

[283] Linda T. Darling, "Ottoman Politics through British Eyes: Paul Rycaut's *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire*," *Journal of World History*, Vol.5, No.1 (Spring, 1994): 78.
[284] Ibid., 79.
[285] Paul Rycaut, *The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (London: Charles Brom, 1686), 4.

availability of 'the Other' to dramatists as a means of political commentary on political conflicts and anxieties became so increasingly important in England that between 1660 and 1714, at least forty plays set in Asia or the Levant appeared on the London stage. They were almost, all serious, heroic plays or tragedies that referred to the absolutism, civil strifes, harem intrigues, and oriental despotism in Eastern Empires.[286] Thus, Restoration stage preferred to display stereotypical Eastern qualities in order to ensure the *difference* between Eastern barbarity and English civility, Islam and Christianity, the East and the West ensuring validity of superior Self in contrast to inferior Other. In this context, Ottoman Empire provided a negative ideal for the English through dramatization of Ottoman style absolutism, sultanic tyranny, and disregard of law on Restoration stage. It is important to note that Restoration stage combined anti-Islamic polemic, crusading rhetoric and early modern anxiety of the Turkish military aggression in representation of the Turks. In that sense, Restoration stage reinforced the image of stereotypical Turk established in previous Western discourses binding them into Restoration network of meaning. To put it simply, Restoration context combined the image of 'raging and expansionist,' 'cruel,' 'absolute' and 'sensual' Turk drawing on stereotypical Turk image well established in Western consciousness.

There was an over signification of Ottoman and Islamic elements in the aftermath of Restoration. Recent scholarly reevaluation of the perception of the Turks and Islam in Restoration England and dramatic representations by critics like Byron Smith, Bridget Orr, and Matthew Birchwood indicated that the relationship between Ottoman Turks and Restoration England was influenced primarily by the political dynamics of the period. These scholars argue that dramatization of the Turks and Islam in Restoration drama widely referred to the current religious and political issues in England, which found in Islam a rich material for instructing the English politics. Hence, the Restoration stage provided a contemporary mirror in which discourse of oriental despotism, false religion and sexual perversion of the Ottoman Empire, against which England as an emergent empire, could be defined as politically, religiously and sexually more civil. In other words, Restoration drama evoked preconceived notions of sultanic tyranny, oriental despotism, the conflict between the Cross and the Crescent, anti-Islamic polemic in a system of representation based on *difference*. As a system of representation, the Restoration discourse underpinned this *difference* and represented the world as divided according to a

[286] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 61.

simple binary of the West/the East, Islam/Christendom, and European civility/Oriental despotism. In other words, Restoration discourse reemphasized stereotypical representations of 'the Turk' evoking the preconceived notions of Orientalism. Especially, succession problems, fraternal strife and harem intrigues in Oriental settings provided a counter image against which the English reimagined and resolved their local political problems.[287] In other words, in disguise of Ottoman political problems, the Restoration dramatists provided a counter identity for the emergent imperial ideology of England. In displaying contemporary political problems of England in disguise of Ottomans, Restoration dramatists provided a negative ideal from which the English could emulate an empire drawing on preivous anti-Islamic polemic, crusading rhetoric and early modern discourse regarding the Turks.

Restoration plays that dealt with Ottoman political problems were almost, all serious, heroic plays or tragedies that aimed to display pro-Stuart vision of restored monarchical authority, national consensus and national greatness. Put it simply, Restoration of monarchy in England constituted a period of contending activities and attitudes and ways of thinking; in other words, the Restoration was "a deeply contradictory affair, the product of an already divided society"[288] since the political crisis of Revolution and Regicide distressed the common Englishmen and divided society. Thus, Charles II's Restoration of monarchy aimed a general return to the conditions prevailing before the civil wars through various constitutional and social changes more importantly restoration of stage. On the one hand, the return of the King brought along with some religious constitutions including the return of bishops, tithing, and the licensing of clergyman authorized to preach and interpret the Bible. Besides, church courts were reopened and Court censorship also returned in order to ensure religious and social uniformity. On the other hand, King's return marked 1660 as Restoration of the stage; that is, public theatres were back in business, the publishing trade flourished, often under government control the women continued to act on the stage, write and publish.[289] For social, cultural, and political historians, the Restoration changed ideas that were central to our understanding of early modern England and brought along new practices. Gerald Maclean remarks this phenomenon as follows:

[287] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 61.
[288] Gerald MacLean, *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration: Literature, Drama, History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 4.
[289] Ibid., 5.

> In 1660, after a period of bloody civil unrest during which arms flourished and arts withered, the king returned. Now that the "Puritan" revolution was over, everyone wanted peace and order: satire flourished to translate disruptive anger and hostility into either companionable irony and innuendo or partisan indignation, the public theaters reopened (with women actors) to entertain an urban public, poets started writing in heroic couplets that structurally replicated principles of social order and civic harmony.[290]

It can be inferred that King's return suggests the pairing of monarchy and theater. The institution shut down by the Puritans, returned with style after Restoration. The relicensing of the public theatres in London after 1660 was a signal event in the literary culture of the nation. Bridget Orr argues that the politics of Restoration drama was also extended to the streets. That is, scripted articulations of English ideology of empire were also used in such performances as the pageants at the Lord Mayor's Shows of the 1670s, masques performed for the Court and public ceremonies such as the coronation as well as the theatre itself.[291] The King's entry into London on May 29 1660 was the first in a series of public shows designed to awe audiences and impose them with a pro-Stuart vision of restored monarchical authority. London used the coronation festivities to proclaim her loyalty to the restored monarchy by putting up spectacular triumphal acts and masque-like performances. The aim of this spectacle was to amaze them with the manifestation of real authority after the uncertainties of the Interregnum. In general, Restoration drama aimed to establish a claim upon the national identity and to reflect "a belief in national consensus supporting the restored monarchy."[292] In other words, throughout the 1660s, the Restoration drama and the Restoration court influenced each other, together developing the aesthetic and ideology of the heroic.

The ideology of the heroic served Restoration's style that seemed to be obsessed with stories of Regicide and Restoration and re-writing the recent past; that is, Restoration stage was transformed into an arena in which the playwrights were expected to display their royalist loyalties.[293] The constant appearance of the exotic sultans, valiant heroes and revered kings from the past who assured absolute authority over their dominion aimed to

---

[290] Ibid., 6.
[291] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 17.
[292] Gerald MacLean, *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration: Literature, Drama, History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 23.
[293] Nancy Klein Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy, 1660-71* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 34.

invoke royal authority over the audiences through stage performances. Therefore, Charles II publicly commended his preferences to be acted; he authorized plays written in the French style of rhymed couplets from Sir Roger Boyle.[294] The King's commissions shaped the theater's style and paved way to playwright's extreme dedication to royal authority that resulted in identification between stage and court, king and hero, the heroic and the court. According to McGirr, "the heroic became the cultural language of Stuart rule. It functioned as a metonym for the characters and 'plots' – the policies and actions – of Charles II and his brother James."[295] In other words, the close relationship between the restored Stuarts with heroic drama in general explains that Restoration stage provided an outlet to impose the audience pro-Stuart vision of monarchy.

Through their explicit political contexts, the heroic plays pioneered on Restoration stage. On the origins of the heroic play in his article "The Sources of the Restoration Heroic Play" William S. Clark quotes Professor Allardyce Nicoll's remarks of heroic play as follows:

> …The heroic play…is to be explained by a threefold formula- Elizabethan substratum, the spirit of the age, and foreign influence…The impossible platonic love, the conflict of passion and honor, the distant scenes of countries unknown or idealized, all these Beaumont and Fletcher handed on to their successors, Davenant, Dryden, and Orrery…The hero of the Restoration tragedy is not the hero of the pure tragedies or tragi-comedies of romance; he moves in a world of greater grandeur, where bombast and rant take the place of clearer and more subdued poetic expression. This heightened atmosphere, this rant, this bombast, and this egotism, may well have been fostered by that other Elizabethan strain which took its rise in Marlowe's *Tamburlaine.*[296]

Nicoll states that heroic plays of Restoration drama had Elizabethan background; however they were accommodated to the period under foreign influence of love and honor code. He observes strong language similarity between Marlovian tradition and the heroic play. However, it is not possible to conclude upon this similarity that the Restoration

[294] James Winn, *John Dryden and His World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), 183.
[295] Elaine M. McGirr, "The Politics of Style: The Heroic Mode and Political Crisis, 1660-1745" (PhD. Diss., Washington University, 2002), 24.
[296] Qtd in. William S. Clark, "The Sources of the Restoration Heroic Play," *The Review of English Studies*, Vol.4, No. 13 Oxford University Press (1928): 50.

heroic play was directly influenced by early modern English drama. Heroic play's emphasis on "heroic virtue" infected Restoration stage quickly and met with high commendation. Restoration playwrights were soon persuaded that "the great Characters and Subjects of serious plays are representations of the past glories of the World."[297] As "heroic play" was first coined by Sir William Davenant in 1663, in his preface to *The Siege of Rhodes,* "the heroic plays set forth the ideas of greatness and virtue in the important actions of persons of high station."[298] Three years later the phrase of "heroic play" was applied by John Dryden as he writes in his preface to *The Indian Emperor:*

> The favor which heroic plays have lately found upon our theatres has been wholly derived to them from the countenance and approbation they have received at court. The most eminent persons for wit and honor in the royal circle having so far owned them, that they have judged no way so fit as verse to entertain a noble audience, or to express a noble passion; and among the rest which have been written in this kind they have been so indulgent to this poem as to allow it no inconsiderable place.[299]

Dryden indicates the composition of *The Indian Emperor*, namely the rhymed couplets, by "verse." By "heroic plays," he plainly refers to those Restoration serious plays written in rhyme and he considers Restoration heroic plays "innovative."[300] The heroic play, in short, is regarded as a peculiar Restoration form as Dryden asserts that "for heroic plays, in which only I have used it [i.e. heroic verse] without the mixture of prose, the first light we had of them, on the English theatre, was from the late Sir William Davenant."[301] *The Siege of Rhodes* attracted his attention since during the years 1661-1663, it was not only the single Restoration example of serious dramatic expression, but also a popular piece that addressed to the tastes of the Restoration audience.

According to Maguire, heroic drama combined the aspects of Caroline masque, French romance, Italian opera, classical epic, and the Roman Catholic Mass. Its distinguished but formulaic plots were known for love triangles and the struggle between

---

[297] William S. Clark, "The Definition of the 'Heroic Play' in the Restoration Period," *The Review of English Studies*. Vol. 8, No. 32 Oxford University Press (1932): 438.
[298] Ibid., 439.
[299] H.T. Swedenberg. Ed, *The Works of John Dryden*. 9 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956), 285.
[300] William S. Clark, "The Definition of the 'Heroic Play' in the Restoration Period," *The Review of English Studies*. Vol. 8, No. 32 Oxford University Press (1932): 440.
[301] H.T. Swedenberg. Ed, *The Works of John Dryden*. 9 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956), 18-19.

love and honor as Maguire summarizes that the heroic plot was a narrative circle revolving around usurpation and restoration, re-writing lived history.[302] The heroic drama was summed up as "general divertissement" including actresses, dynamic and exotic sets, elaborately choreographed dances and battles, songs and rhymed couplets that fascinate its audiences. This fascination was intensified by special effects created by stage machines and lighting.[303] Besides these characteristic divertissements that made it unique, heroic style covered more than mere text or performance. Especially, Dryden's heroic plays were credited with formulating "a new mythology" for the restored monarchy with their powerful monarchs and idealized history.[304] The heroic style's insistence on repetition of idealized history aimed to convince the audience that the heroic told the 'real' history. As Dryden notes that the ultimate aim of the heroic style was "to raise the imagination of the Audience, and perswade them, for the time, what they behold on the Theater is really perform'd. The Poet is, then, to endeavour an absolute dominion over the minds of the Spectators."[305] That is, heroic style's mission was to reconcile "history" and "heroic" consequently assure the audience's royalist authority.

The beheading of Charles I, the fate of individual family fortunes and family members during the civil war, and the return of the monarchy all shaped Restoration literature. The reactions to these events and conditions were manifested in Restoration drama. Susan J. Owen argues that the whole century from 1588 to 1688 was innately important to initiate English culture and identity; that is Restoration dynamics reciprocally shaped the ideology of the period. She argues that Restoration politics had a profound effect on dramatic form and in the 1660s the king had promoted the royalist heroic play in rhyming couplets, since Charles saw the drama as a political instrument.[306] In other words, the new dramatic genre of the heroic play in rhyming couplets came about through royal instigation. Nancy Maguire points out that "for the first time, those in power promoted a consciously contrived campaign to build a new monarchy and a new culture."[307] As Owen similarly emphasizes "in the divided society of the 1660s, in which Stuart ideology has to

[302] Nancy Klein Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy, 1660-71* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 2-3.
[303] Ibid., 84.
[304] Ibid., 11.
[305] W. Ker. Ed, *The Essays of John Dryden* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), XI-14.
[306] Susan J. Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 11.
[307] Nancy Klein Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy, 1660-71* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 7.

be reconstructed and reinstated after the rupture of the Interregnum, the royalist heroic play represents an attempt to paper over ideological cracks."[308]

The Restoration drama, enriched poetically under triumphant Stuart monarchy, played a crucial role in building a new monarchy and culture due to its propagandist nature. In other words, the politics of Restoration period has been implemented in Restoration plays to promote national greatness as well as national consensus. In this context, the Restoration witnessed the development of national literature to which John Dryden contributed enormously. Proud of English national literature enterprises, Dryden remarks in the *Essay of Dramatick Poesie* that "yet, with the restoration of our happiness, we see revive'd Poesie lifting up its head, and already shaking off the rubbish which lay so heavy on it. We have seen since his Majesties return, many Dramatick Poems which yield not to those of any forreign Nation."[309] Obviusly, Dryden establishes a direct relation between national elevation and Charles II's return since literary productions of this period celebrated the king's return to construct a favorable future that only monarchy could guarantee.[310] Furthermore, the heroic plays of Restoration stage reflected the imperial spirit of English nation in the aftermath of Restoration in which political power was underpinned. Interdependency of poetic and political power was performed in heroic dramas of the Restoration stage as Dryden linked poetry and inter-state rivalry in a "patriotic frame" in his *Essay of Dramatick Poesie*: "that memorable day…, when our Navy ingage'd the *Dutch*: a Day wherein the two most mighty and best-appointed Fleets which any age had ever seen, disputed the command of the greater half of the Globe, the commerce of Nations, and the riches of the Universe."[311] Dryden creates a parallel between two international engagements; a naval battle between the English and the Dutch, referring to English navy's prominence and British literary superiority. References to English navy's prominence in literary forms reflect the dramatists were involved in political affairs. Indeed, several of the protagonists of the story told in Restoration plays actively participated in every stage of that transformation through Civil War, Republic and Restoration. Playwrights like William Davenant and Roger Boyle were soldiers in the armed conflict while Elkanah Settle was active propagandist. Diplomats like Paul Rycaut

[308] Susan J. Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 19.
[309] H.T. Swedenberg. Ed, *The Works of John Dryden*. 9 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956), 63.
[310] Ibid., 7.
[311] John Dryden, *Of Dramatick Poesie:An Essay* (1668):1 Retrieved from: https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/html/1807/4350/displayprosef9f5.html?prosenum=14

were informed by their own travels in the Levant. Through such networks, the politics of the time was incorporated into every stratum of English society, connecting drama with diplomacy, political philosophy and propaganda.[312] Dryden had no personal experience in colonial administration; however he was a strong propagandist of English imperial ambitions and court's war decisions.[313] Samuel Johnson reacts Dryden's accommodating himself to the politics of his time and argues that poetry, politics, economics and history interpenetrate, shaping and being shaped by each other.[314] Robert Markley defines this interaction between politics and poetry of Restoration as "the assertion of patriarchal infallibility"; he remarks that:

> The crises of the late seventeenth century, then, are those of both faith and experience, belief and history. It is significant in this regard, that one of the dominant modes of discourse in the 1660s and 1670s is the assertion of patriarchal infallibility, cutting off argument, in other words…the fictions of authority.[315]

According to his remarks, absolute authority was inscribed into the Restoration politics as reflected in the Restoration drama through heroic plays where the order and authority were represented by the patriarchal figures. He asserts that "Restoration, the age of 'failed epic'….elaborate poetic attempts to mythologize the existing political and moral order."[316] In other words, the plays of the Restoration had distinctive political voices, and this quality was developed by dramatists who utilized theatre as a political arena that is an important quality of restored stage's legacy.

In his literary productions, Dryden clearly unites poetics with politics of his time celebrating England's imperial aspirations against Spanish dominance and the rise of northern European states whose naval power took a prominent role in the world. In *Annus Mirabilis* Dryden notes that "Already we have conquer'd half the War,/ And the less dang'rous part is left behind…"(1209-1210) with a propagandistic celebration of English colonial expansion. Similarly, in his dedication to *Indian Emperour* (1667) Dryden celebrates the greatness of the English nation and triumphs colonial expansion:

---

[312] Matthew Birchwood, *Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685* (Cambridge: DS Brewer, 2007), 19.
[313] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 9.
[314] Robert Markley, "Introduction: History, Ideology, and the Study of Restoration Drama," *The Eighteenth Century*. Vol. 24, No. 2 (1983): 96.
[315] Ibid., 97.
[316] Ibid., 98.

> Under your Patronage Montezuma hopes he is more safe than in his Native *Indies*: and therefore comes to throw himself at your Graces feet; paying that homage to your Beauty, which he refus'd to the violence of his Conquerors. He begs only that when he shall relate his sufferings, you will consider he is an *Indian* Prince, and not expect any other Eloquence from his simplicity, than that, with which his griefs have furnished him.[317]

As one of the most successful heroic dramas on the Restoration stage, Dryden's *Indian Emporour* (1665) celebrates the possibilities for English colonial expansion and supports British colonial ambitions in contrast to the Spanish power whose wealth and ambition cast a long shadow over English history until 1640s.[318] Thus, Dryden's interest in comparison with other European powers indicates that Restoration stage also became an arena to defy other European imperial forces to attain universal monarchy. Anthony Pagden points out English's aspiration for the universal monarchy and states that in the minds of the English, Spain had become "a model of what an empire should not be," because they likened the Spanish to Turks whom they regarded "inflexible, illiberal and ultimately corrupting tyranny."[319] Since Spain had founded its colonies not upon agriculture and trade as British and French founded, but upon conquest, Spain's territories were described as "kingdoms".[320] The English regarded themselves as "colonial administrators" as they described the Spanish as "military conquistadors." As Pagden argues, "the Spaniards, like the Turks – with whom they became increasingly identified…-- had only destroyed those whose ends they should have been protecting."[321] Under the light of Dryden's preface to *Indian Emperour* and Pagden's statements, it can be argued that Dryden intends to justify contemporary British imperialism against Spanish cruelty through dramatic representations that positioned the Catholic, Latin and Mediterranean Spaniard as the antithesis of the English. Therefore, the Spanish remained as the proximate figures of otherness among European locales, although their imperial power was waning in the face of increasing British sea power, French imperialist ambitions, and

[317]H.T. Swedenberg. Ed, *The Works of John Dryden*. 9 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956), 25.
[318] John Reeve, "Britain or Europe? The Context of Early Modern English History: Political and Cultural, Economic and Social, Naval and Military," *The New British History: Founding a Modern State, 1603–1715.* Ed. Glenn Burgess (London: I. B. Tauris, 1999), 304. 287–312
[319] Anthony Pagden, *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France, c. 1500–1800* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1995), 116-122.
[320] Ibid., 79.
[321] Ibid., 88.

Dutch economic aspirations.[322] It is obvious that in the pursuit of universal monarchy the English defied other European nations since military effectiveness and colonial thrusts increased national confidence in foreign affairs and imperial arena.[323] Hence, dramatic poems with epic pretensions provided the English dramatists to define Englishness and reinforce superiority of the English on Restoration stage that made heroic mode an important tool for representation of Restoration ideologies.

As stated above Restoration drama not only promoted restored state's legacy but also national greatness and imperial ambitions in the aftermath of Restoration. Inevitably, England's overseas expansion brought about increased contacts with foreign cultures and colonization of Asia, Africa and the New World. In that sense, Restoration stage represented irreducible *difference* of these foreign cultures encountered during or aftermath of discovery and colonization of newfound lands in order to assert the strength of English selfhood against 'the Other.'[324] Especially heroic plays of Restoration displayed aspects of foreign cultures through scenes of seraglio and Oriental wealth, sultanic tyranny and inherent cruelty in their practices. Ultimately, display of foreign cultures in heroic mode with emphasis on cultural, political, and religious *difference* not only reinforced English greatness but also empowered binary oppositions of Self/Other, the West/the East, Christianity/Islam and European civilization/Oriental despotism. In other words, the heroic plays utilized preconceived distinction between the East and the West reinforcing Eastern despotism, backwardness, sexual perversion and inherent cruelty. Bridget Orr argues that representation of foreign cultures on Restoration stage was closely related to domestic concerns and anxities since these locales, as an alternate to English politics and culture, offered the opportunity for disguise as well as comparison. Orr remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> Thus the problem of succession which haunted England in the Restoration could be explored through the representing the fraternal strife in the Turkish empire, where polygamy and the lack of primogeniture provided a very different but equally uncertain set of conditions for the transfer of power. In a play such as Orrery's *Mustapha,* an English audience could detect parallels between the situations of the Ottomans and the Stuarts and would

[322] Ibid., 89.
[323] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 5.
[324] Ibid., 4.

> also be shown that the fratricidal conflicts caused by Oriental practices were crueler and more productive of division than their own.[325]

It can be inferred that dramatization of the problems of succession, fratricide, over-centralized or tyrannical power, and intriguing harem politics in the Ottoman setting provided a counter identity for the emergent ideology of imperial English. In other words, in the face of building a new monarchy and a new culture, the Ottoman Empire not only provided a model to be avoided but also an opportunity for disguise of uncertain political conditions in England. Orr points out that representation of the Ottoman Empire on the Restoration stage provided an imaginary site "in which local problems, whether those of succession or the relation between the Crown and private citizens, could be re-imagined, explored and resolved."[326] Orr maintains that representation of the Ottoman Empire as torn by problematic imperial expansion, Oriental despotism, succession problems and intriguing harem politics provided a counter identity against which Restoration England could define itself:

> The late seventeenth dramas which used the Turkish empire as a setting generally served . . . to remind English audiences of the unique advantages of their own free, law-abiding, Protestant polity even if occasionally, as in *The Siege of Constantinople* (1675), they hymned the virtues of arbitrary government. The representation of the problems of Ottoman expansion, preservation and absolutism, however, also provided a template of Oriental despotism which served as a negative exemplar not simply of statehood, but of empire.[327]

It is clear that representation of the Ottoman Empire in Restoration plays aimed to reflect absolute nature of Ottoman rule and served as a negative ideal for the English. Recent scholarly reevaluation of the perception of the Turks and Islam in Restoration England and dramatic representations by critics like Byron Smith, Bridget Orr, and Matthew Birchwood indicated that the relationship between Ottoman Turks and Restoration England was influenced primarily by the political dynamics of the period. In this context, Byron Smith argues that English literature of Restoration period was free from the anxiety of Turkish aggressions over Europe. In parallel with this altered attitude

[325] Ibid., 11.
[326] Ibid., 66.
[327] Ibid., 66.

towards the Ottomans, the dramatization of Muslim Turk characters can be regarded as "decorative:" that is, the Muslim characters and Eastern settings in Restoration drama referred to current political and social issues in England which often could not be discussed openly and directly.[328] In other words, along with new political perspectives, discussions of Ottoman affairs and themes were revisited in the second half of the seventeenth century. For instance, Royalists resembled English Republic to the "meritocratic, military and multi-ethnic structures of the ungodly Ottoman Empire", and welcomed Charles's Restoration. In other words, in political sphere, members of the Rump Parliament were attributed with some Turkish characteristics such as "arbitrary authority, licentiousness, listening to false prophets."[329] Smith remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> The choice of Turkish characters and settings for the heroic plays is part of the tendency to seek remote times and climes as the scene of heroic action and romantic love. Whether located in ancient Troy or . . . India, or Turkey, the far away and long ago was chosen in preference to the here and now."[330]

It can be asserted that Smith's statements correlated with Orr's statements of disguise as he points out that use of Turkish characters on the Restoration stage was "decorative" and deliberate to refer to the English political and religious issues of the time. Matthew Birchwood notes that "Islam presented a repository of meanings apparently ripe for transposition to the particular contingencies of the time, a process that transfigured the East through the lens of English politics and vice-versa."[331] In other words, Birchwood emphasizes that the choice of Muslim characters and settings by the Restoration dramatists referred to the politics of the age as he points out "English fascination with the Orient may be indexed . . . to religious and political anxieties at home."[332] According to Birchwood, as well as defining Ottomans as the oriental Turk; the choice of Ottoman Turks by the Restoration dramatists was a process of "transfiguration" to refer to the literary and political issues of the period. Birchwood refers to a state of complex "contradiction" in the perception of Ottoman Turks in the Interregnum and Restoration England:

---

[328] Byron Porter Smith, *Islam in English Literature*, 2nd Ed. (New York: Caravan Books, 1939), 37.
[329] Gerald Maclean, *Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 60.
[330] Byron Porter Smith, *Islam in English Literature*, 2nd Ed. (New York: Caravan Books, 1939), 44.
[331] Matthew Birchwood, *Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685* (Cambridge: DS Brewer, 2007), 5.
[332] Ibid., 8.

> Herein lies the contradiction. By mid-century, the idea of Islam was a volatile mixture of longstanding anxieties centered upon the Ottoman Empire as a spiritual and military threat, combined with esteem for its cultural and imperial achievements. As much of the source of material for the drama suggests, the figure of the Turk was Janus-faced to an extraordinary degree, being infidel and trading partner, benighted barbarian and custodian of classical wisdom, enemy of Christianity and yet scourge of Catholic Europe.[333]

According to Birchwood the perception of the Ottoman Empire was contadictory in the second half of the seventeenth century since this perception was based on both anxiety and admiration. The figure of the Turk was also both "infidel" and "partner"; however the image of the Turk remained as the "enemy of Christianity." In the aftermath of Restoration, the figure of the Turk was also associated with political and ideological treason. In other words, in the first half of the seventeenth century, the Turk only had religious connotations and referred to "Anti-Christan forces of Pope or Prophet"; however in the second half of the century, the Turk was also associated with political treason. That is, the image of the Turk always preserved its "connotations of the enemy within" and "the political enemies might be condemned as Turk-like traitors."[334] In this context, representation of the Turk on Restoraton stage was deliberate and related with political treason:

> The possibility that Englishmen might literally be turning Turk was an ever-present concern. Meanwhile, in the crisis of allegiance provoked by Civil War, this trope was accorded a newly powerful and complex significance. . . Depending upon one's point of view, the monarch had himself turned, betraying the religious and constitutional ideals of his Protestant people. More commonly expressed after the defeat and execution of the king, however, was the belief that the nation had been overrun with 'renegadoes,' traitors who had turned Turk and betrayed England to Cromwell's tyranny.[335]

[333] Ibid., 184.
[334] Ibid., 97.
[335] Ibid., 98.

It can be inferred that “turning Turk” was still regarded as a betrayal to the nation and religion in Restoration context; “turning Turk” was associated with conversion to Catholicism and political treason. However, in Restoration context, political treason was also associated with stereotypical image of ‘the Turk.’ The Ottoman Turks have been identified with stereotypical characteristics associated with the East/the Orient/Islam since antiquity. In the second half of the seventeenth century, in the context of Revolution, Regicide, Restoration and Exclusion, the image of ‘the Turk’ and Islamic elements were revisited since dramatization of the Turks and Islam in Restoration drama provided a rich material for instructing the English politics. Furthermore, dramatization of stereotypical Eastern qualities reinforced the *difference* between Eastern barbarity and English civility, Islam and Christianity, the East and the West ensuring validity of superior Self in contrast to inferior Other. Obviously, representation of Turkish and Islamic elements in Restoration drama was quite poplular since between 1660 and 1714, at least forty plays set in Asia or the Levant appeared on the London stage. These representations show that the notions of Turk and Islam took a central position in so many aspects of English cultural life in the seventeenth century.

CHAPTER 3

THE STEREOTYPICAL REPRESENTATION OF THE OTTOMAN TURKS IN ENGLISH RESTORATION DRAMA

3.1. "My anger must be quench'd by Rhodian blood or thine": 'Raging and Expansionist Turk' in William Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes* (1663)

By the time the theatres were reopened after the Restoration, Sir William Davenant had acquired considerable experience as a dramatist. Davenant's innovations in staging greatly enhanced the presentation of the foreign locales peculiar to the Restoration heroic drama. Davenant's crucial role in bringing rhymed verse was respected especially by Dryden as a submission to civilizing convention.[336] Dryden associated blank verse with barbarism, and rhymed verse with civility praising Davenant for the innovation he brought to the Restoration stage. In "Of Heroic Plays" Dryden describes Davenant's production of *The Siege of Rhodes* (1656-1661) as "novelty" and "discovery."[337] Killis Campbell argues that "in the history of the English stage there has been no piece of a more epoch-making character than Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes*."[338] Campbell relates the innovations brought by Davenant such as movable scenery, women actors in female parts, and an attempt at the opera to the French influence.[339] Laura Brown investigates the literary development of the "heroic action" in Restoration England and states that:

> The most important early example of the heroic action is William Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes*…Davenant is a significant figure for historians of the theater because of his association with the dramatic efforts of Henrietta Maria's court, his interregnum compositions, his own attempt at heroic poem, and his later role as patentee of the Duke's company."[340]

It is obvious that Davenant is considered as one of the most prominent figures of Restoration theatre and his *The Siege of Rhodes* is ranked as the most important example of

[336] Bridget Orr, "Theatrical Voyages and Conquests: The Colonial Discourse of Restoration Drama, 1660 - 1696," (Ph.D. Diss., Cornell University, 1995), 36.
[337] Ibid., 38.
[338] Killis Campbell, "The Sources of Davenant's The Siege of Rhodes" *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 13, No. 6 The Johns Hopkins University Press (1898): 177.
[339] Ibid., 177.
[340] Laura Brown, *English Dramatic Form, 1660-1760: An Essay in Generic History* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1981), 4.

heroic tradition. During Restoration, Davenant and Killigrew were authorized to develop the theatrical activity. Edward A. Langhans argues that by 1663 they "had been granted definitive patents not only empowering them to run the only official theatres in London but giving authority to their heirs or assigns."[341] He quotes Charles II's warrant, allowing two courtiers to share the control of the London public theatre:

> Our will and pleasure is that you prepare a Bill for our signature to passe our Greate Seale of England, containing a Grant unto our trusty and well beloved Thomas Killegrew Esquire, one of the Groomes of our Bed-chamber and Sir William Davenant Knight, to give them full power and authoritie to erect Two Companys of Players consisting respectively of such persons as they shall chuse and apoint; and to purchase or build and erect at their charge as they shall thinke fitt Two Houses or Theaters.[342]

It can be inferred that Charles II authorized Davenant and Killegrew to draft a document giving powers to them that strengthened their position in the world of theatre. They were also allowed to decide specific pre-1660 plays to be performed and what new plays would be produced. William Davenant staged three dramas under the Proctectorate to display other European imperial ambitions and glorify Elizabethan past to project future English domination of the Western hemisphere. *The Cruelty of the Spaniards in Peru* and *The History of Sir Francis Drake* were two of them that emphasized barbarity of Spanish colonial practices and "heroic" nature of the English in opposition to the barbaric Spanish. *The Siege of Rhodes*, recognized as having initiated the new mode of heroic drama, were also written and produced by Davenant. Davenant's sources for this play include Richard Knolles's *Historie of the Turks*, and Thomas Artus's *Continuation de l'histoires des Turcs* (1612) as well as various French plays.[343] Although Susan Wiseman suggests that *The Siege of Rhodes* gradually "subverted and unraveled" the contemporary mythologisation of the Turks as 'the Other', the play was fascinated with cultural *difference*.[344] In other words, the *difference* of the Turks was reinforced and they were defined as 'the Other' in the course of the play. Wiseman argues that Davenant's play suppresses "pressing issues of national conflict by the substation of colonial fantasies and histories, relying on the

[341] Edward A. Langhans, "The Theatre," *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre.* Ed. Deborah Payne Fisk (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 1. 1-18.
[342] Qtd in Ibid., 1.
[343] Alwin Thaler**,** "Thomas Heywood, D'Avenant, and *The Siege of Rhodes*," *PMLA* 39 (1924): 624.
[344] Susan Wiseman, *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 151.

representation of others."[345] That is, as an attempt "to paper over ideological cracks"[346] and internal conflicts, Davenant dramatizes imperial dreams of England through representation of the Ottoman Empire. Nevertheless, representation of the Ottoman Empire shows difference from representation of the Spanish or Indians due to lack of direct involvement in a colonial project. In this respect, Davenant attempts to display the contrast between Cross/Crescent, Oriental despotism/European civility, virtuous Christian maidenhood/ambitious Eastern woman reinforcing not only cultural but also religious *difference* as will be analyzed below.

The Siege of Rhodes represents the cultural and military struggle between the Europeans and the Ottomans. In heroic tradition, the rivalry between the Cross and the Crescent is transformed into an individualized conflict of love and honor. As Davenant points out in his preface to the play:

> In this poem I have revived the remembrance of that desolation which was permitted by Christian princes, when they favored the ambition of such as defended the diversity of religions in Germany; whilst those who would never admit learning into their empire (lest is shlould meddle with religion and intangle it with controversy) did make Rhodes defenceless, which was the only fortify'd academy in Christendom where divinity and arms were equally profess'd. I have likewise, for variety, softened the martial encounters between Solyman and the Rhodians, with intermingling the conjugal vertues of Alphonso and Ianthe.[347]

Davenant's innovation of heroic mode tries to reinforce the pattern of oppositions between two cultures rather than martial encounter. As well as innovations brought by Davenant to the Restoration stage, the significant representation of the Turk image lies at the heart of this play and serves to display religious and cultural *difference* between two cultures. In the play, Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent's conquest of Rhodes in 1522 is narrated although it was written at a period when the Ottomans experienced a military setback in the eye of Europeans and "no longer posed such a threat to Europe as it had

[345] Susan Wiseman, "History Digested: Opera and Colonialism in the 1650s," *Literature and the Civil War*. Ed. Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 198.
[346] Susan J. Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 19.
[347] William Davenant, *The Siege of Rhodes*. (1663). Retrieved from: http://www.operalib.eu/zpdf/siegerhodes.pdf

during the sixteenth and parts of the seventeenth centuries."[348] However, even though Ottoman Empire was in crisis because of succession problems and Venetian attacks on Ottoman ships and the isles of Tenedos and Lemnos when the first part of *The Siege of Rhodes* was written in 1656, Europe was once again at the target of Turkish expansion in the aftermath of Koprulu Mehmed Pasha's appointment as grand vizier. Under his command, Ottoman forces purged oppositions to the government and rebellions in Asia Minor.[349] Furthermore, Koprulu eliminated Venetian threat to Istanbul by reopening the Dardanelles by 1657. After his death in 1661, his son Fazıl Ahmed maintained Turkish pressures on the Western borders. In 1663, the grand vizier led his army through Buda and seized Neuhäusel. In 1669, Candia finally was conquered and, in 1672 following a series campaigns against Poland, the Ottoman took dominion over parts of the Ukraine.Hence, the Ottoman territories reached further than at any point in its history.[350] In other words, although Ottoman Empire was regarded less threatening in a military setback in the second half of the seventeenth century, Ottoman pressures on Western borders structured 'the Turk' as 'the Other' in heroic plays of Restoration drama. Moreover, Koprulus' military campaigns against the West from the 1650s through the 1710s, their overthrown and execution of Ibrahim the Twelfth in 1648 was a more menacing symbolic dimension to the English royalists. As a consequence of Ottoman affairs of this period, the Ottoman Empire was frequently compared to Cromwell in Restoration plays.[351] Royalists generally resembled English Republic to the "meritocratic, military and multi-ethnic structures of the ungodly Ottoman Empire", and welcomed Charles II's Restoration. That is, members of the Rump Parliament were attributed with some Turkish characteristics such as "arbitrary authority, licentiousness, listening to false prophets."[352] According to Wiseman, by the time Davenant was writing *The Siege of Rhodes*, "'the Turk' had a long mythic history in England as an oppositonal power threatening Christian virtues."[353] The sultan was equated with Satan or figured as the scourge of Christendom. Drawing on this equation and figuration, Davenant established parallels between the despotic Turkish sultan and

[348] Susan Wiseman, *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 154.
[349] Andrew Wheatcroft, *The Enemy at the Gate Habsburgs, Ottomans and the Battle for Europe* (New York, Basic Books, 2009), 38.
[350] Ibid., 42.
[351] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 62.
[352] Gerald Maclean, *Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 60.
[353] Susan Wiseman, *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 152.

Cromwell, Cromwell's guards and 'janissaries' gesturing towards contemporary events in England. Wiseman remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> Davenant's play draws on the fact that, although 'the Turk' is a recognizable enemy, as personified by the sultan, 'he' also presents a dangerous, uncanny *doppelgänger*; a representation of the West to itself in, for example, the detailed hierarchies and government which might be thought partially analogous to European monarchy in its most absolute aspects.[354]

It is obvious that sultanic tyranny in Davenant's play is figured as a negative exemplar of absolute government for Western monarchies. In that sense, Davenant's play refers to the fear of absolutist form of governments in the West and local political problems of England in disguise of Ottoman sultan. As Rycaut implicitly refers in his *The Present State*, the English monarchical Restoration of 1660 that was intended by some as a step toward French-style absolutism[355] that was regarded as ultimate in tyranny suppressed only by tyranny of the Turks. To put it simply, Turkish sultanic tyranny and absolutism was associated with the absolutist tendencies of Western monarchies.[356]Thus, Davenant aims to provide a negative exemplar in order to instruct English politics following Charles II's Restoration of monarchy in disguise of 'the Turk.'

In *The Siege of Rhodes*, Sultan Solyman, Roxolana, Mustapha, Pirrhus, Haly and Rustan are historical names among the Turks; Phillippus Villerius Lilidama, Grand Master of the city, and Alphonso also is a captain of a galley captured by the Turks. A historical prototype of Ianthe alone of all Davenant's leading characters is unhistorical and could not be found in the history of this period.[357] In addition to the historical skeleton, Davenant incorporates Christian virtue into the play in order to reinforce cultural differences between the Ottomans and the English, figuring Christian victory through the pattern of a Christian virgin taming an Oriental wild man or using the sensual despotism of the Turkish sultan as one of the stereotypical characteristics of the Turkish Other. Ianthe, Alphonso's bride, is taken prisoner by the Turks on her way from Sicily to attend her husband who is fighting in defense of Rhodes. She is conducted before Sultan Solyman, but sent to Alphonso at Rhodes. The Rhodians who are reduced to great distress during the siege needs Ianthe's

[354] Ibid., 153.
[355] Linda T. Darling, "Ottoman Politics through British Eyes: Paul Rycaut's *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire*," *Journal of World History*, Vol.5, No.1 (Spring, 1994): 78.
[356] Ibid., 79.
[357] Killis Campbell, "The Sources of Davenant's The Siege of Rhodes" *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 13, No. 6 The Johns Hopkins University Press (1898): 178.

help who goes in person without any protection to Solyman's court to sue mercy. On the one hand, the audience witness Solyman's admiration of virtuous Christian womanhood and amnesty offer to the Rhodians for the sake of virtuous Ianthe. On the other hand, the jealousy of Roxolana and her brutal nature draw audience's attention to the harem intrigues of the Ottoman Empire. Essentially, the focus of *The Siege of Rhodes* is to display the cultural differences between the Ottomans and the English uncovering the irreducible *difference* between the West/the East, Christianity/Islam, Self/Other in heroic code of love and honor. In order to achieve this aim, Davenant reproduces stereotypical 'raging and expansionist' Turkish sultan and displays his restless expansionism as a counter identity for English politics.

The curtain is raised on the first legitimate English stage and the opening words uttered are a call to arms:

Admiral: Arm, arm, the Bassa's Fleet appears;

To Rhodes his Course from Chios steers;

Her shady wings to distant sight,

Spread like the Curtains of the Night.

Each Squadron thicker and still darker grows;

The Fleet like many floating Forrests shows. (*1The Siege of Rhodes* I.i. 9-14)

Davenant opens the play with a display of the encounter between European knights under the command of Villerius, a knight of St. John, together with Alphonso and the Ottoman military forces. He presents the audience with two rival armies fighting over the town. According to Wiseman, "initially the Turk is represented as an 'other' – dark, plethoric, dangerous."[358] In other words, the image of 'barbarous Turk' who demolished European cities and slaughtered Christians as depicted in medieval and crusade discourse is reproduced at the beginning of the play:

Alphonso: The shriller trumpet, and tempestuous drum:

the deafening clamor from the cannons womb;

which through the air like suddain thunder breaks,

[358] Susan Wiseman, *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 156.

seems calm to soldiers shouts, and women shrieks.

What danger (rev'rend lord) does this portend? (*1 SOR* I.i. 40-44)

Davenant's entry provides a revival of the preconceived notions of 'barbarous' and 'cruel' Turk. As stated in the first chapter, the Turks were depicted as invaders of Christian lands by 'the cruelty of sword' and torturers of the Christians in crusading chronicles. Niccolo Barbaro gives a similar depiction for the siege of Constantinople depicting people "all crying at the top of their voices…all the women were on their knees, and all men too, praying most earnestly and devotedly to our omnipotent God" to save them from "wicked Turks, enemies of the Christian faith."[359] Similar to the atrocities associated with the Turks during the sieges and conquests of other European territories, the siege of Rhodes by the Turks is depicted as a state of chaos in European territories in the play. That is, Davenant aims to evoke Turkish peril that haunted Europe drawing on the elements of previous discourses and binding them into Restoration network of meaning.

In the face of Ottoman attacks, Davenant draws attention to the disunity and the urge to colonize among European nations, Spain, France, England: "All gaining vainly from each others loss;/ While still the Crescent drives away the Cross" (*1 SOR* II.i.13-26). As it can be inferred the play presents Turkish triumph in Rhodes as a consequence of Christian rivalry among the European states. This rivalry is set in contrast to the powerful and united Ottoman military forces whose "bright Crescents/…that increasing Empire show;/ Which must be still in Nonage and still grow" (*1 SOR* I.i.44-46). Thus, the powers of Christian Europe are depicted as engaged in religious rivalry among each other that makes Rhodes defenceless: "Still Christian wars they will pursue, and boast/ unjust successes gain'd, whilst Rhodes is lost" (*1 SOR* I.i. 66-67). The disunity among Christian Europeans is regarded as the main reason of "unjust successes" of the Ottoman Empire in the eye of Europeans. In the face of Ottomans' military power, the Europeans are called to unite against Solyman's "cursed prophed" and "sensual law": "Our swords against proud Solyman we draw/ his cursed prophet, and his sensual law" (*1 SOR* I.i. 85-86). In the first act, Ottoman sultan is structured as a stereotypical Muslim character and Antichrist who aims to demolish Christendom. Davenant's depiction of Sultan Solyman shows clear resemblance to crusade rhetoric that depicts Sultan Mehmed II as "the cruel enemy of God, a new Mohammed, violator of the Cross and the church, despiser of God's law, and prince

[359] Nicolo Barbaro, *Diary of the Siege of Constantinople 1453*, Tr. John Melville-Jones (New York: Exposition Press,1969), 27.

of the army of Satan."[360] In fact, religion plays a vital role in categorization for European Christians and one thing that united Christians is their attitude toward Islam, since to Christians, "Islam was reckoned the greatest enemy of the Christian Church."[361] As Bernard Lewis argues that because Christendom and Islam are competitors for the role of world religion beginning with "*jihad* and Crusade" neither is willing to recognize the other as valid alternative.[362] In his play, Davenant evokes this competition between Islam and Christendom drawing attention to Islamic *jihad* dedication in Pirrhus and Mustapha's words:

> Pirrhus: Tis well our valiant Prophet did
>
> In us not only loss forbid,
>
> But has conjoyn'd us still to get.
>
> Empire must move apace,
>
> When she begins the Race,
>
> And apter is for wings than feet. (*1 SOR* III.i. 25- 30)

Pirrhus's words confirm the conviction commonly held amongst the Europeans that *jihad* or imperial ambitions of the Ottomans are directly related with the teachings of Mohammed. Mustapha maintains that "They vainly interrupt our speed,/ and civil reason lack,/ to know they should go back/ when we determine to proceed" (*1 SOR* III.i. 30- 34). Mustapha's words, on behalf of Ottoman Empire, confirm Ottoman military confidence in expanding their borders into European territories disregarding European futile interruption. Expansion of Muslim Empire's borders is regarded as the desire to demolish Christendom by the Europeans. For instance, Knolles refers to Ottomans' unrestrained desire of conquests in his preface "To the Reader": "holdeth all the rest of the world in scorne, thundering out nothing but still bloud and warre, with a full persuasion in time to rule over all, presining unto it selfe no other limits than the uttermost bounds of the earth, from the rising of the Sunne unto the going downe of the same."[363] In that sense, Davenant incorporates Knolles' notions of the Turks into Restoration referring Ottoman expansionist policy. In other words, Ottoman Empire's unrestrained ambition of conquest aiming

[360] Robert Schwoebel, *The Shadow of the Crescent: The Renaisssance Image of the Turk*, 1453-1517 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1969), 12.
[361] Ibid., 186.
[362] Bernard Lewis, *Islam and the West* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 7.
[363] Knolles, "To the Reader."

Christian borders had long been the concern of Western discourse. Davenant evokes European anxiety of Turkish expansion since in the second half of the seventeenth century, under the command of Koprulus, Ottoman territories reached further than at any point in its history. Therefore, stereotypical expansionist Turk image who aimed to expand into Europe and demolish Christendom was revisited in Restoration context.

Sultan Solyman's appearance in the second entry evokes audience's impression of a stereotypical Turkish Sultan that draws on historically prior texts and discourses. Solyman appears enraged by his army's setback against Rhodians at first attempt, he rages at his general Pirrhus, warning that: "my anger…/ must be quench'd by Rhodian blood or thine" (*1 SOR* II.ii. 32-34). It is obvious that Davenant's depiction of Sultan Solyman is closely related with stereotypical figure of despotic sultan depicted as "given…whims, and sudden fits of irrational anger"[364] in previous Western writings. It is easy to observe Solyman's humiliating attitude towards the Rhodians whom are destined to lose in the face of Ottoman military power:

> These Rhodians, who of honour boast,
>
> a loss excuse, when bravely lost:
>
> now they may bravely lose their Rhodes,
>
> which never play'd against such odds.
>
> To morrow let them see our strength, and weep
>
> whilst they their want of losing blame;
>
> their valiant folly strives too long to keep
>
> what might be render'd without shame. (*1 SOR* III.i. 17-24)

Davenant draws attention to Ottoman military power that would subdue Rhodian forces and Rhodians' "brave" loss of Rhodes. Through Solyman's boast of Turkish strength and humiliating attitude towards the Rhodians, Davenant tries to evoke "ardent confirmation of Europe's anti-Turkish, anti-Islamic fears and stereotypes."[365] In other words, depiction of Sultan Solyman as a 'raging and expansionist Turk' shows clear resemblance to previous discourses that Restoration playwrights draw on and incorporate

[364] Daniel J. Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 115.
[365] Jonathan Burton, "Anglo-Ottoman Relations and the Image of the Turk in *Tamburlaine," Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 30(1), (2000):141.

into their plays. The military encounter between the Ottoman forces and the Rhodians eventally ends up with Ottoman victory over the Rhodes. Nevertheless, essentially, Davenant's aim is not to display Ottoman military power against which the Rhodians stay defenceless. On the contrary, Davenant's aim is to draw audience's attention from military encounter to cultural and religious *difference* between the Europeans and the Ottomans. In that sense, Davenant's introduction of unhistorical character, Ianthe, aims to display Turkish Sultan's stereotypical cruelty and sensual weakness in the face of a Christian beauty. In other words, Ianthe would civilize 'raging' Turkish Sultan and draw him from his barbarous nature into civility. Ianthe appears veiled in the court of Solyman:

> Mustapha: This is Ianthe, the Sicilian flower,
>
> sweeter then buds unfolded in a shower,
>
> bride to Alphonso, who in Rhodes so long
>
> the theam has been of each heroick song;
>
> and she for his relief those gallies fraught;
>
> both stow'd with what her dow'r and jewels bought. (*I SOR* II.ii.70-75)

Ianthe is taken prisoner by Turkish Bassa Mustapha on her way from Sicily to Rhodes and conducted to Solyman "her face veil'd" (*I SOR* II.ii.65). The appearance of the captured Ianthe, veiled like "the Morning pictur'd in a Cloud" (*I SOR* II.ii.51), who intends to save the Rhodians from the Turkish rage, attracts Soylman: "O wond'rous vertue of a christian wife! Advent'ring lifes support, and then her life to save her ruin'd lord!" (*I SOR* II.ii.76-78). Davenant aims to revolve the plot around a virtuous Christian virgin who would tame cruel Turkish Sultan who is known for his cruelty and sensual despotism. In this respect, it can be asserted that Davenant reproduces stereotypical Turkish sultan who exercises all the power to which his subjects merely obey and whose passions, based on possession and domination, are uncontrollable. To put it differently, Davenant reproduces tyrannical, sexually overdriven and emotionally uncontrollable Turkish sultan on Restoration stage and in doing so he sustains stereotype of Turk. Vitkus remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> A conventional set of characteristics for describing Islamic power had already been established: first, there is a sultan who exercises all the power, while all others merely obey. This sultan, in order to feed his passions, is

> bent on possession and domination. He desires to increase his physical boundaries of his realm and also to obtain women for his harem and capture souls for his religion…Because he has absolute power, he rules everyone but himself: his own passions are uncontrollable. This archetypal sultan is depicted as fickle and given to extreme, unstable desires, whims, and sudden fits of irrational anger. He perverts justice, enforcing Islamic law and all codes of honor to suit his whims and lusts.[366]

Vitkus's depiction of stereotypical Muslim sultan is revisited in *The Siege of Rhodes* by depiction of Sultan Solyman who is presented as an infidel tyrant known for his sensual despotism. Ianthe functions as a civilizing agent who would convert the sultan into civilization and virtue from his barbarous nature as Alphonso states: "Ianthe,…;your vertue will not be deny'd:/ it could even Solyman himself withstand./…it seem'd to civilize a barb'rous Foe" (*1 SOR* III.ii. 75-80). Davenant's depiction of sultan refers to Turks' identification as "barbarians" especially after the conquest of Constantinople. The Turks were characterized as "barbarians" and "enemies of the Christian faith" that provided Europeans with a powerful discourse of Self/Other, Christian/Muslim, European civility/Oriental barbarity as Davenant also incorporated into his play. Sultan Solyman, "barb'rous Foe," is expected to be civilized by Christian virtuous Ianthe. Davenant aims to draw audience's attention from martial encounter between the two forces and Ottoman triumph to cultural *difference* between European Christians and Muslim Ottomans in code of love and honor. Following his encounter with Ianthe, Solyman decides to free Rhodians as Ianthe confirms: "All that of Turks and tyrants I had heard,/…he seem'd in civil France, and monarch there:/ for soon my person, gallies, fraight, were free by his command" (*1 SOR* III.ii.97-104). Ianthe refers to pre-existing narrative versions of the Turks; however she reveals her surprise of Solyman's being as civil as the monarch in France during her stay as Solyman's prisoner. Following Solyman's conversion to civility form barbarity, he is called as "Christian Turk" (*1 SOR* III.ii.109). Obviously, attribution of non-Christian and non-Western characteristics to 'the Other' establishes an image of Muslim/Turk that is regarded as the counter identity to European Christians in Western discourse. This wholly foreign image portrayed as barbarous, cruel, lustful, and Antichrist enable Western Christians to define themselves as Said asserts: "[the Other] has helped to define Europe

[366]Daniel J. Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 115.

(or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience."[367] European Christian perception of Muslim Turks as 'the Other' reproduced by Western discourse enabled the West to construct 'the Other' as a cultural opposite and position itself as superior 'Self.' Thus, Sultan Solyman who is depicted as tyrant, sexually overdriven, and emotionally uncontrollable is the counter identity for the new monarch Charles II in the aftermath of Restoration, since the Muslim characters and Eastern settings in Restoration drama refer to current political and social issues which often could not be discussed openly and directly.

Following Ianthe's appearance at Solyman's court, the sultan offers amnesty to the Rhodians; however his offer of amnesty is refused by the Rhodians. On the eve of Christian refusal to accept Sultan's offer, the pashas Pirrhus and Mustapha counsel the Sultan to punish the Christians:

> Pirrhus: They in to morrows storm will change their mind,
>
> Then, though too late instructed, they shall find,
>
> That those who your protection dare reject
>
> No humane Power dares venture to protect.
>
> They are not Foes, but Rebels, who withstand
>
> The pow'r that does their Fate command. (*1 SOR* IV.i.7–12)

Davenant refers to conceptualization of the Ottoman Empire as an instrument of 'Fate,' in eschatological terms, as the providential scourge of Christendom that was prevalent in crusade and early modern discourse. Eschatology[368] provides a well-known script with places for both the threatening Muslim Other and for Christians: the ascendancy of Mohammed meant the arrival of the Antichrist and the Muslim invasion was a sign that the end of days was near. The Monophysite Armenian bishop Sebeos provides Christian descriptions of the Muslim invasions in the Levant quoting the Archangel Daniel's Apocalyptic prophesy (Daniel 7):

> "the fourth beast was awesome and dreadful with teeth of iron, and claws of copper. It would eat and devour then stomped the residue with its feet." This fourth emerged from the South and represents the Ishmaelite kingdom. As the chief of the angels said: "The fourth beast will come to possess a

[367] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York, Vintage Books, 1978), 2.
[368] The part of theology concerned with death, judgement, and the final destiny of the soul and of humankind. *Oxford English Disctionary*. Retrieved from: https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/eschatology

> kingdom greater than any kingdom, and will devour the entire world." "And … ten kings will arise but after them yet another shall arise who in wickedness will surpass all the previous ones."[369]

Depiction of Muslims as Antichrist and dreadful beast which would "arise from the south" and "eat the whole world" attempts to dehumanize the Muslims who would bring about the apocalypse. This medieval anti-Islamic polemic was revived after Protestant Reformation and Turks were associated with Catholics in early modern discourse. In this context, the Turks were always associated with the Catholics or Jews as representatives of the Antichrist on earth who would combine to bring about the apocalypse. In other words, the Muslims/Turks were regarded as the instrument of 'Fate' and 'the providential scourge of Christendom.' Davenant draws on previous discourses that defined the Turks as 'the scourge of God' and incorporates this conceptualization into his play as it can be traced in Pirrhus's words. Solyman reaffirms Davenant's reference to medieval discourse that defined the Muslims/Turks as dreadful beasts who would bring the apocalypse:

> Solyman: Oh Mustapha, our strength we measure ill,
>
> we want the half of what we think we have;
>
> for we enjoy the beastlike pow'r to kill,
>
> but not the godlike pow'r to save.
>
> Who laughs at death, laughs at our highest pow'r;
>
> the valiant man is his own emperour. (*1 SOR* IV.i.13-18)

Through Solyman's self-realization of "the beastlike pow'r to kill," Davenant aims to evoke dehumanized image of the Muslim/Turk that was prevalent in previous Western discourses. Here, Solyman's critique of government legitimized by military power aims to display a counter identity for the English government As Matthew Birchwood points out Sultan's apprehension of government legitimized by military power had direct connotations to the political affairs of the period when the play was written. Following the dissolution of the First Protectorate Parliament in August 1655, England had been subject to direct military rule. However, by September 1656, Cromwell called the Second Protectorate Parliament in order to curb the power of Major Generals, since there was a

[369]Qtd. in Paul T. Levin, "From "Saracen Scourge" to "Terrible Turk": Medieval, Renaissance, and Enlightment Images of the "Other" in the Narrative Construction of "Europe,"" (Ph.D. Diss., University of Southern California, 2007), 136.

growing civilian pressure. According to Birchwood, in this context Davenant's play aims to favor a more consultative form of government based upon a correlation between the individual and society by displaying critique of Ottoman state legitimized by military might.[370]

The second part of the play begins similar to the first part referring to the inaction of the Western powers to fight back; "slow Venice," "long consulting Spain," "furious French," and "fiercer English" fail to help "famisht Rhodes" (*2 SOR* I.i. 1-9). While Alphonso favors action against Turkish siege, the Rhodian Council requests Ianthe's help: "The people find that they have no defence/ But in [Ianthe's] beauty and your Eloquence" (*2 SOR* I.i. 227- 8). The Rhodian Council concedes that in the face of Ottoman military attacks, the European Christians should seek ways of treaty with the help of Ianthe. In the second half of the act, Davenant turns attention to Solyman's camp and displays Ottoman unity; however in soliloquy Solyman questions his restless imperialism:

Solyman: Of spacious Empire, what can I enjoy?

Gaining at last but what I first Destroy.

Tis fatal (Rhodes) to thee,

And troublesome to me

That I was born to govern swarms

Of Vassals boldly bred to arms:

For whose accurs'd diversion, I must still

Provide new Towns to Sack, new Foes to Kill.

Excuse that Pow'r, which by my Slaves is aw'd:

For I shall find my peace

Destroy'd at home, unless

I seek for them destructive Warr abroad. (*2 SOR* II.ii.53–64)

Solyman's questioning of instinctive militarism of the Turks is posited not as a measure of the empire's strength, but of its weakness. Davenant refers to the Empire's unrestrained imperial ambitions founded upon destruction of the besieged territories and

[370] Matthew Birchwood, *Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685* (Cambridge: DS Brewer, 2007), 114.

their people. Bridget Orr points out that Solyman's critique here represents Turkish conquests "as operating in accordance with a logic of self-destruction."[371] In other words, through Solyman's soliloquy, Davenant criticizes oriental despotism associated with Ottoman Empire. Solyman's confirmation of absolute rule is set in contrast to the collective oligarchy of the Rhodian Council. Thorough Solyman's confirmation of Turkish propensity for war, Davenant not only aims to posit the Ottoman Empire as 'the Other,' but also warns English government against absolute rule in disguise of the Ottomans. Birchwood correlates Davenant's preoccupation with absolute rule with Cromwell's dissolution of the Third Protectorate Parliament under army pressure in 1659, only six days before the play's registration with the Stationer's Company.[372] In that sense, utilization of Ottoman settings and characters provide Restoration playwright Davenant an outlet in which he refers to the political affairs of England by posing the Turks as the counter identities.

In the following act, Davenant presents Solyman's confirmation of the inherent cruelty in Ottoman practices: "Those are the secret Nerves of Empires force./ Empire grows often high/ By rules of cruelty,/ But seldome prospers when it feels remorse" (*2 SOR* IV.iii.341-4). Solyman's confirmation of inherent cruelty in Ottoman practices reaffirms the relation between barbarity and Ottoman Empire represented in numerous Western writings. Clearly, these writings helped construction of binaries between European Self and Muslim Other. By fostering a contrasting image of Muslims and also demeaning Islam, Europeans helped to create their own self image as a perceived ideal Christian society as Norman Daniel argues: "Christian misconception of Islam was fitted into the main body of knowledge and opinion in which European society found expression."[373] European Christians generally depicted Muslims in binary opposites to construct their own 'Self' as a superior society by stigmatizing the Muslims as the 'Other.' Here, positing Ottoman Empire as inherently cruel based on absolute rule, Davenant aims to create a culturally, politically and religiously stronger Western against the Ottomans.

[371]Bridget Orr, "Theatrical Voyages and Conquests: The Colonial Discourse of Restoration Drama, 1660 - 1696," (Ph.D. Diss., Cornell University, 1995), 36.
[372] Matthew Birchwood, *Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685* (Cambridge: DS Brewer, 2007), 119.
[373] Norman Daniel, "Crusade Propaganda," *A History of the Crusades: The Impact of the Crusades on Europe, Volume 6*. Ed. Harry W. Hazard & Norman P. Zacour (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 54.

Roxolana, wife to the sultan, is introduced as an entirely new character in three additional scenes before the choruses. Her introduction to the play as a fierce and rebellious spouse in contrast to Ianthe's depiction as a virtuous Christian wife plays an important role in the dramatization since Davenant incorporates the seraglio life into the play in order to reinforce the cultural *difference* between the English and the Turks. The image of Roxolana helps the playwright to depict domestic strife within the Ottoman state, leading the Sultan to conclude, "My war with Rhodes will never have success,/ Till I at home, Roxana, make my peace" (*1 SOR* V.iv.19–20). In general, the second part of *The Siege of Rhodes* focuses on the contrast between Eastern Roxolana and Western Ianthe. Bridget Orr argues that as the Christian military power declines in the course of the siege, the contrast between the two women becomes more central to the play; "Ianthe is cast as a figure of gentle modesty and Roxolana as an ambitious virago."[374] In the first part of the play, Ianthe is presented to the audience as a brave Christian wife who sold her jewels, braved the seas to join her husband Alphonso and fought in defense of Rhodes. However, Roxolona is introduced in the midst of managing state affairs, as pashas solicit her favor. In her soliloquy at the end of the second act, Roxolona contrasts herself with the European queens: "But they shall find, I'm no European queen,/ who in a throne does sit but to be seen;/ and lives in peace with such state-thieves as these/ who robb us of our business for our ease" (*2 SOR* II. iii. 49-50). When the audience sees Roxolana again, she is amidst a revengeful jealousy as Davenant describes through scene direction:

> Being wholly fill'd with Roxolana's rich pavilion, wherein is discern'd at distance, Ianthe sleeping on a couch; Roxolana at one end of it, and Haly at the other; guards of eunuchs are discovered at the wings of the pavilion; Roxolana having a Turkish Embroidered Handkerchief in her left hand, And a naked Ponyard in her right. (*2 SOR* IV.iii)

Davenant's stage direction refers to Oriental conventions through setting; the eunuch's presence, the luxury of the décor, the femininity of the handkerchief and the violence of the naked poniard. Davenant's details aim to evoke powerful cliché of the seraglio that serves sexual desires of the sensual sultan. As it can be contemplated that her jealousy motivates her to kill sleeping Ianthe; however Ianthe's waking beauty subdues Roxolana's aggression towards her:

> Though beautious when she slept,

[374] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 70.

yet now would I had kept her safely sleeping still.

She, waking, turns my envy into shame,

and does it so reclaim

that I am conquer'd who came here to kill. (*2 SOR* IV.iii. 61-66)

Roxolana is depicted in a remorseful state showing mercy to Ianthe and taking an oath of sparing her life, then the audience is presented the comparison between the Western and Eastern women. Roxolana seems curious about whether Alphonso is civil and loyal to Ianthe. Then she deduces that: "These Christian-turtles live too happily./ I wish, for breed, they would to Asia fly" (*2 SOR* IV.iii. 129-130). The final scene in Roxolana's pavilion intensifies the contrast between the Western and Eastern women. Ianthe is presented weeping over her fear for Alphonso, and Roxolana humiliates her softness and naivety:

Soft fool! bred up in narrow western courts,

which are by subjects storm'd like paper-ports,

Italian courts, fair inns for forein posts

where little princes are but civil hosts,

think'st thou that she, who does wide empire sway,

can breed such storms as lovers' show'rs allay?

Can half the world be govern'd by a mind

that shews domestick pitty, and grows kind? (*2 SOR* V.vi. 55-62)

Roxolana's words affirm Solyman's previous confirmation of inherent cruelty in Ottoman practices; she also affirms that there is no place for remorse and "domestick pitty" in Ottoman Empire that governs half of the world. Roxolana's naturalization of cruelty is marked as specifically Eastern and peculiar to Islam. Roxolana ignores her oaths of sparing Ianthe's and prisoner Alphonso's life and claims that: "Religion is but publique fashion here;/ And Justice is but private interest" (*2 SOR* V.vi. 73-74). Davenant refers to the arbitrary nature of Ottoman governance system in contrast to European governments bound by Law and aims to portray brutal Eastern womanhood perverted by corrupt institutions, false religion and despotism in contrast to virtuous Christian womanhood. The final act of the play confirms "wondrous Christian" womanhood:

Solyman: Go back Ianthe; make your own

Conditions boldly for the Town.

I am content it should recorded be,

That, when I vanquist Rhodes, you conquer'd me. (*2 SOR* V.vi. 208-211)

In the final act, Davenant aims to evoke the impression that the "wondrous virtue of Christian wife" has subdued the Turk, rather than the Christian arms. In other words, Davenant aims to compensate European military defeat against the Ottomans through display of European/Christian superiority over Ottoman/Muslim otherness. Davenant achieves this end by comparing and evelauating non-Western based on *difference* since Europe's contact and self-comparison with 'the Other' based on *difference* helps Europe to acquire sense of identity as Hall remarks as follows:

> The West's sense of itself- its identity- was formed not only by the internal processes that gradually molded Western European countries into a distinct type of society, but also through Europe's sense of difference from other worlds how it came to represent itself in relation to these "others."[375]

The Siege of Rhodes aims to display the *difference* between Self/Other, the East/the West, Christian virtue/Muslim brutality utilizing a military encounter between the Ottomans and Europeans. The play strengthens the *difference* between the two cultures and helps the English to define themselves against the Turks. Davenant's dramatization of Ottomans and Islamic elements provided a rich material for instructing the English politics in disguise of the Turk. To put it differently, discourse of Ottoman despotism, false religion, and sensual law centered upon a tyrant sultan provided many instructions for emergent imperial ideology of England and new monarchy. Posing the Ottoman Empire as the counter identity, Davenant aimed to evoke the impression of politically, religiously, and sexually more civil England. More importantly, Davenant combined medieval anti-Islamic polemic, crusading rhetoric and early modern anxiety of the Turkish military aggression with Restoration context in representation of the Turks. Drawing on the elements of previous discourses, Davenant incorporated the binary of the East/the West, Islam/Christianity and Oriental despotism/European civility into his play. Representation of Ottoman quest for endless expansion, harem politics, and sensual despotism not only

[375] Stuart Hall, "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power," *Formations of Modernity*, Ed. Stuart Hall and Gieben Bram (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), 188.

reinforced preconceived negative qualities attributed to the Turks but also provided a model from which the English emulate an empire. In this respect, Davenant, in his heroic play, aimed to portray Christian European superiority in contrast to Muslim otherness utilizing Ottoman characters and settings. Drawing stereotypical representations of Turks as cruel, sexually overdriven, and emotionally uncontrollable on previous discourses, Davenant caused perpetuation of negative image of the Turk in contrast to European Christian identity. Depiction of Sultan Solyman and his fierce spouse Roxolana established a pattern of opposition between Alphonso and Ianthe and served as a pivotal record of *difference* between the two cultures. In other words, the Muslim sultan and sultana were presented as English and Christian should not be. To sum up, Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes* primarily dealt with a historical event in heroic tradition in order to display cultural *difference* between the English and the Ottomans. In order to achieve this aim, Davenat displayed stereotypical 'raging and expansionist' Turkish sultan who was tamed by Christian virtue at the end of the play. In his depiction of stereotypical image of 'the Turk', Davenant widely referred to the previous Western discourses that stigmatized the Turks as 'the Other'. Ultimately, Davenant's dramatization of 'the Turk' in Restoration context had clear references to the crisis of Revolution, Regicide and Restoration in the second half of the century.

3.2. "Their fatal Maxims made our Sultans still, as soon as they were Crown'd, their Brothers kill": 'the Cruel Turk' in Roger Boyle's *The Tragedy of Mustapha* (1668)

Roger Boyle, First Earl of Orrery (1621-1679), was "a brilliant soldier, an experienced politician, a vigorous pamphleteer, a graceful romancer, and the initiator of Restoration heroic drama," and, perhaps even more remarkable, "he enjoyed the personal friendship of both Cromwell and Charles II and served both masters well."[376] According to Tomlinson, Boyle previously wrote heroic plays in order to show his loyalist experience and his accomodation to Cromwellian rule during Interregnum.[377] The English heroic play proliferated in the early years of the Restoration since Charles II employed English history in the coronation ceremonies and London pageants of the early 1660s. Charles's propagandistic use of historical symbols and allusions aimed to rehistoricize his regime

[376] Kathleen M. Lynch, *Roger Boyle, First Earl of Orrery* (TE: University of Tennessee Press, 1965), vii.
[377] Tracey E. Tomlinson, "The Restoration Heroic Plays of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 43, No. 3, Restoration and Eighteenth Century (2003): 560.

and construct a new mythology for the second phase of Stuart kingship.[378] In the aftermath of Restoration, Boyle refashioned this genre to fit the tastes of Restoration audience. In obedience to the king's command, in his *Henry the Fifth* and *The Black Prince,* Boyle attempted not only to reintroduce a pro-stuart history play to the stage but also to encourage Charles to become a better and more heroic king. In that sense, it can be asserted that Boyle used his writing for the stage in order to promise Charles a place among England's theatrical hero-kings. Furthermore, the English heroic play provided a unique opportunity for Boyle to examine some of the most pressing political issues of his day in the presence of the king.[379] In other words, local anxieties about the recent revolution, regicide, usurpation of power and succession problems were debated in heroic plays of Restoration drama in disguise of foreign settings and characters. Especially the late seventeenth century heroic plays used Ottoman Empire as a setting and Ottoman sultan as a negative exemplar for the new monarch of England. Actually, as Hattaway suggests, these plays were better called "political plays" as they were "not mere chronicles," but "dramatic essays" on the institution of kingship and on the origins, nature and transfer of power.[380] As in the case of historical accounts, what these dramatic texts do was to offer a record of the periods when they were composed, on the perception of 'the Other.'

Ottoman historical stories widely attracted attention of English playwrights since by the second half of the seventeenth century the most proximate and pressing threat to Europe was still the Ottomans. One of the early Restoration playwrights who developed the tragic story of Sultan Solyman and Mustapha was Roger Boyle, whose *Mustapha* apparently drew on Knolles's *Generall Historie of the Turkes*.[381] William S. Clark notes that Boyle also drew his plot from Madeleine de Scudéry's *Ibrahim, or the Illustrious Bassa.*[382] According to Clark, the play was considered one of Boyle's masterpieces and underwent numerous performances in the early Restoration.[383] The Ottoman stories always attracted Western imagination, as Burton argues, in which the West demonized Oriental rulers to assure their own superiority, or conversely use the Eastern ruler as a "model for

[378] Paula R. Backscheider, *Spectacular Politics: Theatrical Power and Mass Culture in Early Modern England* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1993), 5-25.
[379] Tracey E. Tomlinson, "The Restoration Heroic Plays of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, Vol. 43, No. 3, Restoration and Eighteenth Century (2003): 560.
[380] Michael Hattway, "Drama and Society" *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*, Ed. A. R. Brounmuller and Michael. Hattaway (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 94.
[381] William Smith Clark, *The Dramatic Works of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery*, 2 vols. Vol. 1. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937), 225–304.
[382]Ibid., 226.
[383] Ibid., 227.

admiration and imitation, shaming or schooling the English supremacy."[384] The story of Sehzade Mustapha's death in 1553 became one of the most interesting and appealing stories about the Ottomans for both historians and playwrights that infiltrated into Europe through different sources including official reports and records, personal letters of the diplomats and ambassadors, and travel accounts. After two years, in 1555, Nicolas à Moffan's Latin text, entitled *Soltani Solymanni Turcorum Imperatoris horrendum facinus, scelerato in proprium filium, natu maximum, Soltanum Mustapham, parricidio, anno domini 1553 patratum*, appeared and set off the echoes of Sultan Solyman's eldest son Mustapha's death in Europe. When Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq's *The Turkish Letters* were published in 1581, the story of Mustapha had long been circulating in Europe in Latin. Both Moffan's and Busbecq's accounts of Solyman and Mustapha served stereotypical representation of inherent cruelty in Ottoman practices that attracted much more attention in Europe.[385] In other words, the story of the execution of a son by tyrant Turkish sultan appealed to the European audience's taste. Galina I. Yermolenko remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> The interest in the Mustapha story reflected the West's fear of and fascination with the Ottoman Empire, feeding into the stereotypical images of the "cruel Turk" and the "lascivious Turk" that Europe conjured up in response to the Ottoman practices of fratricide (the custom of executing all the brothers and half-brothers of a new sultan to prevent feuds between them) and polygamy. Suleiman's violent act against his own son and his excessive love for Roxolana gave the western world an opportunity to moralize on the tyrannical nature of the Ottoman system.[386]

According to Yermolenko, execution of Mustapha attracted European attention and intensified Western fear of the Ottoman imperial practices. As Burton also argues above, the Mustapha story presented a negative exemplar for Western monarchies evoking stereotypical image of 'cruel Turk.' Drawing on previous anti-Islamic polemics, Mustapha story drew European audience's attention to the practices of fratricide and polygamy in Ottoman *harem*. As a result of this intense interest in Mustapha story, after Moffan and

[384] Jonathan Burton, "Anglo-Ottoman Relations and the Image of the Turk in *Tamberlaine*," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 30.1 Winter (2000): 129.
[385] Seda Erkoç, "Repercussions of a Murder: The Death Of Sehzade Mustafa on Early Modern English Stage," (Ph.D. Diss., Central European Society, 2008), 2.
[386] Galina I Yermolenko, "Roxolana in Europe," *Roxolana in European Literature, History and Culture* Ed. Galina I. Yermolenko (England: Ashgate, 2010), 27.

Busbecq's publications, this Ottoman story was revised, translated and edited many times to be published in various collections about the Turks. In his *Generalle Historie*, Knolles provides an account of the year 1553 in which Mustapha was executed. He begins his account of the year by stating that:

> The same yeare Solyman seduced by Roxolana (sometime his faire concubine, but then his imperious wife) and Rustan Bassa his sonne in law, most unnaturally murdered his eldest sonne Mustapha, the mirrour of the Othoman familie: Which tragicall fact, the like whereof both for the treacherous contriving and inhuman execution hath seldome times beene heard of, I have thought good here in due time to set downe, in such sort as it is by most credible writers of that time reported.[387]

Knolles's depiction of Solyman-Mustapha story, influenced by previous Western writings, provides an account for seventeenth century chroniclers and dramatists. This Ottoman story was dramatized and performed for the public. In this period three plays that were plotted around Solyman-Mustapha story were written in England. [388]

Solymannidae, an anonymous Cambridge play applies Senecan model to an Oriental topic, written in 1581 and probably never performed. The dramatic construction follows the sources closely, with some alterations and an additional sub-plot which is again an execution story from the Ottoman court. The violence is not staged, and is reported by another character who does not, like the chorus, only tell of events, but also comments on the actions.[389] Probably for the sake of keeping the unities, some changes were made in the story through the introduction of messengers and ambassadors coming into the palace rather than the characters leaving for campaigns and meetings. Therefore, the setting is Suleiman's palace in Istanbul: Mustapha is summoned to the palace and executed there.[390] Fulke Greville's *Mustapha* is a closet drama in the Senecan tragedy style that heavily relies on Moffan's account and Busbecq's letters for the Solyman-Mustapha story.[391] It is filled with long interventions of either one character or the chorus for the discussion of political

[387] Richard Knolles, *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (London: Islip, 1603), 757.
[388] Anonymous Cambridge play *Solymannidae* (1581), Fulke Greville's *The Tragedy of Mustapha* (1594) and Roger Boyle's *The Tragedy of Mustapha, the Son of Solyman the Magnificent* (1668).
[389] Seda Erkoç, "Repercussions of a Murder: The Death Of Sehzade Mustafa on Early Modern English Stage," (PhD. Diss., Central European Society, 2008), 61.
[390] Ibid., 61.
[391] U. M. Ellis-Fermor, *The Jacobean Drama: An Interpretation* (London: Methuen, 1936),191.

views, the explanation of personal conflicts and comments on religion. Geoffrey Bullough argues this phenomenon as follows:

> [Greville] treats the story, not as the personal tragedy of Mustapha, Solyman, and Rossa, but as a political and moral conflict in which the motives of the major figures are complicated and even the minor personages have some importance...[I]t is a study in statecraft, in the political perplexities of rulers and subjects.[392]

As Bullough argues Greville's treatment of the story does not aim to display Mustapha's tragedy or mere dynastic problems of the Ottoman court. Rather, in a broader context, he aims to reinforce moral, political and religious conflicts through issues of statecraft, the absolute rule of a Turkish tyrant and obedience to him, and the weaknesses of Ottoman subjects. In executing Mustapha, Soylman affirms preconceived notions of Ottoman cruelty, thus, doubly reinforcing 'the cruel Turk' stereotype. Furthermore, Greville aims to warn English monarchy that was intended by some as a step toward French-style absolutism against Ottoman style absolutism. Thus, Greville intends to provide a negative ideal for English politics dramatizing the relationship between Ottoman sultan and his subjects based on absolutism and sultanic disregard of Law.

The death of Sehzade Mustapha was repeatedly recorded by the contemporary chroniclers and numerous mourning poems dedicated to Mustapha's death on the Ottoman side. Mustapha was well-educated, moral and beloved son of Solyman who was also respected and admired by other statesmen and the janissaries. However, Roxolana reacted in order to eliminate Mustapha from succession to throne in favor of her own sons Selim and Bayazıd.[393] Roxolana plotted against Mustapha with the support of Rustem Pasha who wrote a letter to Iran's Shah Tahmasb asking Shah to help him against his father by imitating Mustapha's signet.[394] They also spread rumors of Mustapha's attempts to succession to the throne with the help of Anatolian sipahis, Turkomans, and bandits. They succeeded in convincing Solyman to decide to murder his son Mustapha.[395] Rustem Pasha

[392] Geoffrey Bullough, *The Poems and Dramas of Fulke Greville*. 2 vols. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1945), 21-22.
[393] Yaşar Yücel, Ali Sevim, *Klasik Dönemin Üç Hükümdarı: Fatih, Yavuz, Kanuni* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1991), 201.
[394] Fahri Unan, "Kanuni Devri Şehzade Mücadeleleri ve Bunun Osmanlı Siyasi ve Sosyal Tarihi Bakımından Önemi", *Türk Yurdu*, X/35, Ankara, (1990): 9-16.
[395] Stanford Shaw, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Modern Türkiye,* Çev. Mehmet Harmancı (İstanbul: E Yayınları, 1994), 160-161.

was accused of this plot that recorded in Ottoman history as "Mekr-i Rüstem."[396] The murder of Mustapha was overreacted by society, and this reaction was reflected by Ottoman poets of the period in their epicedials. The most famous epicedial belongs to Taşlıcalı Yahya who lambasted Roxolana and Rustem Pasha in his work.[397]

Roger Boyle's *Mustapha* was generally align with historical events as recorded in Ottoman chronicles; however it also included many characteristics peculiar to the heroic drama. Boyle sets his play in Hungary in the 1540s, during one of Solyman's campaigns. Boyle displays the compact between Roxolana and Rustan to prevent Mustapha from inheriting the throne in favor of Zanger. Boyle directly refers to the Ottoman practice of fratricide to which Ottoman Sultans adhere. In the play, Rustan tries to gain Roxolana's favor by misusing her fear for Zanger's safety following potential heir Mustapha's succession to the throne. In heroic fashion, Mustapha promises that when he succeeds to the throne he would not follow the Ottoman custom and murder Zanger. In return, Zanger promises that he would not outlive the day Mustapha dies. Unaware of the pact between Mustapha and Zanger, Roxolana concludes a pact with Rustan to bring Mustapha's downfall by provoking Solyman's jealousy of his son. According to Andre Clot, Boyle digresses from historical events with his inclusion of heroic fashion, since "hump-backed and deformed" Jehangir (Zanger in Boyle's play) never had a serious claim for the throne.[398] In his *Turkish Letters*, Busbecq provides a clear account of Jehangir's death:

> The news of Mustapha's death…overwhelmed [Jehangir] with terror and dismay. The poor lad, whose person was disfigured by a hump, had no strength of mind or body to enable him to resist the shock. The death of his brother reminded him of the fate in store for himself at no distant day… These sad thoughts took hold of him to such an extent, that an order for his instant execution could not have terrified him more. So great was his misery that it brought on an illness which terminated in his death.[399]

Busbecq turns attention to Jehangir's physical deformity and his death as a result of the illness brought on by his fear he felt upon the succession of one of his brothers to the throne. Moreover, in heroic fashion, Boyle adds an elaborate subplot involving the

[396] İbrahim Peçevi, *Peçevi Tarihi*, Hz. Bekir Sıtkı Baykal, C. I, (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1999), 252.
[397] İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Tarihi*, C.II, (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1995), 403.
[398] André Clot, *Suleiman the Magnificent*, Trans. Matthew J. Reisz, (London: Saqi Books, 2005), 155.
[399] Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, *The Life and Letters of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq.* 2 Vols. Vol. 1. (London, 1881), 178-179. Retrieved from: https://archive.org/details/lifelettbusbecq01forsuoft

beautiful, widowed and virtuous Christian Queen of Buda for whose love Mustapha and Zanger struggle to test their honor. Following Christian defeat in Buda, Queen sends her infant son to Roxolana in order to secure her infant son from death. Similar to Davenant's incorporation of love and honor code in *The Siege of Rhodes,* Boyle employs love and honor code in order to assure European/Christian supremacy over the Ottoman/Muslim drawing attention away from the military struggle between the Europeans and the Ottomans to cultural *difference*. Bridget Orr argues that Mustapha and Zanger's love for Christian Queen and Roxolana's protective decisions for the sake of Queen's infant son markedly depart from Knolles's interpretation of the Solyman-Mustapha story. In his *Generalle Historie*, Knolles is extremely critical of Roxolana "the greatest empresse of the East"; he begins his account of her by noting that:

> To fairest looks trust not too farre, nor yet to beautie brave:
>
> For hatefull thoughts so finely maskt, their deadly poisons have,
>
> Loves charmed cups, the subtile dame doth to her husband fill:
>
> And causeth him with cruell hand, his childrens bloud to spill.[400]

Knolles depicts Roxolana as a "wicked woman laboured cunningly by little and little to breed in Solymans head no small suspicion of Mustapha."[401] According to Knolles, manipulative Roxolana first persuaded Solyman to break with custom in marrying her and then schemed with Rustan to displace the popular Mustapha.[402] Knolles gives a detailed account of Mustapha's death in Solyman's tent evoking inherent cruelty in Ottoman practices referring to the presence of the eunuchs and mutes. Knolles remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> So when he was come into the more inward rooms of the tent, he was with such honour as belonged to his state cheerfully received by his fathers eunuchs… Whereunto they answered, That he should by and by see [Solyman]: and with that casting his eye aside, he saw seaven Muts (these are strong men, bereft of their speech, whom the Turkih tyrants have alwaies in readinesse, the more secretly to execute their boludie butcherie) comming from the other side of the tent towards him: at whose fight stricken with a sudden terrour, said no more, but *Lo my death*; and with that, arising, was

[400] Richard Knolles, *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (London: Islip, 1603), 759.
[401] Ibid., 760.
[402] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 73.

about to have fled: but in vaine, for he was caught hold on by the eunuch and Muts, and by force drawne to the place appointed for his death.[403]

Knolles depiction of Mustapha's being strangled by the eunuch and the Muts provided a detailed account for the seventeenth century dramatists evoking tyranny of Ottoman style absolutism. In *Mustapha*, Boyle also aims to reinforce the cruel maxims of the Ottoman governance system. Similar to Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes*, *Mustapha* derives its historical setting from the reign of Solyman the Magnificent, supplanting Rhodes with Budapest as the object of the Sultan's seemingly unstoppable westward expansion. Boyle's play opens with a display of Ottoman military might:

Rustan: What Influence, Mighty Sultan, rules the day,
And stops your course where glory leads the way?
Th' Hungarian Armies hasten from the Field,
And Buda waits for your approach to yield;
Yet you seem doubtful what you are to do,
And turn from Triumphs when they follow you. (*The Tragedy of Mustapha* I. 1-6)

It is clear that Boyle draws attention to Solyman's triumphal progress and Turkish strength against Hungarian military forces that left the battle field in the face of Ottoman advance. Boyle wrote *Mustapha* in 1668 following Koprulu Fazıl Ahmed's pressures on Buda and Neuhäusel in 1663. In 1669, Candia finally was conquered and, in 1672 following a series of campaigns against Poland, the Ottoman took dominion over parts of the Ukraine. Thus, the Ottoman territories reached further than at any point in its history.[404] In other words, although Ottoman Empire was regarded less threatening in a military setback in the second half of the seventeenth century, it can be contemplated that Ottoman Empire maintaind pressures on Western borders that structured it as 'the Other' in heroic plays of Restoration drama.

Pirrhus turns attention to the necessity of expansion for the sake of Empire and states that: "Glory, like Time, progression does require,/ When it does cease t'advance, it

[403] Richard Knolles, *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (London: Islip, 1603), 763.
[404] Andrew Wheatcroft, *The Enemy at the Gate Habsburgs, Ottomans and the Battle for Europe* (New York: Basic Books, 2009), 42.

does expire" (*TOM* I. 9-10). However, Solyman seems doubtful of his victory and questions his unstoppable westward expansion:

Solyman: You both mistake; my glory is the cause
That in my Conquest I have made this pause;
Whilst Hungary did pow'rful Foes afford,
I thought her Ruine worthy of my Sword;
But now the War does seem too low a thing,
Against a Mourning Queen, and Infant King;
Pyrrhus, it will unequal seem in me
To Conquer, and then blush at Victory. (*TOM* I. 11-18)

Sultan Solyman humiliates Hungarian forces who left the battle field and questions his victory over "a mourning Queen, and infant King" in heroic tradition of Restoration drama. With his depiction of Solyman's paradoxical questioning, Boyle departs markedly from Knolles's depiction of Ottomans' unrestrained desire of conquests as he refers in his preface "To the Reader": "holdeth all the rest of the world in scorne, thundering out nothing but still bloud and warre, with a full persuasion in time to rule over all, presining unto it selfe no other limits than the uttermost bounds of the earth, from the rising of the Sunne unto the going downe of the same."[405] As it can be inferred Knolles associates the Turks with unrestrained desire for imperial expansion; however Boyle displays Ottoman Sultan's paradoxical approach to the worth of a war and conquest. Following Solyman's paradoxical deduction of the worth of Hungarian conquest Rustan maintains that:

Rustan:None but the Conquer'd should have sence of shame.
Shall shows of Vertue darken your bright Fame?
Success does cover all the crimes of War,
And Fame and Vertue still consistent are.
In lazie peace let Christian Monarchs rust,
Who think no War, but what's defensive, just.
Our Valiant Prophet did by Slaughter rise:

[405] Knolles, "To the Reader."

Conquest a part of our Religion is. (*TOM* I. 19-26)

It can be inferred from Rustan's statements that Ottoman conquest is justified as a dedication to *jihad* asserting conquest as a requirement of Islam. In other words, Rustan's words assure the conviction commonly held amongst the Europeans that *jihad* or imperial ambitions of the Ottomans are directly related with the teachings of Mohammed. With his reference to *jihad*, Boyle evokes the rivalry between Crescent and Cross explicitly represented as the clash of competing religions since encounter between the two religions. The rivalry between Crescent and Cross can easily be traced in Solyman's boastful speech of Ottoman triumph over Christian Europeans whom were destined to lose and sue mercy in the face of Ottoman military power:

Solyman: To Rome I will my dreadful Ensigns lead,

Rome which was once the Universal head,

Which still the worlds important part controuls;

Once she gave Laws to Kingdoms, now to Souls;

To that great Conquest my designs I bend,

This Kingdom is my way and not my end,

Which now, since too much scar'd by my Alarms,

Seems worthier of my pity then my Arms. (*TOM* I. 31-38)

Solyman seems confident of his power that scared European states and filled them with terror. Solyman boasts of his power and humiliates European forces "scar'd" by his "Alarms" stating that they are only worth of his pity. Through Solyman's boast of military power and humiliating attitude Boyle aims to present him as an "ardent confirmation of Europe's anti-Turkish, anti-Islamic fears and stereotypes."[406] That is, referring to the Ottoman sultan's unrestrained desire of expansion that alarmed Europeans, Boyle reproduces stereotypical Turkish Sultan on Restoration stage. In the play, Solyman's expansion into Europe and conquest of Buda is depicted "as the Instrument of Fate" (*TOM* I. 45) evoking preconceived image of Islam as the providential scourge of Christendom that was prevalent in crusade rehetoric and early modern discourse regarding the Turks. Boyle evokes the conviction commonly held amongst the Europeans that *jihad* or imperial

[406] Jonathan Burton, "Anglo-Ottoman Relations and the Image of the Turk in *Tamburlaine," Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 30 (1), (2000):141.

ambitions of the Ottomans would bring the downfall of Christendom. In the course of the play, Boyle repeatedly refers to Ottoman dedication to *jihad* through Solyman's statements and the Pashas' insistence on the necessity of the conquest. The Pashas demand not only the kingdom but the Hungarian crown in the person of 'the Infant King' whose fate was devolved to *Divan*, the Ottoman Council of State. Solyman orders Pashas to call the *Divan* and consult with them about the Infant King's fate reflecting upon the inner mechanisms of the State:

> Divans like Common-wealths regard not fame,
>
> Disdaining honour they can feel no shame;
>
> Each does, for what the publick safety call,
>
> Venture his Vertue in behalf of all,
>
> Doing by pow'r what Nature does forbid,
>
> Each hoping, amongst all, that he is hid,
>
> Hidden because they on each other wink,
>
> When they dare act what Monarchs scorne to think. (*TOM* I.65–72)

Matthew Birchwood points out that Solyman's remark of *Divan* and Boyle's display of the Hungarian Council in a state of disorder and fear can be regarded as an attempt to assimilate the ideological cracks of England's own recent history and a clear reference to Regicide and its aftermath.[407] Hungarian Council evaluates that "Religion too makes it a greater thing,/ To die a Martyr than to live a King" (*TOM* I.149-150). Praise of Hungarian King's death at the hands of his enemy to secure his honor bound his infant heir to the same apotheosis of exected king Charles I. This evaluation is an explicit allusion to the martyred Stuart King Charles I's victory but shamefulness of anti-monarchical treatments of the Regicide.[408] In that sense, Boyle refers to some of the most pressing political issues of his day in the presence of the king in disguise of the inner mechanisms of the Ottoman Empire.

Boyle turns attention to the Turkish laws of inheritance that specifies the death of all younger sons on the succession of the heir as Zanger points out: "Their fatal Maxims

[407] Matthew Birchwood, *Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685* (Cambridge: DS Brewer, 2007), 131.
[408] Ibid., 132.

made our Sultans still/ As soon as they were Crown'd, their Brothers kill" (*TOM* I.207-208). Ottoman practice of fratricide is widely referred in Western discourse in order to reinforce the difference between European civility and Ottoman despotism evoking the stereotypical cruel Turk image. In the section of Turcomania of his *Cosmographie* (1665), Peter Hylyn provides an account of this Islamic practice:

> To prevent… publick emotions, the Emperors of *Habassia* use to immure up all their younger children, in the hill, Amaza; the *Persians* do put out the eyes of their younger brothers , and the Turks do murder them: strange and horrid courses, whereby to avoid the fear of war in the State, they stir up a war in their own bowels.[409]

Hylyn specifies the murders committed by various Ottoman Sultans as follows:

> The first amonst the *Turks* that began this barbarous cruelty, was *Bajazet* the First, on his brother *Jacup*; whom immediately after his Father's death he strangled with a Bow-string; this being the only Instrument of their *Fratricide*, because none of the blood-royal of *Ottoman* is spilt to the ground. After him, *Mahomet* the *Great* caused his young brother, then at nurse, to die and death; and was not without much ado perswaded from being the executioner himself. *Amurath* the third, caused his five brethren to be at one strangled before his face; and *Mahomet*, his son, no fewer than nineteen in one day.[410]

According to Heylyn, the practice of fratricide that aims to prevent family feuds is regarded as the signet of inherent cruelty in Ottoman practices. Boyle's re-enactment of Ottoman history aims to evoke inherent cruelty in Ottoman practices and unconditional obedience to Sultan's arbitrary rule although Halil İnalcık argues that Ottoman Sultan acts for the sake of *devlet.*[411] İnalcık remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> The unhappy fate of the Ottoman princes was always met with resignation, as the foreordained result of a divine decree, beyond their control. When father and son came face to face in battle order, as did Bayezid II and Selim,

[409] Qtd in Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 74.
[410] Qtd in ibid., 296.
[411] Halil İnalcık, "The Ottoman Succession and Its Relation to the Turkish Concept of Sovereignty," *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy and Society* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1993), 60.

and Süleyman the Lawgiver and Mustafa, they believed themselves to be not acting of their own free will, but subject to an abstract force, to the will of God and *devlet.*[412]

According to İnalcık, the royal authority was absolute and indivisible among the Ottomans. The *pâdishâh*, as the caliph and emperor, was the bearer of absolute and abstract authority with whom state power manifested itself as an absolute and indivisible will. The equation between state and ruler as İnalcık points out validated all forms of privilege and dispositions for the sake of *devlet.*[413] In this respect, Boyle's display of Turkish laws of inheritance evokes preconceived notions of oriental despotism and anti-Islamic polemic of previous discourses regarding the Turks. Drawing on previous discourses, Boyle incorporates the binary of the East/the West, Islam/Christianity and Oriental despotism/European civility into his play. Representation of Ottoman inheritance law in heroic fashion not only underlines the distinction between the English and the Ottomans but also refers to the Restoration politics of the seventeenth century. In heroic fashion, Mustapha and Zanger disavow this constitutional precedent of fratricide as follows:

Mustapha: By our great Prophet solemnly I swear

If the Turkish Crown do ever wear

Our bloody Custom I will overthrow

That Debt I both to you and Justice owe.

Zanger: And here I vow by all that's good and high,

I will not out-live the Day in which you die. (*TOM* I.217-222)

According to Birchwood, denial of this constitutional precedent between two brothers sets in motion the tragic events of the play and reminds the audience to consider the fragility of their own restored government.[414] In other words, representation of the national and religious difference of the Ottomans, and succession problems in Ottoman dynasty in heroic fashion refers to domestic anxieties that attended the early years of the

[412] Ibid., 60.
[413] Ibid., 61.
[414] Matthew Birchwood, *Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685* (Cambridge: DS Brewer, 2007), 133.

Restoration.[415] Unaware of the pact between Mustapha and Zanger, Roxolana and Rustan conspire to bring potential heir Mustapha's downfall. As İnalcık points out in Ottoman dynasty "the eldest prince was unquestionably put in an advantageous position" since the first Ottoman Sultans were all eldest sons and that the eldest son was chosen heir apparent.[416] Conspired with Rustan, Roxolana designs to divert this line of succession motivated by maternal care. The emphasis of Turkish Sultana's maternal care aims to display the cruel laws of Ottoman Empire. On the one hand, Roxolana rebels against *Divan*'s decision of "Royal Infant's Doom." Rustan enters and announces that:

> From the Divan, great Empress, I am come
>
> They have pronounced the Royal Infant's Doom,
>
> And now their Mutes at your Pavilion Gate,
>
> For Execution in your Pleasure wait. (*TOM* I.347-350)

Boyle points out to the cruelty of Oriental conventions through the setting evoking the preconceived notions of Ottoman cruelty in Western discourse. Roxolana does not hand over the infant Hungarian heir to Rustan, and rebels against *Divan's* decision and supreme authority of Sultan. Roxolana states that: "A Viziers power is but subordinate,/ He's but the chief dissembler of the State;/ And oft for publick Interest lies; but I,/ The partner of Supreme Authority" (*TOM* I.347-350). In the end Roxolana "conquers" Solyman's cruel impulses with her tears, she compliments him on his rejection to kill Hungarian infant king: "By yielding you prevail, and your Recourse/ Gains more than other Victors get by force" (*TOM* I.470-471). In historical context, when Solyman soon arrived in Buda with his troops, Isabella was in need of Solyman's help against Ferdinand I.[417] Solyman commanded Isabella to send her son to him for protection and promised that when John- Sigismund reached the age of majority, he would give up the throne for him to

[415] Charles II's brother James II's sympathy of Catholicism threatened to undermine the king's religious and thereby his political authority, although James II did not officially convert to Catholicism until 1673.

[416]Halil İnalcık, "The Ottoman Succession and Its Relation to the Turkish Concept of Sovereignty," *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy and Society* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1993), 54.

[417]Historically, Isabella, the daughter of the Polish King Sigismund, became the wife of John Zapolya, the sovereign of Hungary, in 1539. Before his marriage, Zapolya, who, it seemed, would not have an heir, had signed a secret treaty with the Hapsburg Ferdinand I in 1538, which stated that upon his death, Ferdinand would receive Hungary. Zapolya married shortly thereafter, but died the following year after the birth of his son, John-Sigismund. Ferdinand immediately occupied Buda, refusing to acknowledge Zapolya and Isabella's child as the royal heir. Galina I Yermolenko, "Roxolana in Europe," *Roxolana in European Literature, History and Culture* Ed. Galina I. Yermolenko (England: Ashgate, 2010), 81.

rule.[418] Until that time, Isabella and her son were sent to Transylvania where he was to rule as a vassal of the Porte.[419] However, in Boyle's version, Solyman intends to put the infant king to death; however the Queen sends the child instead to Roxolana, having been advised by her cardinal that "Send the Crown-Jewels, and the Infant King/ To Roxolana as an Offering;/ … In gaining her you make the *Sultan* sure" (*TOM* I.117-123). On the other hand, Roxolana manipulates Solyman scheming with Rustan to displace Mustapha from succession to the throne. To put it simply, Roxolana firmly opposes to *Divan*'s decision of infant's execution that is ironically in contrast with the main plot in which she conspires with Rustan in the death of Mustapha. She remarks her condition as follows:

> And I, in my perplex condition, must
>
> Become unnatural, or else unjust:
>
> Must leave a Son to Empires cruelty,
>
> Or to a gen'rous Prince inhumane be.
>
> My husband, whom I love, I cruel make,
>
> Even against Nature, yet for Natures Sake. (*TOM* IV.656-661)

Boyle's inclusion of Hungarian Queen's need of help from Turkish sultana to save her infant son aims to display preconceived stereotypical representation of 'cruel' Turkish Sultan and Ottoman practices against which Roxolana rebels. Throughout the play, Boyle sets Roxolana's maternal care against the cruelty of Turkish practices:

> Oh cruel Empire! that does thus ordain
>
> Of Royal Race the youngest to be slain,
>
> That so the eldest may securely Reign;
>
> Making th' Imperial Mother ever mourn,
>
> For all her Infants in succession born:
>
> Excuse, oh Nature, what by me is done,
>
> If it be cruel to preserve a Son! (*TOM* IV.315-21)

Bridget Orr argues that the inherent cruelty in Ottoman practices inspires Roxolana to bring about Mustapha's downfall as her maternal care rebels against the cruel laws of

[418] André Clot, *Suleiman the Magnificent*, Trans. Matthew J. Reisz (London: Saqi Books, 2012), 121-122.
[419] Ibid., 121.

Empire.[420] In other words, although Roxolana's maternal nature is set against the cruelty of Turkish practice in Hungarian infant's situation, her maternal nature is identified with Ottoman cruelty in Mustapha's situation. Ros Ballaster argues that "figure of the plotting Roxolana is usually countered by the presence of another female who stands for virtues explicitly associated with the Occident within the narrative: temperance, wifely devotion, the rational pursuit of virtue."[421] In other words, the presence of equally maternal the Queen of Buda in the play aims to evoke the Oriental characteristics attributed with the Turks through her counter-example Roxolana. Boyle depicts the Queen as a properly governed model of feminine nature, while Roxolana whose ungoverned nature struggling with arbitrary laws is identified with Ottoman cruelty. In that sense, Boyle's dramatization of Turkish sultana and Hungarian Queen evokes Orientalist notions that associated the East/the Orient/Muslim with oriental despotism, backwardness, and inherent cruelty.

Roxolana's identification with cruel Ottoman practices is displayed through her conspiracy with Rustan to bring Mustapha's downfall. As Busbecq remarks "the calumnies of Roostem and the spells of Roxolana, who was in ill repute as a practiser of witchcraft" causes Solyman's estrangement from Mustapha and his decision to get rid of him.[422] Rustan aims to increase his power by gaining Roxolana's favor, since he is sure of her influence over Sultan. Rustan incites Roxolana's fear for the safety of Zanger following Mustapha's succession to the throne and inflames Solyman's jealousy of his son in order to provoke a crisis in the succession:

> To make the Father jealous of the Son…
>
> Last night some words I artfully did say,
>
> From Fame, not from myself, of Mustapha,
>
> Which might the Sultan's jealous anger raise,
>
> Not words of accusation, but of praise:
>
> For nothing can old Monarchs more offend,
>
> Then when their Successors we much commend. (*TOM* II.118-126)

[420] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 74.
[421] Ros Ballaster, *Fabulous Orients: Fictions of the East in England 1662–1785* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 132.
[422] Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, *The Life and Letters of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq.* 2 Vols. Vol. 1. (London, 1881), 114.

It can be inferred that Rustan's praise of Mustapha raises Sultan's anger as it can easily be traced in the following scene. At his first attempt, Rustan tries to convince Solyman to decide Mustapha's exile: "Our Sultans have their ripe Successours sent/ To some remote and quiet Government;/ Why since that rule is safe, and ancient too,/ Should it for Mustapha be broke by you?" (*TOM* II.270-273) Rustan, under the influence of Roxolana, intends to make sultan to decide Mustapha's removal from the power circle around the palace. Historically, as a result of Rustan and Roxolana's attempts, Mustapha was sent to Saruhan as a *sanjak beyi*,[423] then he was appointed as the official ruler of Manisa and from there he was sent to a remoter *sanjak* in 1541.[424] Rycaut remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> The story of…the Sons of Solyman the Magnificent, is a perfect experiment of the feud and dissension which is bred in the desires of barbarous Princes; so that when they arrive to any maturity of Age, they are always transplanted to different *Seraglio*'s abroad, where they keep their Courts distinct, and cannot enter within the Walls of *Constantinople,* during the life of their Father, left by interview with each other, their minds should be moved with emulation, or inhibiting in the Imperial City, should be provided with means before their attempt to the Throne of their Father.[425]

Rycaut refers to the fratricide the "barbarous custome began in the time of *Sultan Bajazet*" that was regarded as an inner threat to the Empire.[426] The feud between the brothers and their any attempts to succeed sultan's throne were deployed through *sanjak* that removed them from the confines of Constantinople. In his play, Boyle employs this inner threat in his play and Rustan announces that the soldiers rose in mutiny upon Mustapha's removal from the palace and maintains to exploit Solyman's fear of disloyalty misusing Mustapha's popularity with the army: "By his first deeds he seem'd to study you;/ And of your story a fair Copy drew./ Can he deface the Virtue he has shown/ And on his fathers Ruine build his Throne?" (*TOM* IV.333-36) Sultan Solyman soliloquises on his situation: "My race of Glory did proceed too fast./ My Armies now grow weary of my haste./ And yet, though tir'd, they shout and gladly run/ To see me over-taken by my Son"

[423]A *sanjak* was a subdivision of a province; *sanjak beyi* was the governor of a *sanjak*. Halil İnalcık. *The Ottoman Empire* (London: Phoenix, 1994), 224.
[424] Seda Erkoç, "Repercussions of a Murder: The Death Of Sehzade Mustafa on Early Modern English Stage," (Ph.D. Diss., Central European Society, 2008), 28.
[425] Paul Rycaut, *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (London: Charles Brom, 1686), 136-137.
[426] Ibid., 137.

(*TOM* IV.368-371). Sultan Solyman seems convinced at Mustapha's disloyalty and decrees his death at the beginning of the fifth act: "I Will not stay to see him in my Throne:/ I yet can reach him and will take him down,/ Rustan has now my orders: he shall die" (*TOM* V.1-3). Boyle's stage direction refers to the Oriental conventions evoking stereotypical Turkish cruelty:

> Enter six Mutes, one of them advances before the rest and kneels down, delivers Mustapha a black Box with a Parchment, the Sultan's Great Seal hanging at it in a black Ribbond. Then he holds up a Bow-string and makes signs that he should kneel and submit to the Sultan's sentence. (*TOM* V.p.68)

Boyle's detailed depiction of Mustapha's death aims to evoke inherent cruelty in Ottoman practices repeatedly represented in Western discourse. Ottoman practice of fratricide reproduced by Boyle's *Mustapha* not only aims to display cruelty of the maxims of Ottoman Empire but also to warn European monarchs against Ottoman style despotism and arbitrariness. Boyle refers to the arbitrary nature of Ottoman governance system and unquestionable authority of Sultan in contrast to European governments bound by Law and aims to portray cruel maxims of Ottoman Empire perverted by Oriental despotism in contrast to European civility. After Mustapha is executed, Solyman learns from Zanger of the plot that raged against his son. Although Zanger does not implicate his mother, Solyman is nevertheless aware of her complicity and vows that Roxolana is not safe from his revenge, "For they, without her int'rest in the deed, / [Rustan and Pyrrhus] Durst not at last have urg'd me to proceed" (*TOM* V. vi. 417–8). Solyman demands that Roxolana "Make haste! Write full your ambition down/ In changing the succession of my Crown" (*TOM* V. vi. 697-8). In spite of his excessive love for Roxolana, Solyman proclaims her banishment and sends her forth out of his sight forever.

In the course of the play, Boyle draws attention from Solyman's triumphal progress towards Europe to the intrigues and rebellions within the state as a result of succession system. At the beginning of the play, Ottoman expansionist policy and European progress is displayed while in the course of the play Boyle draws audience's attention to the cruelty of Turkish laws of inheritance. Boyle's dramatization of Mustapha's execution as a requirement of Turkish laws of inheritance, sultanic tyranny and Roxolana's intrigues provide restored monarchy of England with a negative exemplar. Moreover, death of Mustapha, polygamous and tyrant sultan, and Oriental sultana identified with the cruelty of

Turkish practices all reinforce the stereotypical image of 'the Turk.' In that sense, dramatization of 'cruel Turk' on Restoration stage aims to evoke impression of politically, religiously, and sexually more civil England against the Ottomans. To sum up, Boyle's representation of a sixteenth century Ottoman episode in the seventeenth century Restoration context clearly reflected constant European interest in Ottoman stories. Especially the interest in Solyman-Mustapha story provided Europeans an opportunity to moralize themselves against tyrannical nature of the Ottoman system. In *Mustapha,* Boyle reproduced stereotypical 'cruel Turk' image within Restoration context incorporating the intrigues and cruelty of Turkish succession system into his play. Thus, Boyle not only evoked stereotypical representation of the Ottoman Turks on Restoration stage but also aimed to display the conflict between Self/Other, the West/the East, and Christianity/Islam. Boyle's display of the *difference* between the Ottomans and the English widely utilized preconceived notions of Oriental despotism associated with the Turks in general that enabled the English to develop a growing sense of superiority called 'Eurocentric' view of the world that was strongly felt in the play.

3.3. "This is the way to govern: Severity, not Mercy, strengthens power": 'Absolute Turk' in Neville Payne's *The Siege of Constantinople* (1675)

Henry Neville Payne, politician and author, was widely known for his political activities as well as his plays. He wrote *The Fatal Jealousy* (1672), *Morning Ramble* (1673), and *The Siege of Constantinople* (1674) acted by the Duke's company. In *The Siege of Constantinople,* Payne aimed to reflect his engagement in the political affairs of England in the second half of the seventeenth century incorporating Ottoman Turks into his play. Aphra Behn draws attention to Payne's role as a conspirator in the Popish Plot[427] of 1678 that resulted in Exclusion Crisis[428] in English history and asserts that he was twice examined by the Privy Council in 1678-79. Behn defines Payne as "a thorough Tory and ardent partisan of James II," and especially after James II's accession to the throne he became "the most active and determined of all King James's agents."[429] After the deposition of James II, Payne was involved in various attempts to return James to power,

[427] Popish Plot (1678), in English history, is fictious but widely believed plot in which it was alleged that the Catholics were planning the assasination of King Charles II in order to bring his Roman Catholic brother, the Duke of York, James II, to the throne who publicly admitted that he was a Roman Catholic in 1673.
[428] The Exclusion Crisis was a political episode that run from 1679 through 1681. In 1679, a bill that intended to exlclude James II from succession was introduced by Anthony Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury.
[429] Aphra Behn, *Oroonoko and Other Writings*. Ed. Paul Salzman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 70.

beginning with the Montgomery Plot in 1690.[430] In her *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (1997), Susan J. Owen argues that these political debates were all responded to in Restoration drama. She remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> From the outbreak of the Popish Plot scare in the autumn of 1678 onwards, the dramatists denounced the plot as a piece of theatre and suggested that there was more truth and less artifice in the theatre than outside it in the 'theatre of news': "The Devil take this cursed plotting age," wrote Aphra Behn, "T has ruined all our plots upon the stage."[431]

It can be inferred that political crisis of the period was reflected in dramatic forms of the period. That is, dramatic form and content were radically transformed by dramatists' intense political engagements. The mid-Restoration crisis which was often called the Exclusion Crisis deepened political divisions and gave rise to party politics and rival parties, Whigs and Tories. Whigs feared the growth of Catholicism and "arbitrary government" that resulted in so-called Popish plot scare of 1678. Tories feared renewed rebellion of the sort which led to the English civil wars and the execution of Charles I in 1649.[432] During the Exclusion Crisis, the dramatists responded to the beginning of political divisions in England in their plays and fifty-four new plays or new versions of old plays were written.[433] It is hardly surprising that the dramatists dealt with political anxities of their day; however they preferred to deal with political issues in disguise of remote settings and 'the Other.' In this respect, through his brief excursion into the theatre, Payne reflected his political vision in his plays. Owen remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> Henry Neville Payne's *The Siege of Constantinople* (1674) foreshadows the tragedies of the Exclusion Crisis in its use of blank verse, its political topicality, and its peculiar combination of royalism with skepticism and pessimism. The wicked, plotting Chancellor, modeled on opposition noblemen such as Shaftesbury, was a model for subsequent villains of Tory tragedy; but Payne's play also evinces what was to become typical unease about the problems caused by unruly royal desire and caprice.[434]

---

[430] Ibid., 70.
[431] Susan J. Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 3.
[432] Susan J. Owen, "Drama and Political Crisis," *Cambridge Companion to English Restoration* Theatre, Ed. Deborah Payne Fisk (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 158.
[433]Susan J. Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 2, 3.
[434] Susan J. Owen, "Drama and Political Crisis," *Cambridge Companion to English Restoration* Theatre, Ed. Deborah Payne Fisk (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 163.

It is obvious that as a Restoration playwright Payne clearly referred to the political context of the period. Especially fear of "unruly royal desire" or "arbitrary government" was reflected in the play in disguise of the Ottoman Empire. As the author of a burlesque life of Payne remarks that "Then [after his return from Ireland in 1672] he composes a Tragedy of a certain Emperour of Constantinople, whom he never knew; but in whose person he vilifies a certain Prince [Charles II], whom he very well knows."[435] That is, in his play *The Siege of Constantinople* he intended to veil his affairs as an agent of the Catholic party and passionate sympathizer of Catholic James II.

Payne draws his plot on Knolles's *General Historie of the Turkes* but he alters it according to the political context of the period. Payne set the action in the Court of the Christian Emperor, dramatizing the actual siege and Roman loss of Constantinople. In fact, Payne returns to Irene plays dramatized three times between 1658 and 1675 that retold Sultan Mahomet's conquest of Constantinople and his love for fair Greek captive Irene.[436] The famous episode in which Sultan Mahomet, enamored of fair Greek captive Irene, beheaded her in order to put down the threatening rising of the janissaries is depicted in Knolles's account as follows:

> And having so said, presently with one of his hands catching the faire Greek by the haire of her head, and drawing his falchion with the other, at one blow strucke off her head, to the great terror of them all. And having so done, said unto them; *Now by this judge whether your emperour is able to bridle his affections, or not.* And within a while after, meaning to bridle the rest of choller, caused great preparation to be made for the PELOPONESUS and the besieging of BELGRADE.[437]

Knolles's detailed depiction of Irene's being beheaded inspired English dramatists to dramatize Turkish sultan's stereotypical cruelty and sensuality incorporating this detailed decapitation story into their plays. Sultan's beheading Irene and command for the preparations of next sieges were regarded as the justification of the sultan's priority of state affairs and dedication to *jihad.* As Bridget Orr points out that "the need for the Emperor to enact cruelty personally, killing his beloved, demonstrated to English eyes the absolute

[435] Qtd in. Willard Thorp, "Introduction," *The Fatal Jealousie 1673* (Germany: Tredition Classics 2012), 1-2.
[436] In 1658, Gilbert Swinhoe published *The Tragedy of the Unhappy Fair Irene*. In 1664, the next version *Irena* was published by an anonymous author.
[437] Richard Knolles, *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (London: Islip, 1603), 353.

priority of war over love among the Ottomans."[438] Turkish sultan's dedication to *jihad* or imperial expansion was depicted as the sole means the Ottomans expanded and preserved their empire since, as Paul Rycaut notes, the condition of the Ottomans "was a continued state of War"; and he adds that:

> In this Government, severity, violence and cruelty are natural to it, and it were as great an errour to begin to loose the reins, and ease the people of that oppression to which they and their fore-fathers have since their first original been accustomed,…to exercise a Tyrannical power over their Estates and Lives, and change their liberty into servitude and slavery. The *Turks* had the original of their Civil Government founded in the time of the War:…[they] submitted unto one General, it is supposed, that they had no Laws but what were Arbitrary and Martial.[439]

According to Rycaut the Ottoman Empire was founded on a martial form of government and had no laws that bound the sultan in his actions and decisions to which the Ottomans obeyed. In this martial and arbitrary form of government, the cruelty and tyranny were regarded as natural. Rycaut maintains as follows:

> The whole conditionof this People was but a continued state of War; wherefore it is not strange, if their Laws are severe, and in most things arbitrary; that the Emperour should be absolute and in most things arbitrary; that the Emporour should be Absolute and above Law, and that most of their Customs should run in a certain Chanel and Course most answerable to the height and unlimited power of the Governour, and consequently to the oppression and subjection of the people: and that they should thrive most by servitude, be most happy, prosperous and contented under Tyranny, is as natural to them, as to a body to be nourished with that diet, which it had from its infancy or birth been acquainted with.[440]

In his political commentary on Ottoman form of government, Rycaut defined the Ottoman government as a tyranny ruled by a severe and absolute sultan who was above the law. However, the Ottomans were accustomed to the absolute and arbitrary nature of their state and the infinite rights of the sultan over them that turned their liberty into servitude.

[438] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 80.
[439] Paul Rycaut, *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (London: Charles Brom, 1686), 4.
[440] Ibid., 5.

The subjection and oppression of the Ottomans under the rule of an irrational despotic sultan contrasted with the English who were born in a free nation "and used to live under the protection of good Laws, and the Clemency of a vertuos and Christian Prince."[441] Rycaut's contrast between the impulsive irrationality and despotic cruelty of the Ottoman Sultan and the virtue and tolerance of the English king essentially aimed to emphasize English fear of Ottoman style absolutism and French style monarchy that was regarded as ultimate in tyranny suppressed only by tyranny of the Turks in the aftermath of Restoration. Rycaut's account of Ottoman absolutism also intended to warn the English politics that if the king became absolute, such might be the fate of all Englishmen. Here is his detailed comparison of the Turkish and English subjects:

> If (Reader), superstition, vanity and ill-foundation of the Mahometan religion seems fabulous as a Dream, or the fancies of a distracted and wild Brain, thank God that thou wert born a Christian, and within the Pale of an Holy and Orthodox Church. If the Tyranny, Oppression and Cruelty of that State, wherein Reason stands in no competition with the pride and lust of an unreasonable Minister, seem strange to thy Liberty and Happiness, thank God thou wert born in a country the most free and just in the world; and a Subject to the most indulgent, the most gracious, of all the Princes of the Universe: that thy Wife, thy Children and the fruits of thy labor can be called thine own and protected by the valiant Arm of thy most fortunate King…[442]

It is obvious that Rycaut's account of the Ottomans addressed the English Christians to be grateful not to be born a Muslim. Rycaut redefined Islam as a religion of "pride and lust" ruled by an "unreasonable Minister" evoking the steotypical Turkish sultan image established in medieval anti-Islamic polemic, crusading rhetoric and early modern discourse regarding the Turks. In other words, Rycaut juxtaposed the Muslim sultan and the Christian king's attitudes towards their subjects; he depicted Muslim Sultan as tyrannical and cruel motivated by pride and lust while he exalted Christian king restrained by law. On the one hand, Rycaut's comparison aimed to reproduce preconceived *difference* between Turkish barbarity and English civility, Islam and Christianity, the East and the West ensuring validity of superior Western Christian Self in contrast to inferior

[441] Ibid., 4.
[442] Paul Rycaut, "Epistle to the Reader."

Eastern Muslim Other. On the other hand, Rycaut's account aimed to warn the English politics against a new Revolution attempt. He farewelled the Reader adding that: "And thus learn to know and prize thy own freedom, by comparison with Foreign Servitude, that thou mayst ever bless God and thy King, and make the Happiness breed thy Content, without degenerating into wantonness, or desire of Revolution."[443] Rycaut's political account of the Ottoman Empire was popular in the seventeenth century in which tyranny, despotism, and sultanic rule were associated with the absolutist tendencies of the Stuart monarchy. Thus, similar to Richard Knolles's *Generall Historie,* this account proved to be a lasting source of information and fasciation for the dramatists.

Rycaut's account of the Ottomans and Richard Knolles's depiction of Irene story attracted Payne's attention who incorporated these elements into his play written in heroic form. Payne dramatized actual siege of Constantinople and the conquest of the city by Ottoman Turks which was regarded as "an abject defeat for the Christian powers of Europe, bringing the infidel to the very doorstep of Christendom."[444] The Ottoman conquest of Constantinople proved to be a longstanding source of fascination for Western discourse. Especially the chroniclers that documented the siege of the city aroused the fear and hatred of the Turks. The Turks were depicted as a savage race who demolished the Empire of Constantine. The sultan of the Turkish Empire was depicted as "the cruel enemy of God, a new Mohammed, violator of the Cross and the church, despiser of God's law, and prince of the army of Satan."[445] Payne's version did not aim to display the fall of the city and the aftermath, rather the play aimed to display the internal strife within the Christians that led to the fall of the city. Payne depicted false counsellors, disloyal soldiers and avaricious citizens as responsible for Turkish triumph. In other words, although the cataclysmic loss of Constantinople for the Christians was central to the play's context, Payne's emphasis of internal dissension in the Christian world attracted attention more, since the loss of the city had long been associated with the betrayal of Christians by fellow Christians.[446] As Knolles asserts in his account of the siege, the Christian citizens of Constantinople hesitated to contribute to the defense of the city.[447] Knolles's depiction of

[443] Ibid.
[444] Matthew Birchwood, *Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685* (Cambridge: DS Brewer, 2007), 168.
[445] Robert Schwoebel, *The Shadow of the Crescent: The Renaisssance Image of the Turk*, 1453-1517 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1969), 12.
[446] Matthew Birchwood, *Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685* (Cambridge: DS Brewer, 2007), 168.
[447] Richard Knolles, *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (London: Islip, 1603), 340.

the Emperor of the Constantinople as "a Prince of a mild and soft spirit, fitter for the Church than for the field" was evoked by Payne through his depiction of the Emperor.[448] Although Knolles gives no reference to the betrayal in his account, the Chancellor, the agent of the Porte, was depicted as the most traitorous character who conspired secretly with the Turks and diverted Christians' help that left Constantinople defenseless in Payne's version. Over all, the Chancellor prostituted her ambitious daughter Calista who intended to be sultana to Turkish sultan in disguise of virtuous Irene. Moreover, the army, under Justiniano, was reluctant to fight without payment while necessary funds being kept by avaricious citizens. In contrast to the false counsellors, disloyal soldiers and avaricious citizens, Thomazo, Emperor's brother, was depicted as a loyal character who fought bravely in the battle field. As a requirement of the heroic mode of the Restoration drama, Thomazo's honor was rewarded with the Kingdom of Morea and Irene's love by Sultan Mahomet at the end of the play. However, besides the dissension and the treason in the Christian world, representation of the Ottoman Turks lies at the heart of this analysis. Clearly, the Ottoman Empire is depicted as a "growing Monarchy" dedicated to *jihad*; Payne's representation of absolute and expansionist Turk image shows a remarkable resemblance to the previous Western discourses regarding the Turks.

The scene opens with the Emperor and Thomazo's discussion of Christian counsel and critic of consultation: "For such aren't Counsellors but Advocates,/ And plead the cause of their own Interest" (*The Siege of Constantinople* I. 9-10). Payne emphasizes the nature of European monarch bound by law, not arbitrary, consults with his Counsel and cannot act without their consent. As Rycaut previously celebrated the English governance system bound by law, there is a clear reference to European governance system. The Emperor maintains as follows:

> The grand concern this Councel has debated
>
> Affects no less than all the Christian world:
>
> It is indeed, chuse Christ or Mahomet,
>
> Whose Law shall have the universal sway,
>
> And can a Christian think that Christians would
>
> Give selfish Councels in their Saviour's cause? (*SOC* I.36–41)

[448]Ibid., 347.

It can be inferred that Emperor defends his practice of consulting his Counsel and remarks that his counsellors would decide the best for the sake of Christianity. Through Emperor's words, Payne evokes the rivalry between Islam and Christianity beginning with *jihad* and crusade to "have the universal sway." Thomazo seems unconvinced and argues that: "Christian! Ay that's the word; but Interest/ Is the thing. That Damn'd Chancellor,/ *Romes* Pentionary lately, now the Turks" (*SOC* I.46–48). These lines refer to the compact between the Chancellor and the Turks and Chancellor's betrayal to the Christianity. Furthermore, these lines refer to the analogy between Romish and Turkish forces who were depicted as Antichrist in Western discourse as Luther argued previously that "Antichrist is at the same time the Pope and the Turk. A living creature consists of body and soul. The spirit of Antichrist is the Pope, his flesh the Turk. One attacks the Church physically, the other spiritually."[449]Clearly, Luther associated the Turks with papists who were regarded as the enemies of Christian faith. Luther consistently depicted the Turks as the Antichrist, precisely defined as the body of the Antichrist, whereas the Pope was its head or soul. Payne evokes the correspondence between the Turks and papists as Antichrist, and Chancellor's allegiance to them. The Chancellor, similar to the forces of Rome at Constantinople, is motivated by self-interest and notes that:

> I know their minds –
>
> The Turk must take this Town, and then the Pope
>
> Will have no Rival Bishop in the World.
>
> Let them have their design, so I can be
>
> Grand Vizier to this growing Monarchy. (*SOC* I.253–7)

Christian Chancellor confesses his conspiracy with the Turks since following the Ottoman conquest of the city he desires to be the grand vizier to the Ottoman Empire. Payne depicts the Ottoman Empire as a "growing Monarchy", while the republican government at Constantinople is torn by internal conflicts of self-interest and external competition with other European powers:

> I wish your Eminence, would press them hard
>
> For speedy succors, and that his Holiness

[449] Qtd. in Daniel J. Vitkus, "Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Europe," *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other*. Ed. David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), 212.

Would interpose his sacred admonitions

To reconcile the Kings of France and England,

That private discords, lay'd by them aside,

They might assist the general Christian Cause: (*SOC* I.182–7)

The Chancellor hopes the English and French would not make peace in time to contribute to defense of Constantinople for his own sake. Payne refers to the devastating effects of the Hundred Years' War, "that private discords, lay'd by them aside." Birchwood argues that Charles II' and Louis XIV's joint declaration of war on the Dutch brought about the long standing Anglo-French enmities with a particular context in the playhouse of 1674. It was rumored that the aim was not to fight the Dutch but to join with the French in introducing forced popery into England.[450] In other words, Charles II's foreign policy was ascribed with religious dimension that incited oppositions to his royal policy in general. For this reason, Parliament refused to authorize further money to finance the war, and the king was forced to make peace with the Dutch.[451] Within this political context, Payne displays Counsel's refusal of funding the war against the Turks with the Chancellor's counsel:

Shall make us far more feeble than we were,

As I will order it; for the Senate,

I'le still possess with jealousies and fears

Of Laws subverting, and religious change,

That they no aid shall to the Emperor give" (*SOC* I.226-9).

Obviously, Payne displays Christian unwillingness to defend the city and clearly refers to the contemporary political anxities of the Restoration period in the disguise of fifteenth century Ottoman conquest of Constantinople. In other words, representation of the Ottomans is closely related to domestic concerns since representation of 'the Other' in the heroic plays provides a contrast between Self and the Other, civility and barbarity, absolute and law-abiding governance system. Put it simply, non-European locales, as an alternate to Western politics and culture, offer the opportunity for disguise as well as

[450] Matthew Birchwood, *Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685* (Cambridge: DS Brewer, 2007), 162.
[451] Ibid., 162.

comparison. In his dramatization of the Turks, Payne employs preconceived notions of the Turks of previous Western discourses and reinforces these notions. Following his association between the Turks and the Antichrist, Payne aims to evoke the cruel and barbarian Turk image well established in Western consciousness. As it is aimed to be demonstrated below, Turks' approaching to the city intensifies the fear of the Christians:

> Consider *Turks* are coming, Turks d'you hear!
>
> What place will then be sacred, if we don't
>
> By our undaunted Courage keep them so!
>
> In fine, do you see my Lord, we know this place
>
> To be our Garrison, where we will be free,
>
> Nay too, without the Laws of Masquerade. (*SOC* I.484-9)

Here, Payne clearly draws on Western descriptions of the siege of Constantinople. In the eye of Westerner, Constantinople possessed a rich heritage of famous monuments, churches, and libraries, made the city seem a living piece of ancient history to Western scholars. Descriptions of how the Ottoman soldiers vandalized altars and statues, especially Sultan Mehmed II's conversion of the great cathedral of Hagia Sophia into a mosque shattered the vision of this illustrious city for the Westerner. As a result, Europeans viewed the Turks as a threat to European culture as well as to European security.[452] In other words, typical depictions of disproportionate violence and cruelty on the part of the conquerors, sexual violence often committed by "barbarian leader" himself and demolishment of holy places were depicted in the Western discourse. These depictions occupied an important position in Western discourse to which Payne refers in his play. Payne depicts Turks' presence as violation of "sacred" places in Christian lands. Furthermore, Payne, referring to European governance system bound by law, informs the audience about arbitrary form of Ottoman governance system. In other words, Payne aims to reinforce the *difference* between European law-abiding system that ensures freedom of the subjects and Ottoman State known for its arbitrary governance system in Western discourse. Payne evokes this feeling of insecurity through the citizens of Constantinople who are afraid of Turks' approaching to the city. Payne clearly refers to Rycaut's account

[452] Nancy Bisaha, *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 65.

of the Ottoman State in which he compares the Romans and the Ottomans. Rycaut remarks this comparison as follows:

> There will be found a vast difference in the original, foundation, progress, and maximes each of other. For the *Romans* built their City in peace, made Laws by which the arbitrary will of the Prince was corrected; and afterwards, as their Arms succeeded, and their Dominions were extended, they accommodated themselves often to present necessities and humors, and constitutions of the people they had conquered; and accordingly made provision and used proper Arts to keep them in obedience; and next, by their generosity and wisdom won these Nations to admire and imitate their Vertues and be contented in their Subjection. But the Turks have but one means to maintain their Countries, which is the same by which they were gained, which is the cruelty of the Sword.[453]

It can be inferred from Rycaut's account of the Ottoman State that "the Romans built their City in peace," but the Ottomans "by the cruelty of the Sword." According to Rycaut, the Romans made laws that corrected arbitrary acts of the rulers who were known for their generosity and wisdom. Rycaut's juxtaposition between the Romans and the Ottomans reaffirmed the *difference* between European Christian Self and Eastern Muslim Other. By fostering a contrasting image of Muslim Other and also demeaning Islam, Rycaut enabled the Europeans to create their own self image as a perceived ideal Christian society. Payne incorporates Rycaut's statements into his play and dramatizes Ottoman arbitrary governance system. Orr points out that the late seventeenth century dramas which used the Ottoman State as a setting aimed to remind the English audiences the uniqueness of their Protestant and law-abiding governance system, although Payne associates the Counsellors with treason and depicts self interest as the prior motive of the Counsel.[454] Payne turns attention to the corruption and dissension of government by consultation as it can be traced in Empreror's words:

> To head our first attempt with my own person,
>
> The *Turks* shall find' tis not our want of Courage,
>
> But fractions in our State that makes them be

[453]Paul Rycaut, "The Turkish Polity," *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (London: Charles Brom, 1686), 125.
[454] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 66.

Successful still in all their Wars against us. (*SOC* I.647-50)

It is obvious that dissension of the government is displayed as the reason for the fall of Constantinople. And for Payne's purposes, the story of Constantinople serves to remind the English audience the consequences of self-serving ultimately self-defeating policy. In the face of Ottoman march towards the city, Payne introduces Justiniano who would lead the army against the Turks: "Great Justiniano here, without whose help/ This barb'rous *Turk* would quickly swallow us" (*SOC* I. 116-17). However, Justiniano demands payment for his "valiant Country men" who would fight in defense of the city who do not care Christian cause. In contrast to false counsellors and disloyal soldiers, Thomazo seems confident of himself in fighting back the Turks and assures the Emperor:

To your imperial self, that's all I'le say;

If so, make no doubt by the help of Heav'n

To drive this *Sultan* back with as much shame

As once his Father found when he besieg'd us. (*SOC* I.663-66)

Payne refers to previous Ottoman attempts to siege the city that resulted in "shame" as Knolles also states in his account: "Prowd Bajazet most false of faith, and loathing blessed peace: His warlike troupes like lightening, to shake he doth not cease…Constantinople he distrest, twice with straight siege and long: And vainly thought to have possest the Graecians wealth by wrong."[455] Knolles clearly refers to Sultan Bajazet's serial sieges of the city in 1395 and 1396. Following Sultan Bajazet, Musa Celebi and Murat II laid a siege to Constantinople. However, in the play, Sultan Mahomet gains ground determinedly and Thomazo's attempts seem futile in the face of Sultan Mahomet's power. At the beginning of Act II, Theophilus interrupts the Emperor and Chancellor's discussion and informs that:

Our Scouts are beaten in; the *Turks* Van-guard

Are easily discerned from off the Steeples,

Which does all the Streets produce the Crys

Of Women, Children, and the heartless Crowd

That nothing but Confusion fills the Town. (*SOC* II.i. 14-18)

[455]Richard Knolles, *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (London: Islip, 1603), 220, 221.

Sultan Mahomet's forces march to the city that caused a state of chaos similar to the chroniclers that documented the siege of the city in which all women and men cried and prayed to be saved from "this pagan race, these wicked Turks, enemies of the Christian faith."[456] Similarly, Payne tries to evoke the state of fear and chaos documented in chroniclers. His depiction of the Turks as "heartless Crowd" and the streets full of "crys of Women and Children" reminds the Restoration audience the association between the Turks and the barbarity ensuring that Restoration drama draws on previous discourses on the Turks binding some of the elements into its network of meaning. This state of chaos is intertextually associated with political treason within the state and this treason evokes early modern phenomenon of "turning Turk" in Restoration context. Theophilus maintains that "But now I fear the Rumour's true, that you have got a *Turk* to manage your Intelligence" (*SOC* II.i. 35-37). In early modern English texts, internal and external enemies were always associated with "the pope and the Ottoman sultan; Satan or the Anti-Christ."[457] According to Vitkus, "conversion to Islam (or to Roman Catholicism) was considered a kind of sexual transgression or spiritual whoredom, and Protestantism proclaimed the same judgment – eternal damnation – for all those who were seduced by either the pope or the Prophet."[458] In other words, in Renaissance context "to turn Turk" meant betrayal to one's nation and religion; hence, "to turn Turk" anxiety was a longstanding source of fascination for the dramatists who dramatized betrayal of the Christians to the service of their nation and religion. The dramatization of renegades' damnation on early modern stage provided relief from the Turkish and Islamic threat for the theatregoers. In that sense, "to turn Turk" was always associated with betrayal and treason; Payne makes use of this phenomenon and transfers it to the Restoration context. For Payne's purposes, "to turn Turk" preserves its inherent nature of betrayal and treason; however it means a political treason rather than conversion to Islam in Restoration context.

In the battle field scene, Payne depicts encounter between Roman forces led by Thomazo and Turkish forces drown by Synan, Mustapha and other Pashas. Payne's depiction of the battle field reminds the English audience cruelty and barbarity of the Turkish forces:

Synan: What wretched fearful Slaves! dare you not die?

[456] Nicolo Barbaro, *Diary of the Siege of Constantinople 1453*, Tr. John Melville-Jones (New York: Exposition Press,1969), 27.
[457] Ibid., 77.
[458] Ibid., 78.

Can you forget the Laws of Destiny?

Mustapha: Fight; or the Death you'd shun, you'll sooner find;

Our swords give Death to all who seek to fly. (*SOC* II.ii. 19-22)

Similar to Davenant's depiction of Sultan Solyman's boast of Turkish military power, Payne not only depicts Pashas' confidence of Turkish forces and humiliation of Christian Roman forces but also draws attention to "cruelty of sword" associated with Turkish dedication to *jihad*. Furthermore, as analyzed in *The Siege of Rhodes,* Payne refers to conceptualization of the Ottoman Empire as an instrument of "Destiny" in eschatological terms, as the providential scourge of Christendom that was prevalent in medieval and crusade discourse. In this context, the ascendancy of Mohammed meant the arrival of the Antichrist and the Muslim invasion was a sign that informed the end of Christendom was near. Associating Ottoman invasion with the "Laws of Destiny," Payne evokes preconceived notion of Islamic threat that would bring the end of the Christendom.

Payne refers to arbitrary acts of Turkish sultan through incorporation of a beheading scene into his play drawing on Knolles's detailed depiction of Irene's being beheaded by Sultan Mahomet. Payne's traitor, the Chancellor, prostitutes her daughter Calista to Turkish sultan in disguise of fair Irene. Addressing Sultan Mahomet's "sensual law," Calista willingly takes Irene's place and becomes sultan's concubine. In her pursuit of power, she takes on the cruelty and barbarity associated with the Turks in Western discourse and she is repeatedly referred as Medea, the archetypal Asian villainess. She asserts that she learnt the cruelty from Turkish sultan:

Dorello: Ah thou cursed monster!

What Devil taught thee all this cruelty?

Calista: I learn't it of that Prince, he taught me first

To find my nature bad… (*SOC* V. 66-9)

It can be inferred that Calista's cruel attempts of murdering fair Irene with both poison and the string are associated with Ottoman cruelty as Orr argues that Calista who "prostituted herself willingly to the Ottoman Sultan [with] the pursuit of power, takes on the hall-marks of Levantine barbarity."[459] In other words, it can be asserted that Payne reproduces the distinction between the East and the West reinforcing Eastern despotism,

[459] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 84.

backwardness, sexual perversion and inherent cruelty through representation of Calista as a Turkish sultana. Put it simply, Payne's characterization of the Turks based on binary opposites draws upon and transforms other contemporary and historically prior texts fostering common Eastern stereotypes that are culturally inferior, backward, tyrant and sexually perverted. Payne reinforces his assertion of Eastern cruelty and sensuality through incorporation of Calista's beheading by 'absolute Turkish sultan' at the end of the play:

> Given by the Sultan's Sword, took off her Head
>
> So quick, the cou'd not shreek one Pray'r for Mercy:
>
> Then throwing me the Head…cry'd Synan take it
>
> And smiling, bid us see, how much he valu'd
>
> True Glory above Beauty... (*SOC* V. 303-7)

Depicted in detail in Knolles's account, the Irene story is evoked by Payne in order to reinforce Mahomet's ruthless and decisive personal cruelty reflected in the absolute power invested in the Turkish sultan. In other words, Payne aims to display 'absolute Turk' endowed with limitless rights over his subjects as a requirement of arbitrary governance system. In his account, Knolles also details "tyrannicall" nature of the Ottoman government the master slave relationship between the sultan and his subjects:

> The Ottoman government in this his so great an empire is altogether like the government of the master over his slave, and indeed mere tyrannicall: for the great Sultan is so absolute a lord of all things within the compasse of his empire, that all his subjects and people be they never so great, doe call themselves his slave and not his subjects: neither hath any man power over himselfe, much lesse is he lord of the house wherein he dwelleth, or of the land which he tilleth … Neither is any man in that empire so great or yet so farre in favour with the great Sultan, as that he can assure himselfe of his life, much lesse of his present fortune or state, longer than it pleaseth the Grand Signior.[460]

Here, positing Ottoman Empire as inherently tyrannical based on absolute rule; Knolles provides a source of information for the dramatists as observed in Payne's play. Payne draws his plot on Knolles' account and creates an 'absolute Sultan' reinforcing his

[460]Richard Knolles, *The Generall Historie of the Turkes*, (London: Islip, 1603), sig. Fffffi v–Fffffii r.

arbitrary acts. On the one hand, in structuring Sultan Mahomet as inherently tyrannical based on absolute rule, Payne aims to create a culturally, politically and religiously stronger sense of English selfhood against a clearly defined religious and cultural Other. On the other hand, he refers to the common English anxiety of "arbitrary government" by the end of the seventeenth century; thus, Payne's dramatization of Ottoman absolutism also intended to warn the English politics that if the king became absolute, such might be the fate of all Englishmen.

At the end of the play, Payne displays cataclysmic loss of the city for the Christians and lamentation of the Christian Emperor: "A *Constantine,* whose Mothers name was *Helena,*/ Began this Empire…but let Heavens will be done" (*SOC* V. 232-3); he hopes a new beginning to this Empire "by driving back this faithless Mahomet" (*SOC* V. 240). Payne's ending reproduces a remarkably consistent image of the Ottoman rule prevalent in Western discourse invoking the stereotypical Turk image:

Thomazo: This Turkish way of rule threatens the world,

As is their Crescent would at last be full, and rule it all.

Synan: This is the way to govern:

Severity, not Mercy, strengthens power. (*SOC* V. 473-6)

It is obvious that Payne's ending reflects fear of "Turkish way of rule" that "threatens the world" evoking anxiety and fear of Turkish expansion that threatened the European Christians until the end of the seventeenth century. Payne reinforces tyrannical nature of Ottoman government and reflects European fear of Islamic expansion that would bring Christendom's end. Thomazo's statements reflect the longstanding rivalry between the Cross and the Crescent and Turkish Pasha Synan's emphasis on "Turkish Severity" reproduces stereotypical Turk image in the play. Payne produced his text during the Ottoman war against Crete in 1675-1676 following a series campaigns against Poland through which the Ottoman took dominion over parts of the Ukraine in 1672 and expanded Ottoman territories further than at any point in its history.[461] Although England was outside the periphery of direct Ottoman attack, other parts of Europe still exposed to direct threat in the second half of the seventeenth century. Payne warned the Christian states against Ottoman campaigns against Europe in the 1670s through dramatization of internal

[461] Andrew Wheatcroft, *The Enemy at the Gate Habsburgs, Ottomans and the Battle for Europe* (New York, Basic Books, 2009), 42.

dissension and self-interest policy within fifteenth centry Roman Empire. The main point to get hold of here is that Payne reproduced stereotypical 'absolute Turk' image within Restoration context drawing on previous discourses on the Turks including Knolles and Rycaut's accounts. Payne's version not only evoked stereotypical representation of the Ottoman Turks on Restoration stage but also warned against the treachery in the Christian camp that led to the Turkish triumph and fall of the city. In heroic tradition of the Restoration drama the historic military victory was Ottoman; however Payne aimed to emphasize on the arbitrary form of Ottoman government, absolute and tyrannical sultan, and severity of Turkish rules that enabled the Turks to expand by "the cruelty of sword." However, Payne also intended to draw attention to the unquestionable sultanic power over his subjects dramatizing the Ottoman government as a tyranny ruled by a severe and absolute ruler who was above the law. Thorough juxtaposition between the European and Ottoman form of government, in heroic tradition of love and honor code, Payne personalized the interactions of the Turks and Europeans and restored a sense of European triumph. Besides, Payne's incorporation of Thomazo's honorable defense of the city and his love for Irene drew audience's attention from the actual Ottoman triumph to the love of honorable Thomazo and virtuous Irene. To sum up, in *The Siege of Constantinople*, dramatizing the Ottoman Empire as the counter identity, Payne aimed to evoke the impression of politically, religiously, and sexually more civil English against the Ottomans. More importantly, Payne combined medieval anti-Islamic polemic, crusading rhetoric and early modern anxiety of the Turkish military aggression with Restoration context in representation of the Turks. Drawing on the elements of previous discourses, Payne incorporated the binary of the East/the West, Islam/Christianity and Oriental despotism/European civility into his play reinforcing absolute nature of Ottoman government from which the English emulate an empire. In this respect, Payne, in his heroic play, aimed to portray Christian European superiority in contrast to Muslim Eastern otherness utilizing Ottomans. Drawing stereotypical representations of Turkish sultan as tyrant, sexually overdriven, and absolute on previous discourses, Payne caused perpetuation of negative image of the Turk in contrast to European Christian identity in Restoration context.

3.4. "Yes Sir; you rais'd me to a Crown, forsook The rude delights your wilde Fore-fathers took": 'Sensual Turk' in Elkanah Settle's *Ibrahim The Illustrious Bassa* (1676)

Elkanah Settle was known for his competency of English, French, ancient history, and English dramatic literature. His *Cambyses* (1666) was accepted at the theater in Lincoln's-Inn-Fields and succeeded in gaining favor of the court.[462] This favoritism pleased and incited Settle then he wrote *The Conquest of China*, *The Empress of Morocco* and *Love and Revenge*.[463] Settle, with his exceptionally successful *The Empressof Morocco*, brought theatrical spectacle to a peak. With its crowd secenes, special effects, and horrific ending, *The Empress of Morocco* demonstrated the variety of spectacle possible in late seventeenth century drama.[464] In his plays, Settle incorporated a variety of visual effects and combined serious drama of the late 1670s and 1680s with horror. According to Marsden, these dark and often disturbing dramas coincided with the current political turmoil of the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis.[465] In other words, Settle's use of horrifyingly graphic secenes was deliberately employed as vehicle for political messages to evoke a specific political response within Restoration theatre audience.

In 1676, *Ibrahim the Illustrious Bassa* was presented and a second edition was issued in 1694. According to Brown, Settle's aim was to appeal to the audience's taste rather than to write the kind of literature true to life: "every effort was made by the poet in the production of his plays to get material that would please the popular taste."[466] In *Ibrahim*, he had made use of a French romance; about the same time he was working the English translation of the Italian work by Guarini into a pastoral which he called *Pastor Fido* which was acted in 1676 soon after *Ibrahim* at the Duke's Theatre. In taking this poem as the basis of his play, Settle sought a work that was popular with the public and also with his patron.[467] In his "The Epistle Dedicatory" dedicated to the Duchess of Albemarle, Settle indicates that:

---

[462] Frank Clyde Brown, *Elkanah Settle: His Life and Works* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1910), 10.
[463] Ibid., 12-18.
[464] Jean I. Marsden, "Spectacle, Horror, and Pathos," *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre.* Ed. Deborah Payne Fisk (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 176.
[465] Ibid., 179.
[466] Frank Clyde Brown, *Elkanah Settle: His Life and Works* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1910), 19.
[467] Ibid., 19.

> Under that shelter I approach your *Grace*, when I must own I have play'd the *Plagiary* in making the Dutchess of *Albemarle* the Pattern for my *Roxolana;* only with this difference, that I have copyed below the Life. Your *Grace* has all her *Vertue*, without the allay of her Vanity; and this advantage above her, that Your *Grace* possesses those Charms which *Story* never attributed to *Roxolana;* Her *Beauty* could subdue, but not secure her Solyman. But your Graces Victories are more compleat.[468]

In his dedication, Settle compared the Duchess of Albemarle to Roxolana so targeted the English royal favor. The "*Grace*" and "*Vertue*" of Duchess of Albemarle were reinforced in contrast to Roxolana's "Vanity." He addressed the Duchess with qualities that never attributed to Roxolana. It can be inferred that Settle aimed to display the *difference* between the English duchess and the Ottoman sultana in order to assert English supremacy over the Ottomans. Obviously, in 1676, Settle returned to the ever-popular subject of the reign of Solyman the Magnificent, producing his *Ibrahim* for the Duke's Company. Settle's use of Turkish theme may be related to the Ottoman campaigns to Europe in the 1670s. Settle evoked anxiety and fear of Turkish expansion that threatened the European Christians. Settle produced his text after the Ottoman war against Crete in 1675-1676 following a series campaigns against Poland through which the Ottoman took dominion over parts of the Ukraine in 1672 and expanded Ottoman territories further than at any point in its history.[469] Returning to the theme of Sultan Solyman's preconceived infatuation with a Christian beauty; Settle drew audience's attention from martial encounters between Ottoman and European forces to Oriental nature and sensual weakness of the Ottoman sultans. Orr remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> Again, the play's use of a Turkish theme seems responsive to recent campaigns in Poland and Crete, with the action suggesting that the contest between love and honor among the Ottomans always results in erotic failure, for which the resumption of military campaigning is compensation.[470]

According to Orr, European military failure against Ottoman campaigns was compensated in dramatic representations in the form of the contest between love and

[468] Elkanah Settle, "The Epistle Dedicatory," *Ibrahim the Illustrious Bassa* (London, 1676), A 2.
[469] Andrew Wheatcroft, *The Enemy at the Gate Habsburgs, Ottomans and the Battle for Europe* (New York, Basic Books, 2009), 42.
[470] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 77.

honor. Incorporation of stereotypical Ottoman representations in heroic plays also aimed to evoke preconceived distinction between the East and the West reinforcing Eastern despotism, backwardness, sexual perversion and inherent cruelty. In this respect, representation of Ottoman culture in Restoration context was closely related to assertion of European supremacy over 'the Other' providing a counter image that an English monarch should not be. Settle, in his heroic play, aimed to portray Christian European superiority in contrast to Muslim otherness utilizing an episode from Ottoman history. Drawing stereotypical representations of Turks as cruel, sexually overdriven, and emotionally uncontrollable on previous discourses, Settle dramatized Sultan Solyman as the confirmation of Turkish stereotype well established in Western consciousness. In other words, Settle's portrayal of Sultan Solyman who abandoned his wife for another one, simply because she was more beautiful reinforced the preconceived image of 'sensual Turkish Sultan.' Settle's emphasis on 'sensual Turk' displayed polygamy and licentiousness as the characteristics of the Eastern marriage, which virtually rendered it a fragile one.

In Settle's plot of unrequited love, Solyman presents his daughter Asteria to his Vizier Pasha Ibrahim. However, Ibrahim refuses Asteria's love and he prefers captive Christian princess Isabella sent to the court by Rustan. When Solyman is informed of Isabella's arrival, he makes Asteria his adopted daughter so that Ibrahim would be his son once they are married. When Christian Isabella is presented at Solyman's court, Solyman finds himself so deeply affected by her beauty that he sends Ibrahim off to war, intending to obtain Isabella for himself. Settle depicts Solyman so bent on his sensual intentions that he disregards many calamities that await his kingdom including Roxolana's poisoning herself, Asteria's being murdered, and Ulama's committing suicide in the course of the play. In this context, Settle's play aims to display how Eastern empires torn by domestic strife, polygamy and harem intrigues. Through display of Ottoman Empire ruled by a sensually despot sultan whose uncontrollable sexual drives lead many calamities within the Empire, Settle sets Ottoman Empire as a negative exemplar for the English.

In general, Settle's plot is align with the historical events as recorded in Ottoman chronicles; however Settle includes many characteristics peculiar to heroic drama. Drawing on previous discourses about Ibrahim Pasha, Settle's play is a rhymed heroic tragedy which treats the love and honor of the main couple, Ibrahim and Isabella. Similar to the prior heroic plays analyzed above, Settle incorporates love and honor code in order

to assure European Christian supremacy over the Ottoman Muslim drawing attention away from the military struggle between the Europeans and the Ottomans to the Ottoman moral corruption. Similar to *The Siege of Rhodes* and *Mustapha*, *Ibrahim* derives its historical setting from the reign of Solyman the Magnificent supplanting Rhodes and Buda with Persia in order to highlight Sultan's unrestrained expansionist policy. In the course of the play, Settle aims to reinforce preconceived notions of oriental despotism and sensual weakness attributed to the Turkish sultans. That is, Settle constructs his play on the stereotypical Turkish Sultan image applying it to the fashion of Restoration heroic drama.

Ibrahim opens with the scene of seraglio in which Roxolana proudly glories in unique honor granted to her through marriage to Solyman:

> By Sacred Rites, I have bound my Royal Slave
>
> It has been mine, and only my Renown
>
> T'have joyn'd a Nuptial Wreath t'a Turkish Crown.
>
> He saw me, and he look'd his pow'r away;
>
> Nor can years raize the Structures of that day:
>
> The Siege I laid, an Age cannot remove;
>
> His Constancy's as great as is His Love. (*Ibrahim* I.i. 21-27)

It is clear that Roxolana assures her position and increases her power through her marriage to Solyman. She is so confident of her control over Solyman's emotions that she assures that the Sultan's love would never change and last forever. In historical context, Sultan Solyman practically broke every article of the imperial harem protocol for Roxolana's favor. While there were no legal barriers against the marriage, the weight of custom (known for law, *kanun*) militated against Solyman's marriage to a slave concubine. After the death of Solyman's mother, *valide sultan* Hafsa, in 1533 Solyman contracted a legal marriage with Roxolana. In his *Turkish Letters*, Busbecq writes that "In taking her as his wife, he broke through the custom of his later predecessors on the throne, none of whom, since the days of Bajazeth the elder, had a lawful wife."[471] That is, with a contract of legal marriage Roxolana guaranteed her unique status and attachment of Solyman to one

[471] Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, *The Life and Letters of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq.* 2 Vols. Vol. 1. (London, 1881), 112.

woman that was regarded as a radical break with the past tradition. Settle underpins Solyman's devotion to Roxolana drawing attention to the old tradition of Ottoman harem:

> Love, which in *Turkish* Kings no limits knew,
>
> But wide and spreading like their Ensigns flew;
>
> By the new Miracle your Beauty wrought,
>
> Its first and only constancy was taught. (*Ibrahim* II.i. 461-64)

It can be inferred that Settle points to the Turkish custom of harem pleasures widely represented in Western discourse. However, Roxolana made the Sultan break with the principal features of earlier tradition. The Ottoman harem system operated on the principle "one concubine mother-one son, and the presence of a prince's mother at her son's provincial post" that was designed to prevent the mothers' influence over the sultans and dynastic affairs.[472] However, Roxolana remained in the harem even after her sons – Mehmed, Selim, Bayazid- left Istanbul to govern their provinces. That is, Roxolana was the first mother of a prince since at least the mid-fifteenth century who remained behind the capital. Settle turns attention to Roxolana's power over Solyman in the course of the play. Triumphant of having confined Solyman's heart to herself, Roxolana welcomes Solyman's return from Ottoman campaign against the Persians pointing out the Sultan's worldwide fame:

> Welcome the Worlds great Conqueror and mine;
>
> Enough before did your bright Luster shine.
>
> You needed not new Victories, new Charms,
>
> To welcome you to Roxolana's Arms" (*Ibrahim* I.i. 81-84).

Solyman, on his part, returns her warm reception with a warmer one. He tells her that he needs all his "glories" when he is by her to be able to pay what is due to her. Then he declares his surrender to her power and submits himself to her eyes even though he is the "Great Solyman:

> Yes I need all my glories, when you're near,
>
> I bring my Trophies as a Tribute here.

[472] Leslie P. Peirce, *The Imperial Harem: Woman and Sovereignity in the Ottoman Empire* (USA: Oxford University Press, 1993), 58-59.

Great, though I am, your pow'r is greater yet;

The World to me, I, to your eyes submit. (*Ibrahim* I.i. 85-88)

Roxolana's broadcast of her unique status and the Sultan's persistent attachment to one woman was considered unnatural among the public. Unable to comprehend these radical changes, the public blamed Roxolana for bewitching the Sultan. Bassano remarks this phenomenon as follows:

> [S]uch love does [Suleyman] bear her that he has so astonished all his subjects that they say she has bewitched; therefore they call her *Ziadi*, which means witch. For this reason the Janissaries and the entire court hate her and her children likewise, but because the sultan loves her, no one dares to speak. I have always heard every one speak ill of her children, and well of the first- born [Mustapha] and his mother [Mahidevran], who has been repudiated.[473]

Obviously, Roxolana's control over the Sultan created a discontentment among the public and his charms had been associated with witches. Busbecq also defined Roxolana as "a practiser of witchcraft" and referred to her ill reputation among the public.[474] Roxolana holds a special place in the construction of the play since the problematic relationship between Solyman and Roxolana especially in the aftermath of Isabella's appearance in the play evokes the image of all-powerful Ottoman Sultan torn by domestic strife and harem intrigues also overwhelmed by his tendency to polygamy. To achieve this end, Settle constructs all his scenes in the seraglio or Roxolana's chamber. In other words, *Ibrahim* aims to display Ottoman Empire as torn by harem politics, polygamy and sensual despotism juxtaposing military power with moral weakness. Especially with Isabella's appearance in the play, Settle draws the audience's attention away from the military triumphs of the sultan to his moral collapse. Ulama announces the rising "Storm" in "*Roxolana*'s sphere" (*Ibrahim* II.i. 477) and states that:

There is a Christian Beauty hither come,

That has out done the Arms of Christendom.

The Turkish Crescents were Triumphant there;

[473] Qtd in Ibid., 63.
[474] Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, *The Life and Letters of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq.* 2 Vols. Vol. 1. (London, 1881), 114.

But their great Leader is a captive here. (*Ibrahim* II.i. 479-481)

Settle aims to strengthen the image of sexually overdriven Turkish Sultan overwhelmed by a Christian virgin. Settle's inclusion of Isabella into the play reinforces cultural differences between the Ottomans and the English figuring Christian victory through a pattern of Christian virgin captivating an Oriental sultan and utilizing the sensual despotism of the Turkish sultan as one of the stereotypical characteristics of the Turkish Other. Ulama's announcement of Solyman's captivity to Isabella's beauty reminds the audience uncivil nature of Turkish Sultan through Roxolana's statements:

Yes Sir; you rais'd me to a Crown, forsook

The rude delights your wilde Fore-fathers took.

When from the feeble Charms of multitude,

And change, your heart with one pure flame endu'd,

Was all entire to Roxolana giv'n:

As Converts quit Idolatry for Heav'n. (*Ibrahim* III.ii. 135-140)

As stated above Solyman practically broke with the old traditions of imperial harem granting privileges to Roxolana through "A Nuptial Tye" that made her "sharer in a Throne" (*Ibrahim* III. 473). Settle depicts Solyman as a civil character at the beginning of the play dedicated himself to monogamy; however he returns to the theme of Turkish sultan's infatuation with a Christian beauty who was overwhelmed by his sensual weakness. When Isabella is introduced to him, Solyman stops being a civil character and is transformed into a sensually weak polygamous Eastern sultan creating the intended discontentment of such a practice in the audience. Roxolana upbraids him for his disloyalty and his conversion to uncivil pleasures of imperial harem. In this respect, it can be asserted that Settle dramatizes sensual despotism of Ottoman sultan sustaining sexually overdriven Muslim sultan image established in previous Western discourses. Settle's portrayal of sensually weak Oriental ruler intends to assure English superiority, or conversely use the Eastern ruler as a "model for admiration and imitation, shaming or schooling the English supremacy."[475] In other words, according to Hayden, dramatization of Ottoman sultan's sensual weakness on Restoration stage referred to Charles II's mistresses Lady Castlemaine, Duchess of Portsmouth, Duchess of Mazarin and Frances Stuart who were

[475] Jonathan Burton, "Anglo-Ottoman Relations and the Image of the Turk in *Tamberlaine*," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 30.1 Winter (2000): 129.

too ambitious, too plotting and too involved in state affairs.[476] Their political influence generated a great concern in English politics and Settle's *Ibrahim* was associated with Charles II's sexual habits since "King's sexual habits continued to create a mixture of disgust and ribaldry and to sap confidence in the government in general."[477] To put it simply, Settle's dramatization of 'the sensual Turk' on Restoration stage had clear references to King Charles II's sexual habits in disguise of Ottoman sultan and sultana.

Ibrahim starts with the boast of Turkish military power against the Persians; however in the course of the play Settle's emphasis shifts to the display of the problems by polygamy and licentiousness. In doing so, Settle aims to juxtapose Turkish military power with moral corruption that linked his depiction of Solyman's court to the preconceived notions of Turkish image. Following his return from Persian campaign in which Ibrahim showed glorious power and strength, Solyman compliments Ibrahim's courageous efforts against Ottomans' foes and states his admiration as follows:

> For when my Ibrahim did to Persia go,
>
> Against the *Sophy*, my most pow'rful Foe;
>
> So small his Forces were, so few his Arms,
>
> That they seem'd only fit to give Alarms,…
>
> His Wondrous Arm such Miracles had done,
>
> I came but to behold the Fields he won. (*Ibrahim* I.i. 103-114)

Solyman praises his grand vizier Ibrahim's military skills that alarmed Persian forces and states his admiration of Ibrahim defined as "the Champion-Friend of Christendom" (*Ibrahim* II.i.58) in the play. The historical figure Ibrahim was familiar to the English audience through previous plays and chronicles that dealt with Sultan Solyman's reign. In *The Tragedy of Soliman and Perseda* (1592), Thomas Kyd constructed his fictional character Erastus on the historical figure Ibrahim Pasha and captured Ibrahim's special position during Solyman's reign. Solyman proposed Ibrahim that: "Thou shalt be Captain of our janissaries,/ And in our counsel shalt thou sit with us,/ And be great Solyman's adopted friend" (*The Tragedy of Soliman and Perseda* II.40). Drawing on

[476] Judy A. Hayden, "The Tragedy of Roxolana in the Court of Charles II," *Roxolana in European Literature, History and Culture* Ed. Galina I. Yermolenko (England: Ashgate ,2010), 78.
[477] Ronald Hutton, *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 338.

historical accounts, Kyd aimed to evoke the intimate relationship between Solyman and Ibrahim. Historically, Ibrahim gained Solyman's favor and rose to eminence as the all-powerful grand vizier in the Ottoman history. The first European account that dealt with career of Ibrahim was Paolo Giovio's *Histories* published in Lyon in 1522 and later in Paris in 1570. Giovio narrates Ibrahim's origin as follows:

> Born in a hamlet above Parga in the country of Butintro in Albania, he was taken away according to the custom of the Turkish rulers, who collect Christian boys. In his early youth he served Iskender Pasha…In this Iskender Pasha's place, Ibrahim, having accepted the Muhammadan religion, with marvelous skills, since he was quick witted, learned to read Arabic, write, and to play the lyre very well…Since he was pleasant in every action, a gentile speaker, and always courteous, he delighted this man of severe war and fighting. For that reason he was sent as a gift to Suleyman, the son of Sultan Selim, as a slave of great manners, while the grandfather Bayezid was still alive. Also he [Suleiman] cherished the most pleasant and gentile manners of this sharp boy to such an extent that he was raised with Suleyman at the same time and in all accounts of elegance he satisfied well the liking of the master.[478]

Giovio's account was regarded as the principal source of historical information on the Ottomans in the mid-sixteenth century Europe although he had never any kind of contact with the Ottomans.[479] Giovio's account of Ibrahim referred to the system of *devşirme*[480] widely reported in Western discourse and informed subsequent accounts of Ibrahim's life and rise in the Ottoman Empire. Similar to Giovio's account of Ibrahim Pasha, Turkish historian Tayyib Gökbilgin cites that Ibrahim Pasha was born in Parga, recruited by Ottoman forces during a campaign, and presented to the service of Solyman when he was a governor prince in Manisa. Also known as "Pargalı," "Frenk," and "Maktul", Ibrahim was able to maintain his intimate relationship with Solyman since the

[478] Qtd.in Ebru Turan, "The Sultan's Favorite: Ibrahim Pasha and the Making of the Ottoman Universal Sovereignity in the Reign of Sultan Solyman (1516-1526)" (PhD. Diss., The University of Chicago, 2007), 131.

[479] Ibid., 131. Giovio's history does not draw on first hand observation but on his contemporaries who were well informed of the Turkish affairs such as famous Venetian historian Marino Sanudo. See T.C. Price Zimmermann,. *Paolo Giovio the Historian and the Crisis o f Sixteenth-Century Italy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995), 15, 50.

[480] *Devşirme* (recruit) refers to the levy of Christian children to be trained for posts in the palace. Halil Inalcık, *The Ottoman Empire* (London: Phoenix, 1994), 219.

days of Solyman's princely governorate.[481] In a very short time, Ibrahim became Suleyman's 'favorite' and accompanied him from Manisa to Istanbul when he succeeded his father in 1520. Halil İnalcık points out that after Solyman's accession to the throne in 1520, the two began to live together in the imperial palace. Solyman made Ibrahim his *hasodabaşı*, which means the head of the privy chamber or the royal bedroom who was in constant contact with the Sultan, guarded him even in his sleep and accompanied him everywhere.[482] In 1523, Ibrahim was appointed as the grand vizier, at the head of government, the administration and the army and then he was conferred another honor, *beylerbeyi*[483] of Rumelia and Egypt. In 1536, at the height of his career, he was summoned to the palace for *iftar* and he was strangled by the mutes. Andre Clot remarks his rise and death as follows:

> What an extraordinary and romantic career! A son of a fisherman still under 30 years of age when he attained the highest positions in the most powerful empire of his time, husband of the sultan's sister and almost his equal – only to be cut down one night, at the height of his prestige, caught in the trap laid by the mute servants of the Seraglio![484]

It can be inferred from Clots's statements that Ibrahim's constant and rapid promotion resulted in his tragedy. Although history had preserved no record of the fact, there was much speculation about what could have led Solyman to command his execution. Everything indicated that his recent errors and attitudes exerted a decisive influence. It was alleged that his ambition of sultanate, his disapproved behaviors following Iraq campaign, and the intrigues of Roxolana caused his downfall.[485] In that sense, Settle refers to the intimate relationship between Solyman and Ibrahim incorporating historical context into his play. Historically, Solyman and Ibrahim bound such an intimate relationship since the years of Solyman's princely governorate in Manisa that Ibrahim drew attention with the privileges that were never granted to the prior grand viziers. Ibrahim's appointment to the grand vizirate was attributed not only to Solyman's affection

[481] Tayyib Gökbilgin, "İbrâhîm Paşa, Pargalı, Frenk, Makbûl, Maktûl," *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, (1949), 908.
[482] Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300-1600*. Trans. C. Imber and N. Itzkowitz (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973): 80.
[483] *Beylerbey* had the aouthority over all the Turkish territories in Europe and, in time of war, the command of all the troops in the region.
[484] André Clot, *Suleiman the Magnificent*, Trans. Matthew J. Reisz, (London: Saqi Books, 2012), Part 1.1. para.77.
[485] Feridun Emecen, "İbrahim Paşa, Makbul," *Türk Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Cilt: 21. (İstanbul. 2000), 334. Retrived from: http://www.islamansiklopedisi.info/dia/pdf/c21/c210260.pdf

to him, but to his skills and talents as well as Suleyman's discomfort with his grand viziers Piri Pasha and Ahmed Pasha. With Ibrahim's appointment to the grand vizierate, Suleyman granted him also the privilege to hold the *divan* (council) meetings in his own palace built for him at the Hippodrome of Istanbul; this novelty became the norm for the later grand viziers.[486] Besides his decisive power in Ottoman politics, Ibrahim was claimed to have participated in dynasty through his marriage to a sister of Sultan Solyman, Hatice Sultan, although there is no consensus in Ottoman historiography on this subject. Turkish historian İ. Hakkı Uzunçarşılı disregards this argument and points out that Ibrahim Pasha was not married to Hatice Sultan, but to Muhsine Hatun whose origin did not belong to the Ottoman dynasty.[487] It can be asserted that Settle constructs his play on historical context of the relationship between Sultan Solyman and Ibrahim Pasha incorporating a fictional love story among Solyman-Ibrahim-Isabella in order to evoke preconceived notions of Turkish sensual despotism and moral weakness on Restoration stage. In other words, Settle presents the reign of Sultan Solyman in the fashion of Restoration heroic play incorporating love and honor code in order to assert European civility and supremacy against Ottoman otherness.

In the play Solyman promises that: "Heav'n make me happy as I am just to you/ Whilst *Solyman* lives, his Ibrahim shall not die/ By any violent death" (*Ibrahim* I.i. 223-25). That is, he promises to save Ibrahim's life as long as he lives. Solyman feels such an intense admiration for Ibrahim that he presents his daughter Asteria to Ibrahim to be his wife:

> I'll take this surer way;
>
> Though Friendship have no influence, Love may.
>
> Here be your looks as Conqu'ring as your Sword;
>
> I call you Friend, and she shall call you Lord. (*Ibrahim* I.i. 232-35)

It is clear that Solyman presents her daughter so that Ibrahim would be his son once they are married. However, Ibrahim rejects Asteria's love, since he loves Christian beauty Isabella. Isabella's appearance in the play aims to display Ottoman sultan's oriental and sensual despotism evoking the stereotypical Turk image that directly links Solyman to the

[486] Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300-1600*. Trans. C. Imber and N. Itzkowitz (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973): 95.
[487] İ. Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, " Kanuni Sultan Suleyman'in Vezir-i Azami Makbul ve Maktul ibrahim Paşa Padişah Damadi Degildi," *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten* 29. 113-116 (1965): 355-361.

stereotypical sensually despot sultan. In other words, Settle's plot departs markedly from historical line through Christian beauty Isabella's presence in the play since Ibrahim's rejection of Sultan's order would derive from his love for Isabella. Solyman is so infatuated with Isabella that he orders Ibrahim's death as Asteria informs:

> My Cruel Father----oh that Sacred Name!
>
> None but a daughter to pronounce his shame!
>
> My Father, Sir, has laid his Vertue down,
>
> Has shaded all the lustre of his Crown;
>
> And in that black degenerate disguise,
>
> Has seen his Ibrahim's Saint with impious Eyes. (*Ibrahim* III. 185-190)

Solyman who raised Ibrahim once now decides to destroy him because of his uncontrollable drives for Isabella. Asteria asserts that Solyman "has laid his Vertue down," and transformed into an "Infidel and Hellish Minister" (*Ibrahim* III. 194) who would punish Ibrahim disregarding his service for the Ottomans. By the way, Settle finds an outlet to display Ottoman practice of *devşirme* that recruited Christian subjects for the Ottoman service as a trophy of the wars between the Ottomans and the Europeans. As recorded in historical accounts, Ibrahim was recruited at the age of six and served in Ottoman army and state. Ibrahim states his situation as follows:

> By the ill chance of War, 'twas our hard doom,
>
> In three set Battels, to be overcome:
>
> My Family destroy'd, my hopes undone,
>
> The Field by her Insulting Father won;
>
> I strait took Ship, and for new aids did flye
>
> To our Allies, the States of *Sicily*.
>
> And taken Prisoner by the *Algereens,*
>
> I to that Voyage owed my Turkish chains. (*Ibrahim* II.i. 30-37)

Settle aims to evoke brutality of Ottoman practices drawing attention to the system of *devşirme* through which Ibrahim was also recruited. 17th century chronicler M. Baudier states that "he was a Christian, borne of a very base extraction; at the age of seven or eight

yeeres, they which extract the tribute of Christians Children, tooke him from his fathers house, and conducted him with a troupe of other young slaves to Constantinople."[488] In fact, Turkish historian Emecen argues that there is no clear information about Ibrahim's early years although it is widely known that he was born in Parga and brought to Constantinople at the age of six.[489] Ibrahim maintains and states his yearn for his "Freedom" as follows:

> To beg my Freedom, and returning home,
>
> To meet my only Joys in Christendom:
>
> One War scarce finisht, still succeeded new,
>
> The Sultan found fresh Kingdoms to subdue:
>
> And whilst he had Foes t'oppose, or Crowns to gain;
>
> My Passion with my Honour strove in vain. (*Ibrahim* III.i. 5-10)

Settle depicts Ibrahim as a recruited Christian boy for the service of Ottoman army who longs for his "Freedom" and "Joys in Christendom." To achieve this end, Settle brings out the conviction commonly held amongst the Europeans that *jihad* or imperial ambitions of the Ottomans would never end and the sultan would find new territories to conquer. Along with Ottoman expansionist policy, Settle also brings forward arbitrary nature of Ottoman Empire in which the Sultan was bound by no laws, that his will was absolute and that there was no security in property and persons. In other words, Settle refers to the arbitrary nature of Ottoman governance system and unquestionable authority of Sultan in contrast to European governments bound by law and aims to portray cruel maxims of Ottoman Empire perverted by Oriental despotism in contrast to European civility. Ibrahim's complaint echoes Rycaut's admonition to the Reader in the *Present State* reminding the audience arbitrary nature of the Ottoman governance system and warning European monarchs.[490] In the face of Solyman's arbitrary acts, Ibrahim notes that:

> No, *Sultan*, call it be another Name,
>
> A subjects Zeal to Guard his Soveraigns Fame.

[488] Qtd.in Ebru Turan, "The Sultan's Favorite: Ibrahim Pasha and the Making of the Ottoman Universal Sovereignity in the Reign of Sultan Solyman (1516-1526)" (Ph.D. Diss., The University of Chicago, 2007), 124-125.
[489] Feridun Emecen, "İbrahim Paşa, Makbul," *Türk Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Cilt: 21. (İstanbul. 2000), 333.
[490] Paul Rycaut, "Epistle to the Reader."

More worthy and more Kingly Thoughts pursue:

How little does this change appear in You?

When *Solyman*, who lately took Delight

In Thoughts that soar'd above an Eagles Flight,

Now humbly stoops t' invade his Vassals right. (*Ibrahim* IV.i. 239-245)

Ibrahim's complaint refers to the arbitrary nature of Ottoman governance system that granted the Sultan limitless freedom to act towards his subjects. Settle aims to portray the Sultan motivated by pride and lust who made use of religion for the sake of his pleasure. Once Isabella is delivered to the Ottoman court, Settle revolves his plot around the theme of Solyman's infatuation with the Christian beauty and arbitrary acts that posed his state in dangerous situations. Settle's emphasis shifts to the Sultan's machinations in order to obtain Isabella by murdering Ibrahim. However, having assured earlier that Ibrahim would not die as long as Solyman lives, the Sultan calls for a Mufti to resolve the problem. The Mufti assures Solyman that Ibrahim's death may properly take place when the Sultan is asleep, since "Sir, whilst you sleep you are not living,/ Death's its retreat, and sleep is its disguise" (*Ibrahim* IV.i. 368-374). Settle aims to display that the Turkish sultan motivated by pride and sexual drives may act arbitrarily through misuse of religion. In order to obtain Isabella, Solyman orders the death of Ibrahim who was previously pledged as the "the Champion-Friend of Christendom" (*Ibrahim* II.i.58). Solyman's conduct towards Isabella and his order of Ibrahim's death presents a return to the exercise of arbitrary power although he pledged to quit luxury pleasures of the harem for the sake of Roxolana. However, in the course of the play Solyman who "forsook the rude delights" of his "wild Fore-Fathers took" (*Ibrahim* III.ii. 135-136) transforms into "other *Turkish* Kings" who adopted polygamy. Roxolana laments on her pathetic situation:

Had Solyman lov'd like other *Turkish* Kings,

And I been one of those tame suffering things,

Who as your Slaves, your scatter'd Favours caught,

I in the Crowd had had no higher Thought. (*Ibrahim* III.ii. 146-149)

Here, Roxolana turns attention to the situation of Eastern women and sultan's authority on them. Roxolana's agency is a hostage in Solyman's hands; he is the one who bestows that agency and the one who takes it back when he wishes to do so. This absolute

authority over Roxolana's identity is apparent in his declaration that although he once loved Roxolana, he is now infatuated with Isabella, and he has decided to take back the glory he once has bestowed on her. The absoluteness of his authority is conspicuous in his decision to eclipse her character: "Down go her Altars, and her pow'r decays;/ To a new Saint I a new Temple raise" (*Ibrahim* II.381-82). In due course Isabella reminds the Sultan repeatedly his honor and his nuptial vows:

> Do not his Constancy so much mistake;
>
> Yet if for you he could my Love forsake:
>
> That Heart which justly as his falsehoods due,
>
> I took from him, I could not give to you.
>
> Though you such Irreligous thoughts admit,
>
> Your Honour and your Nuptial Vows forget,
>
> I cannot— (*Ibrahim* IV.i. 129-135).

Isabella, here, assumes the role of reminding the Sultan his "Honour" and "Nuptial Vows." On the one hand, in spite of his loath of eternal faith to Roxolana, he intends to remove the crown from Roxolana's head and give it to Isabella. On the other hand, in spite of his pledge of guaranteeing Ibrahim's death as long as he lives, he plans to get rid of him. Solyman's disavow of his loath is presented as a return to the exercise of arbitrary power that was always associated with Ottoman sultan's absolute authority free from legal constraints and his infinite rights over the subject persons. It can be asserted that Settle positions Christian beauty Isabella as a reminder of virtue against Muslim characters in the play. Roxolana confronts her husband and accuses him:

> Can you plead reason for your Guilts defence?
>
> And thus Usurp the name of Innocence?
>
> No, *Sultan*, speak like what you are, and call
>
> Your self a Tyrant, Monster, Savage, all
>
> The blackest names from injur'd Tongues can fall.
>
> Since you prove false, 'twould be more just t'express
>
> Your Perjury in the most hateful dress:

Then I could bear my loss, and love you less. (*Ibrahim* IV.i. 488-495).

Roxolana severely criticizes sultan's arbitrary acts and calls him "Tyrant, Monster, Savage" associating his tendency to polygamy with Eastern tyranny. She asserts that her love for Solyman evaporates; instead hatred and anger fill her heart. When Solyman tires of Roxolana's arguments, he orders Morat to take her away, but Roxolana draws a dagger, telling him, "I've so much Pride for that which I have been,/ No common hands shall touch the Worlds once Sacred Queen" (*Ibrahim* IV.i. 560-561). In the final act of the play, Roxolana decides "To die!/ From scorn and shame, to peace and Heav'n I'll fly./ No perjur'd Kings, no ruine, no despair/ Come near that place---pow'r is immortal there" (*Ibrahim* V. 263-66). Solyman's sensual weakness and his uncontrollable desire for Isabella result in many calamities that Roxolana remarks as follows:

Oh Sultan! what reward does falsehood bring;

What judgments persecute a Perjur'd King?

Your Empress dyes; your Friend and Daughter bleed,

To pull down Vengeance on your guilty head.

Of th'unjust torments I have undergone,

Heav'n has a sence, though Solyman has none (*Ibrahim* V.i. 415-20).

Roxolana blames Solyman's arbitrary acts that gave way Roxolana's poisoning herself, Asteria's being murdered, and Ulama's committing suicide in the course of the play. In this context, *Ibrahim* draws attention from Solyman's triumphal progress in Persia to the harem intrigues within the Ottoman state as a result of Solyman's preconceived sensual weakness. In other words, at the beginning of the play, Ottoman expansionist policy and progress is displayed and Solyman's civil nature is reinforced while in the course of the play Settle draws audience's attention to the moral deterioration of Sultan Solyman and his transformation to Eastern polygamous ruler. Although Settle restores Solyman's virtue at the end of the play as Solyman states "Vertue, thy Gift, I'll to the World proclaim", he constantly revolves his plot around the polygamy and licentiousness in Ottoman Empire. In this respect, drawing on elements of previous discourses and binding them into Restoration network of meaning, Settle's *Ibrahim* aimed to evoke stereotypical 'sensual Turk' image. Depiction of sixteenth century reign of Sultan Solyman in seventeenth century Restoration stage clearly showed constant European interest in

Ottoman history. Representation of Ottoman sultan on Restoration stage provided the English an opportunity to moralize themselves against the problems of arbitrariness, polygamy and sexual licence of the Ottoman Empire. Thus, through dramatization of the Ottoman Empire as the counter identity, Settle aimed to evoke the impression of politically, religiously, and sexually more civil England. On the one hand, choice of Ottomans was deliberate and enabled Settle to deal with the most pressing political issues of the period in the presence of the king in disguise of Ottoman sultan. On the other hand, Settle aimed to portray Christian European superiority in contrast to Eastern Muslim otherness positing the ideal couple Ibrahim and Isabella against Solyman and Roxolana. That is, depiction of Sultan Solyman and his fierce spouse Roxolana established a pattern of opposition between Ibrahim and Isabella and served as a pivotal record of *difference* between the two cultures.

CONCLUSION

The image of 'the Turk' and Islam has been for so long a symbol of *difference* against which the Christian Europeans adopted an ideological, religious and cultural unity. This image helped the Europeans to create a 'Euroecentric' worldview through which they could assert European Christan supremacy. Crusade rhetoric primarily established the foundations of the 'Eurocentric' worldview invoking binary of Christendom and Islam. In crusade rhetoric, the European Christians defined the Turks as 'servants of Devil,' 'Antichrist,' 'enemy of Christianity' and 'infidel.' However, in the aftermath of Ottoman Empire's emergence as a world power and stunning victories against the Christians, the Turks were defined as 'the new barbarians.' The use of this term reached the level of discourse on the Turks following the conquest of Constantinople with a stronger and more unified rhetoric and set of images highlighting their status as the enemy of Western civilization and Christendom.[491] Before the eighteenth century, the European states were well aware that the Ottoman Empire was in a superior position to the West disrupting order and stability of Western binary oppositions of Self/Other, the West/the East, and Christianity/Islam. That is, the essential relationship on political, cultural and even religious grounds between the Ottomans and Europeans can not be simply defined as a fixed relationship between the West and the East; rather it was the East that held 'positional superiority' before the eighteenth century.

The relationship between the English and the Ottomans was also based on the Ottoman superiority in political, social and economic grounds to which the English were subordinated. English-Ottoman commercial relations in the Mediterranean, sponsored by Queen Elizabeth, proved that the Ottomans were not only commerce partners but also they were a threat penetrating into Europe day by day and converting the Protestant English to Islam. The cultural change, aroused as a result of exchange and encounter with the Ottomans, generated a great concern for the English as reflected in English dramatic representations regarding the Turks. The representation of the Turks based on demonization, simplification and stereotyping reflected English anxiety of 'the Turk' and showed that the notions of 'the Turk' and Islam took a central position in many aspects of

[491] Nancy Bisaha, *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 60.

English cultural life. Moreover, 'the Turk' had become a powerful medium through which a remarkable variety of cultural, political and religious anxieties could be addressed.

In this thesis, it has been aimed to show that dramatic representations provided the English with imaginatively controlled environments in which they were able to confront with the powerful Ottomans, humiliate Ottoman sultans and damn the renegades who converted to Islam. Especially, in the second half of the seventeenth century, English drama aimed to reflect political anxieties in England in disguise of Ottoman history. Representation of Ottoman style absolutism, sultanic tyranny, and inherent cruelty in Ottoman practices enabled the English dramatists to deal with the most pressing political issues of England including Revolution, Regicide, Restoration and Exclusion Crisis in the presence of the king. This imaginative authority exercised over the Ottomans, which later developed to what Said refers as *Orientalism*, enabled the English to represent the Ottomans through misrepresentation produced by English cultural and ideological perceptions, since the image of Turk was based on preconceived notions and imagination rather than real contacts. In that sense, the Ottoman Turk functioned as an ideological construct compared/contrasted to English identity in these dramatic representations.

English dramatic representations widely drew on the traditional repertoire of Western cultural concepts about the Ottoman Turks; since "the Turks with their banners, crescents, turbans and brazen head, signifying the supposedly Islamic idol 'Mahomet', their scimitars, bows and arrows, have stood for a wealth of emotive and mental associations in the Western consciousness."[492] That is, the image of 'the Turk' deeply rooted in Western history and ideology offered a wide variety of different kinds of themes to the English dramatists. The dramatization of themes including oriental despotism, sultanic tyranny, familicide, inherent cruelty and sexual perversion had a differentiating function through which the English defined themselves against the Eastern Muslim Other. In that sense, the image of 'the Turk' was a twofold process; on the one hand it was stereotyped as "cowardly, duplicitious, lustful, self-indulgent pagans", on the other hand, it enabled the English to define themselves against a negative ideal.[493] Thus, when the public were presented the 'raging and expansionist', 'cruel', 'absolute', and 'sensual' Turk through dramatic representations, they were also informed about their counter-identity;

[492]Esin Akalin, "Discovering Self and Other: Representation of Ottoman Turks in English Drama," (Ph.D Diss., University of Toronto, 2001), 57.
[493]David R. Blanks & M. Frasetto, *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other* (New York: St. Martin's Press. 1999), 3.

they helped them to affirm their identity through display of religious, cultural and religious *difference*. In the plays which concentrated upon key characters who were predominantly Ottoman sultans, the playwrights ultimately created a negative exemplar for restored monarchy of England.

In this thesis, it has been aimed to address that the relationship between 'the Turk' as an ideological entity constructed through Western discourse and the Ottoman Empire as a historical fact showed that the Western discourse fostered misrepresentations and misconceptions of 'the Turk' based on a conviction of Western superiority. In that sense, I share Said's conviction that *Orientalism,* as a discursive formation, enabled the Westerner to produce knowledge about non-Western cultures positioning the Westerners to a superior position. However, for the Westerners to have "knowledge" about the Ottomans was not to maintain power over it, since they were subordinated to Ottoman military, political, and economic power during the period under study. In this context, the critical intent of this thesis has been mainly to explore the historical and ideological basis for the distorted images of the Ottoman Turks on the English stage especially in the plays written in the second half of the seventeenth century. In that sense, this thesis has asserted that Ottoman Empire's superior position in Ottoman/European binary opposite and European fear of being conquered or converted by the Ottomans were the main reason for the distorted images of the Turks in these dramatic representations. In the formation of such distorted images, preconceived notions of 'the Turk' well established in anti-Islamic polemic and crusading rhetoric held greater importance than the historical realities. Thus, drawing on previous Western writings, English dramatic representations sustained these preconceived negative qualities attributed to the Turks as anlayzed in selected plays of the seventeenth century.

The evaluation of the English dramatic representations conducted through reading of selected plays from early modern and Restoration period has indicated that it is possible to assert a continuity and coherence in English depictions of the Ottoman Turks. In spite of the continually changing political, military, religious and economic circumstances and alliances that were formed in line with these alterations, the general characteristics of the English texts' attitude towards the Ottomans have showed an ideological consistency. On the one hand, as selected plays revealed, early modern playwrights reflected the English fear of being conquered or converted by the powerful Ottomans through stereotypical representations of the Turks based on simplification and demonization. In general, these

plays displayed English intolerance of conversion to Islam and stereotypical Ottoman sultans who were overwhelmed by their enemies. Such dramatizations appealed to the audience's taste when Europe was haunted by 'Ottoman peril.' On the other hand, as heroic plays of Restoration drama revealed, the choice of Ottoman history and sultans was deliberate and enabled the playwrights to deal with the most pressing political issues of the period in the presence of the king. In disguise of Ottoman sultans, the Restoration dramatists could reflect their political visions of Revolution, Regicide, Restoration and Exclusion Crisis. In that sense, this thesis has aimed to show that representation of the Ottoman Turks on Restoration stage encouraged consolidation of English national identity reinforcing the *difference* between the English and the Ottomans.

The critical intent of this thesis is to show that there was an over signification of Ottoman and Islamic elements in the aftermath of Restoration as recent scholarly reevaluation of the perception of the Turks and Islam in Restoration dramatic representations showed. The dramatization of the Turks and Islam in Restoration drama widely referred to the current religious and political issues in England, which found in Islam and Ottoman history a rich material for instructing the English politics. Hence, the Restoration stage provided a contemporary mirror in which England could be defined as politically, religiously, and sexually more civil against Ottoman style absolutism, sultanic tyranny, polygamy and arbitrary nature of Ottoman government. To put it simply, the heroic plays' special emphasis on political and religious aspects of the Ottoman Empire both aimed to evoke the impression of politically, religiously, and sexually more civil England against the Ottomans and warn the English politics that if the king became absolute, such might be the fate of all Englishmen. In that sense, the effects of Ottoman style absolutism, sultanic tyranny, polygamy and familicide were incorporated into the narrative structure and characterization of texts by Davenant, Boyle, Payne and Settle as analyzed in this thesis.

In this thesis, it has been aimed to assert that heroic plays not only provided an outlet in which the political and religious aspects of the Turks were displayed but also introduced Ottoman culture to the English. The Restoration heroic plays pleasured its audience with visions of the popular new commodities of tea and coffee or luxury goods besides scenes from *harem* or the sultana's chamber. Once the theatres reopened by 1660, the dramatists staged plays set amidst the imperial magnificence of Ottoman court and paraded Eastern costumes that both influenced and reflected newly fashions of the English

royal court. Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes* managed to dazzle the audiences with display of Ottoman culture and tradition when Thomas Betterton, Solyman in Davenant's play, performed wearing a turban and "Turkish vest," a knee-length coat of fancy brocade, a style that would become popular male costume following the Restoration.[494] In 1666, Samuel Pepys noted "the King begins to put on his Vest…being a long Cassocke close to the body, of black cloth and pinked with white silk under it, and a coat over it, and the legs rufled with black riband…a very fine and handsome garment" and found Sir Philip Howard dressed "in his night-gown and Turban like a Turk."[495] Clearly, Ottoman male costume fashion of silk and linen infilterated into the English royal men's suit through dramatic representations of the Ottoman court. Certainly by the second half of the seventeenth century, many other aspects of Ottoman culture had become thoroughly infilterated into English culture including coffee houses, imported carpets besides costumes made of Eastern fabrics. In other words, 'Ottoman' customs, habits, and objects were well known in English Restoration culture and widely referred in later literary productions. For instance, Aphra Behn's imaginary portrayal of West African royal court in *Oroonoko* (1688) was said to have been derived from accounts of the Ottoman court and seraglio.[496] Similarly, Congreve's depiction of "'tea, chocolate, and coffee' as 'native' drinks" in *The Way of the World* (1700) showed how English culture was transformed by the encounter and exchange between the English and the Ottomans.[497] Furthermore, in the same play, Sir Willful preferred not to visit Muslim lands looking at his map since the "Turks are infidels and, and believe not in grape."[498]

By the end of the seventeenth century, the Turks were still often called 'infidel', 'terrible', or 'non-Christian enemy' and the term 'Turk' still referred to all Muslims regardless of ethnic or national origin. However they became increasingly familiar in English culture and common members of English society was well aware of 'the Turks' since they found reports more easily and did not have to go very far to find traveler's accounts. By the second half of the seventeenth century, 'broadside ballads'[499] of the

[494] Charlotte Jirousek, "Ottoman Influences in Western Dress," *Ottoman Costumes*. Ed. Suraiya Faroqhi and Christopher K. Neumann (İstanbul: Eren Yayıncılık, 2004), 242.
[495] Qtd in Gerald Maclean, *Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 207.
[496] Ibid., 208.
[497] Ibid., 208.
[498] Qtd in Ibid., 22.
[499] In her *The English Political Broadside Ballad in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century* (Phd. Diss. Leiden University, 2008) Lijnetje Pronk defines the broadside ballad as one of the most popular and widespread forms of seventeenth-century English literature. Its mass appeal among members of all layers of

seventeenth century suggested how English interest in the Ottomans was no longer restricted to learned historians and politicians alone but attracted the national imagination of common Englishmen. Besides Restoration heroic plays, as Katie S. Sisneros argues, the anonymous English broadside ballads instigated common Englishman's imagination, helped them to define themselves against the Turks and became "ideal incubator for propagating Turkish stereotypes."[500] That is, the anonymous broadside ballads addressed the interests of the common Englishmen who had limited leisure time and lack of funds for purchasing printed materials and attending dramas. They were short and easy to memorize so reached common Englishmen quickly as Sisneros points out that:

> Broadside ballads instigated a particular kind of knowledge— specific enough to be threatening, vague enough to be easily applicable to other occasions— through their utilization of the term 'Turk' as a shorthand scare tactic intended to capitalize on the fears that already existed among the poor of England. Those fears were intensified by the overarching use of the word "Turk" by broadside ballads. It came to represent more than just a person, but all the intense fright the English learned to feel toward Islamic enemies abroad— anyone reading the ballads would have known immediately what he was expected to feel at the mention of a Turk.[501]

It can be inferred that broadside ballads not only introduced the the Turk to the common members of the society buts also intensified the fear of 'the Turk' among Englishmen in the second half of the seventeenth century. In that sense, this thesis has indicated that the common English interest in 'the Turk', Ottoman history and culture showed that that the notions of 'the Turk' took a central position in many aspects of English cultural life and 'the Turk' had become a powerful medium through which a remarkable variety of cultural anxieties and beliefs could be addressed.

The great interest in 'the Turk', Ottoman history and culture continued to characterize English attittudes towards the Ottoman Empire by the late seventeenth

---

society made this simple, cheap form of poetry part of the daily lives of the majority of seventeenth-century English citizens. The broadside ballad is a highly heterogeneous type of song that is primarily defined by the way it was published rather than by any intrinsic literary characteristics of the song itself: a broadside ballad is a song, printed on one side of a single sheet. The wide variety of topics and styles helped to attract a wide audience and to suit all tastes. Broadside ballads sang of miracles and disasters, of crime and punishment, of unfortunate love and successful seduction, of sinful life and the approach of death, and of events and figures of national or even international importance.

[500]Katie Sue Sisneros, "The Abhorred Name of Turk": Muslims and the Politics of Identity in SeventeenthCentury English Broadside Ballads" (Ph.D. Diss., University of Minnesota, 2006), 18.

[501] Ibid., 25.

century. The heroic plays remained primary site for the representation of 'the Turk' or encounter with foreign cultures until the 1690s. Following heroic tradition, Charles Saunders's *Tamerlane the Great* (1681), Mary Pix's *Ibrahim the Thirteenth Emperour of the Turks* (1696) and Joseph Trapp's *Abra-mule* (1704) were also based on episodes from Ottoman history; however they were categorized as 'Oriental melodrama' became something of a specialty among women dramatists in the late seventeenth century.[502] These plays were based on ineffective Ottoman sultans who failed to overcome their sensual weakness and were killed at the end of the play or replaced by another sensually weaker sultan. According to Orr, this shift to dramatizing weak Ottomans was not only a reflection of Ottoman military retreat in the 1680s that witnessed Vienna failure in 1683 but also a more confident English view of the Turks.[503] On the one hand, Aphra Behn's *The False Count* (1682) turned attention to the exotic image of the Turk referring to the "Palace of Pleasure" of "the Grand Seignior" where he pleasured himself with the mistresses.[504] On the other hand, George Farquhar's *The Beaux Stratagem* (1707) dramatized "humble Turk's" harem "where women have no soul nor property" (IV.i) reproducing polygamy, licentiousness and oppression of women as the characteristics of the Ottoman marriage. In that sense, this thesis has asserted that previous discourses regarding the Turks established the perceptions about the Ottoman Turks; however, towards the eighteenth century the stage productions focused attention on weaker or ineffective sultans and *harem* issues rather than the battle field or military strength of the Ottomans.

The heroic plays that remained primary site for the representation of 'the Turk' until 1690s were thereafter replaced by other forms, notably the novel, the oriental tale and the periodical essay. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the English interest focused on accounts of Ottoman social life rather than diplomatic or military aspects. Lady Mary Montagu's *Letters* written during her stay in Constantinople in 1713-1714 reflected that English perspective of Ottoman Empire had dramatically changed. The Ottoman Empire was no longer regarded as a diplomatic or military challenge although the Empire maintained campaigns against the Russians and the Austrians in early eighteenth

[502] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 87.
[503] Ibid., 86.
[504] Esin Akalin, "Discovering Self and Other: Representation of Ottoman Turks in English Drama," (Ph.D Diss., University of Toronto, 2001), 307.

century.[505] Lady Mary's epistolary vision of the Ottoman Empire that stated "the manners of our mankind do not differ so widely as our voyage writers make us believe"[506] showed that the Ottomans began to be regarded as more familiar to the Europeans. This shift in perception of the Ottoman Turks could be associated with Ottoman adoption of European dress, furniture, art and architecture during the "Tulip Period" of reform after 1703. Turkish ambassadors were sent to European courts and they sent back reports of European social life, army organization and scientific developments that were regarded as first "westernization" of the Ottoman Empire.[507] These developments suggest that the imaginary European influence exercised over the Ottomans in dramatic representations was being replaced by a real degree of European influence on Ottoman social and cultural aspects. In other words, the desire to tame 'raging and expansionist', 'cruel', 'absolute' and 'sensual' Turkish Sultan through European civility, fantastically represented in English dramatic reresentations in the period of Ottoman military superiority, evolved into Ottoman admission of imitating Europe. That is, the European willingness to learn of a 'Turk' in the second half of the seventeenth century was replaced by Ottoman willingness to learn of a 'European' in early eighteenth century.

[505] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 96.
[506] Qtd in Esin Akalin, "Discovering Self and Other: Representation of Ottoman Turks in English Drama," (Ph.D Diss., University of Toronto, 2001), 311.
[507] Justin Mccarthy, *The Ottoman Turks: An Introductory History to 1923* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 183, 184.

DRAMATIS PERSONAE

William Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes* (1663)

Solyman the Magnificent

Pirrhus Vizier Pasha

Mustapha Pasha

Rustan Pasha

Haly Eunuch Pasha

Roxolana Wife to Solyman

Villerius Grand Master of Rhodes

Alphonso a Cicilian Duke

Admiral of Rhodes

High Marshal of Rhodes

Ianthe Wife to Alphonso

Women attendants to Roxolana and Ianthe

Roger Boyle's *The Tragedy of Mustapha* (1668)

Solyman the Magnificent

Mustapha and Zanger, His Sons

Rustan Vizier Pasha

Pirrhus Vizier Pasha

Haly and Achmat Eunch Pashas

The King of Hungary, an Infant

The Cardinal of Veradium, Thuricus, and Viche, Hungarian Lords

Roxolana Wife to Solyman

Queen of Hungary

Zarma and Mirza, Roxolana's Women

Cleora, Queen of Hungary's Woman

The Sultan's Guards/Mutes/Pages

And other Attendants.

Henry Neville Payne's *The Siege of Constantinople* (1675)

Emperor of Constantinople	Sultan Mahomet
Thomazo, His Brother	Synan Pasha
Lord Chancellor	Mustapha Pasha
Cardinal	Mutantrope
Justiniano, General	Irene, Chamberlain's Daughter
Theophilus, Lord Chamberlaine	Calista, Chancellor's Daughter
Dorello, Friend to Thomazo	Idoxia
Michael and Lorenzo, The Chancellor's Secretaries	Several Turkish/ Christian Soldiers
Andrea and Lionello, Two Captains	Messenger/Mutes

Elkanah Settle's *Ibrahim The Illustrious Bassa* (1676)

Solyman the Magnificent	Roxolana Wife to Solyman
Ibrahim Vizier Pasha	Asteria, Solyman and Roxolana's Daughter
Ulama, the Heir of Persia	Isabella, a Christian Princess
Morat Pasha	Mirva
Muphti	Pashas, Mutes, Janissaries, other Attendants

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akalin, Esin. "Discovering Self and Other: Representation of Ottoman Turks in English Drama." PhD Diss., University of Toronto, 2001.

Akalın, Esin. "The Ottoman Phenomenon and Edward Said's Monolithic Discourse on the Orient." *Challenging the Boundaries.* Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007.

Backscheider, Paula R. *Spectacular Politics: Theatrical Power and Mass Culture in Early Modern England*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Ballaster, Ros. *Fabulous Orients: Fictions of the East in England 1662–1785.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Barbaro, Nicolo. *Diary of the Siege of Constantinople 1453*, Tr. John Melville-Jones. New York: Exposition Press,1969.

Barbour, Richmond. *Before Orientalism: London's Theatre of the East 1576-1626.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Barthes, Roland. "The Discourse of History." *Comparative Criticism,* 3, (1967/1981): 7-20.

Behn, Aphra. *Oroonoko and Other Writings*. Ed. Paul Salzman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Bhabha, Homi. "The Other Question: The Stereotype and Colonial Discourse." *Screen* 24, (1983): 18-36.

Birchwood, Matthew. *Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685*. Cambridge: DS Brewer, 2007.

Bisaha, Nancy. *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Bisaha, Nancy. "Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks." Phd. Diss,, Cornell University, 1997.

Blanks, David R. and Michael Frassetto. "Introduction." *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other*. Ed. David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto. New York: St. Martin Press, 1999.

Boyle, Roger. *The Tragedy of Mustapha, the Son of Solyman the Magnificent.* 1668. Gale Eighteenth Century Collections Online Print Editions. Reproduction of the original in Bodleian Library (Oxford).

Brown, Frank Clyde. *Elkanah Settle: His Life and Works*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1910.

Brown, Laura. *English Dramatic Form, 1660-1760: An Essay in Generic History*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1981.

Bullough, Geoffrey. *The Poems and Dramas of Fulke Greville*. 2 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 1945.

Busbecq, Ogier Ghiselin. *The Life and Letters of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq.* 2 Vols. Vol. 1. London, 1881.

Burian, Orhan. “Interest of the English in Turkey as Reflected in English Literature of the Renaissance,” *Oriens* Vol.5. No. 2 (1952): 209- 229.

Burton, Jonathan. “Anglo-Ottoman Relations and the Image of the Turk in *Tamburlaine.” Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 30 (Winter 2000):125-156.

Burton, Jonathan. “English Anxiety and the Muslim Power of Conversion: Five Perspectives on ‘Turning Turk’ in Early Modern Texts.*” Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, Vol.2 No. 1. (2002): 35-67.

Burton, Jonathan. *Traffic and Turning Islam and English Drama 1579-1624.* Cranbury: Rosemont Publishing, 2005.

Campbell, Killis. “The Sources of Davenant’s The Siege of Rhodes.” *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 13, No. 6 (June 1898): 177-182.

Chejne, Anwar G. *Islam and the West: The Moriscos*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1983.

Chew, Samuel. *The Crescent and the Rose*: *Islam and Britain during the Renaissance.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937.

Clark, William S. “The Definition of the ‘Heroic Play’ in the Restoration Period” *The Review of English Studies*. Vol. 8, No. 32 (October, 1932): 437-444.

Clark, William Smith. *The Dramatic Works of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery*, 2 vols. Vol. 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937.

Clark, William S. "The Sources of the Restoration Heroic Play." *The Review of English Studies*, Vol.4, No. 13 (January, 1928): 49-63.

Clot, André. *Suleiman the Magnificent*, Trans. Matthew J. Reisz. London: Saqi Books, 2012.

Council of the European Union, "Copenhagen European Council, Presidency Conclusions" Retrieved from: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ ec/73842.pdf, 29 January 2003

Crowley, Roger. "The Present Terror of the World 1453-1683." *1453: The Holy War for Constantinople and the Clash of Islam and the West*. Epub Version. New York: Hyperion, 2005.

Culler, Jonathan D. *Saussure*. London: Fontana/Collins, 1976.

Daniel, Norman. "Crusade Propaganda." *A History of the Crusades: The Impact of the Crusades on Europe, Volume 6*. Ed. Harry W. Hazard and Norman P. Zacour. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

Daniel, Norman. *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1962.

Darling, Linda T. "Ottoman Politics through British Eyes: Paul Rycaut's The Present State of the Ottoman Empire." *Journal of World History*, Vol.5, No.1 (Spring, 1994): 71-97.

Davenant, William. *The Siege of Rhodes*. 1663. Epub Version.

Davison, Roderic H. *Turkey: A Short History*. 3rd Ed. Huntingdon, England: The Eothen Press, 1998.

Denton, A. Blake. "The Medieval Canon and the Renaissance Image of the Turk: A Brief Historiography of Pre-Modern European Conceptions of the Muslim World." *Madison Historical Review*. Vol. 12, Article 5. (2015): 1-19.

Derrida, Jacques. *Positions.* Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press. 1981.

Dimmock, Matthew. *New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005.

Dryden, John. *Of Dramatick Poesie:An Essay.* 1668.

Dyer, Richard. "Stereotyping." *Gays and Film*. Ed. Richard Dyer. London, UK: British Film Institute, 1977.

Dyer, Richard. *The Matter of Images: Essays on Representations*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Edward Said. *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Books, 1978.

Ellis, Fermor and Una Mary. *The Jacobean Drama: An Interpretation.* London: Methuen, 1936.

Emecen, Feridun. "İbrahim Paşa, Makbul," *Türk Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Cilt: 21. İstanbul, 2000.

Erkoç, Seda. "Repercussions of a Murder: The Death Of Sehzade Mustafa on Early Modern English Stage." PhD. Diss., Central European Society, 2008.

Fairclough, Norman. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 1993/2009.

Fisk, Deborah Payne. *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972 – 1977*. Ed. C. Gordon, Trans. C. Gordon and Others. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Trans. Alan Sheridan Smith. New York*:* Pantheon Books, 1972.

Gilman, Sander L. *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race, and Madness.* New York: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Goffman, Daniel. *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Gökbilgin, Tayyib. "İbrâhîm Paşa, Pargalı, Frenk, Makbûl, Maktûl," *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*. 1949.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Ed. and Trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. London: ElecBook, 1999.

Greene, Robert. *The First Part of the Tragicall Reign of Selimus.* London, 1594. *Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England*. Ed. Daniel J. Vitkus. New Tork: Columbia University Press, 2000.

Hall, Stuart. *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage Publications, 1997b.

Hall, Stuart. "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power." *Formations of Modernity*. Ed. Stuart Hall and Gieben Bram. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992.

Hankins, James. "Renaissance Crusaders: Humanist Crusade Literature in the Age of Mehmed II," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 49,* Symposium on Byzantium and the Italians, 13th –15th Centuries, 1995.

Housley, Norman. "The Crusades and Islam." *Medieval Encounters, 13,* (2007): 189-208.

Harriot, Thomas. *A brief and true report of the new found land of Virginia*. London, 1590.

Hattway, Michael. "Drama and Society." *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama,* ed. A. R. Brounmuller and Michael Hattaway. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Hayden, Judy A. "The Tragedy of Roxolana in the Court of Charles II." *Roxolana in European Literature, History and Culture*. Ed. Galina I. Yermolenko. England: Ashgate ,2010.

Hulme, Peter. *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492-1797.* London: Methuen ,1986.

Hunter, G. K. "Elizabethans and Foreigners." *Shakespeare Survey* 17 (1964): 37-52.

Hutton, Ronald. *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

İnalcık, Halil and Donald Quataert. "Northerners in the Mediterranean." *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1600.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

İnalcik, Halil. "The Heyday and Decline of the Ottoman Empire." *The Cambridge History of Islam Volume 1A: The Central Islamic Lands from Pre-Islamic Times to the First World War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

İnalcık, Halil. *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age 1300-1600*. Trans. C. Imber and N. Itzkowitz. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973.

İnalcık, Halil. "The Ottoman Succession and Its Relation to the Turkish Concept of Sovereignty." *The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays on Economy and Society*. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1993.

İşçi, Günseli S. "Othello'da Türklere Yönelik Söylenenler ve Söylenmeyenler." *Tarih ve Toplum Dergisi*, Vol. 31 (Mayıs/1999): 49-59.

Jirousek, Charlotte. "Ottoman Influences in Western Dress." *Ottoman Costumes*. Ed. Suraiya Faroqhi and Christopher K. Neumann. İstanbul: Eren Yayıncılık, 2004.

Karpat, Kemal H. "Introduction." *The Ottoman State and Its Place in World History*. Ed. Kemal H. Karpat. Belgium: E. J.Brill, 1974.

Ker. W. Ed, *The Essays of John Dryden.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Kinross, Lord. *The Ottoman Centuries*: *The Rise and Fall of the Turkish Empire*. New York: Morrow Quill Paperbacks, 1977.

Knolles, Richard. *The Generall Historie of the Turkes*. London: Islip, 1603.

Langhans, Edward A. "The Theatre." *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre.* Ed. Deborah Payne Fisk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Levin, Paul T. "From "Saracen Scourge" to "Terrible Turk": Medieval, Renaissance, and Enlightment Images of the "Other" in the Narrative Construction of "Europe."" PhD. Diss. University of Southern California, 2007.

Lewis, Bernard. *Islam and the West.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Lippmann, Walter. *Public Opinion*. Filiquarian Publishing LLC., 1922/2007.

Lynch, Kathleen M. *Roger Boyle, First Earl of Orrery.* TE: University of Tennessee Press, 1965.

MacLean, Gerald. *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration: Literature, Drama, History.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Maclean, Gerald. *Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Madden, Thomas F. *The New Concise History of the Crusades*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2014.

Maguire, Nancy Klein. *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy, 1660-71*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Markley, Robert. "Introduction: History, Ideology, and the Study of Restoration Drama." *The Eighteenth Century*. Vol. 24, No. 2 (Spring 1983): 91-102.

Marlowe, Christopher. *Tamburlaine the Great, Part One.* 1590, London. *Christopher Marlowe Four Plays*. Ed. Brian Gibbons. New York: Bloonsbury, 2011.

Marsden, Jean I. "Spectacle, Horror, and Pathos." *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre.* Ed. Deborah Payne Fisk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Matar, Nabil. *Britain and Barbary, 1589-1689*. Gainesville: Florida University Press, 2005.

Matar, Nabil. "Introduction: England and Mediterranean Captivity, 1577-1704." *Piracy, Slavery, and Redemption: Barbary Captivity Narratives From Early Modern England*. Ed. Daniel J. Vitkus and Nabil Matar. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.

Matar, Nabil. *Islam in Britain, 1558-1685*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Matar, Nabil. *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Mccarthy, Justin. *The Ottoman Turks: An Introductory History to 1923*. New York: Routledge, 2013.

McGirr, Elaine M. "The Politics of Style: The Heroic Mode and Political Crisis, 1660-1745." PhD. Diss. Washington University, 2002.

McJannet, Linda. *The Sultan Speaks: Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Meyerson, Mark D. *The Muslims of Valencia in the Age of Fernando and Isabel: Between Coexistence and Crusade*. California: California University Press, 1991.

Orr, Bridget. "Theatrical Voyages and Conquests: The Colonial Discourse of Restoration Drama, 1660 -1696." PhD. Diss. Cornell University, 1995.

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

Owen, Susan J. *Restoration Theatre and Crisis.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Owen, Susan J. "Drama and Political Crisis," *Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*. Ed. Deborah Payne Fisk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Oxford English Dictionary. Retrieved from: www.oxforddictionaries.com.

Öktem, Öz. "The Representation of the Muslim Woman in Early Modern English Drama." Ph.D. Diss., Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2013.

Pagden, Anthony. *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France, c. 1500–1800.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1995.

Payne, Henry Neville. *The Siege of Constantinople*. 1675. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Reproduction of the original in the Duke University Library.

Payne, Robert. *The Dream and the Tomb: A History of the Crusades*. New York: Dorset Press, 1990.

Peçevi, İbrahim. *Peçevi Tarihi*. Hz. Bekir Sıtkı Baykal, C. I. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1999.

Peirce, Leslie P. *The Imperial Harem: Woman and Sovereignity in the Ottoman Empire*. USA: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Peters, Edward. *Christian Society and the Crusades 1198-1229.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971.

Pronk, Lijnetje. *The English Political Broadside Ballad in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century*. Phd. Diss. Leiden University, 2008.

Reeve, John. "Britain or Europe? The Context of Early Modern English History: Political and Cultural, Economic and Social, Naval and Military." *The New British History: Founding a Modern State, 1603–1715*. Ed. Glenn Burgess. London: I. B. Tauris, 1999. 304. 287–312

Riley-Smith, Jonathan. *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading.* London: Continuum Books, 2001.

Roberts, J. M. *The Triumph of the West.* London: British Broadcasting Corporation, 1985.

Rodinson, Maxime. *Europe and the Mystique of Islam.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1987.

Rycaut, Sir Paul. *The History of The Present State of the Ottoman Empire*. London: Charles Brom, 1686.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Books, 1978.

Schmuck, Stephan. "From Sermon to Play: Literary Representations of 'Turks' in Renaissance England 1550-1625." *Literature Compass*, 2, (2006): 1-29.

Schwoebel, Robert. *The Shadow of the Crescent: The Renaisssance Image of the Turk, 1453-1517.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1969.

Settle, Elkanah. *Ibrahim the Illustrious Bassa a Tragedy Acted by Their Majesties Servants.* 1676. ProQuest. Early English Books Online Publishings. Reproduction of the original in Harvard University Library.

Settle, Elkanah. "The Epistle Dedicatory." *Ibrahim the Illustrious Bassa*. London, Epub Version, 1676.

Shakespeare, William. *Othello.* London, 1604. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. 2nd ed. New York: Norton & Company, 2008.

Shaw, Stanford. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve Modern Türkiye,* Çev. Mehmet Harmancı. İstanbul: E. Yayınları, 1994.

Sisneros, Katie Sue. "The Abhorred Name of Turk": Muslims and the Politics of Identity in SeventeenthCentury English Broadside Ballads." PhD. Diss., University of Minnesota, 2006.

Smith, Byron Porter. *Islam in English Literature*, 2nd Ed. New York: Caravan Books, 1939.

Southern, Richard William. *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Swedenberg, H.T. Ed, *The Works of John Dryden*. 9 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956.

Şenlen, Sıla. "Richard Knolles' *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* as a Reflection of Christian Historiography." *Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi OTAM* 18.18 (2005): 379-393.

Tolan, John V. "Muslims as Pagan Idolaters in Chronicles of the First Crusade," *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other*. Ed. David R. Blanks & M. Frasetto. New York: St. Martin's Press. 1999.

Tolan, John V. *Saracens: Islam in the Medieval European Imagination*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.

Thaler**,** Alwin. "Thomas Heywood, D'Avenant, and *The Siege of Rhodes,*" *PMLA* 39 (1924): 624-641.

The Song of Roland, Ed. and Tr. Glyn Burgess. London: Penguin Books, 1990.

Thorp, Willard. "Introduction." *The Fatal Jealousie, 1673.* Germany: Tredition Classics 2012.

Tiryakilioğlu, Nevsal Olcen. "The Western Image of Turks from the Middle Ages to the 21st Cnetury: The Myth of 'Terrible Turk' and 'Lustful Turk.'" Ph.D. Diss., Nottingham Trent University, 2015.

Tomlinson, Tracey E. "The Restoration Heroic Plays of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900,* Vol. 43, No. 3. (2003): 559-577.

Turan, Ebru. "The Sultan's Favorite: Ibrahim Pasha and the Making of the Ottoman Universal Sovereignity in the Reign of Sultan Solyman (1516-1526)." Ph.D. Diss., The University of Chicago, 2007.

Unan, Fahri. "Kanuni Devri Şehzade Mücadeleleri ve Bunun Osmanlı Siyasi ve Sosyal Tarihi Bakımından Önemi." *Türk Yurdu*, X/35, Ankara, (1990): 9-16.

Uzunçarşılı, İ. Hakkı. "Kanuni Sultan Suleyman'in Vezir-i Azami Makbul ve Maktul ibrahim Paşa Padişah Damadi Degildi." *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten* 29. 113-116 (1965): 355-361.

Uzunçarşılı, İ. Hakkı. *Osmanlı Tarihi*. C.II. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1995.

Vaughan, Dorothy Margaret. *Europe and the Turk: A Pattern of Alliances, 1350-1700.* New York: Ams Pr Inc, 1954.

Vitkus, Daniel J. “Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Europe.” *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other.* Ed. David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999.

Vitkus ,Daniel J. *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Vivien, Thomas and William Tydeman. *Christopher Marlowe: The Plays and Their Sources.* London: Routledge, 1994.

Wann, Louis. “The Orient in Elizabethan Drama.” *Modern Philology* 12, No. 7 (1915): 423-447.

Wheatcroft, Andrew. *Infidels: A History of the Conflict between Christendom and Islam.* Newyork: Random House, 2005.

Wheatcroft, Andrew. *The Enemy at the Gate Habsburgs, Ottomans and the Battle for Europe.* New York: Basic Books, 2009.

Wheatcroft, Andrew. *The Ottomans.* London: Viking, 1993.

Winn, James. *John Dryden and His World.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.

Wiseman, Susan. *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Wiseman, Susan. “History Digested: Opera and Colonialism in the 1650s.” *Literature and the Civil War*. Ed. Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Wunder, Amanda. “Western Travelers, Eastern Antiquities, and the Image of the Turk in Early Modern Europe.” *Journal of Early Modern History 7*, No. 1/2 (2003): 89-119.

Yermolenko, Galina İ. *Roxolana in European Literature, History and Culture*. England: Ashgate, 2010.

Yücel, Yaşar and Ali Sevim. *Klasik Dönemin Üç Hükümdarı: Fatih, Yavuz, Kanuni*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1991.

Zimmermann, T.C. Price. *Paolo Giovio the Historian and the Crisis o f Sixteenth-Century Italy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995.